Sample Asset Benchmark Report

GRESB Infrastructure

GRESB Benchmark Report 2016

DATE: 21 Oct 2016 4:02:14pm Fri UTC

© 2016 GRESB BV

Table of Contents

Scorecard/Key Highlights

Summary . . . 3
Aspects . . . 4
Entity & Peer Group Characteristics . . . 5
Additional context . . . 5

Management

Strategic Plan . . . 5
Leadership & Accountability . . . 6
Training . . . 7

Policy & Disclosure

Policies . . . 8
Engagement & Reporting . . . 12
Communications . . . 15

Risks & Opportunities

Summary . . . 18

Implementation

Summary . . . 23

Monitoring & EMS

Summary . . . 24

Stakeholder Engagement

Summary . . . 26

Performance Indicators

Output . . . 27
Health & Safety . . . 27
Energy & Emissions . . . 28
Water & Waste . . . 29
Biodiversity & Habitat . . . 30

Certifications & Awards

Certifications . . . 30
Awards & Case Studies . . . 31

2016 Infrastructure Assessment

Sample Asset

Example Asset Manager

Participation & GRESB Score

70 / 100

GRESB Score

GRESB Average 28 | Peer Average 41

Peer Comparison

1st

Transportation / Europe

out of 12

GRESB ★★★★★ 2016

GRESB Model



70 / 100 — GRESB Score

GRESB Average 28 | Peer Average 41

56 / 100 — Implementation & Measurement

GRESB Average 24 | Peer Average 33

89 / 100 — Management & Policy

GRESB Average 34 | Peer Average 43

Rankings

1st — Europe

out of 22

2nd — Investment type: Transportation

out of 12

1st — Transportation / Europe

out of 12

7th — All Infrastructure Assets

out of 134

Aspects

Aspect Weight in GRESB Score	This Entity	Peer Group		GRESB
Management 11%	**76**	PEER 40 AVERAGE		GRESB 42 AVERAGE
Policy & Disclosure 14%	**93**	PEER 48 AVERAGE		GRESB 39 AVERAGE
Risks & Opportunities 10%	**71**	PEER 33 AVERAGE		GRESB 31 AVERAGE
Implementation 7.5%	**90**	PEER 50 AVERAGE		GRESB 43 AVERAGE
Monitoring & EMS 10%	**95**	PEER 52 AVERAGE		GRESB 39 AVERAGE
Stakeholder Engagement 10%	**78**	PEER 37 AVERAGE		GRESB 21 AVERAGE
Performance Indicators 30%	**51**	PEER 18 AVERAGE		GRESB 18 AVERAGE
Certifications & Awards 7.5%	**0**	PEER 2 AVERAGE		GRESB 9 AVERAGE

Entity & Peer Group Characteristics

This Entity

Benchmark Geography: Europe

Benchmark Sector: Transportation

Peer Group (6 entities)

Benchmark Geography: Europe

Benchmark Sector: Transportation

Countries

[100%] Europe

Peer Group Countries

[100%] Europe

Sectors

[100%] Transportation: Railroad

Peer Group Sectors

[50%] Transportation: Toll Road Operations

[17%] Transportation: Railroad

[17%] Transportation: Ports

[17%] Transportation: Airport

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Management

POINTS: 9/11

WEIGHT: 11%

Strategic Plan

MA1 POINTS: 2.8/2.8

ESG issues in long-term strategic plan(s) — Percentage of Peers

- Yes — 100%

  Elements addressed in the entity's long-term strategic plan(s)

  - [x] Environmental performance — 100%
  - [ ] Social performance — 80%
  - [x] Governance performance — 80%

  Evidence provided

  Percentage of Peers

  - [80%] No
  - [20%] Yes

    Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

- No — 0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomized data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Leadership & Accountability

MA2 POINTS: 2/2.8

Senior decision-maker accountable for ESG issues

Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 100%
  - Name: Harold
  - Job title: Sustainability
  - LinkedIn profile (optional):

This senior decision maker is part of the

☐	Board of Directors	20%
☑	Senior Management Team	80%
☐	Other	0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- ( ) [80%] No
- (●) [20%] Yes
  - Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

- ( ) No — 0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

MA3 POINTS: 2/2.8

ESG performance targets for senior leadership

Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 80%

Senior leadership has targets for:

- [x] Environmental performance — 80%
- [x] Social performance — 80%
- [x] Governance performance — 80%
- [ ] Other — 0%

Does performance on these targets have pre-determined consequences?

- (●) Yes — 80%
  - [ ] Positive consequences for meeting or exceeding ESG targets — 20%
  - [x] Negative consequences for not achieving ESG targets — 60%
    - [x] Negative recognition — 0%
    - [x] Loss of financial compensation — 60%
    - [x] Additional support, resources, or training — 0%
    - [ ] Other consequences — 0%
- ( ) No — 20%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- ( ) [100%] No
- (●) [0%] Yes

Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

- ( ) No — 20%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Training

MA4 POINTS: 2.6/2.8

ESG-related training

	Percentage of Peers
◉ Yes	100%

Categorize ESG-related training provided to different categories of workers

	Percentage of Peers
☑ Employees	100%
☑ Environmental issues	100%
☐ Social issues	40%
☐ Governance issues	40%
☑ Other example	0%
☑ Contractors	40%
☑ Environmental issues	60%
☐ Social issues	0%
☑ Governance issues	0%
☐ Other	0%
☐ Other	20%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

◉ [60%] Yes

Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

○ [40%] No

○ No	0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Policy & Disclosure

POINTS: 13/14
WEIGHT: 14%

Policies

PD1 POINTS: 1.8/1.8

Policy or policies on environmental issues

Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 100%

Specific issues included in the entity's policy or policies

- [x] Air pollutants — 80%
- [ ] Biodiversity and habitat protection — 80%
- [ ] Energy — 80%
- [ ] Greenhouse gas emissions — 60%
- [ ] Invasive species — 80%
- [ ] Resilience to catastrophe/disaster — 80%
- [x] Resilience (adaptation) to climate change — 60%
- [x] Water — 80%
- [x] Waste — 80%
- [x] Other issues — 20%

  Material and Construction Life Cycle Impacts, Vehicle Miles Traveled [ACCEPTED]

Policy or policies apply to

- [x] Entity — 100%
- [x] Contractors — 100%

Contractors Covered by Entity ESG Policies

- (●) [83%] ≥75, ≤100%
- ( ) [17%] ≥25%, <50%

- [ ] Other — 0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- (●) [60%] Yes

  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]
- ( ) [40%] No

- ( ) No — 0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

PD2 POINTS: 1.8/1.8

Policy or policies on social issues

Percentage of Peers

- ◉ Yes — 100%

Specific issues included in the entity's policy or policies

- ☑ Child labor — 80%
- ☐ Community relations — 100%
- ☐ Customer satisfaction — 80%
- ☐ Data protection and privacy — 100%
- ☑ Employee engagement — 60%
- ☑ Forced or compulsory labor — 80%
- ☑ Gender and diversity — 100%
- ☑ Health and safety: employees — 100%
- ☑ Health and safety: customers — 100%
- ☑ Health and safety: community — 80%
- ☐ Health and safety: supply chain — 20%
- ☑ Labor standards and working conditions — 100%
- ☑ Discrimination — 100%
- ☑ Other issues — 0%

  Environmental Justice [ACCEPTED]

Policy or policies apply to

- ☑ Entity — 100%
- ☑ Contractors — 20%

Contractors Covered by Entity ESG Policies

- ○ [67%] (no answer provided)
- ○ [17%] ≥50%, <75%
- ◉ [17%] ≥75, ≤100%

- ☐ Other — 0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- ○ [100%] No
- ◉ [0%] Yes

  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

- ○ No — 0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here.

PD3 POINTS: 1.6/1.8

Policy or policies on governance issues

Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 100%

Specific issues included in the entities governance policy or policies:

- [x] Audit committee structure/independence — 20%
- [x] Board composition — 80%
- [ ] Bribery and corruption — 80%
- [ ] Compensation committee structure/independence — 20%
- [x] Executive compensation — 20%
- [ ] Fraud — 80%
- [x] Fiduciary duty — 80%
- [ ] Independence of Board chair — 60%
- [ ] Lobbying activities — 80%
- [ ] One share/one vote — 0%
- [ ] Political contributions — 0%
- [x] Whistleblower protection — 0%
- [x] Other — 20%

  Conflict of Interest, Anti-Discrimination [ACCEPTED]

Policy or policies apply to

- [x] Entity — 100%
- [x] Contractors — 0%

Contractors Covered by Entity ESG Policies

- ( ) [83%] (no answer provided)
- (●) [17%] ≥75, ≤100%

- [ ] Other — 0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- ( ) [100%] No
- (●) [0%] Yes

  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

- ( ) No — 0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here.

Engagement & Reporting

PD4 POINTS: 1.6/1.8

Stakeholder grievances process	Percentage of Peers
◉ Yes	100%

Describe the elements of the process (select all that apply)

	Percentage of Peers
☐ Anonymous communications	100%
☑ 24/7 availability (e.g., phone, email, post)	100%
☑ Clear prohibition against retaliation	20%
☐ Fair and independent review	20%

Describe the use of the process during the reporting period (select all that apply)

	Percentage of Peers
☑ Number of grievances communicated	100%
☐ Summary of types of grievances	80%
☐ Summary of types of resolutions for grievances	80%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

◉ [60%] Yes

Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

○ [40%] No

	Percentage of Peers
○ No	0%

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

PD5 POINTS: 1.2/1.8

Third-party review of ESG reporting and/or data

Percentage of Peers

- [x] Yes — 100%

Select the most stringent level of review in each area

- [x] ESG reporting — 80%
  - [x] Internal audit — 60%
  - [x] Externally checked by — 0%
    - Service Provider Name [ACCEPTED]
  - [ ] Externally verified by — 0%
  - [ ] Externally assured by — 20%
- [x] Environmental data — 100%
  - [ ] Internal audit — 80%
  - [x] Externally checked by — 0%
    - 4 See Ltd [ACCEPTED]
  - [ ] Externally verified by — 0%
  - [ ] Externally assured by — 20%
- [ ] Social data — 60%
- [ ] Governance data — 80%
- [x] Information submitted in this assessment (GRESB Infrastructure) — 0%
  - [ ] Internal audit — 0%
  - [x] Externally checked by — 0%
    - Carbon Trust [ACCEPTED]
    - Asahi Facilities Inc.
  - [ ] Externally verified by — 0%
  - [ ] Externally assured by — 0%
- [ ] Other ESG information — 60%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- [60%] Yes
  - Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]
- [40%] No

- [ ] No — 0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here.

PD6 POINTS: 1.8/1.8

Impact assessment during the last 3 years

Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 60%

Types of assessments

- [x] Environmental impact statement/report/assessment — 60%
- [x] Health Impact Assessment — 0%
- [ ] Social Impact Assessment — 0%
- [x] Community needs assessment — 0%
- [x] Other technical assessment — 0%

  Geology, Soils, and Seismicity; Cultural and Paleontological Resources; Aesthetic and Visual Quality [ACCEPTED]

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- [60%] No
- [40%] (no answer provided)
- (●) [0%] Yes

  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

- ( ) No — 40%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Communications

PD7 POINTS: 1.5/1.8

Communication of ESG activities — Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 80%

  Communication strategy:

  - [x] No communications — 0%
    - [ ] ESG Policy/Policies — 0%
    - [x] ESG Targets — 20%
    - [x] ESG Actions — 0%
    - [ ] ESG Performance — 0%
  - [x] Website — 20%
    - [x] ESG Policy/Policies — 0%
    - [x] ESG Targets — 0%
    - [x] ESG Actions — 20%
    - [x] ESG Performance — 20%
  - [ ] Section of annual report — 20%
  - [ ] Integrated report — 0%
  - [x] Sustainability report — 20%
    - [x] ESG Policy/Policies — 0%
    - [ ] ESG Targets — 0%
    - [x] ESG Actions — 20%
    - [x] ESG Performance — 20%
  - [x] Other — 80%

    2016 Business Plan [ACCEPTED]

    - [x] ESG Policy/Policies — 80%
    - [ ] ESG Targets — 60%
    - [x] ESG Actions — 60%
    - [x] ESG Performance — 60%

  Evidence provided
  Percentage of Peers

  (●) [80%] Yes

  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

  ( ) [20%] (no answer provided)

- ( ) No — 20%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here.

PD8 POINTS: 1.5/1.8

Process for communication of ESG-related misconduct or penalties	Percentage of Peers
◉ Yes	60%

Elements of the entity's communications process

☑ Entity informs investors about misconduct or penalties	60%
☐ Entity informs the public about misconduct or penalties	60%
☑ Entity informs other stakeholders about misconduct or penalties	60%
☐ No communications	0%

Application of the communication process

☐ The entity has used one or more of these communication processes during the reporting period	60%
☑ The entity did not use any of these communication processes during the reporting period	0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

◉ [60%] Yes

Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

○ [40%] (no answer provided)

○ No	40%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Risks & Opportunities

POINTS: 8/10
WEIGHT: 10%

RO1 POINTS: 3.1/3.3

Assess and mitigate risks associated with environmental issues — Percentage of Peers

- ◉ Yes — 100%

Issues addressed

- ☑ Air pollutants — 100%
  - ☑ Included in Risk Assessment — 100%
  - ☐ Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s) — 20%
  - ☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented — 20%
- ☑ Biodiversity and habitat protection — 100%
  - ☐ Included in Risk Assessment — 100%
  - ☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s) — 20%
  - ☐ Mitigation Actions Implemented — 20%
- ☑ Energy — 100%
  - ☑ Included in Risk Assessment — 100%
  - ☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s) — 20%
  - ☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented — 20%
- ☑ Greenhouse gas emissions — 80%
  - ☑ Included in Risk Assessment — 80%
  - ☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s) — 20%
  - ☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented — 20%
- ☑ Invasive species — 80%
  - ☐ Included in Risk Assessment — 80%
  - ☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s) — 0%
  - ☐ Mitigation Actions Implemented — 0%
- ☑ Resilience to catastrophe/disaster — 100%
  - ☑ Included in Risk Assessment — 100%
  - ☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s) — 20%
  - ☐ Mitigation Actions Implemented — 20%
- ☑ Resilience to climate change — 80%
  - ☑ Included in Risk Assessment — 80%
  - ☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s) — 20%

Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
Water resources	100%
Waste management	100%
Included in Risk Assessment	100%
Addressed in Mitigation Plan(s)	20%
Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
Other	0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

[60%] Yes

Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

[40%] No

No	0%

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

R02 POINTS: 3.1/3.3

Assess and mitigate risks associated with social issues	Percentage of Peers
Yes	100%
Child labor	100%
Community relations	100%
Included in Risk Assessment	100%
Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
Customer satisfaction	100%
Included in Risk Assessment	100%
Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%

Issues addressed

☑ Data protection and privacy	100%
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	100%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☐ Employee engagement	80%
☑ Forced labor	100%
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	100%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☐ Gender and diversity	100%
☑ Health and safety: employees	100%
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	100%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☑ Health and safety: customers	100%
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	100%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☐ Health and safety: community	80%
☑ Supply chain health and safety	20%
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	20%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☐ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☑ Labor standards/working conditions	80%
☐ Included in Risk Assessment	80%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☑ Discrimination	80%
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	80%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%

Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
Other	0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

[100%] No

[0%] Yes

Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

No	0%

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

R03 POINTS: 1.4/3.3

Assess and mitigate risks associated with governance issues	Percentage of Peers
Yes	100%

Issues addressed

Audit committee structure/independence	40%
Board composition	100%
Bribery and corruption	100%
Compensation committee structure/independence	40%
Included in Risk Assessment	40%
Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
Executive compensation	40%
Included in Risk Assessment	40%
Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
Fraud	80%
Independence of Board chair	80%
Lobbying activities	80%

RO3 POINTS: 1.4/3.3

Assess and mitigate risks associated with governance issues	Percentage of Peers
◉ Yes	100%

Issues addressed

	Percentage of Peers
☐ Audit committee structure/independence	40%
☐ Board composition	100%
☐ Bribery and corruption	100%
☑ Compensation committee structure/independence	40%
☐ Included in Risk Assessment	40%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☑ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☑ Executive compensation	40%
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	40%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	20%
☐ Mitigation Actions Implemented	20%
☐ Fraud	80%
☐ Independence of Board chair	80%
☐ Lobbying activities	80%
☐ One share/one vote	0%
☐ Political contributions	20%
☐ Whistleblower protection	20%
☑ Other	0%
Legal [ACCEPTED]	
☑ Included in Risk Assessment	0%
☑ Addressed in Mitigation Plan	0%
☐ Mitigation Actions Implemented	0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

○ [100%] No

◉ [0%] Yes

Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

○ No	0%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here.

Implementation

POINTS: 7/8
WEIGHT: 7.5%

IM1 POINTS: 7/7.5

Examples of ESG management and performance

	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	80%
◉ No	20%

Additional context

[Not provided]

Monitoring & EMS

POINTS: 8/10
WEIGHT: 10%

ME1 POINTS: 3.2/5

Environmental Management System

	Percentage of Peers
◉ Yes	100%

Describe the EMS

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Aligned with third-party standard

◉ Yes	100%
☐ ISO 14001	80%
☑ BS7750	0%
☐ EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme	0%
☐ Other	20%
○ No	0%

Verified or certified by a third-party

○ Yes	40%
◉ No	60%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

◉ [60%] Yes	
Evidence provided	[ACCEPTED]
○ [40%] No	

○ No	0%

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

ME2 POINTS: 5/5

Collection of ESG performance data

Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 80%

Type of ESG data collected by the entity

- [x] Environmental performance data — 80%
- [ ] Social performance data — 20%
- [x] Governance performance data — 0%
- [ ] Other data — 0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- (●) [60%] Yes
  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]
- ( ) [20%] No
- ( ) [20%] (no answer provided)

- ( ) No — 20%

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Stakeholder Engagement

POINTS: 10/10
WEIGHT: 10%

SE1 POINTS: 5/5

Stakeholder engagement program — Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 100%

  Elements included

  - [x] Planning and preparation for engagement — 100%
  - [ ] Implementation of engagement plan — 100%
  - [x] Program review and evaluation — 100%

  Aligned with third-party standards and/or guidance

  - (●) Yes — 0%
    - [x] AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement standard — 0%
    - [ ] International Association for Public Participation spectrum, Australasia — 0%
    - [ ] UNEP Stakeholder Engagement Manual — 0%
    - [ ] Other — 0%
  - ( ) No — 100%

  Evidence provided

  Percentage of Peers

  (●) [60%] Yes
  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]

  ( ) [40%] No

- ( ) No — 0%

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

SE2 POINTS: 4.8/5

Actions taken to implement stakeholder engagement program — Percentage of Peers

- ( ) Yes — 40%
- (●) No — 60%

Additional context

[Not provided]

Performance Indicators

POINTS: 17/30
WEIGHT: 30%

Output

PI1 Not scored

Measures of output

Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 80%

Indicator	Units	Baseline	History 2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
PI 1 (continued)							
Passengers	persons	2000	20011	12000	20000	200001	119

Types of information included in evidence

- ☐ Methods and calculations underlying output metrics — 20%
- ☑ Interpretation of output metrics and targets — 20%
- ☐ Other — 0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- (●) [80%] Yes
  Evidence provided [ACCEPTED]
- ( ) [20%] No

- ( ) No — 20%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Health & Safety

PI2 POINTS: 1.4/4.3

Health and safety performance — Percentage of Peers

- (●) Yes — 80%
- ( ) No — 20%

Employees

Indicator	Units	Baseline	History 2013	History 2014	History 2015	Targets 2018
PI 2 (continued)						
Fatalities	Number		0	0	1	0
Reportable injuries	Number		16	14	12	5

Types of information included in evidence

- [ ] Methods and calculations underlying output metrics — 0%
- [x] Interpretation of output metrics and targets — 0%
- [ ] Other — 0%

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- [60%] Yes
- [20%] No
- [20%] (no answer provided)

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Energy & Emissions

PI3 POINTS: 0/4.3

Energy generation and purchase — Percentage of Peers

- ( ) Yes — 60%
- (●) No — 40%

Additional context

[Not provided]

PI4 POINTS: 0/4.3

Greenhouse gas emissions — Percentage of Peers

- ( ) Yes — 0%
- (●) No — 100%

Additional context

> Text provided by respondent will be displayed here.

PI5 POINTS: 0/4.3

Air pollutant emissions

	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	0%
◉ No	100%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Water & Waste

PI6 POINTS: 2.1/4.3

Water use

	Percentage of Peers
◉ Yes	60%

Withdrawals

			History		
Indicator	Units	Baseline	2013	2014	2015
PI 6 (continued)					
Water Supply	US gal		180000	190000	200000

Types of information included in evidence

☐ Methods and calculations underlying output metrics	0%
☐ Interpretation of output metrics and targets	0%
☑ Other	0%
Water Estimation Methodology; Water Records [ACCEPTED]	

Evidence provided

Percentage of Peers

- ○ [40%] Yes
- ◉ [40%] No
- ○ [20%] (no answer provided)

○ No	40%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

PI7 POINTS: 0/4.3

Waste generation and disposal	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	60%
◉ No	40%

Additional context

[Not provided]

Biodiversity & Habitat

PI8 POINTS: 0/4.3

Biodiversity and habitat	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	0%
◉ No	100%

Additional context

[Not provided]

Certifications & Awards

POINTS: 0/8
WEIGHT: 7.5%

Certifications

CA1 POINTS: 0/3.8

Entity level certifications for ESG-related management and/or performance	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	20%
◉ No	80%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not

CA2 POINTS: 0/3.8

Project level certifications for ESG-related management and/or performance	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	0%
◉ No	100%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.

Awards & Case Studies

CA3 Not scored

Awards for ESG-related actions, performance, or achievements	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	40%
◉ No	60%

Additional context

[Not provided]

CA4 Not scored

ESG case studies, research or similar publications	Percentage of Peers
○ Yes	0%
◉ No	100%

Additional context

Text provided by respondent will be displayed here. The purpose of this sample report is to demonstrate the appearance and format of GRESB's assessment. To protect data confidentiality, the sample contains randomised data and does not include any real data submitted in the 2016 GRESB Survey. As a result, displayed data may contain inconsistencies which will not appear in a company or fund's actual Report.