



2018

---

# Real Estate Scoring Document

# Contents

Management	
Policy & Disclosure	
Risks & Opportunities	
Monitoring & EMS	
Performance Indicators	
Building Certifications	
Stakeholder Engagement	
New Construction & Major Renovations	

# Document preface

---

This document aims to outline the scoring methodology of the 2018 Real Estate Assessment. It is shared for information purposes in an effort to increase transparency around the Assessment, Methodology and Scoring processes.

## How to read this document?

The GRESB Real Estate Scoring Document provides a visual breakdown of each indicator score included in the 2018 GRESB Real Estate Assessment. Since it does not include the reporting requirements of indicators, we recommend to read this document in conjunction with the 2018 GRESB Real Estate Reference Guide, available on our website at [www.gresb.com/resources](http://www.gresb.com/resources).

Each indicator presented in the GRESB Real Estate Scoring Document is presented in a consistent manner to reflect the 2018 GRESB Real Estate Reference Guide. In addition to this, numbers documented in red on the left side of each scored indicator have been added to provide the scoring breakdown of that indicator, as well as explanation underneath.

Numbers provided on the most left represent the fraction of the total number of points for that indicator that contributing to the overall indicator score, and apply to all options contained within their respective bracket (when applicable).

In addition, numbers provided within brackets represent the fraction of the fraction of the total number of points for that indicator contributing to the overall indicator score.

Finally, symbols "x" outside (or inside) brackets acts as a multiplier depending on the value associated to it. "x" can either refer to a validation decision (ex: based on a supporting evidence uploaded by the participant), a percentage number entered by the participant, or a quartile. What this multiplier applies to is documented in the narrative underneath each indicator in the Reference Guide.

## Example: Indicator ME2

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

Q22

☐ Yes

Select one of the following

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Developed internally

$\frac{2}{2}$  ☐ Bespoke (custom) internal system developed by a third party

Name of the organization

$\frac{2}{4}$

☐ External system

$\frac{2}{2}$  Name of the system: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the organization

Select the performance indicators included (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{4}{12}$  ☐ Energy consumption

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

$\frac{2}{12}$  ☐ GHG emissions/management

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Building safety

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Indoor environmental quality

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

$\frac{3}{4}$

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Resilience

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Waste streams/management

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Water

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**UPLOAD**

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

☐ No

**4 points , IM, E**

This indicator is split into three sections represented by two fractions and an "x" in the leftmost column. The first section is about the type of DMS system, the second is about which topics the system covers and the final section is for providing evidence. The leftmost column tells us that the score of the indicator is calculated as follows, where the section and evidence scores are all numbers between 0 and 1:

*Indicator score = (2/4 \* system type section score + 3/4 \* topics covered section score)  
\* evidence score \* 4 points*

Notice two things about the above calculation:

- Any scores used as multipliers are always applied last, after all the section scores with fraction weights are added up.
- The fractions add up to more than 1 ( $2/4 + 3/4 = 5/4 > 1$ )! Does this mean that it is possible to achieve  $5/4$  of the maximum score? No, whenever a sum of scores is calculated the maximum fraction score which can actually be achieved is always 1.

Note that this maximum is applied before any multipliers, so if the respondent got the maximum score for the first two sections of this indicator and had partially accepted evidence (resulting in a multiplier of 0.5) then their score would be;

$$\min(2/4 + 3/4, 1) * 0.5 = 4/8,$$

and not;

$$\min((2/4 + 3/4) * 0.5, 1) = 5/8.$$

The two sections in this indicator, defined by the two red brackets to the right of the section weights of  $2/4$  and  $3/4$ , are calculated as follows:

- The first section contains three radio buttons, of which only one can be selected and the fractions next to those buttons show the fraction of the section score achieved for selecting those options. Note that these fractions are fractions of the section score, which again has a weight expressed as the fraction of the maximum score for the indicator. This means that selecting "Developed internally" increases the indicator score by  $1/2 * 2/4 * 4 \text{ points} = 1 \text{ point}$ .
- The second section contains 8 checkboxes and each additional checkbox which is selected increases the section score by the fraction next to it.

Finally we have the evidence answer which results in a score which is used as a multiplier. The scoring methodology for more complicated answer types like evidence, text answers and table answers will always be described in further detail in the text below each indicator diagram. For validated evidence the standard scoring methodology is:

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0



# Management

---

## Sustainability Objectives

2017 Indicator

## MA1 Does the entity have specific ESG objectives?

Q1

☐ Yes

The objectives relate to (multiple answers possible)

- $\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ General sustainability
- $\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Environment
- $\frac{1}{4}$   $\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Social
- $\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Governance
- $\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Health and well-being

The objectives are

- $\frac{2}{2}$  ☐ Fully integrated into the overall business strategy
- $\frac{1}{4}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Partially integrated into the overall business strategy
- $\frac{0}{2}$  ☐ Not integrated into the overall business strategy

The objectives are

$\frac{2}{4}$  ☐ 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 \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{0}{4}$  ☐ 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

### 2 points , MP, G

The score of this indicator equals the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the number of ESG objectives multiplied by the evidence score;
2. the integration of the objective(s) into the business strategy;
3. the public availability of the objectives multiplied by the evidence score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.

**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)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ 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): \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ 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): \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ External consultants/manager

Name of the organization

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

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

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

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

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Investment partners (co-investors/JV partners)

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

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

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

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**3 points , MP, G**



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

☐ Yes

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

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Asset managers

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Board of Directors

$\frac{2}{8}$  ☐ External consultants

Name of the organization

$\frac{2}{8}$  ☐ Fund/portfolio managers

$\frac{2}{8}$  ☐ Property managers

$\frac{2}{8}$  ☐ Senior Management Team

$\frac{2}{8}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

2 points , MP, G

Q3

| Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

**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

- 1 ☐ Board of Directors
- 1 ☐ Senior Management Team
- 1 ☐ Fund/portfolio managers
- 2/4 ☐ Investment Committee
- 1/4 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**1 point , MP, G**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.

**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?

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Yes

☐ Financial consequences

☐ Non-financial consequences

$\frac{0}{2}$  ☐ No

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

- $\frac{3}{3}$  ☐ All employees
- $\frac{2}{3}$  ☐ Board of Directors
- $\frac{2}{3}$  ☐ Senior Management Team
- $\frac{2}{3}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

**3 points , MP, G**

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the existence of predetermined consequences of performance targets (financial or non-financial).
2. the group(s) of employees that the targets apply

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0



# 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?

☐ Yes

Select all environmental issues included (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Biodiversity and habitat

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Climate/climate change adaptation

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Energy consumption/management

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Environmental attributes of building materials

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ GHG emissions/management

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Resilience

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Waste management

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Water consumption/management

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

x

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

☐ No

3 points , MP, G

Q8

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

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

☐ Yes

Select all social issues included (multiple answers possible)

- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Child labor
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Diversity and equal opportunity
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Forced or compulsory labor
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Occupational safety (for employees)
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Asset level safety (for tenants)
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Labor-management relationships
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Employee performance and career development
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Stakeholder engagement
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Worker rights
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

×

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

☐ No

**2 points , MP, G**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

**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)

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Bribery and corruption

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Data protection and privacy

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Employee remuneration

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Executive compensation

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Fiduciary duty

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Fraud

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Political contributions

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Shareholder rights

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Whistleblower protection

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

×

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

☐ No

**2 points , MP, G**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

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

☐ 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

**Not scored , MP, G**

**|** This indicator is not scored and is used for reporting purposes only.





☐ Yes (multiple answers possible)

1/2

☐ Section in Annual Report  
 Select the applicable reporting level

2/4

4/4

☐ Entity

2/4

☐ Investment manager

1/4

☐ Group

or URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

1/2

Aligned with

2/3

☐ Stand-alone sustainability report(s)  
 Select the applicable reporting level

3/4

4/4

☐ Entity

2/4

☐ Investment manager

1/4

☐ Group

or URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

1/3

Aligned with

3/4

☐ Integrated Report  
 \*Integrated Report must be aligned with IIRC framework  
 Select the applicable reporting level

4/4

4/4

☐ Entity

2/4

☐ Investment manager

1/4

☐ Group

or URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

1/4

Aligned with

1

☐ Dedicated section on corporate website  
 Select the applicable reporting level

1/4

4/4

☐ Entity

2/4

☐ Investment manager

1/4

☐ Group

URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

1/2

☐ Section in entity reporting to investors  
 Aligned with



**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

- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Externally checked by
- $\frac{2}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Externally verified by  using
- $1$  ☐ Externally assured by  using

☐ Stand-alone sustainability report

- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Externally checked by
- $\frac{2}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Externally verified by  using
- $1$  ☐ Externally assured by  using

☐ Integrated Report

- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Externally checked by
- $\frac{2}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Externally verified by  using
- $1$  ☐ Externally assured by  using

☐ Section in entity reporting to investors

- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Externally checked by
- $\frac{2}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Externally verified by  using
- $1$  ☐ Externally assured by  using

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Externally checked by
- $\frac{2}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Externally verified by  using
- $1$  ☐ Externally assured by  using

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**2 points , MP, G**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

In order to achieve points for any of the checkboxes above, the number of points received in the corresponding section in PD5.1 must be higher than 0. Each response is validated using the evidence uploaded in PD5.1.

**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

**Not scored , MP, G**

| This indicator is not scored and is used for reporting purposes only.

**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

**Not scored , MP, G**

| This indicator is not scored and is used for reporting purposes only.

**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

**Not scored , MP, G**

**|** This indicator is not scored and is used for reporting purposes only.



# 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?**

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{2}{4}$  ☐ Investment due diligence process

☐ Training related to governance risks for employees (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Regular follow-ups

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ When an employee joins the organization

$\frac{2}{4}$  ☐ Whistle-blower mechanism

$\frac{2}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**1 point , IM, G**

**Q12**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

This indicator is linked to PD3. In order to achieve points for this indicator, the number of points received in PD3 must be higher than 0.

**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)

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Bribery and corruption

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Child labor

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Diversity and equal opportunity

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Executive compensation

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Forced or compulsory labor

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Labor-management relationships

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Shareholder rights

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Worker rights

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

x

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

☐ No

**2 points , IM, G**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0





**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)

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Building safety and materials

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Climate change adaptation

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Contamination

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Energy efficiency

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Energy supply

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Flooding

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ GHG emissions

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Health and well-being

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Indoor environmental quality

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Natural hazards

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Regulatory

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Resilience

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Socio-economic

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Transportation

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Water efficiency

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Waste management

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Water supply

$\frac{1}{8}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

×

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**2 points , IM, E**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

**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

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Biodiversity

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Climate change adaptation

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Contamination

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Energy efficiency

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Energy supply

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Flooding

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
GHG emissions

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Health and well-being

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Indoor environmental quality

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Natural hazards

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Regulatory

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Resilience

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Socio-economic

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Transportation

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Water efficiency

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Waste management

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Water supply

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☒ 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

**2 points , IM, E**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Percentage number: The coverage percentage number reported is used as a multiplier to determine the score assigned.

The question on third-party standard alignment of the risk assessments is not scored.

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.

**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

$\frac{1}{2}$  Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ External assessment

$\frac{4}{9}$   $\frac{2}{2}$  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

$\frac{1}{2}$  Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ External assessment

$\frac{3}{9}$   $\frac{2}{2}$  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

$\frac{1}{2}$  Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ External assessment

$\frac{1}{9}$   $\frac{2}{2}$  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

$\frac{1}{2}$  Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ External assessment

$\frac{1}{9}$   $\frac{2}{2}$  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

**4.5 points , IM, E**

Each type of technical building assessment is assigned with a maximum number of points achieved by:

1. the nature of the assessment (in-house or external assessment)
2. the percentage of portfolio covered

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4

< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

3. the validation status of the corresponding evidence

Evidence: The evidence is validated and assigned a score which is used as a multiplying factor, according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

## 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

### 3 points, IM, E

Each measure is assigned a maximum of 1.5 points, multiplied by a factor associated with the percentage of portfolio covered during the last 4 years. Percentage is provided by selecting one of four drop down menu options. The score given for each coverage percentage drop down option is described in the table below:

Drop down option    Score

> 0%, < 25%	2/6
≥ 25%, < 50%	3/6
≥ 50%, < 75%	4/6
≥ 75%, ≤ 100%	6/6

Note that measures have to be accepted during the validation process for any points to be achieved. The score of each measure is finally aggregated to determine the score of this indicator.

☐ 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

2.5 points , IM, E

Each measure is assigned a maximum of 1.25 points, multiplied by a factor associated with the percentage of portfolio covered during the last 4 years. Percentage is provided by selecting one of four drop down menu options. The score given for each coverage percentage drop down option is described in the table below:

Drop down option	Score
> 0%, < 25%	2/5
≥ 25%, < 50%	3/5
≥ 50%, < 75%	4/5
≥ 75%, ≤ 100%	5/5

Note that measures have to be accepted during the validation process for any points to be achieved. The score of each mesure is finally aggregated to determine the score of this indicator.

## 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

### 1 point , IM, E

Each measure is assigned a maximum of 0.5 points, multiplied by a factor associated with the percentage of portfolio covered during the last 4 years. Percentage is provided by selecting one of four drop down menu options. The score given for each coverage percentage drop down option is described in the table below:

Drop down option    Score

> 0%, < 25%	2/5
≥ 25%, < 50%	3/5
≥ 50%, < 75%	4/5
≥ 75%, ≤ 100%	5/5

Note that measures have to be accepted during the validation process for any points to be achieved. The score of each measure is finally aggregated to determine the score of this indicator.



# Monitoring & EMS

## Environmental Management Systems

2017 Indicator

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

☐ Yes

☐ The EMS is aligned with a standard

1 ☐ ISO 14001

5/6 1 ☐ EMAS (EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme)

1 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ The EMS is externally certified by an independent third party

Name of the organization

1 ☐ ISO 14001

6/6 1 ☐ EMAS (EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme)

1 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

3/6 ☐ The EMS is not aligned with a standard nor certified externally

#### UPLOAD

x

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

☐ No

3 points , MP, G

Q21.1 &  
Q21.2

This indicator consists of three mutually exclusive options:

1. An externally certified EMS has a maximum score of 3 points;
2. An EMS aligned with an accepted standard has a maximum score of 2.5 points;
3. An EMS that is not aligned with a standard nor certified externally has a maximum score of 1.5 points

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0





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

Q22

☐ Yes

Select one of the following

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Developed internally

$\frac{2}{2}$  ☐ Bespoke (custom) internal system developed by a third party

Name of the organization

$\frac{2}{4}$  ☐ External system

$\frac{2}{2}$  Name of the system: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the organization

Select the performance indicators included (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{4}{12}$  ☐ Energy consumption

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

$\frac{2}{12}$  ☐ GHG emissions/management

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Building safety

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Indoor environmental quality

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Resilience

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Waste streams/management

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Water

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

$\frac{1}{12}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**UPLOAD**

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

☐ No

**4 points , IM, E**

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the type of the system;

◦ If the DMS is an external system, the name of the system must be provided in the text box.

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score

Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

2. the performance indicators included in the system.

- Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.
- The percentage of portfolio covered by each checkbox option does not affect the score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Scores of section 1 and 2 above are then aggregated and capped at 4 points

## Monitoring Consumption

2017 Indicator

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

☐ Yes

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

Type of monitoring (multiple answers possible)

☐ Automatic meter readings

$\frac{3}{3}$  Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Based on invoices

$\frac{2}{3}$  Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Manual-visual readings

$\frac{1}{3}$  Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Provided by the tenant

$\frac{1}{3}$  Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{3}$  1 Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

Q23

3 points, IM, E

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

Percentage of whole portfolio covered by floor area is not used for scoring but for reporting purpose only.

**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<sup>4</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%☐ Based on invoices<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%☐ Manual-visual readings<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%☐ Provided by the tenant<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> 1 Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%☐ No☐ Not applicable**2 points , IM, E**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

Percentage of whole portfolio covered by floor area is not used for scoring but for reporting purpose only.

**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

**Not scored , IM, E**

**|** This indicator is not scored and is used for reporting purposes only.



# Performance Indicators

The indicators in this Aspect are reported and scored separately for each property type. The total score of the Aspect is calculated by taking a weighted average of the scores per property type weighted by the GAV percentage allocated to each property type in RC5.1.

## Energy Consumption Data

2017 Indicator

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

☐ 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

Not scored

Q25.0

## 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	N/A
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

12 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The score of this indicator equals the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. Data coverage = 8 points;
2. Like-for-Like performance improvement = 2 points.
3. Like-for-Like data availability = 0.5 points;
4. Asset-level data reporting = 1.5 points;

#### Data coverage:

Data coverage percentages are calculated and scored separately against different benchmarks for landlord and tenant obtained data for each property type, where "landlord obtained" and "tenant obtained" are defined as:

- Landlord obtained data:
  - Managed Assets: Base Building, Tenant Space purchased by Landlord, and Whole Building.
- Tenant obtained data:
  - Managed Assets: Tenant space purchased by tenant;
  - Indirectly Managed Assets: Whole building.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  where  $b_1 < b_2 < b_3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage	Fraction of maximum score
0%	0/4
< 0%, $b_1$ >	1/4
[ $b_1$ , $b_2$ >	2/4
[ $b_2$ , $b_3$ >	3/4
[ $b_3$ ,100% ]	4/4

The resulting scores are then aggregated to a single score using a weighted mean with weights determined by floor area, except for base building and tenant space for which base building has a static weight of 40% and tenant space has a static weight of 60%. As tenant space has both a landlord obtained and a tenant obtained section the 60% weight has to be shared between the two which is done based on relative floor area. If a respondent reports on both base building pluss tenant space and whole building, then base building pluss tenant space is given a weight based on floor area which is then split further based on the 40% - 60% weights.

#### Like-for-Like performance improvement:

Like-for-Like performance is scored based on the percentage change in consumption using a methodology identical to the scoring of data coverage, except for that having a lower value (for example a negative one) which ends up in a lower quartile will always result in a higher or equal score, and that scores are aggregated using Like-for-Like consumption in the previous year as weights instead of area. If the GRESB reporting universe does not contain a sufficient number of peers to construct a global benchmark (minimum of 12), the benchmark will use a static model with cut off points at: -5%, -2.5% and 0%.



We will refer to the three benchmark numbers  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  where  $b_1 < b_2 < b_3$ . These will be used to split the LFL percentage changes into four intervals. As for data coverage the score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their LFL percentage change lands in, but how many points are given for each interval depends on the relationship between the mean, median and 0 percentage change. Which percentage change results in which score depending on the different relationships between the mean, median and 0 percentage change are described in the tables below:

If  $0 < \text{mean} \ \& \ \text{median} < \text{mean}$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b_1$	3/3
$b_1 \leq LFLpc < b_2 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq \text{mean}$	2/3
$b_2 \leq LFLpc < b_3 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq \text{mean}$	1/3
$b_3 \leq LFLpc \ \text{or} \ LFLpc > \text{mean}$	0/3

If  $\text{mean} \leq 0$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b_1$	3/3
$b_1 \leq LFLpc < b_2 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq 0$	2/3
$b_2 \leq LFLpc < b_3 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq 0$	1/3
$b_3 \leq LFLpc \ \text{or} \ LFLpc > 0$	0/3

If  $0 < \text{mean} \leq \text{median}$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b_1$	3/3
$b_1 \leq LFLpc < b_2 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq \text{mean}$	2/3
$b_2 \leq LFLpc \ \text{or} \ LFLpc > \text{mean}$	0/3

Like-for-Like data availability:

Points for Like-for-Like data availability are given if any Like-for-Like data is provided and not excluded in the GRESB outlier check.

Asset-level data reporting:

Points relating to asset-level data reporting are granted if participants report their energy consumption values at asset-level.

Open text box: The content of this open text box is not used for scoring, but will be included in the Benchmark Report.

Outlier checks:

GRESB performs two outlier checks for the data provided in this indicator, one based on the energy consumption intensity per square meter and one based on the percentage change in like-for-like consumption.

Intensity outliers:

For intensities, GRESB checks whether the reported values result in an intensity outside a range of expected values. If the value is outside that range, then the respondent is requested to provide an explanation for why their data is abnormal and this explanation is then checked in combination with statistics on the distribution of intensities for the same property type. If the explanation is not accepted, then the respondent will be scored as if they didn't provide the data associated with the explanation.

Like-for-like outliers:

For like-for-like changes, GRESB checks whether the provided values result in absolute percentage changes greater than a threshold between 10% and 20% depending on the like-for-like values reported for the previous year. Higher values result in a lower threshold for what is deemed abnormal. As for intensities, if an outlier is flagged the respondent is prompted to explain the abnormal value and the explanation is then

checked in combination with statistics on like-for-like changes for the given property type. Data associated with explanations which are not accepted are treated as if they were not provided for all scoring purposes.

## 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
$\frac{1}{4}$ Energy use intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Air conditioning and/or natural ventilation
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Building age
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Degree days
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Footfall
- $\frac{2}{4}$   $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Occupancy rate
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Operational hours
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Weather conditions
- $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ None of the above

$\frac{2}{4}$  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

### 1.5 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

- Reporting intensity data for the current reporting year;
- Number of selected intensity normalization factor;
  - Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.
  - The checkbox "None of the above" is not scored.
- The validation status of the open text box.

Text Box: The text box is validated, and its validation status is determined based on the requirements of the indicators. Various validation status lead to different scores according to the table below:

Validation status    Score

Full points	2/2
Partial points	1/2

No point	0
----------	---

### 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

### 3 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The scoring of this indicator is split into two parts. The first part can result in a maximum of 2/3 of the maximum score. This is achieved if any on-site renewable energy was generated in the current year. If this is not the case, but some off-site renewable energy was generated in the current year, then 1/3 of the maximum score is achieved instead.

The remaining 1/3 of the maximum score is given based on the percentage renewable energy in the current year and the improvement compared to the previous year. These two elements are combined using the following formula, where  $p$  is the percentage renewable energy and  $i$  is the improvement score:

$$\text{Score} = (100 + p) / 200 * p / 100 + (100 - p) / 200 * i$$

The improvement score is calculated based on the improvement in the percentage renewable energy compared to the previous year, if there was one. The improvement is compared against a benchmark based on the improvements of other respondents which is constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with improvements (changes greater than 0%) within the same property type and region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with improvements within the property type across all regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with improvements across all property types within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
4. If the step above failed, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of the percentage improvements across all regions and property types.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as  $b1$ ,  $b2$  and  $b3$  where  $b1 < b2 < b3$ , these numbers are used to split the improvement percentages into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their improvement percentage lands in. The relationship between improvement percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Improvement percentage	Fraction of maximum score
$\leq 0\%$	0/4
$< 0\%, b1 >$	1/4
$[ b1, b2 >$	2/4

[ b2,b3 >	3/4
>= b3	4/4

#### PI1.4 Review, verification and assurance of energy consumption data

Q25.4

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

☐ Yes

2/6 ☐ Externally checked

Checked by

3/4 ☐ Externally verified

4/6 Verified by

1/4 Using scheme

5/6 ☐ Externally assured

6/6 Assured by

1/6 Using scheme

**UPLOAD**

×

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

#### 1 point , MP, E

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the level of the third-party data review
2. the verification/assurance standard scheme (if applicable)

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Scheme name: Scheme name must be accepted during the validation process to receive its associated score.

**PI2.0 Does the entity collect GHG emissions data for this property type?**

**Q26.0**

☐ 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

**Not scored**

## 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 Consumption				Like-for-Like Consumption			
	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		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

### 3.5 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The score of this indicator equals the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. Data coverage = 2 points;
2. Like-for-Like performance improvement = 1 points.
3. Asset-level data reporting = 0.5 points;

Data coverage:

Data coverage percentages are calculated and scored separately against different benchmarks for scope 1, 2 and 3.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.



Referring to the three benchmark numbers as  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  where  $b_1 < b_2 < b_3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage    Fraction of maximum score

0%	0/4
$< 0\%, b_1 >$	1/4
$[ b_1, b_2 >$	2/4
$[ b_2, b_3 >$	3/4
$[ b_3, 100\% ]$	4/4

The resulting scores for each scope are aggregated to a single score using a weighted mean using the maximum data coverages as weights.

Like-for-Like performance improvement:

Like-for-Like performance is scored based on the percentage change in consumption using a methodology identical to the scoring of data coverage, except for that having a lower value (for example a negative one) which ends up in a lower quartile will always result in a higher or equal score, and that scores are aggregated using Like-for-Like consumption in the previous year as weights instead of area. If the GRESB reporting universe does not contain a sufficient number of peers to construct a global benchmark (minimum of 12), the benchmark will use a static model with cut off points at: -5%, -2.5% and 0%.

We will refer to the three benchmark numbers  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  where  $b_1 < b_2 < b_3$ . These will be used to split the LFL percentage changes into four intervals. As for data coverage the score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their LFL percentage change lands in, but how many points are given for each interval depends on the relationship between the mean, median and 0 percentage change. Which percentage change results in which score depending on the different relationships between the mean, median and 0 percentage change are described in the tables below:

If  $0 < \text{mean} \ \& \ \text{median} < \text{mean}$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b_1$	3/3
$b_1 \leq LFLpc < b_2 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq \text{mean}$	2/3
$b_2 \leq LFLpc < b_3 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq \text{mean}$	1/3
$b_3 \leq LFLpc \ \text{or} \ LFLpc > \text{mean}$	0/3

If  $\text{mean} \leq 0$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b_1$	3/3
$b_1 \leq LFLpc < b_2 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq 0$	2/3
$b_2 \leq LFLpc < b_3 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq 0$	1/3
$b_3 \leq LFLpc \ \text{or} \ LFLpc > 0$	0/3

If  $0 < \text{mean} \ \& \ \text{median}$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b_1$	3/3
$b_1 \leq LFLpc < b_2 \ \& \ LFLpc \leq \text{mean}$	2/3
$b_2 \leq LFLpc \ \text{or} \ LFLpc > \text{mean}$	0/3

Asset-level data reporting:

Points relating to the asset-level data reporting are granted if participants report their GHG emissions at asset-level.

Open text box: The content of this open text box is not used for scoring, but will be included in the Benchmark Report.

Outlier checks:

GRESB performs two outlier checks for the data provided in this indicator, one based on the GHG emissions intensity per square meter and one based on the percentage change in like-for-like consumption.

Intensity outliers:

For intensities, GRESB checks whether the reported values result in an intensity outside a range of expected values. If the value is outside that range, then the respondent is requested to provide an explanation for why their data is abnormal and this explanation is then checked in combination with statistics on the distribution of intensities for the same property type. If the explanation is not accepted, then the respondent will be scored as if they didn't provide the data associated with the explanation.

Like-for-like outliers:

For like-for-like changes, GRESB checks whether the provided values result in absolute percentage changes greater than a threshold between 10% and 20% depending on the like-for-like values reported for the previous year. Higher values result in a lower threshold for what is deemed abnormal. As for intensities, if an outlier is flagged the respondent is prompted to explain the abnormal value and the explanation is then checked in combination with statistics on like-for-like changes for the given property type. Data associated with explanations which are not accepted are treated as if they were not provided for all scoring purposes.

## 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
$\frac{1}{4}$ GHG emissions intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

- $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{2}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$

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

$\frac{2}{4}$  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

0.75 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

- Reporting intensity data for the current reporting year;
- Number of selected intensity normalization factor;
  - Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.
  - There is also a checkbox for answering "None of the above" which is not scored.
- The validation status of the open text box.

Text Box: The text box is validated, and its validation status is determined based on the requirements of the indicators. Various validation status lead to different scores according to the table below:

Validation status    Score

Full points	2/2
Partial points	1/2
No point	0

### PI2.3 Review, verification and assurance GHG emissions data

Q26.3

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

☐ Yes

2/6

☐ Externally checked

Checked by

3/4

☐ Externally verified

4/6

Verified by

1/4

Using scheme

5/6

☐ Externally assured

6/6

Assured by

1/6

Using scheme

**UPLOAD**

×

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

0.75 points , MP, E

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the level of the third-party data review
2. the verification/assurance standard scheme (if applicable)

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Scheme name: Scheme name must be accepted during the validation process to receive its associated score.

### 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

Not scored

### 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

### 3.5 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The score of this indicator equals the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. Data coverage = 2 points;
2. Like-for-Like performance improvement = 1 points.
3. Asset-level data reporting = 0.5 points;

Data coverage:

Data coverage percentages are calculated and scored separately against different benchmarks for landlord and tenant obtained data for each property type, where "landlord obtained" and "tenant obtained" are defined as:

- Landlord obtained data:
  - Managed Assets: Base Building, Tenant Space purchased by Landlord, and Whole Building.
- Tenant obtained data:
  - Managed Assets: Tenant space purchased by tenant;
  - Indirectly Managed Assets: Whole building.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  where  $b_1 < b_2 < b_3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage	Fraction of maximum score
0%	0/4
$< 0\%, b_1 >$	1/4
$[ b_1, b_2 >$	2/4
$[ b_2, b_3 >$	3/4
$[ b_3, 100\% ]$	4/4

The resulting scores are then aggregated to a single score using a weighted mean with weights determined by floor area, except for base building and tenant space for which base building has a static weight of 40% and tenant space has a static weight of 60%. As tenant space has both a landlord obtained and a tenant obtained section the 60% weight has to be shared between the two which is done based on relative floor area. If a respondent reports on both base building plus tenant space and whole building, then base building plus tenant space is given a weight based on floor area which is then split further based on the 40% - 60% weights.

Like-for-Like performance improvement:

Like-for-Like performance is scored based on the percentage change in consumption using a methodology identical to the scoring of data coverage, except for that having a lower value (for example a negative one) which ends up in a lower quartile will always result in a higher or equal score, and that scores are aggregated using Like-for-Like consumption in the previous year as weights instead of area. If the GRESB reporting universe does not contain a sufficient number of peers to construct a global benchmark (minimum of 12), the benchmark will use a static model with cut off points at: -5%, -2.5% and 0%.

We will refer to the three benchmark numbers  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  where  $b_1 < b_2 < b_3$ . These will be used to split the LFL percentage changes into four intervals. As for data coverage the score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their LFL percentage change lands in, but how many points are given for each interval depends on the relationship between the mean, median and 0 percentage change. Which percentage change results in which score depending on the different relationships between the mean, median and 0 percentage change are described in the tables below:

If  $0 < \text{mean} \ \& \ \text{median} < \text{mean}$ :

Condition	Score
$LFL_{pc} < b_1$	3/3

$b1 = < LFLpc < b2 \ \& \ LFLpc = < mean$	2/3
$b2 = < LFLpc < b3 \ \& \ LFLpc = < mean$	1/3
$b3 = < LFLpc \ or \ LFLpc > mean$	0/3

If  $mean = < 0$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b1$	3/3
$b1 = < LFLpc < b2 \ \& \ LFLpc = < 0$	2/3
$b2 = < LFLpc < b3 \ \& \ LFLpc = < 0$	1/3
$b3 = < LFLpc \ or \ LFLpc > 0$	0/3

If  $0 < mean = < median$ :

Condition	Score
$LFLpc < b1$	3/3
$b1 = < LFLpc < b2 \ \& \ LFLpc = < mean$	2/3
$b2 = < LFLpc \ or \ LFLpc > mean$	0/3

Asset-level data reporting:

Points relating to the asset-level data reporting are granted if participants report their water consumption values at asset-level.

Open text box: The content of this open text box is not used for scoring, but will be included in the Benchmark Report.

Outlier checks:

GRESB performs two outlier checks for the data provided in this indicator, one based on the water consumption intensity per square meter and one based on the percentage change in like-for-like consumption.

Intensity outliers:

For intensities, GRESB checks whether the reported values result in an intensity outside a range of expected values. If the value is outside that range, then the respondent is requested to provide an explanation for why their data is abnormal and this explanation is then checked in combination with statistics on the distribution of intensities for the same property type. If the explanation is not accepted, then the respondent will be scored as if they didn't provide the data associated with the explanation.

Like-for-like outliers:

For like-for-like changes, GRESB checks whether the provided values result in absolute percentage changes greater than a threshold between 10% and 20% depending on the like-for-like values reported for the previous year. Higher values result in a lower threshold for what is deemed abnormal. As for intensities, if an outlier is flagged the respondent is prompted to explain the abnormal value and the explanation is then checked in combination with statistics on like-for-like changes for the given property type. Data associated with explanations which are not accepted are treated as if they were not provided for all scoring purposes.

### 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
$\frac{1}{4}$ Water use intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

- $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{2}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$   
 $\frac{1}{4}$

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

$\frac{2}{4}$  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

0.75 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

- Reporting intensity data for the current reporting period;
- Number of selected intensity normalization factor;
  - Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.
  - There is also a checkbox for answering "None of the above" which is not scored.
- The validation status of the open text box.

Text Box: The text box is validated, and its validation status is determined based on the requirements of the indicators. Various validation status lead to different scores according to the table below:

Validation status    Score

Full points	2/2
Partial points	1/2
No point	0





☐ 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

### 0.5 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The scoring of this indicator is split into two parts. The first part can result in a maximum of 2/3 of the maximum score. This is achieved if any on-site water reuse and recycling data is entered for the current year.

The remaining 1/3 of the maximum score is given based on the percentage reused and recycled water in the current year and the improvement compared to the previous year. These two elements are combined using the following formula, where  $p$  is the percentage reused and recycled water and  $i$  is the improvement score:

$$\text{Score} = (100 + p) / 200 * p / 100 + (100 - p) / 200 * i$$

The improvement score is calculated based on the improvement in the percentage reused and recycled water compared to the previous year, if there was one. The improvement is compared against a benchmark based on the improvements of other respondents which is constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with improvements (changes greater than 0%) within the same property type and region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with improvements within the property type across all regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with improvements across all property types within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
4. If the step above failed, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of the percentage improvements across all regions and property types.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as  $b1$ ,  $b2$  and  $b3$  where  $b1 < b2 < b3$ , these numbers are used to split the improvement percentages into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their improvement percentage lands in. The relationship between improvement percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Improvement percentage	Fraction of maximum score
$\leq 0\%$	0/4
$< 0\%, b1 >$	1/4
$[ b1, b2 >$	2/4
$[ b2, b3 >$	3/4

**PI3.4 Review, verification and assurance water consumption data****Q27.4**

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

☐ Yes

2/6

☐ Externally checkedChecked by 

3/4

☐ Externally verified

4/6

Verified by 

1/4

Using scheme 

5/6

☐ Externally assured

6/6

Assured by 

1/6

Using scheme **UPLOAD**

x

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

☐ No☐ Not applicable**0.75 points , MP, E**

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the level of the third-party data review
2. the verification/assurance standard scheme (if applicable)

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Scheme name: Scheme name must be accepted during the validation process to receive its associated score.

**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**Not scored**

## 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

### 3.25 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

The score of this indicator equals the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. Data coverage = 1.5 points;
2. Proportion of waste diverted = 1.5 points.
3. Asset-level data reporting = 0.25 points;

Data coverage:

Data coverage percentages for the current year are scored separately against different benchmarks for directly and indirectly managed assets for each property type.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  where  $b_1 < b_2 < b_3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage    Fraction of maximum score

0%	0/4
$< 0\%, b_1 >$	1/4
$[ b_1, b_2 >$	2/4
$[ b_2, b_3 >$	3/4
$[ b_3, 100\% ]$	4/4

The resulting scores are then aggregated to a single score using a weighted mean with weights determined by the reported percentage of indirectly managed area from RC5.1.

Proportion of waste diverted:

The percentage of waste diverted (total) for the current reporting year is scored the same way as data coverage, except that there is only one benchmark and one score for each property type as this number is not reported separately for directly and indirectly managed assets.

Asset-level data reporting:

Points relating to the asset-level data reporting are granted if participants report their waste consumption values at asset-level.

Open text box: The content of this open text box is not used for scoring, but will be included in the Benchmark Report.

Outlier checks:

For this indicator we only do an outlier check based on the waste generation intensity per square meter.

For intensities, GRESB checks whether the reported values result in an intensity outside a range of expected values. If the value is outside that range, then the respondent is requested to provide an explanation for why their data is abnormal and this explanation is then checked in combination with statistics on the distribution of intensities for the same property type. If the explanation is not accepted, then the respondent will be scored as if they didn't provide the data associated with the explanation.

## PI4.2 Review, verification and assurance of waste management data

Q28.2

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

☐ Yes

2/6

☐ Externally checked

Checked by

3/4

☐ Externally verified

4/6

Verified by

1/4

Using scheme

5/6

☐ Externally assured

6/6

Assured by

1/6

Using scheme

**UPLOAD**

×

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

0.75 points , MP, E

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the level of the third-party data review
2. the verification/assurance standard scheme (if applicable)

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Scheme name: Scheme name must be accepted during the validation process to receive its associated score.

**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**3 points , MP, E**

Participants receive 0.75 points for each reported target and additional 0.25 point if the target is externally communicated.

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.



# Building Certifications

---

The indicators in this Aspect are reported and scored separately for each property type, resulting in a score for each property type. The maximum points available for BC1.1 is 10 points and the maximum points available for BC1.2 is 12 points. The two scores are then added up and capped at a maximum of 12 points. The maximum points available for BC2 is 3 points.

. The achieved scores are then aggregated across property types by taking a weighted average of the scores weighted by the percentage of GAV invested in each property type listed in RC5.1.

## 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

**10 points , IM, E**

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

Each certification is validated by GRESB according to a list of predefined criteria which can result in several possible validation decision outcomes to which a weight is associated:

Validation status   Weight

Full points	1.0
Partial plus	0.6
Partial minus	0.3
No points	0.0

The overall portfolio coverage of building certification of this indicator is the sum of weighted coverage percentages of each reported certification scheme. The overall portfolio coverage number is benchmarked to determine the overall score of the indicator.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as b1, b2 and b3 where  $b1 < b2 < b3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage   Fraction of maximum score

0%	0/4
< 0%,b1 >	1/4
[ b1,b2 >	2/4

[ b2,b3 >	3/4
[ b3,100% ]	4/4

Level of certification is for reporting purposes only and not used for scoring.

## 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

### 12 points, IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

Each certification is validated by GRESB according to a list of predefined criteria which can result in several possible validation decision outcomes to which a weight is associated:

Validation status    Weight

Full points	1.0
Partial plus	0.6
Partial minus	0.3
No points	0.0

The overall portfolio coverage of building certification of this indicator is the sum of weighted coverage percentages of each reported certification scheme. The overall portfolio coverage number is benchmarked to determine the overall score of the indicator.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as b1, b2 and b3 where  $b1 < b2 < b3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage    Fraction of maximum score

0%	0/4
< 0%, b1 >	1/4
[ b1, b2 >	2/4
[ b2, b3 >	3/4

[ b3,100% ]	4/4
-------------	-----

Level of certification is for reporting purposes only and not used for scoring.



**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

	the country]	assets	2016	2017
Country ▼				
Country ▼				

\*full flexibility to describe performance

- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable

### 3 points , IM, E

This indicator is answered separately for each property type. These answers are also scored per property type, resulting in multiple scores for the same indicator. Scores are aggregated across property types by taking a weighted mean of the property type scores, weighted by the percentage of GAV reported for each property type in R1.1.

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

The coverage percentage used for scoring is equal to the sum of the 5 coverage percentages. If the sum is greater than 100% it is treated as if it is 100%. These coverage percentages are then scored against a property type specific benchmark consisting of three cut-off numbers.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as b1, b2 and b3 where  $b1 < b2 < b3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage	Fraction of maximum score
0%	0/4
< 0%,b1 >	1/4
[ b1,b2 >	2/4
[ b2,b3 >	3/4
[ b3,100% ]	4/4

Levels of certification is for reporting purposes only and not used for scoring.



# 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

<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>

\_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of employees who received sustainability-specific training in 2017

<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>

\_\_\_\_\_

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

2 points , IM, S

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

The training topics are not used for scoring but for reporting purpose only.

## 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

<sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub> Percentage of employees covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

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

☐ By an independent third party

<sup>3</sup>/<sub>3</sub> 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

1.5 points , IM, S

Points are awarded based on the percentage of employees covered of the selected survey type(s).

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

The survey response rate and the quantitative metrics sub-indicator are not used for scoring but for reporting purpose only.

Evidence: The evidence is validated and assigned a score which is used as a multiplying factor, according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

**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)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Development of action plan

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Feedback sessions with Senior Management Team

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Feedback sessions with separate teams/departments

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Focus groups

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**1 point, IM, S**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

This indicator is linked to SE2.1. In order to achieve points for this indicator, the number of points received in SE2.1 must be higher than 0.

### 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

$\frac{1}{2}$  Percentage of employees: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Physical and/or mental health checks

$\frac{1}{2}$  Percentage of employees: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{2}$  1 Percentage of employees: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

1 point , IM, S

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

**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

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

1 ☐ Absentee rate: \_\_\_\_\_

1 ☐ Injury rate: \_\_\_\_\_

1 ☐ Lost day rate: \_\_\_\_\_

1 ☐ Other metrics: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

0.5 points , IM, S

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

The score awarded to the option Work station and/or workplace checks is based on the percentage of employees covered.

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

The rate of the metrics reported is not scored.

It is mandatory to use the open text box to explain the applied calculation method/formula and monitoring scope of each of the selected metrics.

Text Box: The text box is validated, and its validation status is determined based on the requirements of the indicators. Various validation status lead to different scores according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Full points	2/2
Partial points	1/2
No point	0

## 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)

- 1/4 ☐ Business ethics
- 1/4 ☐ Environmental process standards
- 1/4 ☐ Environmental product standards
- 1/4 ☐ Human rights
- 2/3 1/4 ☐ Human health-based product standards
- 1/4 ☐ Occupational safety
- 1/4 ☐ Health and well-being
- 1/4 ☐ ESG-specific requirements for sub-contractors
- 1/4 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

- 1/2 ☐ Contractors
- 1/2 ☐ Property/asset managers
- 1/3 1/2 ☐ Suppliers
- 1/2 ☐ Supply chain (beyond 1 tier suppliers and contractors)
- 1/2 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

×

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**3 points , MP, G**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

**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

**Not scored , MP, G**

**I** This indicator is not scored and is used for reporting purposes only.



**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

**2 points , IM, S**

The scoring of this indicator is based on the number of selected monitor methods.

If the entity requires external property/asset managers' alignment with a professional standard, the name of the standard must be provided in the text box.

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

**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)

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Checks performed by an independent third party

Name of the organization

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Regular meetings and/or checks performed by the organization's employees

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Regular meetings and/or checks performed by external property/asset managers

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

$\frac{3}{8}$  Standard: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Supplier/service provider sustainability training

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Supplier/service provider self-assessments

$\frac{3}{8}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**2 points , IM, S**

If the entity requires supplier/service providers' to align with a professional standard, the name of the standard must be provided in the text box.

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

**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

**Not scored , MP, S**

**I** This indicator is not scored and is used for reporting purposes only.

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

☐ Yes

Select all approaches to engage tenants (multiple answers possible)

☐ Building/asset communication

$\frac{2}{8}$

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

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

$\frac{3}{8}$

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Social media/online platform

$\frac{2}{8}$

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant engagement meetings

$\frac{3}{8}$

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant events focused on increasing sustainability awareness

$\frac{2}{8}$

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant sustainability guide

$\frac{2}{8}$

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant sustainability training

$\frac{3}{8}$

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{2}{8}$

1

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ No

4 points , IM, S

Q36

Percentage portfolio covered: The coverage percentage number is provided by selecting one of four drop-down menu options. The selected option then acts as a multiplier to determine the score according to the table below:

Drop down option	Multiplier
0% - 25%	0.25
25% - 50%	0.50
50% - 75%	0.75
75% - 100%	1.00

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

**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

<sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub> Percentage of tenants covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

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

☐ By an independent third party

<sup>3</sup>/<sub>3</sub> 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

**3 points , IM, S**

Points are awarded based on the percentage of tenants covered of the selected survey type(s).

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

The survey response rate and the quantitative metrics sub-indicator are not used for scoring but for reporting purpose only.

Evidence: The evidence is validated and assigned a score which is used as a multiplying factor, according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

**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)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Development of an asset-specific action plan

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Feedback sessions with asset/property managers

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Feedback sessions with individual tenants

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the tenant satisfaction improvement program (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**1 point , IM, S**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.

This indicator is linked to SE8.1. In order to achieve points for this indicator, the number of points received in SE8.1 must be higher than 0.

**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

<sup>3</sup>/<sub>6</sub>  ▼

☐ Tenant fit-out guides

<sup>2</sup>/<sub>6</sub>  ▼

☐ Minimum fit-out standards are prescribed

<sup>2</sup>/<sub>6</sub>  ▼

☐ Procurement assistance for tenants

<sup>3</sup>/<sub>6</sub>  ▼

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>2</sup>/<sub>6</sub> 1  ▼

☐ No

**3 points , IM, E**

Percentage portfolio covered: The coverage percentage number is provided by selecting one of four drop down menu options, and the number is used as a multiplier to multiply the score assigned according to the table below:

Drop down option    Multiplier

0% - 25%	0.25
25% - 50%	0.50
50% - 75%	0.75
75% - 100%	1.00

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

**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

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Environmental initiatives

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Enabling upgrade works

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Sustainability management collaboration

$\frac{1}{3}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Premises design for performance

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Managing waste from works

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Social initiatives

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Management and consumption

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Energy management

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Water management

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Waste management

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Indoor environmental quality management

$\frac{1}{3}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Sustainable procurement

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Sustainable utilities

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Sustainable transport

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Sustainable cleaning

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Reporting and standards

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Information sharing

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Performance rating

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Design/development rating

$\frac{1}{3}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Performance standards

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Metering

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Comfort

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

3 points , IM, E



Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

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

**Q39.2**

☐ Yes

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

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**1 point , IM, E**

Text Box: The text box is validated, and its validation status is determined based on the requirements of the indicators. Various validation status lead to different scores according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Full points	2/2
Partial points	1/2
No point	0

This indicator is linked to SE10.1. In order to achieve points for this indicator, the number of points received in SE10.1 must be higher than 0.

**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)

- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Effective communication and process to address community concerns
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Enhancement programs for public spaces
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Employment creation in local communities
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Community health and well-being
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Research and network activities
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Resilience, including assistance or support in case of disaster
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Supporting charities and community groups
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Sustainability education program
- $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

---

☐ No☐ Not applicable**3 points , IM, S**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.

### 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)

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Housing affordability

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Impact on crime levels

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Livability score

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Local income generated

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Local residents' well-being

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Walkability score

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

1.5 points , IM, S

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

# 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)

- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Biodiversity and habitat
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Climate/climate change adaptation
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Energy consumption/management
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Environmental attributes of building materials
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ GHG emissions/management
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Green building certifications
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Building safety
- $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Health and well-being
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Location and transportation
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Resilience
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Supply chain
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Water consumption/management
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Waste management
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The strategy is

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ 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 \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{0}{2}$  ☐ 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

**1 point**

The scoring of this indicator is the sum of the scores achieved by:

1. the number of ESG strategies;
2. the public availability of the objectives.

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be

partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.

## 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)

- 1/5 ☐ Connect to multi-modal transit networks
- 1/5 ☐ Locate projects within existing developed areas
- 1/5 ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve aquatic ecosystems
- 1/5 ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve farmland
- 5/6 1/5 ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve floodplain functions
- 1/5 ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve habitats for threatened and endangered species
- 1/5 ☐ Redevelop brownfield sites
- 1/5 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The entity's sustainable site selection criteria are aligned with

- 1/6 ☐ Third-party guidelines
- 1 Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Third-party rating system(s)
- 1 Specify scheme(s)/sub-scheme(s): \_\_\_\_\_
- 1 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Not aligned

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

### 3 points

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

If Third-party guidelines or Third-party rating system is selected, the name of the guideline or system must be provided in the text box.

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2

Not accepted/not provided	0
---------------------------	---



### 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)

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Manage waste by diverting construction and demolition materials from disposal

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Manage waste by diverting reusable vegetation, rocks, and soil from disposal

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Protect air quality during construction

$\frac{2}{3}$   $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Protect surface water and aquatic ecosystems by controlling and retaining construction pollutants

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Protect and restore habitat and soils disturbed during construction and/or during previous development

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ Third-party guidelines

$\frac{1}{3}$  1 Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Third-party rating system(s)

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

1 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Not aligned

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

1.5 points

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

If Third-party guidelines or Third-party rating system is selected, the name of the guideline or system must be provided in the text box.

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0



#### 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)

$\frac{2}{10}$  ☐ Formal adoption of a policy on health attributes of building materials

$\frac{2}{10}$  ☐ 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)

$\frac{1}{10}$  ☐ Health and environmental information

$\frac{1}{10}$  ☐ Environmental Product Declarations

$\frac{1}{10}$  ☐ Health Product Declarations

$\frac{1}{10}$  ☐ Other types of health and environmental information: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Material characteristics specification, including (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Preference for materials that disclose environmental impacts

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Preference for materials that disclose potential health hazards

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ "Red list" of prohibited materials or ingredients that should not be used on the basis of their human and/or environmental impacts

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Locally extracted or recovered materials

$\frac{6}{10}$   $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Rapidly renewable materials, low embodied carbon materials, and recycled content materials

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Materials that can easily be recycled

☐ Third-party certified wood-based materials and products

$\frac{1}{6}$  Types of third-party certification used: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Low-emitting materials

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

#### 2.5 points

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

If Third-party certified wood-based materials and products is selected, the name of the certification must be provided in the text box.

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1

Not accepted/not provided	0
---------------------------	---

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
-------------------	-------

Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

## 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

2/4

1 Percentage portfolio covered ▼

x 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

3/4

1 Percentage portfolio covered ▼

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

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

4/4

1 Percentage portfolio covered ▼

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

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

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

### 2 points

The name of the green building rating systems and the level of certification (if applicable) must be provided to the corresponding selected answer option in the text box.

Text Box: The text box is validated, and its validation status is determined based on the requirements of the indicators. Various validation status lead to different scores according to the table below:

Validation status    Score

Full points	2/2
Partial points	1/2
No point	0

Percentage portfolio covered: The coverage percentage number is provided by selecting one of four drop down menu options, and the number is used as a multiplier to multiply the score assigned according to the table below:

Drop down option    Multiplier

0% - 25%	0.25
25% - 50%	0.50
50% - 75%	0.75
75% - 100%	1.00

## 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

### 5 points

Each certification is validated by GRESB according to a list of predefined criteria which results in a weight as shown in the table below:

Validation status    Weight

Full points	1.0
Partial plus	0.6
Partial minus	0.3
No points	0.0

The overall portfolio coverage of building certification of this indicator is the sum of weighted coverage percentages of each reported certification scheme. The overall portfolio coverage number is benchmarked.

Benchmarks are constructed by following the steps below:

1. Check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater than 0% and less than 100% within the same region. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
2. If the step above failed, check if there are at least 12 respondents with coverage percentages greater 0% and less than 100% across regions. If so, make the benchmark the quartiles of the distribution of these percentages.
3. If the step above failed, use static cut-off points of 25%, 50% and 75% to make the benchmark.

Referring to the three benchmark numbers as b1, b2 and b3 where  $b1 < b2 < b3$ , these numbers are used to split the coverage percentages between 0% and 100% into four intervals. The score achieved by a respondent depends on which interval their coverage percentage lands in, unless they had a coverage percentage of 0% or 100% in which case they will always receive a specific score. The relationship between coverage percentages and scores is described in the table below:

Coverage percentage    Fraction of maximum score

0%	0/4
< 0%,b1 >	1/4

[ b1,b2 >	2/4
[ b2,b3 >	3/4
[ b3,100% ]	4/4

Note that the benchmark is constructed using data from both Real Estate and Developer assessment respondents.

Level of certification is for reporting purposes only and not used for scoring.

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

☐ Yes

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

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Integrative design process

$\frac{1}{6}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ To exceed relevant energy codes or standards

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Common energy efficiency measures include (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Air conditioning

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Commissioning

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Energy modeling

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Lighting

$\frac{2}{3}$   $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Occupant controls

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Space heating

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Ventilation

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Water heating

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Operational energy efficiency monitoring (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Energy use analytics

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Post-construction energy monitoring for on

$\frac{1}{6}$  Average years: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Sub-meter

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

3 points

NC6

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.



**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

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

☐ Geothermal

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

☐ Hydro

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

☐ Solar/photovoltaic

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

☐ Wind

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

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1 1 Percentage of all projects: \_\_\_\_\_ %

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

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**3 points**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Percentage number: The coverage percentage number reported is used as a multiplier to determine the score assigned.

Average design target for the fraction of total energy demand met with on-site renewable energy is not used for scoring.

**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)

<sup>3/4</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

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

<sup>4/4</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>2/4</sup> ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

**1 point**

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

The percentage of projects covered is used as a multiplier to multiply the scores achieved above.

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4



**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)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Development and implementation of a commissioning plan

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Integrative design for water conservation

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Requirements for indoor water efficiency

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Requirements for outdoor water efficiency

$\frac{1}{4}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Requirements for process water efficiency

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Requirements for water supply

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

×

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

☐ Common water efficiency measures include (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Commissioning of water systems

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Drip/smart irrigation

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Drought tolerant/low-water landscaping

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ High-efficiency/dry fixtures

$\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Leak detection system

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Occupant sensors

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ On-site wastewater treatment

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Re-use of stormwater and grey water for non-potable applications

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Operational water efficiency monitoring (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Post-construction water monitoring for on

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

$\frac{1}{4}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Sub-meter

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Water use analytics

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**2 points**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

The evidence score only applies to the selected options in Requirements for planning and design.

**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)

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Construction waste signage

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Education of employees/contractors on waste management

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Incentives for contractors for recovering, reusing and recycling building materials

$\frac{3}{4}$   $\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Targets for waste stream recovery, reuse and recycling

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Waste management plans

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Waste separation facilities

$\frac{1}{6}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ On-site waste monitoring (multiple answers possible)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Hazardous waste monitoring

$\frac{1}{4}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Non-hazardous waste monitoring

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

**2 points**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

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

NC10.1

☐ Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

☐ <sup>1/4</sup> Business ethics☐ <sup>1/4</sup> Community engagement☐ <sup>1/4</sup> Environmental process standards☐ <sup>1/4</sup> Environmental product standards☐ <sup>1/4</sup> Fundamental human rights☐ <sup>1/4</sup> Human health-based product standards☐ <sup>1/4</sup> On-site occupational safety☐ <sup>1/4</sup> ESG-specific requirements for sub-contractors☐ <sup>1/4</sup> Other: \_\_\_\_\_☒ Percentage of projects covered: \_\_\_\_\_%☒ **UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_☒ Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_☐ No

## 2 points

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Percentage number: The score assigned to the coverage percentage number reported above is multiplied by the relative factor associated with the relevant quartile as per the table below:

Quantile	Score
0%	0/4
< 0%, 25% >	1/4
[ 25%, 50% >	2/4
[ 50%, 75% >	3/4
[ 75%, 100% ]	4/4

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

**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)

<sup>1/4</sup> ☐ Contractors provide update reports on environmental and social aspects during construction

<sup>2/4</sup> ☐ External audits by third party

Percentage of projects audited during the reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Name of the organization

<sup>1/4</sup> ☐ Internal audits

Percentage of projects audited during the reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_ %

<sup>1/4</sup> ☐ Weekly/monthly (on-site) meetings and/or ad hoc site visits

Percentage of projects visited during the reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_ %

<sup>1/4</sup> ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**2 points**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

This indicator is linked to NC10.1. In order to achieve points for this indicator, the number of points received in NC10.1 must be higher than 0.





## 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)

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Health Impact Assessment

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Integrated planning process

$\frac{1}{4}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other planning process: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or document name \_\_\_\_\_ and publication date \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Access to spaces for active and passive recreation

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Active design features

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Commissioning

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Daylight

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Indoor air quality monitoring

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Indoor air quality source control

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Natural ventilation

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Occupant controls

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Provisions for active transport

$\frac{1}{4}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Occupant education

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Post-construction health and well-being monitoring (e.g., occupant comfort and satisfaction) for on

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

$\frac{1}{2}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

2 points

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score

Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

The evidence score only applies to the selected options in Requirements for planning and design.

### 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)

- 1/4 ☐ Availability of medical personnel
- 1/4 ☐ Communicating safety information
- 1/4 ☐ Continuously improving safety performance
- 1/4 ☐ Demonstrating safety leadership
- 1/4 ☐ Entrenching safety practices
- 1/4 ☐ Managing safety risks
- 1/4 ☐ Personal Protective and Life Saving Equipment
- 1/4 ☐ Promoting design for safety
- 1/4 ☐ Training curriculum
- 1/4 ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**1 point**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

**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)

$\frac{1}{2}$

\_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{2}$

☐ Fatalities: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{2}$

☐ Near misses: \_\_\_\_\_

$\frac{1}{2}$

☐ Other metrics: \_\_\_\_\_

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

☐ No

**1 point**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

If the option Injury rate is selected, the calculation method must be provided in the text box.

Text Box: The text box response is validated, and its score is determined by the validation status according to the table below:

Validation status	Score
Accepted	1
Not accepted/not provided	0

The rate of the metrics reported is not scored.

## 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?

☐ Yes

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

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Housing affordability

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Impact on crime levels

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Livability score

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Local income generated

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Local residents' well-being

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Walkability score

$\frac{1}{3}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

NC13

1.5 points

| Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

**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)

- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Analysis and interpretation of monitoring data
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Development and implementation of a communication plan
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Development and implementation of a community monitoring plan
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Development and implementation of a risk mitigation plan
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Identification of nuisance and/or disruption risks
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Identification of stakeholders and impacted groups
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Management practices to ensure accountability for performance goals and issues identified during community monitoring
- $\frac{1}{5}$  ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the monitoring process (maximum 250 words): \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

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

☐ No

**1.5 points**

Other: 'Other' answer must be accepted during validation to achieve a score.

Evidence: The evidence is manually validated and assigned a multiplier, according to the table below. The evidence must support the validation requirements. If any requirements are not met, the evidence may be partially accepted or not accepted depending on the level of alignment with the requirements.

Validation status	Score
Accepted	2/2
Partially accepted	1/2
Not accepted/not provided	0

Open text box: The open text box is not scored and is for reporting purposes only.