

# Call for feedback on the Platform on Sustainable Finance's draft report on social taxonomy

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

### Disclaimer:

This call for feedback is part of ongoing work by the [Platform on Sustainable Finance](#), which was set up by the Commission to provide advice on the further development of the EU taxonomy framework.

This feedback process is not an official Commission consultation. The draft report produced by the Platform is not an official Commission document. Nothing in this feedback process commits the Commission nor does it preclude any policy outcomes.

In March 2018 the Commission published its [action plan: financing sustainable growth](#), based on the advice of the [High Level Expert Group \(HLEG\)](#). Action 1 of the Commission's action plan calls for the establishment of an EU classification system for sustainable activities, or taxonomy. The Commission followed through on this action by proposing a regulation for such a taxonomy. The [Taxonomy Regulation](#) was adopted by the co-legislators in June 2020. It establishes the basis for the [EU taxonomy](#) by setting out 4 overarching conditions that an economic activity has to meet in order to qualify as making a substantial contribution to environmental objectives.

Development of the EU taxonomy relies on extensive input from experts from across the economy and civil society. The [Platform on Sustainable Finance](#) plays a key role in enabling such cooperation by bringing together the best expertise on sustainability from the corporate and public sector, from industry as well as academia, civil society and the financial industry join forces.

While the work started with classifying environmentally sustainable activities, the need to better understand socially sustainable investments was acknowledged from the onset, and featured among the recommendations of the HLEG in

2 0 1 8 .

In October 2020, the Commission established the Platform for Sustainable Finance, and created with five working groups, including the [Subgroup on social taxonomy](#), which was tasked to:

1. explore the extension of the taxonomy regulation to social topics
2. elaborate potential objectives of a social taxonomy
3. work out a structure of a social taxonomy
4. identify approaches to substantial contribution and 'do no significant harm' in the field of 'social'
5. reflect on governance, business ethics, anti-bribery and tax compliance
6. consider potentially harmful activities
7. suggest a relationship between a green and a social taxonomy

**On 12 July 2021, the Platform published its [first draft report on a proposal for a social taxonomy](#).**

The report assesses the merits of a social taxonomy in addition to the environmental taxonomy, and explores possible avenues to complement the existing taxonomy. The report also proposes various objectives and sub-objectives for a social taxonomy, as well as possible approaches for defining "substantial contribution" and "do no significant harm" criteria. Finally, it develops two alternative models for articulating the social taxonomy with the environmental taxonomy.

## Call for feedback

The Platform is inviting stakeholders to provide feedback on the draft report through this online questionnaire.

**The deadline for providing feedback has been extended to Thursday 2 September 2021 at 12:00 CEST (midday).**

In the online questionnaire, you will be asked to comment on certain aspects of the report and make suggestions.

## Next steps

The Platform is still working on some important aspects of these questions and will proceed to develop its final report and final recommendations after considering the stakeholder input collected through this call for feedback.

The Platform will submit the final report with their advice to the Commission in autumn 2021. The Commission will analyse and consider the report in view of the continuous developing of the EU taxonomy, as anticipated in the new [sustainable finance strategy](#).

By the end of 2021, the Commission will publish a report on the provisions required for a social taxonomy, as required by the Taxonomy Regulation.

---

**Please note:** In order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact [fisma-platform-sf@ec.europa.eu](mailto:fisma-platform-sf@ec.europa.eu).

More information on

- [the call for feedback document](#)
- [the draft report on a social taxonomy](#)

- [the publication of the 2 draft reports](#)
- [the Platform on Sustainable Finance](#)
- [sustainable finance](#)
- [the protection of personal data regime for this call for feedback](#)

## About you

---

\* I am giving my contribution as

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

\* First name

maria

\* Surname

van der heide

\* Email (this won't be published)

maria.vanderheide@shareaction.org

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

ShareAction

## Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

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

75791956264-20

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

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia

- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- United Kingdom
- Other country

**Field of activity**

**\* Financial activity**

Please select as many answers as you like

- Accounting
- Auditing
- Banking
- Credit rating agencies
- Insurance
- Pension provision
- Investment management (e.g. hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds, securities)
- Market infrastructure operation (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
- Social entrepreneurship
- Other
- Not applicable

**\* Non-financial activity (NACE)**

Please select as many answers as you like

- Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- Mining and quarrying
- Manufacturing
- Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply
- Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities
- Construction
- Transportation and storage
- Accommodation and food service activities
- Information and communication
- Real estate activities
- Professional, scientific and technical activities

- Administrative and support service activities
- Public administration and defence; compulsory social security
- Education
- Human health and social work activities
- Other
- Not applicable

**\* Contributions received are intended for publication on the Commission’s website. Do you agree to your contribution being published?**

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

- Yes, I agree to my responses being published under the name I indicate ( name of your organisation/company/public authority or your name if your reply as an individual – your email address will never be published)**
- No, I do not want my response to be published**

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

## Your opinion

---

### Merits and concerns

The draft report describes the merits of a social taxonomy and potential concerns.

#### Question 1.1 Which in your view are the main merits of a social taxonomy?

Please select as many answers as you like

- supporting investment in social sustainability and a just transition
- responding to investors’ demand for socially orientated investments
- addressing social and human rights risks and opportunities for investors
- strengthening the definition and measurement of social investment
- other
- none

#### Please specify to what other merit(s) you refer in your answer to question 1.1:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

A social taxonomy will help investors with an interest to invest in promoting social factors by defining what constitutes socially sustainable financial activities. It will also function as a tool to fight 'social washing'. A social taxonomy will facilitate investments that support a transition to a net zero economy that is fair and inclusive, prioritising the social needs of workers, communities, consumers and citizens and it will generate dedicated social investments are needed to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

## Question 1.2 Which in your view are the main concerns about a social taxonomy?

Please select as many answers as you like

- interference with national regulations and social partners' autonomy
- increasing administrative burden for companies
- other
- none

## Structure of the social taxonomy

The draft report suggests a structure for a social taxonomy distinguishing between a vertical and a horizontal dimension. The vertical dimension would focus on directing investments to activities that make products and services for basic human needs and for basic economic infrastructure more accessible, while the horizontal dimension would focus on human rights processes.

The objective linked to the vertical dimension of the social taxonomy would be to promote adequate living standards. This includes improving the accessibility of products and services for basic human needs such as water, food, housing, healthcare, education (including vocational training) as well as basic economic infrastructure including transport, Internet, clean electricity, financial inclusion.

The objective linked to the horizontal dimension would be to promote positive impacts and avoid and address negative impacts on affected stakeholder groups, namely by ensuring decent work, promoting consumer interests and enabling the creation of inclusive and sustainable communities.

## Question 2. In your view, are there other objectives that should be considered in vertical or horizontal dimension?

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

## Please explain your answer to question 2:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

We support the presented objectives in both dimensions, and we welcome the emphasis on Living Wage, which is a topic that attracts a strong interest from investors.

We would like to suggest taking the following objectives into consideration:

Horizontal: 1) Stronger minimum standards on living wages, working hours and tackling precarious work are needed in addition to clarifying expectations on human rights due diligence and core labour standards in the DNSH criteria, 2) Promoting gender equality (equality between men, women and people with other gender identities) in inclusive and sustainable communities, not only in relation to work but also to e.g. land rights and freedom of assembly and expression.

Vertical: 1) The right to breathe clean air, as one of the elements of the right to a healthy environment. Air pollution negatively impacts on the enjoyment of many human rights, in particular the right to life and the right to health, especially in relation to vulnerable groups.

### **Question 3. Which of the following activities should in your view be covered in the vertical dimension (social products and services)?**

Please select as many answers as you like

- A1 - Crop and animal production,
- A1.1- Growing of non-perennial crops
- A1.2 - Growing of perennial crops
- A1.4 - Animal production
- A3 - Fishing and aquaculture
- C10 - Manufacture of food products
- C10.8.2 - Manufacture of cocoa, chocolate and sugar confectionery
- C10.8.3 - Processing of tea and coffee
- C10.8.6 - Manufacture of homogenised food preparations and dietetic food
- C13 - Manufacture of textiles
- C20.1.5 - Manufacture of fertilisers and nitrogen compounds
- C20.2 - Manufacture of pesticides and other agrochemical products
- C21 - Manufacture of basic pharmaceutical products and pharmaceutical preparations
- C23.3 - Manufacture of clay building materials
- C23.5 - Manufacture of cement, lime and plaster
- C25.2.1 - Manufacture of central heating radiators and boilers
- C30.1 - Building of ships and boats
- C30.2 - Manufacture of railway locomotives and rolling stock
- C30.3 - Manufacture of air and spacecraft and related machinery
- C30.9.2 - Manufacture of bicycles and invalid carriages
- C31 - Manufacture of furniture

- C32.2 - Manufacture of musical instruments
- C32.3 - Manufacture of sports goods
- C32.5 - Manufacture of medical and dental instruments and supplies
- D35.1 - Electric power generation, transmission and distribution
- D35.3 - Steam and air conditioning supply
- E - Water supply; sewerage; waste management and remediation activities
- E36 - Water collection, treatment and supply
- E37 - Sewerage
- E38 - Waste collection, treatment and disposal activities; materials recovery
- E38.3 - Materials recovery
- E39 - Remediation activities and other waste management services
- F41 - Construction of buildings
- F42.1 - Construction of roads and railways
- F42.1.2 - Construction of railways and underground railways
- F42.2.2 - Construction of utility projects for electricity and telecommunications
- F43.3 - Building completion and finishing
- G45.2 - Maintenance and repair of motor vehicles
- G46.1.6 - Agents involved in the sale of textiles, clothing, fur, footwear and leather goods
- G46.1.7 - Agents involved in the sale of food, beverages
- G47.5.1 - Retail sale of textiles in specialised stores
- H49.1 - Passenger rail transport, interurban
- H49.2 - Freight rail transport
- H49.3 - Other passenger land transport
- H49.3.1 - Urban and suburban passenger land transport
- H50.1 - Sea and coastal passenger water transport
- H50.3 - Inland passenger water transport
- H51.1 - Passenger air transport
- J58.1 - Publishing of books, periodicals and other publishing activities
- J59.1 - Motion picture, video and television programme activities
- J60 - Programming and broadcasting activities
- K - Financial and insurance activities
- L68.2 - Renting and operating of own or leased real estate
- M71 - Architectural and engineering activities; technical testing and analysis
- M72.1.1 - Research and experimental development on biotechnology

- N77.1.1 - Renting and leasing of cars and light motor vehicles
- N77.2 - Renting and leasing of personal and household goods
- N78.1 - Activities of employment placement agencies
- N78.2 - Temporary employment agency activities
- N78.3 - Other human resources provision
- O84.1.2 - Regulation of the activities of providing health care, education, cultural services and other social services, excluding social security
- O84.2 - Provision of services to the community as a whole
- O84.2.4 - Public order and safety activities
- O84.2.5 - Fire service activities
- O84.3 - Compulsory social security activities
- P85.1 - Pre-primary education
- P85.2 - Primary education
- P85.2.0 - Primary education
- P85.3 - Secondary education
- P85.3.2 - Technical and vocational secondary education
- P85.4.2 - Tertiary education
- Q - Human health and social work activities
- Q86.1 - Hospital activities
- Q86.2 - Medical and dental practice activities
- Q87 - Residential care activities
- Q88 - Social work activities without accommodation
- Q88.9.1 - Child day-care activities
- Q88.9.9 - Other social work activities without accommodation n.e.c.
- R - Arts, entertainment and recreation
- R93.1.3 - Fitness facilities
- S95 - Repair of computers and personal and household goods
- S96.0.4 - Physical well-being activities
- Other

**Please specify to what other activity(ies) you refer in your answer to question 3:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

Due to our experience and knowledge of work and health issues, we are very supportive of the inclusion of many products and services that support accessible healthcare, healthy food and decent jobs for all. In addition, we would suggest including the following NACE codes:

G47.2.1 - Retail sale of fruit and vegetables in specialised stores  
G47.7.4 - Retail sale of medical and orthopaedic goods in specialised stores  
S96.0.4 - Physical well-being activities  
S94.2 - Activities of trade unions

**Question 4. Do you agree with the approach that the objectives in the horizontal dimension, which focusses on processes in companies such as the due diligence process for respecting human rights, would likely necessitate inclusion of criteria targeting economic entities in addition to criteria targeting economic activities?**

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

**Please explain your answer to question 4:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

The inclusion of the entity level in the horizontal dimension is very important because due diligence processes and good governance are difficult to distinguish per activity and are done at entity level. It is also good to note that positive human rights processes and due diligence processes for one activity can be undermined by other activities of the same entity.

We welcome the horizontal dimension focus on workers, communities and consumers.

We would very much support to have the criteria cover impacts in the whole value chain, in line with the position of the European Parliament on Mandatory Human Rights and Environmental Due Diligence.

We think it would be useful to have the social taxonomy refer to the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Conduct (2018) and the various sector based guidance documents (on e.g. garment and minerals), in addition to the OECD guidelines for multinationals and the UNGPs.

## Harmful activities

The report envisages harmful activities as those which are fundamentally and under all circumstances opposed to the objectives suggested in this proposal for a social taxonomy. There would be two sources on which this rationale can be build: internationally agreed conventions, e.g. on certain kinds of weapons & detrimental effects of certain activities, for example on health.

**Question 5. Based on these assumptions, would you consider certain of the following activities as 'socially harmful'?**

Please select as many answers as you like

- A1.1.5 - Growing of tobacco
- B5 - Mining of coal and lignite
- B7 - Mining of metal or iron ores
- B9 - Mining support service activities
- B9.1 - Support activities for petroleum and natural gas extraction
- C10.8.1 - Manufacture of sugar
- C10.8.2 - Manufacture of cocoa, chocolate and sugar confectionery
- C10.8.3 - Processing of tea and coffee
- C11.0.1 - Distilling, rectifying and blending of spirits
- C11.0.2 - Manufacture of wine from grape
- C11.0.5 - Manufacture of beer
- C11.0.7 - Manufacture of soft drinks;
- C12 - Manufacture of tobacco products
- C13 - Manufacture of textiles
- C15.2 - Manufacture of footwear
- C20.2 - Manufacture of pesticides and other agrochemical products
- C25.4 - Manufacture of weapons and ammunition
- C25.4.0 - Manufacture of weapons and ammunition
- C30.4 - Manufacture of military fighting vehicles
- G46.1.6 - Agents involved in the sale of textiles, clothing, fur, footwear and leather goods
- G46.3.5 - Wholesale of tobacco products
- G46.3.6 - Wholesale of sugar and chocolate and sugar confectionery
- G46.4.2 - Wholesale of clothing and footwear
- G47.1.1 - Retail sale tobacco predominating
- N80.1 - Private security activities
- O84.2.2 - Defence activities
- Other

**Please specify to what other activity(ies) you refer in your answer to question 5:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

Many of the listed activities can be harmful, but to different extents and depending on the context. We have therefore selected the activities, that in our view will always be harmful, regardless the execution and context of the activity.

We suggest to add “R92 - Gambling and betting activities” as an activity that is under all circumstances opposed to the objectives suggested in this proposal for a social taxonomy.

## Governance objectives

**Question 6. Sustainability linked remuneration is already widely applied in sustainable investment. In your view, would executive remuneration linked to environmental and social factors in line with companies' own targets, therefore also be a suitable criterion in a social classification tool such as the social taxonomy?**

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

**Please explain your answer to question 6:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

Including sustainability linked remuneration in the social taxonomy could be a relevant criterion to measure the alignment between companies' short-term actions and objectives with its long-term sustainability strategy and minimise the chance that companies focus solely on attainment of momentary financial profits at the expense of the company's long-term and sustainable success. An example of where this is already happening is in the food retail sector where some companies have linked remuneration to health targets. It is however important to stress that linking remuneration to company targets is only as effective and meaningful as the targets themselves. In addition, the explanation and interpretation of own targets can be subject to manipulation and be hard to compare. Targets should therefore at a minimum be aligned with Do No Significant Harm criteria.

**Question 7. The report envisages governance objectives and analyses a certain number of governance topics. Please select the governance topics which in your view should be covered:**

Please select as many answers as you like

- Sustainability competencies in the highest governance body
- Diversity of the highest governance body (gender, skillset, experience, background), including employee participation.
- Transparent and non-aggressive tax planning
- Diversity in senior management (gender, skillset, experience, background)

- Executive remuneration linked to environmental and social factors in line with companies' own targets
- Anti-bribery and anti-corruption
- Responsible auditing
- Responsible lobbying and political engagement
- Other

**Please specify to what other governance topic(s) you refer in your answer to question 7:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

We strongly support the Platform's suggestion to include:

- whistleblowing, as part of anti-bribery and anti-corruption, and in the report described as an important tool in the prevention and detection of corruption and other malpractice.
- diversity, at the level of senior management and the highest governance body. This aligns with the SFDR principal adverse impact indicators on gender diversity and gender pay gap.

We suggest adding:

- diversity in terms of ethnicity, for the markets where there are no prohibitions to disclose this
- a limited CEO to median worker wage gap

## Models for linking an environmental and a social taxonomy

The report suggests two models for linking an environmental and a social taxonomy

- **Model 1:** The social and an environmental taxonomy would only be related through social and environmental minimum safeguards with governance safeguards being valid for both. The [UN guiding principles](#) would serve as minimum safeguards for the environmental part, while the environmental part of the [OECD guidelines](#) would serve as environmental minimum safeguards for the social part. The downside would be thin social and environmental criteria in the respective other part of the taxonomy
- **Model 2:** There would be one taxonomy with a list of social and environmental objectives and DNSH criteria. It would essentially be one system with the same detailed 'do no significant harm' criteria for the social and environmental objectives. The downside would be that there would be fewer activities that would meet both social and environmental 'do no significant harm' criteria

**Question 8. Which model for extending the taxonomy to social objectives do you prefer?**

- Model 1
- Model 2
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

## Please explain your answer to question 8:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

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

ShareAction sees merit in using model 2. We think that model 2, through preventing contradictions between the environmental and social objectives is a more sustainable and future proof model which sets better standards for a just transition. In addition, we think model 2 would be simpler to use, as it integrates the social and environmental considerations as opposed to model 1 in which these are separate lists. Additionally, we think that having the same 'do no significant harm' criteria for the social and environmental objectives simplifies implementation and reporting.

## General expectation from the social taxonomy

### Question 9. What do you expect from a social taxonomy?

*5000 character(s) maximum*

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

ShareAction welcomes the draft report on a Social Taxonomy by the subgroup of the Platform for Sustainable Finance and appreciates the opportunity to submit our views. We support the direction of travel outlined in the draft support and we are pleased to see that the presented social taxonomy structure:

- is based on international human rights norms
- makes a distinction between a vertical dimension and a horizontal dimension
- recognises three groups of stakeholders most commonly impacted by business, workers, consumers and communities;
- combines entity- and activity-level criteria and pertains to impacts in the whole value chain

The introduction of the minimum safeguards in the Taxonomy Regulation was a welcome step to prevent harm to people when undertaking environmentally sustainable activities. But it is not sufficient to drive the social change that is needed and to achieve the SDGs.

In our work, we have seen investor demand for social investments grow. There is an emergent recognition amongst investors of the materiality of social factors and that a consistent integration of these factors into investment processes can help build resilience across their portfolios. COVID-19 has put this further in the spotlight. The trend is also prompted by end-investors expressing their support for social objectives and by the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation and the proposed Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive in which environmental, social and governance factors are put on an equal footing.

We have seen this in the steep growth in interest in and membership of our Workforce Disclosure Initiative, Good Work Investor Coalition and Healthy Markets initiative. For example, in the five months from April to August 2021 the value of assets under management in the Healthy Markets coalition has grown by 40% to \$2.5tn.

Many investors we work with have already set up ways to measure social factors, for example the proportion of healthier products sold by food retailers, or whether a company is paying the Living Wage. The challenge is not that it cannot be measured, the challenge is the absence of a broadly agreed way of measuring and comparing. This results in a lack of data to assess social factors and how to define what good looks like. For example, just 4 percent of companies responding to the 2020 WDI survey could provide data on the ethnicity pay gap, and 32 percent of companies could not provide any data on whether they had identified instances on forced labour, modern slavery or human trafficking, even to say that none had been identified. The social taxonomy will help in closing this data gap.

In addition to the lack of data and the challenge to define what sustainable from a social perspective looks like, engagement and research by ShareAction with investors on health shows that the status quo risks undermining health outcomes:

- vast amounts of capital remain available to the most health damaging industries
- investor engagement on health is piecemeal and unlikely to drive real-world impact

Furthermore, while the investor interest around social issues has increased, the level of knowledge and expertise within the financial sector is just catching up. Investor and company best practice around workforce and human rights issues, their prevention and remedy are not well understood.

We therefore wholeheartedly agree that a social taxonomy is needed to:

- help more investors invest socially responsibly by defining what socially sustainable looks like. This will also allow investors to reduce the in-house resources/expertise needed to do so
- improve the awareness of the intricacies, systemic importance and connected nature of social and workforce issues, re-focusing investor attention from climate change solely
- enable forward looking and robust risk assessments, the mitigation of those abuses and the proper market valuation of companies that participate in them. This addresses the challenge of social issues only materializing financially after the fact, such as companies that partake in unfair worker treatment in the market e.g. lower costs (higher margins and operating profit) and the proliferation of workforce malpractice

Due to the urgency of driving the social change that is needed, we would like to stress the importance of not delaying the introduction of the social taxonomy. Starting the development of the social taxonomy in 2022 will most probably mean that it will not be applied before 2025. Delaying it further would leave less than five years until 2030, the target year for the realization of the SDGs. In addition, the development of the social taxonomy in parallel to the discussions on Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and the Sustainable Corporate Governance initiative allows for a strong alignment between the different initiatives.

## Additional information

---

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

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

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

**d23fed5f-4926-4080-b9c7-67437d57a62b**

**/ShareAction\_position\_on\_the\_Social\_Taxonomy\_consultation\_2021.pdf**

## Useful links

[Call for feedback document \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-social-taxonomy-report-call-for-feedback-document\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-social-taxonomy-report-call-for-feedback-document_en)

[Draft report on a social taxonomy \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/210712-sustainable-finance-platform-report-social-taxonomy\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/210712-sustainable-finance-platform-report-social-taxonomy_en)

[More on the publication of the 2 draft reports \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/210712-sustainable-finance-platform-draft-reports\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/210712-sustainable-finance-platform-draft-reports_en)

[More on sustainable finance \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/sustainable-finance\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/sustainable-finance_en)

[Platform on Sustainable Finance \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/sustainable-finance/overview-sustainable-finance/platform-sustainable-finance\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/sustainable-finance/overview-sustainable-finance/platform-sustainable-finance_en)

[Specific privacy statement \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-social-taxonomy-report-specific-privacy-statement\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-social-taxonomy-report-specific-privacy-statement_en)

## Contact

fisma-platform-sf@ec.europa.eu