



G R E S B<sup>®</sup>  
REAL ESTATE

2019

---

# Real Estate Assessment

# Contents

Introduction

---

2019 Real Estate Assessment Changes

---

Entity & Reporting Characteristics

---

Management

---

Policy & Disclosure

---

Risks & Opportunities

---

Monitoring & EMS

---

Performance Indicators

---

Building Certifications

---

Stakeholder Engagement

---

New Construction & Major Renovations

---

**Disclaimer: 2019 GRESB Real Estate Assessment**

The 2019 GRESB Real Estate Assessment Document accompanies the 2019 GRESB Real Estate Assessment and is published both as a standalone document and in the GRESB Portal alongside each Assessment indicator. The Assessment Document reflects the opinions of GRESB and not of our members. The information in the Assessment Document has been provided in good faith and is provided on an “as is” basis. We take reasonable care to check the accuracy and completeness of the Assessment Document prior to its publication. While we do not anticipate major changes, we reserve the right to make modifications to the Assessment Document. We will publicly announce any such modifications. The Assessment Document is not provided as the basis for any professional advice or for transactional use. GRESB and its advisors, consultants and sub-contractors shall not be responsible or liable for any advice given to third parties, any investment decisions or trading or any other actions taken by you or by third parties based on information contained in the Assessment Document. Except where stated otherwise, GRESB is the exclusive owner of all intellectual property rights in all the information contained in the Assessment Document.

# Introduction

---

## About GRESB

GRESB is the environmental, social and governance (ESG) benchmark for real assets. Working in collaboration with the industry, GRESB defines the global standard for sustainability performance in real assets providing standardized and validated ESG data to more than 75 institutional investors, representing over USD 18 trillion in institutional capital.

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

## Overview of GRESB Assessments

### GRESB Real Estate Assessment

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment is the global standard for ESG benchmarking and reporting for listed property companies, private property funds, developers and investors that invest directly in real estate. The Assessment evaluates performance against 7 Sustainability Aspects, including information on performance indicators, such as energy, GHG emissions, water and waste. The methodology is consistent across different regions, investment vehicles and property types and aligns with international reporting frameworks, such as GRI and PRI.

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

### GRESB Developer Assessment

In addition to the GRESB Real Estate Assessment for property companies and fund managers that focus on the management of standing investments, GRESB provides a stand-alone GRESB Developer Assessment to evaluate the ESG performance of organizations that focus on development activities. The Developer Assessment focuses on policies, strategies, and measurable actions related to new construction and major renovation projects. It contains a subset of indicators from the GRESB Real Estate Assessment, plus the 14 indicators in the New Construction & Major Renovations (NC&MR) Aspect.

The GRESB Developer Assessment is designed for:

- Organizations that develop projects, or acquire development projects, with the aim to sell the projects at completion. Projects can be developed to a tenant's specification (build to suit), commissioned by an investment manager, or can be developed at risk;
- Organizations that acquire properties exclusively for redevelopment and resale;
- Organizations that manage standing investments as a by-product of their development activities, and for whom the development activities are considered to be the core business.

### GRESB Public Disclosure

[GRESB Public Disclosure](#) evaluates the level of ESG disclosure by listed property companies and REITs. The evaluation is based on a set of indicators aligned with the GRESB Real Estate Assessment, allowing for a comparison of ESG disclosure performance between GRESB participants and non-participants. It also provides investors with a resource hub to access ESG disclosure documents across their full investment portfolio.

GRESB Public Disclosure data is initially collected by the GRESB team for selected companies, including both 2018 GRESB Real Estate Assessment participants and non-participants. All constituents have the opportunity to review and update this data before it becomes accessible to GRESB Investor Members. GRESB Public Disclosure consists of four Aspects: Governance of Sustainability, Implementation, Operational Performance

and Stakeholder Engagement. Together, these Aspects contribute towards a Public Disclosure Level, expressed through an A to E sliding scale.

## **(Real Estate and Infrastructure) Supplement: Resilience**

The GRESB Resilience Module is an optional supplement to the GRESB Real Estate and Infrastructure Assessments. It evaluates how real estate and infrastructure companies and funds are preparing for potentially disruptive events and changing conditions, assessing long-term trends, and becoming more resilient over time.

The Module is motivated by two key factors:

- Meeting investor demand for information about the resilience of property and infrastructure companies and funds; and
- Increasing access to information about resilience-promoting actions among companies and funds.

## **(Real Estate) Supplement: Nareit Leader in the Light**

GRESB works in close collaboration with the National Association of Real Estate Investments Trusts (Nareit), a GRESB Industry Partner. Nareit encourages its corporate members to complete the annual GRESB Real Estate Assessments, which, for the past six years, has been the basis for their annual Leader in the Light Award competition. The Leader in the Light Awards are presented to REITs in eight property sectors: Diversified, Global (for non-U.S. companies), Health Care, Industrial, Lodging/Resorts, Office, Residential and Retail. If there are both large and small cap entries that meet the awards criteria in a given property sector, awards are presented to both the leading large and small cap companies. To participate in the Leader in the Light Award program, Nareit members must complete both the GRESB Real Estate Assessment and the Leader in the Light Supplement. Once all sections of the GRESB Real Estate Assessment are completed, including the Leader in the Light Supplement, participants are able to submit their entire submission which will automatically be included in the Leader in the Light Award competition.

## **GRESB Infrastructure Assessment**

The GRESB Infrastructure Assessment provides the basis for the systematic assessment, objective scoring, and peer benchmarking of the ESG performance of infrastructure investments. The Assessment provides infrastructure investors with actionable information and the tools they need to accurately monitor and manage the sustainability risks of their assets, and to prepare for increasingly rigorous ESG obligations

The GRESB Infrastructure Assessment has an initial focus on operating investments, infrastructure assets, companies and funds and covers a variety of infrastructure sectors, including:

- Data Infrastructure
- Energy Resources
- Environmental Services
- Network Utilities
- Power Generation X-Renewables
- Renewable Power
- Social infrastructure
- Transport
- Other

Assessment participants receive comparative business intelligence on where they stand against their peers, a roadmap with the actions they can take to improve their ESG performance and a communication platform to engage with investors.

## **The role of the GRESB benchmark**

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

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment is structured around seven aspects and contains approximately 55 indicators. The indicators follow a plan-do-check-act logic and are designed to encompass the wide variety of property companies and funds included in the benchmark.

GRESB results provide a practical way to understand ESG performance and communicate that performance to investors and other stakeholders. GRESB provides overall scores of ESG performance - such as the GRESB Score and GRESB Ratings - as well as detailed aspect-level and individual indicator-level assessments of performance. The key to analyzing GRESB data is in peer group comparisons that take into account country, regional, sectoral and investment type variations. This richer analysis enables fund managers and companies to understand their results in the context of their investment strategies and communicate this to their investors.

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

## 2019 Participation Fee

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

Additional information about the 2019 participation fee is available [here](#).

## Timeline and Process

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment opens in the Assessment Portal on April 1, 2019. The submission deadline is July 1, 2019, providing participants with a three-month window to complete the Assessment. This is a fixed deadline, and GRESB will not accept submissions received after this date.

The GRESB validation process starts on June 15 and continues until July 31, 2019. We may need to contact you during this time to clarify any issues with your response.

Results are published in September and are distributed as follows:

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

For an overview of key dates and activities for the 2019 Assessment cycle, please see the [Assessment timeline](#).

## Response Check

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

The [Response Check](#) is available for request from April 1 to June 1, 2019 (midnight, Pacific time) subject to available resources. We strongly encourage participants to place their request as early as possible.

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

## Guidance & Support

The Assessment Portal includes indicator-specific guidance, available under the “*Guidance*” tab that explains:

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

In addition to the guidance in the Portal, each Assessment is accompanied by a Reference Guide. The Reference Guide provides introductory information on the Assessments and a report-format version of the indicator-by-indicator guidance that is available under the Guidance tab in the Portal. The Reference Guide will be available on March 1, 2019.

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

- The pre-filling function adds the information already provided in previous years.
- The document section provides an overview of documents submitted as evidence.
- The Portal allows participants to upload multiple documents as evidence per indicator, eliminating the need to merge different documentation into one file.
- Participants can manage access rights, adding users with different levels of access.
- The Portal has real-time error detection systems and warnings
- Automated data uploads are available through API connections.
- The Template Tool enables participants to copy information across multiple submissions

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

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

## GRESB Assessment Training Program

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

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

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

Both programs are delivered via face-to-face group sessions, in select locations across all regions with GRESB participation, including Europe, North America and Asia Pacific. [See dates and locations for 2019 GRESB Assessment Training](#).

# About the 2019 GRESB Real Estate Reference Guide

---

This Guide accompanies the 2019 GRESB Real Estate Assessment (referred to as “*the Assessment*”). Guidance is included for all Assessment indicators that comprise GRESB Real Estate’s seven aspects, plus the Assessment indicators addressing New Construction & Major Renovations. This Guide provides:

- The intent of each indicator as well as their current relevance regarding ESG performance;
- Terminology of specific concepts addressed by each indicator;
- Technical instructions for each indicator;
- Information about changes relative to previous versions of the assessment;
- Details about validation, scoring, and documentation requirements.

This Guide should provide all the basic information needed to complete the 2019 Assessment. If you need additional help, please contact the [GRESB Helpdesk](#) at any time for support and guidance.

## Who can see my data?

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

- In the case of non-listed property companies and funds, to GRESB Investor Members that are investors in the company or fund, using GRESB’s Data Access Request Tool in the online GRESB Portal. GRESB Investor Members must request access to a non-listed participant’s benchmark scores, allowing the participant the control to either accept or deny this request;
- In the case of listed real estate companies, to all GRESB Investor Members that invest in listed real estate securities.

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

Documentation provided as evidence can be made available to GRESB Real Estate Investor Members on a document by document basis. Each uploaded document has a checkbox (with the default set to ‘not available’) which, when selected by the participant, makes this evidence available to all investors with access to that entity. It is not possible to choose a subset of investors which you would like to share the documents for.

GRESB has developed a number of tools to assist participants with the collection and aggregation of asset level data that is required to complete certain aspects of the Assessment. Property companies and funds are encouraged to use the asset level tools to streamline data flows, and to increase data quality. The asset level data provided to GRESB is strictly confidential and will only be used for aggregation to portfolio level. No individual asset level information will be disclosed to participants’ investors.

As a default, GRESB does not disclose a participant’s data to other participants. For listed entities, the entity name is disclosed in the Benchmark Report, as well as the entity names of listed peer group constituents. For non-listed entities, only the fund manager’s name is disclosed, as well as the fund manager’s name of private peer group constituents.

GRESB provides an opt-in option that will disclose the entity’s name (public) or fund manager’s name (private), as well as the scores for the two dimensions (Management & Policy and Implementation & Measurement), to participants in the peer group that also opted to disclose their name and dimension scores.

## Grace Period

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

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

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

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

## Participant tools

The following tools help participants with the submission process:

- Pre-filling: Property companies and funds that participated in GRESB in 2019 are able to pre-fill selected questions in the 2019 Assessment response.
- Information-sharing template: This template is available to participants who are GRESB Members. Participants can use the template to store and share question responses that are identical across multiple participating entities. Members can access the sharing template via the GRESB Portal.
- Assessment access tool: A participating property company or fund manager can invite colleagues, advisors and consultants to register in the Portal to assist with the submission of data to GRESB.
- Asset level data tools: GRESB has developed a number of tools to assist participants with the collection and aggregation of asset level data that is required to complete the Performance Indicators aspect and five qualitative indicators.



The tools are designed to streamline data flows and increase data quality.

- Automated Data Feed (ADF): This tool is available through an increasing number of data providers. It allows participants to seamlessly feed information from a data provider's data collection system to the GRESB Portal, automatically completing the Performance Indicators Aspect of the Assessment. The full list of data partners can be found on our website: [Real Estate Data Partners](#).
- GRESB Asset Spreadsheet: Participants who do not have access to the Automated Data Feed can upload asset data to the GRESB Asset Portal using the Asset Level Spreadsheet. Please check the [Asset Portal Guide](#) for more information.
- GRESB Converters: GRESB provides data converters to use data from a third-party source in the GRESB Performance Indicators Aspect. These converters and the underlying mapping process are provided in collaboration with leading green building and energy rating schemes, such as Energy Star, Green Star, NABERS, BREEAM, and LEED.

In 2019, you can use the online GRESB Asset Portal or a data partner system to upload asset level data for the following indicators:

- Reporting characteristics: RC5.1
- Performance Indicators PI1.1, PI2.1, PI3.1, PI4.1
- Building Certifications BC1.1 and BC1.2

Who can see my asset level data?

The asset level data provided to GRESB is strictly confidential and will only be used for aggregation to portfolio level. No individual asset level information will be disclosed to participants' investors.

Why does GRESB ask for asset level data?

The main driver for asset level reporting is to improve investor confidence in data quality. In addition, it enables us to provide participants with additional insights into the impact of their ESG programs, the basis for and paves the way for more tailored assessments in the future. [GRESB data quality page](#)

Does GRESB fully comply with GDPR?

We do. You can check the GRESB Privacy Statement [here](#). We also have specific internal policies, such as our Data Breach Policy and our Data Protection Policy, related to GDPR that we cannot share externally for security reasons. Please note that asset level data does not fall under the incidence of GDPR because it does not contain any personal data.

Cybersecurity. What steps have GRESB taken to prevent unauthorized access to asset level data?

We hired an expert to review all of our data security measures and systems. No issues were flagged. Our website, as well as the GRESB Portal are fully HTTPS/TLS encrypted. We have strict and extensive policies on data security that we cannot share externally for security reasons. Our public policies can be accessed [here](#).

# GRESB Real Estate Assessment and Reference Guide Structure

---

## Allocation to E, S, G

Each indicator is allocated to one of the three sustainability dimensions (E- environmental; S- social; G- governance):

- E – indicators related to actions and efficiency measures undertaken in order to monitor and decrease the environmental footprint of the portfolio;
- S – indicators related to the entity’s relationship with and impact on its stakeholders and direct social impact of its activities;
- G – indicators related to the governance of sustainability, policies and procedures, approach to sustainability at entity or organization level.

## Assessment indicator structure

Every indicator in the 2019 Assessment can be answered with ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ and in some cases with ‘Not applicable’. If ‘Yes’ is selected, the participant has the option to further classify the response by selecting one or more sub-options.

Participants should select all sub-options that accurately describe the entity and for which the entity can provide evidence. If ‘No’ or ‘Not applicable’ is selected, the participant may not select any additional sub-options. A ‘Not Applicable’ answer is interpreted and scored in the same way as a “No” and will yield 0 points. GRESB has marked each indicator to reflect whether it has been amended or is new, by providing the indicator number in orange.

## Evidence

Selected indicators in the Assessment require supporting evidence. Evidence is information that can be used to validate the overall answer to the indicator and support any additionally selected criteria. GRESB does not have a prescriptive standard for evidence, rather the expectation is that a validator with reasonable domain expertise can review the evidence and find support for the overall indicator response and selected answer options. This means that the uploaded evidence should clearly reference the answer options selected by the participant. The evidence should not require extensive interpretation or inference, and participants are strongly encouraged to provide the simplest evidence that supports their claim.

It is the responsibility of the reporting entity to provide clear and concise information that can be easily found and understood by the validator. The validator will reject claimed answers or selected answer options not supported by clear evidence.

- Requirement of uploads: Not all indicators require mandatory document uploads. However, in the absence of an upload, providing the document name AND date of publication is mandatory. If you do not upload the document and instead provide the name/publication date, you may be asked to disclose the document to GRESB as part of the validation process. GRESB will not follow-up with participants that upload incomplete or insufficient evidence. In order to validate your submission as efficiently as possible, we ask that you provide a document upload where possible. An open textbox is available next to each uploaded document which should be used to provide additional context for the document provided.
- Permitted number of uploads: GRESB allows the upload of multiple documents as evidence per indicator. This helps to ease the reporting burden by eliminating the need to merge different documentation into one file. If the information is part of a larger document that the participant does not wish to disclose in its entirety, they can extract the relevant parts using [www.splitpdf.com](http://www.splitpdf.com).
- Location of relevant information: In order to facilitate the data validation process, participants are required to use the assigned box to indicate where in the document, the relevant information can be found. Additionally, they may add a cover page at the beginning of the document or clearly highlight,

encircle, or otherwise identify the specific page number(s) within the upload. Participants can also refer to specific pages in the upload by using the Evidence template, available in the document library.

- Evidence template: This document may be used as a standalone document, or as a cover page for uploaded evidence. This template allows for easier identification of relevant information for each answer option selected within an indicator.
- Sections of documents: Participants may upload sections of larger documents. If so, they should include the name and date of publication of the document from which the extract is taken.
- Redacted documents: You may redact documents. However, they must contain enough information to validate your question response. Re-written summaries of documents must be on the organization's letterhead and contain enough information to validate your question response.
- Optional evidence sharing with investors: GRESB uses uploaded documents for validation purposes. GRESB allows the functionality to make the documentation provided as supporting evidence available to investors on a document by document basis. Each uploaded document will have a checkbox (with the default set to 'not available') which, when selected, will make this evidence available to investors. Once this checkbox is selected, the document will be available to all investors. It is not possible to choose a subset of investors which you would like to share the documents with.
- Upload library: Uploaded documents are stored in a participant's document library, which remains accessible after you submit your response. The library is entity-specific and includes documents that were already uploaded since 2014.
- Previously accepted evidence: Uploaded evidence that was accepted in previous Assessment submissions might not be accepted in following submissions. Enhanced validation checks and/or a change in the level of validation (see [GRESB Data Validation Process](#)) may result in different validation outcomes. In order to be accepted, the provided evidence should meet the requirements as stipulated in this Reference Guide.

## Hyperlink

If a hyperlink (or deep link) is provided, ensure that the relevant page can be accessed within two steps. Ideally, the landing page should contain all the information needed to validate the answer. In order to qualify as valid supporting evidence, the evidence provided must demonstrate the existence of the relevant topic relating to each of the criteria selected. The participant has the obligation to ensure that the hyperlink is functioning. Broken links are the responsibility of the participant and will be interpreted as the absence of evidence. Hyperlinks can only be provided if indicated. In all other instances, the actual document should be uploaded, or the document name and publication date should be provided. Hyperlinks in uploaded documents will not be checked.

## Languages

Your Assessment response must be submitted in English. Documents uploaded as supporting evidence do not need to be entirely translated. However, a thorough summary of the content, sufficient to convey that each requirement has been met, should be provided in English.

GRESB intends to translate the 2019 GRESB Real Estate Assessment in to Japanese.

For other languages, the GRESB assessment portal can be translated by using "Google translate" via the Google Chrome web browser. This applies to the assessment portal, guidance notes and online version of the reference guide.

How to use Google Translate

On your computer, open Chrome.  
Go to web page you wish to translate in another language  
At the top, click the Translate icon.  
Chrome will translate the web page this one time

Turn translation on

You can control whether Chrome will offer to translate web pages.

On your computer, open Chrome.

At the top-right, click : >Settings.

At the bottom, click Advanced.

Under 'Languages', click Language.

Tick or untick 'Offer to translate pages that aren't in a language you read'.

If the page is not yet being translated to your language, click on the Translate icon again, select "options", and make sure your "Translation language" is not set to something else. If it is, change it to the desired language for translation.

## Disclaimer

Please note that not all text may be translated accurately or be translated at all. GRESB is not responsible for incorrect or inaccurate translations. GRESB will not be held responsible for any damage or issues that may result from using Google Translate.

## Open text boxes

Over the years, the number of scored open text boxes has been reduced in an effort to shift focus from management to implementation. GRESB distinguishes between open text boxes:

- That are scored and can receive no, partial or full points. In order to receive the maximum number of points for the scored text boxes, the description should include all of the requirements referred to in the guidance for the question.
- That are used for reporting purposes only (not scored);
- That provide context for specific Assessment indicators (not scored);

Each type of text box is clearly marked in the Assessment.

## "Other" answer

Some indicators offer the opportunity to provide an alternative answer option ('Other'). These other answers must stand outside of the options listed in the question. It is possible to add multiple other answers, however scores will not be aggregated. All answers are validated as part of the data validation process.

## Indicator-specific guidance

The indicator-specific guidance contains:

- Per aspect: An overview which summarizes (a) *the intent of the aspect and (b) the content of the section and any major changes from 2018;*
- Per indicator: An overview which indicates (a) the intent of the indicator, (b) which of the two GRESB dimensions (Management & Policy or Implementation & Measurement) it is allocated, (c) the maximum number of points, (d) which of the E, S or G categories it is allocated, (e) applicable terminology (f) requirements for a well structured response, (g) scoring elements and (h) any applicable supporting materials, examples or references.

## Reporting period

Answers must refer to the reporting period identified in EC3 in the Real Estate Assessment. A response to an indicator must be true at the close of the reporting period; however, the response does not need to have been true for the entire reporting period. GRESB does not favour the use of calendar year over fiscal year or viceversa, as long as the chosen reporting period is used consistently throughout the Assessment.

## Reporting level

Assessment questions are asked at three levels. When a participating entity is part of a larger investment management organization or group of companies (the 'Organization'), GRESB directs some indicators to be answered either:

- (a) At 'Organization Level';
- (b) At 'Organization Level applicable to Entity Level';
- (c) At 'Entity Level'.

**Organization Level:** These indicators do not need to relate specifically to the entity for which you are submitting an Assessment response. Instead, if the entity is part of an investment management organization or group of companies, your response may relate to the Organization.

**Organization Level applicable to Entity Level:** These indicators require you to respond at entity level but, if the entity is part of a larger organization (as defined above), your response may relate to organization level activities. However, in these circumstances, the organization level activities must apply to the entity.

**Entity Level:** These indicators ask for the highest level of detail in your response. Your response should relate specifically to the named entity for which you are submitting an Assessment response.

Each indicator specifies at which level you should respond. As part of the validation process, GRESB may seek confirmation that a question has been answered at the correct reporting level. Where a participating entity is not part of a larger organization, all Assessment responses should be answered at the entity level.

## **Service provider (Organization name)**

This information is used in the data validation process. State the full name of the organization(s). As part of our annual validation of service providers, we may ask you to provide additional information via the GRESB Portal.

# Scoring Methodology

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment is structured into seven sustainability aspects, with a separate aspect for New Construction & Major Renovations. The weighted combination of scores for each aspect generates the overall GRESB Score. This Reference Guide provides detailed insight into the points available for each indicator, and the weighting of Assessment aspects. The information in this section provides additional context. Points per indicator are decided by GRESB in advance of the Assessment opening for responses. Indicator scoring goes through a three-stage review process based on GRESB's rules, principles and guidelines.

## Points per indicator

For indicators where you can select one or more answers, GRESB awards points cumulatively for each individual selected answer and then aggregates to calculate a final score for the indicator. For many indicators, this final score is capped at a maximum, which means that it is not necessary to select all answers in order to receive full points. This scoring mechanism allows the diversity among property companies and funds and the variety of their sustainability-oriented activities to be reflected. Open text boxes (where participants answer through a descriptive text), and indicators for which participants select 'other' answers, are manually validated. Points are awarded based on the validity of the response.

## Scoring model

The scoring model is based on an automated system, which uses a technology platform designed for GRESB by a third party that specializes in data analysis software development. The scoring is completed without manual intervention after data validation has been completed.

The sum of the scores for each indicator adds up to a maximum of 139 points, and the overall GRESB Score is then expressed as a percentage – from 0 to 100. The maximum score for each aspect is a weighted element of the overall GRESB Score. GRESB takes into account the unique characteristics of different property types, not only in benchmarking absolute scores, but also in the scoring of a selection of indicators. A selection of indicators is scored based on each portfolio's main property types – this holds specifically for the Performance Indicators and Building Certifications indicators.

The overall GRESB Score is divided into two dimensions: Management & Policy (MP) and Implementation & Measurement (IM).

Sustainability Aspect	Weight (% Overall Score)
Management	7.9%
Policy & Disclosure	9.4%
Risks & Opportunities	12.9%
Monitoring & EMS	8.6%
Performance Indicators	25.2%
Building Certifications	10.8%
Stakeholder Engagement	25.2%
New Construction & Major Renovations	Scored individually
Resilience Module	Scored individually

Management & Policy is defined as *“the means by which a company or fund deals with or controls its portfolio and its stakeholders and/or a course or principle of action adopted by the company or fund.”* The maximum score for Management & Policy is 36.25 points – this is 26.1 percent of the overall GRESB Score and is expressed as a percentage.

Implementation & Measurement is defined as *“the process of executing a decision or plan or of putting a decision or plan into effect and/or the action of measuring something related to the portfolio.”* The maximum

score for Implementation & Measurement is 102.75 points – this is 73.9 percent of the overall GRESB Score and is expressed as a percentage.

Participants reporting on new construction and major renovation projects complete the additional New Construction & Major Renovations (NC&MR) aspect, which receives a separate aspect score that is not included in the overall GRESB Score. Companies and funds that focus on development activities rather than the management of standing investments must complete the separate GRESB Developer Assessment and will receive a separate Developer Score.

#### Other information

- Open text boxes - GRESB awards full, partial or no points for open text box responses. Responses are assessed based on compliance with question requirements.
- Document uploads – GRESB uses uploads in the data validation process in two ways: (a) uploads requested to validate the response to the Assessment indicator are either accepted or rejected, and (b) uploads requested as standalone answers to Assessment questions are awarded full, partial or no points.
- Role of validation in scoring – Points are awarded per indicator using the methodology published in this Reference Guide.
- Indicators with multiple sections – for some indicators, participants must complete multiple data points within a single question e.g. RO5 (energy efficiency measures implemented), where participants must include (i) number of measures implemented, (ii) percentage portfolio covered and (iii) percentage whole portfolio covered. For these indicators participants must complete all sections, as all of these are included in scoring.
- Benchmarked indicators - some indicators are benchmarked either through:
  - (a) a dynamic benchmark based on relative peer group performance (peer group based on property type and region);
  - (b) a static benchmark using pre-defined intervals – the answer receives points depending on the position relative to four pre-defined interval points;
  - (c) a combination of the previous options.

In response to industry feedback, GRESB has compiled a Scoring Document outlining the scoring methodology in detail as applied to each indicator in the 2019 Real Estate Assessment. The 2019 Scoring Document is available to participants via the Assessment Portal on April 1, 2019 and is shared for information purposes in an effort to increase transparency around the Assessment, Methodology and Scoring processes. GRESB reserves the right to make edits to this document during the scoring and analysis period preceding the 2019 results launch.

## GRESB Rating

The GRESB Rating is an overall measure of how well ESG issues are integrated into the management and practices of companies and funds. The rating is based on the GRESB Score and its quintile position relative to the GRESB universe, with annual calibration of the model. It is calculated relative to the global performance of all reporting entities - property type and geography are not taken into account. In this way the GRESB Rating provides investors with insight into the differentiation of overall ESG performance within the global property sector. If certain regions systematically perform better, they will on average have higher-rated companies and funds. If the entity is placed in the top quintile, it will have a GRESB 5-star rating; if it is in the bottom quintile, it will have a GRESB 1-star rating, etc.

Entities with a score higher than 50 for both the Implementation & Measurement and Management & Policy dimensions receive the Green Star designation, highlighted through a distinctive markup in the Scorecard and Benchmark Reports.

## Entity categorization

A pre-set threshold determines an entity's geographic location and property type:

- The threshold for property type categorization is set at 75 percent of the Gross Asset Value (GAV). This means that based on GAV, 75 percent or more of the Portfolio must be comprised of a single property type. If a participant does not reach the threshold for categorization in a specific sector, it is assigned to

the “*diversified*” category. A participant will be assigned to one of these diversified property type subcategories, where the combination of the two property types is at least 75 percent of GAV.

- GRESB assigns participants to a geographic category using a four-tier system: country, sub-region, region and global. The threshold for assigning a geographic category is set at 60 percent of GAV. The country, subregion, region are defined using the UN country classification guidelines available [here](#)

The four-tier systems works as follows:

- Country: Based on GAV, 60 percent or more of the portfolio must be allocated to a single country;
- Sub-region: If a participant does not reach the threshold for assignment to a specific country, where possible, it is instead assigned to a sub-region, meaning that 60 percent or more of the portfolio must be allocated to that sub-region. The sub-regional categories are: Nordics, Benelux, West Asia, East Asia, or Southeast Asia;
- Region: If a participant does not reach the threshold for assignment to a sub-region, where possible, it is instead assigned to a region, meaning that 60 percent or more of the portfolio must be allocated to that specific region. The regional categories are Asia, Australia/NZ, Asia Pacific, Europe, or North America;
- Super-region: The only super-region used is Asia Pacific, grouped from Asia (code 142 in the UN classification) and Oceania (code 009 in the UN classification)
- Global: If a participant does not reach the threshold for assignment to a region, it is assigned to “globally diversified”.

## Peer group allocation

Each participant is assigned to a peer group, based on the entity’s legal structure (public/private), property type and geographical location. To ensure participant anonymity, GRESB will only create a peer group if there is a minimum of six peers in the group.

Peer group assignments do not affect a company/fund’s score, but determine how GRESB places an Assessment participant’s results into context.

The goal of the peer group creation process is to compare participants who share as many characteristics as possible, while:

- Maintaining a minimum threshold of 6 and;
- Having less than 50% of the participants in the group from the same fund manager.

Each participant can be part of multiple peer groups, but can only have one active peer group. The active peer group is the one which is used for benchmarking and is displayed in the participant’s Benchmark Report. This means that participant A can be in the active peer group of participant B, without participant B being in the active peer group of participant A. The practical consequence of this is that A will be displayed in the Benchmark Report of B under “*Peer Group Constituents*”, while B will not be displayed in the Benchmark Report of A.

The peer group composition is determined by a simple set of quantitative rules and provides consistent treatment for all participants.

GRESB creates peer groups by filtering participants on all relevant characteristics. If the peer group is too small or has too many participants with the same fund manager, we eliminate filters until we have a valid peer group. There are two ways in which the filter can be widened:

- Dropping a characteristic entirely (e.g. ignoring a participant’s nature of ownership: listed / non-listed / government)
- Using a more general version of the characteristic (e.g. filtering on the portfolio’s region, not country)

The system attempts to find the best peer group based on the criteria presented above. This process repeats in a loop following the logic described in the table available in

The system attempts to find the best peer group based on the criteria presented above. This process repeats in a loop following the logic described in the table available in Appendix: 9 Peer Group Allocation Methodology

## Customized Benchmark Reports

Participants who would like to be compared against a different peer group than the one assigned by GRESB can request a Customized Benchmark Report ([click here for details](#)). The GRESB Customized Benchmark Report provides advanced analytics through alternative indicator-level performance comparisons and rankings based on a self-selected peer group. It builds on the detailed insights you can draw from the standard Benchmark Report and adds additional flexibility to understand your relative performance in the market.

## Peer group disclosure

For public companies, the entity name of the peer group constituents is disclosed in the Benchmark Report. For private entities, only the fund manager's name of the peer group constituents is disclosed. GRESB provides an opt-in option that discloses the entity's name (listed) or fund manager's name (private), as well as the scores for the two dimensions (Management & Policy and Implementation & Measurement). However, this is only disclosed to participants in the peer group who also opted to disclose their name and dimension scores.

## Customized Benchmark Reports

Participants who would like to be compared against a different peer group than the one assigned by GRESB can request a Customized Benchmark Report ([click here for details](#)). The GRESB Customized Benchmark Report provides advanced analytics through alternative indicator-level performance comparisons and rankings based on a self-selected peer group. It builds on the detailed insights you can draw from the standard Benchmark Report and adds additional flexibility to understand your relative performance in the market.

# 2019 GRESB Data Validation Process

---

Data validation is an important part of GRESB's annual benchmarking process. The purpose of data validation is to encourage best practices in data collection and reporting. It provides the basis for GRESB's continued efforts to provide investment grade data to its investor members. Following receipt of Assessment submissions, prior to analyzing the data, GRESB validates the input data. This process continues from June 15 until July 31, 2019.

GRESB operates a three-tier validation process (All Participant Check, Validation Plus, Validation Interview). Over the past years, the topics covered by the validation process and the scope of work for Validation Plus and Validation Interviews have increased significantly. The validation process is completely outsourced to GRESB's parent company GBCI.

## What data does GRESB Validate?

GRESB validation is a check on (a) the factual accuracy and (b) the logic (e.g. clear, sound reasoning) of GRESB Assessment submissions including:

- Key topics: Checks on Assessment indicators that ask for (a) quantitative information and (b) indicators that are strongly weighted in the scoring methodology (in turn a reflection of their importance to investors and as indicators of sustainability);
- Third-party review topics: Checks on indicators that ask for confirmation of third-party checks of sustainability data e.g. reviews, verification, assurance;
- Umbrella topics: Checks on indicators with broad, overarching relevance to the sustainability of portfolios.

GRESB checks:

1. The existence and content of answers to open text boxes;
2. The additional information provided to Assessment Indicators, e.g. third-party organization names, assurance, audit, certification and verification standards and 'other' answers;
3. Uploaded documents, and/or on provided document name and date of publication.
4. Automated outlier and consistency checks of performance data (energy and water consumption, GHG emissions and waste).

Document uploads are validated based on the validity of the document relative to the requirements stated in the guidance for the indicator, including the actual reference to selected answer options (see "Evidence"). Uploaded evidence that was accepted in previous Assessment submissions might not be accepted in subsequent submissions. Enhanced validation checks and/or a change in the level of validation may result in different validation outcomes. In order to be accepted, the provided evidence should meet the requirements as stipulated in this Reference Guide.

## All Participant Checks

- Checks on all benchmark submissions, for selected data points;
- Validation per indicator with a secondary review system for quality control;
- Focus on open text boxes and open fields, including service providers, standards, green building certificates and energy ratings;
- Supplemental checks to confirm the existence of supporting evidence for questions requiring documentary evidence (hyperlinks, uploaded documents, or details of the name and date of the document);
- Supplemental checks on energy, GHG emissions, water, waste data outliers.

## Validation Plus

- For all participants, an additional desktop review on a selection of indicators;
- Validation per indicator with a secondary review system for quality control;

- Document review of supporting evidence for selected indicators. Where no document is provided, the GRESB team will request the document from the participant.

The 2019 list of indicators selected for Validation Plus is:

MA5	ESG factors included in performance targets
PD1	Policy on environmental issues
PD5.1	Disclosure of ESG performance
RO3.1	Due diligence on new acquisitions
SE4.1	ESG specific requirements in the procurement process
NC1	Sustainability strategy for new construction & major renovations
NC8	Promotion of water conservation
NC14	Monitoring impact on local community

The GRESB/GBCI validation team reviews the uploaded documents, they are not disclosed by GRESB to any third parties, unless the option to make the evidence available to investors was selected. You may redact the documents, provided that enough information to validate your Assessment responses is available. All supporting evidence for indicators selected for Validation Plus must be submitted alongside the Real Estate Assessments. Documents, clarifications and information provided after submission will not be taken into consideration.

## Validation Interviews

- In-depth assessment of data, performed by GBCI on a selection of all Assessment submissions;
- Random selection of participants using a system that analyzes criteria based on 2019 Assessment submission data. The system automatically picks participants based on a profile that takes into account 2019 Assessment validation decisions, outliers, and performance;
- Focus on the mapping of the portfolio (Reporting and Entity Characteristics), and supporting evidence.

Validation Interviews participants are automatically selected using a system that analyzes criteria based on the previous year's Assessment data. Participants selected will be notified by email after the Assessment submission. In 2019, GRESB anticipates that approximately five percent of participants will be selected for a Validation Interview.

## Quantitative Data Quality Control

Based on statistical modelling, GRESB identifies outliers in all reported quantitative data. This analysis is performed to ensure that all participating entities included in the benchmarking and scoring process are compared based on a fair, quality-controlled dataset.

## Identification of outliers

GRESB identifies reported consumption values as outliers, if the corresponding consumption intensity (consumption/area) and/or its change over time is abnormal relative to all reported data for the particular property type. Through an in-house developed statistical program, GRESB groups and benchmarks values within their property type, which allows for the identification of consumption values that fall outside normally observed ranges. Beyond reviewing the intensity of consumption, the like-for-like development of consumption over a two-year period is also used to identify abnormal data points.

Once the overall portfolio consumption and/or its consumption change over time are identified as abnormal, all underlying data points are reviewed by a member of the validation team. All GRESB participants undergo the same data review and all decisions are automatically protocolled by the system so that they can always be reviewed.

## Elimination of outliers

GRESB acknowledges that some identified abnormal data points are not the result of incorrect data, but rather the result of unusual business development. To account for this explanation, outliers are not removed if a reasonable explanation by the respondent exists. Once participants enter unusual data points, the GRESB Portal requires a written explanation for those reported values. GRESB reviews all explanations for outliers and considers those before making a final decision on removing the outlier from the dataset. If a data point is identified as outlier and no reasonable explanation is provided, the data point is removed from the participant's assessment response, both for scoring and reporting purposes. The outcomes of the outlier validation process are presented in the Benchmark Report and are not communicated to participants during the validation process. Please check [Appendix 7c: Outlier validation for more information](#)

## Validation issues: queries and disputes

Participants with questions on individual validation decisions can contact the [GRESB Helpdesk](#). For a complete interpretation of the validation decisions in the Assessment, participants can request a Results Review. For more information about the Results Review, please click [here](#).

Each validation inquiry sent via the [GRESB Helpdesk](#) is evaluated internally and can be the result of:

- A reporting mistake made by the participant, resulting in a “Not Accepted” / “Partially Accepted” answer. Following the official results release, GRESB cannot provide amended scoring, nor update the Benchmark Reports available via the Portal.
- A validation mistake made by GRESB (for the 2018 Assessment we identified 3 such issues): GRESB recalculates the indicator, aspect, IM, MP and Overall Scores for the entity and communicates them in a formal letter to the participant. This letter can be used in further communication to investors. Participants who want to communicate specific points on the results presented in the Benchmark Report can use the “Respondent score comments” field – this will be seen by investors



# Reporting Scope and Boundaries

---

GRESB requires property companies and funds to report on their whole portfolio, including both managed and indirectly managed assets.

The Annual GRESB Assessment includes all assets that are held during the reporting period, including those that have been sold or purchased. For these assets, ESG data is reported for the period of time that the assets were part of the portfolio. This enables us to deliver the standardized and comparable assessment of portfolio-level ESG performance that the market is seeking. However it is also worth noting that in addition to simple overall scores of ESG performance - such as the GRESB Score and GRESB Ratings - we provide detailed aspect-level and individual indicator-level assessments of performance. This richer analysis, further complimented by peer group benchmarking, enables managers to understand their results in the context of their investment strategies and communicate this to their investors.

## Joint ventures

When an asset or assets are part of a joint venture, joint operation or are in joint ownership, participants are required to report on these assets, even if the joint arrangement means that the participant does not have direct operational control over the asset(s). Joint venture partners with a stake of 25 percent or higher are considered to have significant influence over operational initiatives and can therefore drive implementation of sustainability initiatives and performance improvements, even in the case the operational control resides with another partner. If the equity share in a joint venture, joint operation or joint ownership is more than, or equal to 25 percent, participants can choose to either (a) report on their share or (b) report on the full asset. This must be done consistently throughout the portfolio and is regardless of operational or management control. This may result in an asset being included in two separate submissions. However, this does not impact GRESB's analysis or the benchmark results. If the equity share in a joint venture, joint operation or joint ownership is less than 25 percent, participants can exclude the asset(s) from the reporting boundaries. In either case, participants must explain their approach in the open text box in RC5.1.

If an asset is part of multiple portfolios managed by the same fund manager, the asset should be treated as a joint venture in each portfolio. The rules outlined above apply.

## Managed/Indirectly Managed

The definition of Indirectly Managed assets in the Assessment is solely based on the landlord/tenant relationship.

Managed assets or buildings are those for which the landlord is determined to have “*operational control*” where operational control is defined as having the ability to introduce and implement operating policies, health and safety policies, and/or environmental policies. If both the landlord and tenant have the authority to introduce and implement any or all of the policies mentioned above, the asset or building should be reported as a Managed asset. Where a single tenant has the greatest authority to introduce and implement operating policies and environmental policies, the tenant should be assumed to have operational control. For example, in the case of a full repairing and insuring (FRI) lease in England and Wales, the tenant has operational control meaning that the asset is Indirectly Managed.

GRESB distinguishes between Managed assets and Indirectly Managed assets in the Performance Indicators aspect. GRESB has done so in recognition of the fact that landlords of Indirectly Managed assets may have little or no control over the use or purchase of utilities for the asset, or over waste management practices. The guidance for this aspect explains GRESB's approach in more detail.

GRESB does not specifically distinguish between Managed and Indirectly Managed assets outside the Performance Indicator aspect. The Assessment measures ESG performance using a consistent methodology that applies both to listed companies and private funds and which applies across property sectors and regions. GRESB encourages the collection of data and qualitative information regarding ESG issues that give property companies and funds and their investors the tools to identify areas in which they can improve performance and as a toolkit for internal and external engagement.

Furthermore, while GRESB does measure absolute performance, it emphasizes the importance of peer group comparisons in scoring and the analysis of benchmark results. Where participant numbers allow this, GRESB creates separate peer groups for each property type, for listed and private entities and for Managed and Indirectly Managed assets. Additionally, participants have the opportunity to explain the composition of their portfolio in the open text box in RC5.1, including clarifying limits on asset control that arise from the landlord/tenant relationship.

With these factors in mind, while the landlord's day-to-day involvement in Indirectly Managed assets may be limited, the topics covered by the Assessment are equally relevant to Indirectly Managed assets. Accordingly, the same questions and methodology apply.

# 2019 GRESB Real Estate Assessment Changes

---

GRESB works closely with its members and broader industry stakeholders to ensure the Assessment addresses material issues in the sustainability performance of real estate investments. The main focus of the 2019 Assessment development process were enhancements to asset-level reporting functionality and the integration of selected Health & Well-being Module elements. The changes serve the longer term development of the Assessment, support our efforts for good quality data and reflect the evolution of the real estate industry as measured by the benchmark over the last years.

The table below lists all changes, as well as their implications for your reporting process.

## High-level comments

<b>Continuous, all year use of the GRESB Asset Portal and API</b>
With the year round availability of the Asset Portal and API, assets can be added and edited throughout the year. Added data can then be used during the reporting period for aggregation to portfolio level indicators.
<b>Updated checks in the asset portal and improved guidance for asset level reporting</b>
The updates to data integrity rules and live validation are designed to simplify reporting and improve data quality.
<b>Updated API</b>
API endpoints are updated and migrated to <a href="https://api.gresb.com/api/entities">https://api.gresb.com/api/entities</a> . For more information visit our updated <a href="#">API documentation</a> .
<b>The access to the Template Tool is no longer restricted to members.</b>
The template tool enables participants to copy information across multiple submissions, reducing the amount of time spent replicating information across entities held by the same fund manager.
<b>The Validation Interview process changes structure and will be mainly based on a desktop review.</b>
While the scope of the Validation Interview will remain the same (the validators will do an in-depth analysis of all supporting evidences, mandatory and non-mandatory, performance indicators and outliers), the Validation Interview report, the call with the participant, and the participant's ability to change their responses following the call will be removed from the process. Participants will continue to be automatically notified if they are selected for a Validation Interview and there may still be instances where we need to contact the participant for missing supporting evidence, additional information, clarifications or corrections to the data submitted.
<b>A selection of Health &amp; Well-being indicators are incorporated into the Real Estate Assessment</b>
With the release of the 2018 results and after a successful 3-year cycle, the Health & Well-being Module has served its purpose as an exploratory vehicle and incubator for new indicators. In 2019, a selection of health & well-being indicators are incorporated into the GRESB Real Estate Assessment, effectively making these indicators a reporting requirement for all GRESB participants. The newly introduced Health & Well-being indicators are grouped as a separate section in the Stakeholder Engagement aspect.
<b>Validation Plus indicators</b>
The Validation Plus indicator selection is performed by GRESB and is subject to change on an annual basis in order to rotate the validation scope every year. This allows GRESB to apply a consistent level of scrutiny on all

participating entities. In 2019, the following changes are introduced:

- MA1, PD3: are excluded from the Validation Plus scope and become APC indicators. 2018 supporting evidence is pre-filled and pre-validated
- MA5, PD1: become Validation Plus indicators and the supporting evidence is reviewed for all participants

## Indicators level comments

	<h3>Entity &amp; Reporting Characteristics</h3>
RC5.2	<p><b><u>New evidence requirement for reporting boundaries provided in RC5.1</u></b></p> <p>Rationale for change: RC5.1 determines the entity's peer group composition and enables data checks on benchmarked indicators. To facilitate a fair and accurate benchmark, it is essential that the portfolio boundaries identified in RC5.1 are complete.</p> <p>Impact of change: Increased participant and investor confidence in the accuracy of the GRESB Real Estate Benchmark. An improved ability to confirm accurate portfolio reporting in both Response Checks and Validation.</p>
RC-NC1.1	<p><b><u>Vacant land is excluded from the reporting scope.</u></b></p> <p>Rationale for change: Vacant land does not share the same ESG issues as standing investments or development projects, and it does not directly associate to any performance indicator.</p>
	<h3>Policy and Disclosure</h3>
PD2	<p><b><u>Two new options are added "Employee Health &amp; Well-being" and "Tenant/customer and community health &amp; well-being".</u></b></p> <p>Rationale for change: This is part of the Health &amp; Well-being integration.</p> <p>Impact of change: The scope of the indicator is expanded to assess the presence of policies to address employee, tenant/customer and community health and well-being. The indicator will still be pre-filled for 2018 participants.</p>
PD4	<p><b><u>Non-scored indicator is further developed to introduce a set of quantitative diversity metrics and the ability to report on governance bodies and employees separately.</u></b></p> <p>Rationale for change: This indicator was introduced as a non-scored indicator in 2018. Building on last year's answers, we have further developed it into a more analytical indicator on diversity.</p> <p>Impact of change: The changes bring a better alignment with the GRI Standards and EPRA's SBPRs.</p>
PD5.2	<p><b><u>Third-party verification and third-party assurance of sustainability disclosure receive equal points.</u></b></p> <p>Rationale for change: Over the past years, the non-financial information third-party review industry has witnessed the development of several new verification and assurance standards. The level of scrutiny underpinning such third-party reviews tends to be dictated by the standard used, rather than the terminology used to describe the review process.</p>

Impact of change: The scoring is adjusted to recognize external verification in the same way as external assurance. "Other" answers provided to the Scheme name dropdown menu are subject to validation.

## Risk and Opportunities

**R05/6/7 Indicators are simplified to reflect whether such measures exist across the portfolio. The column for individual measure descriptions is replaced by an open textbox below the table.**

Rationale for change: Participants no longer need to report on the measures that were implemented over four years ago.

Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.

## Monitoring and EMS

**ME2 Evidence removed.**

Rationale for change: The supporting evidence for this indicator was validated for a few consecutive years. More than 99% evidence uploaded in 2018 was Accepted.

Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.

## Performance Indicators

**Asset level data Enable the download of asset-level data**

Rationale for change: Provide a more flexible asset level reporting process controlled by the participant.

Impact of change: This can be done once outliers are solved and missing data is completed, enabling the participant to use a curated dataset online (through the portal) and offline.

**PI1.2/  
PI2.2/  
PI3.2 Open text box for description of intensity calculation methodology is removed, and the scoring of these three indicators is updated.**

Rationale for change: The information provided via the text boxes was repetitive and lacked specificity. This is a simplification step towards the 2020 Assessment framework, which will simplify these indicators even further.

Impact of change: Scoring for these indicators remains the same, but the points previously assigned to the open text boxes are re-distributed to the intensity data tables and selection of normalisation factors.

**PI2.1 Table is extended to capture emissions from outdoor / exterior spaces**

Rationale for change: Participants with outdoor / exterior spaces energy data reported in PI1.1 (and particularly those with only outdoor / exterior spaces data available) were not able to correctly represent the emissions corresponding to this consumption, leading to outlier messages in some cases.

Impact of change: A more accurate representation of GHG emissions data. No impact on scoring.

PI1.4/  
PI2.3/  
PI3.4/  
PI4.2

**Third-party verification and third-party assurance of data receive equal points**

Rationale for change: Over the past years, the non-financial information third-party review industry has witnessed the development of several new verification and assurance standards. The level of scrutiny underpinning such third-party reviews tends to be dictated by the standard used, rather than the terminology used to describe the review process.

Impact of change: The scoring is adjusted to recognize external verification in the same way as external assurance. "Other" answers provided to the Scheme name dropdown menu are subject to validation.

**Stakeholder Engagement**

SE3.1

**Indicator is incorporated into SE12.1**

Rationale for change: Consolidation of health & well-being indicators into an individual section

Impact of change: Indicator maintains its score within SE12.1 and is pre-filled with the 2018 information (if applicable)

SE8.1

**Evidence removed.**

Rationale for change: The supporting evidence for this indicator was validated for all participants in 2018 and had a 90% Accepted rate. The remainder of 10% answers were Partially Accepted, with only a few exceptions.

Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.

SE12.1/  
SE12.2/  
SE13.1/  
SE13.2

**New indicators on employees and tenants health and well-being.**

Rationale for change: Integration of select indicators from the old Health & Well-being Module into the Real Estate Assessment.

Impact of change: The weight of the Stakeholder Engagement aspect increases as a result of:

- SE12.1: 2p, S, IM
- SE12.2: 0p, S, IM
- SE13.1: 1.5p, S, IM
- SE13.2: 0p, S, IM

**New Construction and Major Renovation**

NC7.2

**The open textboxes for describing the entity's definition of "net-zero energy" and referenced code/standards are replaced by checkboxes.**

Rationale for change: Responses in open textboxes are difficult to compare and provide little analytical value.

Impact of change: An easier to report, better-structured indicator.

# Entity & Reporting Characteristics

---

## Entity Characteristics

### EC1 Reporting entity

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

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

### EC2 Nature of ownership:

Listed entity

Please specify ISIN: \_\_\_\_\_

Year of commencement: \_\_\_\_\_

Legal status:

Property company

Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT)

Non-listed entity

Year of first closing: \_\_\_\_\_

Entity style classification:

Core

Value Added

Opportunistic

Open or closed end:

Open end

Closed end

Finite or infinite structure:

Finite structure

Specify termination date: \_\_\_\_\_

Infinite structure

Government entity

### EC3 The reporting period is:

Calendar year

Fiscal year

Specify the starting month

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

Yes (multiple answers possible)

- Asian Association for Investors in Non-listed Real Estate Vehicles (ANREV)
- Asia Pacific Real Estate Association (APREA)
- British Property Federation (BPF)
- European Association for Investors in Non-Listed Real Estate Vehicles (INREV)
- European Public Real Estate Association (EPRA)
- National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts (NAREIT)
- Pension Real Estate Association (PREA)
- Real Property Association of Canada (REALpac)
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

# Reporting Characteristics

**RC1** Values are reported in:

## Currency

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

**RC3** Metrics are reported in:

- m2
- sq. ft.

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

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

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

Property type	% of GAV	Number of Assets	Floor Area		% Indirectly Managed Assets
			m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.	Type	
Retail, High Street				Select type ▾	
Retail, Shopping Center				Select type ▾	
Retail, Warehouse				Select type ▾	
Office				Select type ▾	
Industrial, Distribution Warehouse				Select type ▾	
Industrial, Business Parks				Select type ▾	
Industrial, Manufacturing				Select type ▾	
Residential, Multi-family				Select type ▾	
Residential, Family Homes				Select type ▾	
Senior Homes				Select type ▾	
Residential, Student Housing				Select type ▾	
Hotel				Select type ▾	
Healthcare				Select type ▾	
Medical Office				Select type ▾	
Lodging, Leisure & Recreation				Select type ▾	
Data Centers				Select type ▾	
Self-storage				Select type ▾	
Parking (indoors)				Select type ▾	
Other				Select type ▾	
Other				Select type ▾	

Note: The table above defines the scope of your 2019 GRESB submission and should include the total standing investments portfolio of the investible entity. Any development and/or major renovation projects should only be included in the reporting scope defined in RC-NC1 and/or RC-NC2. The reporting scope reported above should exclude vacant land, cash or other non real estate assets owned by the entity.

### Floor area type

- floor area
- lettable floor area

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

- Yes
- No

### UPLOAD

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

Provide additional context on how the uploaded evidence supports the entity's reporting boundaries and portfolio composition in RC5.1 (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

## New Construction & Major Renovations

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

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

Note: The table above defines the scope of your 2019 GRESB submission on development projects and should include new construction projects that are in progress at the end of reporting period, as well as projects that are completed during the reporting period. The reporting scope reported above should exclude vacant land, cash or other non real estate assets owned by the entity.

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

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

Yes

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Note: The table above defines the scope of your 2019 GRESB submission on development projects and should include major renovation projects that are in progress at the end of reporting period, as well as projects that are completed during the reporting period. The reporting scope reported above should exclude vacant land, cash or other non real estate assets owned by the entity.

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

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

Yes

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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



# Management

---

## Sustainability Objectives

2018 Indicator

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

Yes

The objectives relate to (multiple answers possible)

General sustainability

Environment

Social

Governance

Health and well-being

The objectives are

Fully integrated into the overall business strategy

Partially integrated into the overall business strategy

Not integrated into the overall business strategy

The objectives are

Publicly available

Please provide a hyperlink or a separate publicly available document

**UPLOAD** or URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

Not publicly available

**UPLOAD**

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

MA1

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

MA2

Yes

Select the persons responsible (multiple answers possible)

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

Provide the details for the most senior of these employees

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

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

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

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

Employee(s) for whom sustainability is among their responsibilities

Provide the details for the most senior of these employees

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

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

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

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

External consultants/manager

Name of the organization

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

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

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

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

Investment partners (co-investors/JV partners)

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

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

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

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

No

Not applicable

## 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)

Asset managers

Board of Directors

External consultants

Name of the organization

Fund/portfolio managers

Property managers

Senior Management Team

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

MA3

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

Yes

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

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

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

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

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

The individual is part of

Board of Directors

Senior Management Team

Fund/portfolio managers

Investment Committee

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

MA4

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

MA5

Yes

Does performance on these targets have predetermined consequences?

Yes

Financial consequences

Non-financial consequences

No

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

All employees

Board of Directors

Senior Management Team

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

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

No



# Policy & Disclosure

---

## ESG Policies

2018 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)

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

### UPLOAD

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

No

PD1

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

PD2

Yes

Select all social issues included (multiple answers possible)

- Child labor
- Diversity and equal opportunity
- Forced or compulsory labor
- Occupational safety (for employees)
- Asset level safety (for tenants)
- Employee health & well-being
- Tenant/customer and community health & well-being
- Labor-management relationships
- Employee performance and career development
- Stakeholder engagement
- Worker rights
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

No

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

PD3

Yes

Select all governance issues included (multiple answers possible)

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

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

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

No

**PD4 Does the organization monitor the diversity of the entity's governance bodies and/or the organization's employees?**

Yes

Diversity of the entity's governance bodies

Select all diversity metrics (multiple answers possible)

Age group distribution

Board tenure

Gender pay gap

Gender ratio

Percentage of employees that are:

Women: \_\_\_\_\_%

Men: \_\_\_\_\_%

International background

Racial diversity

Socioeconomic background

Diversity of the organization's employees

Select all diversity metrics (multiple answers possible)

Age group distribution

Percentage of employees that are:

Under 30 years old: \_\_\_\_\_%

Between 30 and 50 years old: \_\_\_\_\_%

Over 50 years old: \_\_\_\_\_%

Gender pay gap

Gender ratio

Percentage of employees that are:

Women: \_\_\_\_\_%

Men: \_\_\_\_\_%

International background

Racial diversity

Socioeconomic background

Provide additional context for the response (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

No



Yes (multiple answers possible)

Section in Annual Report

Select the applicable reporting level

Entity

Investment manager

Group

**UPLOAD** or URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

Aligned with  ▼

Stand-alone sustainability report(s)

Select the applicable reporting level

Entity

Investment manager

Group

**UPLOAD** or URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

Aligned with  ▼

Integrated Report

\*Integrated Report must be aligned with IIRC framework

Select the applicable reporting level

Entity

Investment manager

Group

**UPLOAD** or URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

Aligned with  ▼

Dedicated section on corporate website

Select the applicable reporting level

Entity

Investment manager

Group

URL\_\_\_\_\_

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

Section in entity reporting to investors

Section in entity reporting to investors

Aligned with

**UPLOAD**

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Select the applicable reporting level

Entity

Investment manager

Group

**UPLOAD** or URL \_\_\_\_\_

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

Aligned with

No

### Guideline name

- ANREV Sustainability Reporting Guidelines, 2016
- EPRA Best Practice Recommendations in Sustainability Reporting, 2017
- GRI Standards, 2016
- GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines, G4
- IIRC International Integrated Reporting Framework, 2013
- INREV Sustainability Guidelines, 2016
- PRI Reporting Framework, 2018
- TCFD Recommendations, 2017
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

PD5.2

Yes

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

Section in Annual Report

Externally checked by

Externally verified by

using

Externally assured by

using

Stand-alone sustainability report

Externally checked by

Externally verified by

using

Externally assured by

using

Integrated Report

Externally checked by

Externally verified by

using

Externally assured by

using

Section in entity reporting to investors

Externally checked by

Externally verified by

using

Externally assured by

using

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Externally checked by

Externally verified by

using

Externally assured by

using

No

Not applicable

### Scheme name

- AA1000AS
- Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)
- Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe
- Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation
- ASAE3000
- Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)
- Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)
- California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)
- Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025
- Carbon Trust Standard
- Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard
- Climate Registry General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT
- DNV Verisustain Protocol/ Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting
- Earthcheck Certified
- Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard
- ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology
- IDW PS 821: IDW Prüfungsstandard: Grundsätze ordnungsmäßiger Prüfung oder prüferischer Durchsicht von Berichtenim Bereich der Nachhaltigkeit
- IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues
- ISAE 3000
- ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements
- ISO14064-3
- JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification
- Korean GHG and energy target management system
- NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)
- RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors professional body
- Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program
- SGS Sustainability Report Assurance
- Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)
- Standard 3810N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants
- State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.
- Swiss Climate CO2 label
- Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol
- The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme
- Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

PD6

Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

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

Please provide applicable hyperlink

URL \_\_\_\_\_

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

No

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

PD7.1

Yes

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

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

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

No

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

PD7.2

Yes

Specify the total number of cases imposed: \_\_\_\_\_

Specify the total value of fines and/or penalties resulting 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 2019 Sector Leaders



# Risks & Opportunities

---

## Governance

2018 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)

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

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

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

No

Not applicable

R01

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

R02

Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

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

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

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

No

**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?**

R03.1

 Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

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

**UPLOAD**

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

 No Not applicable

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

R03.2

Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

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

water efficiency

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

Waste management

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

Water supply

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

The risk assessment is aligned with a third party standard

Yes

ISO 31000

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

R04

Yes

Select applicable options (multiple answers possible)

Energy Efficiency

In-house assessment

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

External assessment

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

Name of the organization

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

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

Water Efficiency

In-house assessment

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

External assessment

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

Name of the organization

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

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

Waste Management

In-house assessment

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

External assessment

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

Name of the organization

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

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

Health & Well-being

In-house assessment

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

External assessment

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

Name of the organization

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

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

- No
- Not applicable

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

R05

- Yes

List the measures using the table below.

Category	Measure	% whole portfolio covered	Estimated savings (MWh) (optional)	Target ROI (%) (optional)
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		

Describe the entity’s strategy for implementing efficiency measures (payback period, property type, scope, etc.) and the link to the entity’s ESG objectives and/or targets. (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

- No
- Not applicable

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

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

**Percentage portfolio covered**

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

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

R06

Yes

List the measures using the table below.

Category	Measure	% whole portfolio covered	Estimated savings (MWh) (optional)	Target ROI (%) (optional)
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		

Describe the entity’s strategy for implementing efficiency measures (payback period, property type, scope, etc.) and the link to the entity’s ESG objectives and/or targets. (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

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

**Percentage portfolio covered**

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

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

R07

Yes

List the measures using the table below.

Category	Measure	% whole portfolio covered	Estimated savings (MWh) (optional)	Target ROI (%) (optional)
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		
Select category ▼		Select ▼		

Describe the entity’s strategy for implementing efficiency measures (payback period, property type, scope, etc.) and the link to the entity’s ESG objectives and/or targets. (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

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

**Percentage portfolio covered**

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



# Monitoring & EMS

---

## Environmental Management Systems

2018 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
    - ISO 14001
    - EMAS (EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme)
    - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - The EMS is externally certified by an independent third party
    - Name of the organization
    - ISO 14001
    - EMAS (EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme)
    - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - The EMS is not aligned with a standard nor certified externally

### UPLOAD

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

- No

ME1

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

Yes

Select one of the following

Developed internally

Bespoke (custom) internal system developed by a third party

Name of the organization

External system

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

Name of the organization

Select the performance indicators included (multiple answers possible)

Energy consumption

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

GHG emissions/management

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

Building safety

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

Indoor environmental quality

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

Resilience

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

Waste streams/management

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

Water

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

No

## 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

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

Based on invoices

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

Manual-visual readings

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

Provided by the tenant

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

No

Not applicable

**ME4 Does the entity monitor the water consumption of the portfolio?**

ME4

Yes

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

Type of monitoring (multiple answers possible)

Automatic meter readings

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

Based on invoices

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

Manual-visual readings

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

Provided by the tenant

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

No

Not applicable

**ME5 Does the entity monitor the waste production of the portfolio?**

ME5

Yes

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

Type of monitoring (multiple answers possible)

Internal tracking

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

Provided by haulers

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

Provided by the tenant

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable



# Performance Indicators

## Energy Consumption Data

2018 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

PI1.0

## PI1.1 Energy consumption for this property type

PI1.1

Report absolute values and like-for-like consumption for 2017 and 2018. 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.

		Absolute Consumption				Like-for-Like Consumption				
		2017	2018		2017	2018	Data coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	Like-for-Like Change (%)		
		Consumption (MWh)	Consumption (MWh)	Data coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	Maximum coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	Consumption (MWh)			Consumption (MWh)	
<b>Managed Assets</b>										
Base Building	Common Areas	Fuels							calculated	
		District Heating & Cooling							calculated	
		Electricity							calculated	
	Shared Services/ Central Plant	Fuels							calculated	
		District Heating & Cooling							calculated	
		Electricity							calculated	
	Outdoor/ Exterior Areas/ Parking	Fuels			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
		Electricity			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
<b>Total energy consumption Base Building (rows 1-8)</b>		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated	
Tenant Space	Purchased by landlord	Fuels							calculated	
		District Heating & Cooling							calculated	
		Electricity							calculated	
	Purchased by tenant	Fuels							calculated	
		District Heating & Cooling							calculated	
		Electricity							calculated	
<b>Total energy consumption Tenant Areas (rows 10-15)</b>		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated	
Whole Building	Combined consumption common areas + tenant space	Fuels							calculated	
		District Heating & Cooling							calculated	
		Electricity							calculated	
<b>Total energy consumption Whole Building (rows 17-19)</b>		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated	
<b>Total energy consumption Managed Assets (rows 9 + 16 + 20)</b>		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated	
<b>Indirectly Managed Assets</b>										
Whole Building	Tenant space	Fuels							calculated	
		District Heating & Cooling							calculated	
		Electricity							calculated	
	Outdoor/ Exterior Areas/ Parking	Fuels			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
		Electricity			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
<b>Total energy consumption Indirectly Managed Assets (rows 22-26)</b>		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated	
<b>Total energy consumption of Whole Portfolio (rows 21 + 27)</b>		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)

---

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

PI1.2

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

	A	B	C	D
	Optional base-line year (include year)	2016	2017	2018
Energy use intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

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

No

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

PI1.3

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
	2017	2018
On-site renewable energy (generated and consumed on-site)	MWh	MWh
Off-site renewable energy (generated off-site or purchased from third party)	MWh	MWh
On-site renewable energy (generated on-site and exported)	MWh	MWh
Total renewable energy	calculated	calculated
Percentage renewable energy	%	%

No

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

Yes

Externally checked

Checked by

Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

**UPLOAD**

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

No

Not applicable

**Scheme name**

- AA1000AS
- Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)
- Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe
- Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation
- ASAE3000
- Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)
- Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)
- California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)
- Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025
- Carbon Trust Standard
- Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard
- Climate Registry General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT
- DNV Verisustain Protocol/ Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting
- Earthcheck Certified
- Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard
- ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology
- IDW PS 821: IDW Prüfungsstandard: Grundsätze ordnungsmäßiger Prüfung oder prüferischer Durchsicht von Berichtenim Bereich der Nachhaltigkeit
- IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues
- ISAE 3000
- ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements
- ISO14064-3
- JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification
- Korean GHG and energy target management system
- NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)
- RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors professional body
- Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program
- SGS Sustainability Report Assurance
- Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)
- Standard 3810N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants
- State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.
- Swiss Climate CO2 label
- Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol
- The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme
- Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

PI2.0

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

**PI2.1 GHG emissions for this property type**

PI2.1

Report absolute values and like-for-like consumption for 2017 and 2018. 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				
		2017	2018			2017	2018	Data coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	Like-for-Like Change (%)	
		Emissions (tonnes)	Emissions (tonnes)	Data coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	Maximum Potential Coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	Emissions (tonnes)	Emissions (tonnes)			
1	Whole Building	Scope 1							calculated	
2		Scope 2							calculated	
3		Scope 3							calculated	
4	Outdoor/ Exterior areas / Parking	Scope 1		N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated	
5		Scope 2		N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated	
6		Scope 3			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
7	GHG Offsets purchased			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated	
8	Net GHG Emissions after offsets		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated

\*Row 4 -8 will not be scored in 2019

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 (maximum 250 words)

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

PI2.2

Does the entity report GHG emissions intensities?

Yes

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

	A	B	C	D
	Optional base-line year (include year)	2016	2017	2018
GHG emissions intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

Air conditioning and/or natural ventilation

Building age

Degree days

Footfall

Occupancy rate

Operational hours

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

None of the above

No

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

Yes

Externally checked

Checked by

Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

### UPLOAD

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

No

Not applicable

### Scheme name

- AA1000AS
- Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)
- Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe
- Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation
- ASAE3000
- Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)
- Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)
- California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)
- Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025
- Carbon Trust Standard
- Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard
- Climate Registry General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT
- DNV Verisustain Protocol/ Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting
- Earthcheck Certified
- Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard
- ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology
- IDW PS 821: IDW Prüfungsstandard: Grundsätze ordnungsmäßiger Prüfung oder prüferischer Durchsicht von Berichten im Bereich der Nachhaltigkeit
- IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues
- ISAE 3000
- ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements
- ISO14064-3
- JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification
- Korean GHG and energy target management system
- NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)
- RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors professional body
- Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program
- SGS Sustainability Report Assurance
- Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)
- Standard 3810N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants
- State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.
- Swiss Climate CO2 label
- Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol
- The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme
- Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

PI3.0

Yes

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

Yes

No

No

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

PI3.1

Report absolute values and like-for-like consumption for 2017 and 2018. 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	
		Absolute Consumption				Like-for-Like Consumption				
		2017	2018		Maximum Potential Coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	2017	2018	Data coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)	Like-for-Like Change (%)	
		Consumption (m <sup>3</sup> )	Consumption (m <sup>3</sup> )	Data coverage (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft.)		Consumption (m <sup>3</sup> )	Consumption (m <sup>3</sup> )			
<b>Managed Assets</b>										
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
<b>Indirectly Managed Assets</b>										
11	Whole Building	Tenant space								calculated
12		Outdoor/Exterior areas/Parking			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
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)

---

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

PI3.2

Does the entity report water use intensities?

Yes

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

	A	B	C	D
	Optional base-line year (include year)	2016	2017	2018
Water use intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

Air conditioning and/or natural ventilation

Building age

Degree days

Footfall

Occupancy rate

Operational hours

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

None of the above

No

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

PI3.3

Yes

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

	A	B
	Absolute measurement	
	2017	2018
On-site water reuse (greywater, blackwater)	m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup>
On-site capture (rainwater, fog, condensate)	m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup>
On-site extraction (groundwater)	m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup>
Total reused and recycled water	calculated	calculated
Percentage reused and recycled water	%	%

No

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

Yes

Externally checked

Checked by

Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

### UPLOAD

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

No

Not applicable

### Scheme name

- AA1000AS
- Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)
- Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe
- Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation
- ASAE3000
- Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)
- Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)
- California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)
- Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025
- Carbon Trust Standard
- Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard
- Climate Registry General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT
- DNV Verisustain Protocol/ Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting
- Earthcheck Certified
- Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard
- ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology
- IDW PS 821: IDW Prüfungsstandard: Grundsätze ordnungsmäßiger Prüfung oder prüferischer Durchsicht von Berichten im Bereich der Nachhaltigkeit
- IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues
- ISAE 3000
- ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements
- ISO14064-3
- JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification
- Korean GHG and energy target management system
- NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)
- RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors professional body
- Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program
- SGS Sustainability Report Assurance
- Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)
- Standard 3810N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants
- State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.
- Swiss Climate CO2 label
- Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol
- The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme
- Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

PI4.0

Yes

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

Yes

No

No

**PI4.1 Waste management for this property type**

PI4.1

Report absolute values for 2017 and 2018. All assets in the whole portfolio for this property type should be included.

		A	B
		Absolute measurement	
		2017 Weight (tonnes)	2018 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)		2017	2018
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)

---

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

Yes

Externally checked

Checked by

Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

**UPLOAD**

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

No

Not applicable

**Scheme name**

- AA1000AS
- Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)
- Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe
- Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation
- ASAE3000
- Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)
- Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)
- California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)
- Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025
- Carbon Trust Standard
- Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard
- Climate Registry General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT
- DNV Verisustain Protocol/ Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting
- Earthcheck Certified
- Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard
- ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology
- IDW PS 821: IDW Prüfungsstandard: Grundsätze ordnungsmäßiger Prüfung oder prüferischer Durchsicht von Berichten im Bereich der Nachhaltigkeit
- IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues
- ISAE 3000
- ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements
- ISO14064-3
- JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification
- Korean GHG and energy target management system
- NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)
- RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors professional body
- Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program
- SGS Sustainability Report Assurance
- Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)
- Standard 3810N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants
- State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.
- Swiss Climate CO2 label
- Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol
- The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme
- Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

PI5

Yes

	Target type	Long-term target	Baseline year	End year	2018 target	Portfolio coverage	Are these targets communicated externally?
Energy consumption	Type ▾					Select ▾	Y/N
GHG emissions	Type ▾					Select ▾	Y/N
Water consumption	Type ▾					Select ▾	Y/N
Waste diverted from landfill	Type ▾					Select ▾	Y/N
Other	Type ▾					Select ▾	Y/N

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

---

No

**Select target type:**

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

**Percentage portfolio covered**

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



# Building Certifications

## Green Building Certificates

2018 Indicator  
BC1.1

**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?**

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

### Scheme Name/Sub-scheme Name

A list of provisionally validated certification schemes is provided in Appendix of the Reference Guide.

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

BC1.2

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 2019)	% portfolio covered by floor area 2017 (optional in 2019)	% portfolio covered by floor area 2018	Number of certified assets 2018
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼				
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼				
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼				

No

Not applicable

### Scheme Name/Sub-scheme Name

A list of provisionally validated certification schemes is provided in Appendix of the Reference Guide.



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

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*	
			2017	2018
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*	
			2017	2018
Country ▾				
Country ▾				

Other

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

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

	Coverage (%)		Floor area weighted score*

Country	(coverage within the country)	Number of rated assets	Performance	
			2017	2018
Country ▾				
Country ▾				

\*full flexibility to describe performance

- No
- Not applicable



# Stakeholder Engagement

---

**Employees**

2018 Indicator

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

SE1

Yes

Percentage of employees who received professional training in 2018

\_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of employees who received sustainability-specific training in 2018

\_\_\_\_\_

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

Training topics on environmental issues

Contamination

Greenhouse gas emissions

Energy

Natural hazards

Regulatory standards

Supply chain environmental impacts

Waste

Water

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Training topics on social issues

Community social and economic impacts

Safety

Community safety

Customer / tenant safety

Employee safety

Supply chain safety

Health and well-being

Community health and well-being

Customer / tenant health and well-being

Employee health and well-being

Supply chain health and well-being

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

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

SE2.1

Yes

The survey is undertaken (multiple answers possible)

Internally

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

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

By an independent third party

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

Name of the organization

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

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

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

The survey includes quantitative metrics

Yes

Metrics include

Net Promoter Score

Overall satisfaction score

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

No

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

SE2.2

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

Development of action plan

Feedback sessions with Senior Management Team

Feedback sessions with separate teams/departments

Focus groups

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

SE3.2

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

Work station and/or workplace checks

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

Absentee rate: \_\_\_\_\_

Injury rate: \_\_\_\_\_

Lost day rate: \_\_\_\_\_

Other metrics: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

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

SE4.1

 Yes

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

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

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

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

**UPLOAD**

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

- No
- Not applicable

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

SE4.2

 Yes

Describe the process (maximum 500 words): \_\_\_\_\_

- No
- Not applicable

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

SE5.1

Yes

The organization monitors compliance of:

- Internal property/asset managers
- External property/asset managers
- Both internal and external property/asset managers

Select all methods used (multiple answers possible)

Checks performed by independent third party

Name of the organization

Property/asset manager sustainability training

Property/asset manager self-assessments

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

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

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

No

Not applicable

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

SE5.2

Yes

Select all methods used (multiple answers possible)

Checks performed by an independent third party

Name of the organization

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

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

Require supplier/service providers' alignment with a professional standard

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

Supplier/service provider sustainability training

Supplier/service provider self-assessments

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

SE6

Yes

Select all characteristics applicable to the process (multiple answers possible)

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

Select the stakeholders to whom the process apply (multiple answers possible)

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

No

Not applicable

## 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

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Provide tenants with feedback on energy/water consumption and waste

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Social media/online platform

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Tenant engagement meetings

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Tenant events focused on increasing sustainability awareness

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Tenant sustainability guide

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Tenant sustainability training

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

No

SE7

### Percentage portfolio covered

- > 0%, < 25%
- ≥ 50%, < 75%

- ≥ 25%, < 50%
- ≥ 75%, ≤ 100%

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

SE8.1

Yes

The survey is undertaken (multiple answers possible)

Internally

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

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

By an independent third party

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

Name of the organization

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

The survey includes quantitative metrics

Yes

Metrics include

Net Promoter Score

Overall satisfaction score

Satisfaction with communication

Satisfaction with responsiveness

Satisfaction with property management

Understanding tenant needs

Value for money

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

No

Not applicable

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

SE8.2

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

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

Describe the tenant satisfaction improvement program (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

SE9

Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

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

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- Tenant fit-out guides

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- Minimum fit-out standards are prescribed

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- Procurement assistance for tenants

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

No

**Percentage portfolio covered**

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

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

SE10.1

Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

- Cooperation and works
  - Environmental initiatives
  - Enabling upgrade works
  - Sustainability management collaboration
  - Premises design for performance
  - Managing waste from works
  - Social initiatives
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Management and consumption
  - Energy management
  - Water management
  - Waste management
  - Indoor environmental quality management
  - Sustainable procurement
  - Sustainable utilities
  - Sustainable transport
  - Sustainable cleaning
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Reporting and standards
  - Information sharing
  - Performance rating
  - Design/development rating
  - Performance standards
  - Metering
  - Comfort
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

No

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

SE10.2

Yes

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

---

No

Not applicable

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

SE11.1

 Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

 No Not applicable**SE11.2 Does the entity monitor its impact on the community?**

SE11.2

 Yes

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

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

 No Not applicable

## SE12.1 Does the organization have a program in place for promoting health & well-being of employees?

NEW

Yes

The program includes (multiple answers possible):

Needs assessment

The organization monitors employee health and well-being needs through (multiple answers possible):

Employee surveys on health and well-being

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

Physical and/or mental health checks

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Goal setting

Action

Monitoring

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

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

No

**SE12.2 Does the organization take measures to incorporate the health & well-being program for employees described in SE12.1?**

NEW

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- Creation of goals to address
  - Mental health and well-being
  - Physical health and well-being
  - Social health and well-being
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Action to promote health through
  - Acoustic comfort
  - Biophilic design
  - Physical activity
  - Healthy eating
  - Inclusive design
  - Indoor air quality
  - Lighting controls and/or daylight
  - Physical and/or mental healthcare access
  - Social interaction and connection
  - Thermal comfort
  - Water quality
  - Other building design and construction strategy: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other building operations strategy: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other programmatic intervention: \_\_\_\_\_
- Monitor outcomes by tracking
  - Environmental quality
  - Program performance
  - Population experience and opinions
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

**SE13.1 Does the entity have a program in place for promoting health & well-being through its real estate assets and services?**

NEW

Yes

The program includes (multiple answers possible):

Needs assessment

Goal setting

Action

Monitoring

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

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

No

**SE13.2 Does the entity take measures to incorporate the health & well-being program through its real estate assets and services described in SE13.1?**

NEW

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- Creation of goals to address
  - Mental health and well-being
  - Physical health and well-being
  - Social health and well-being
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Action to promote health through
  - Acoustic comfort
  - Biophilic design
  - Physical activity
  - Healthy eating
  - Inclusive design
  - Indoor air quality
  - Lighting controls and/or daylight
  - Physical and/or mental healthcare access
  - Social interaction and connection
  - Thermal comfort
  - Water quality
  - Other building design and construction strategy: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other building operations strategy: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other programmatic intervention: \_\_\_\_\_
- Monitor outcomes by tracking
  - Environmental quality
  - Program performance
  - Population experience and opinions
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

# New Construction & Major Renovations

---

## Sustainability Requirements

2018 Indicator

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

Yes

Elements addressed in the strategy (multiple answers possible)

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

The strategy is

Publicly available

Please provide a hyperlink or a separate publicly available document

**UPLOAD** or URL \_\_\_\_\_

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

Not publicly available

**UPLOAD**

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

**NC2 Does the entity require sustainable site selection criteria to be considered for new construction and major renovation projects?**

NC1

Yes

Select all criteria included (multiple answers possible)

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

The entity's sustainable site selection criteria are aligned with

Third-party guidelines

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

Third-party rating system(s)

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Not aligned

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

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

No

Not applicable

NC2

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

NC3

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

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

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

Third-party guidelines

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

Third-party rating system(s)

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Not aligned

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

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

No

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

Yes

Select all issues addressed (multiple answers possible)

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

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

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

No

Not applicable

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

NC5.1

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

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

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

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

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

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

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

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

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

**Percentage portfolio covered**

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

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

NC5.2

Yes

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

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

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

No

Not applicable

**Scheme Name/Sub-scheme Name**

A list of provisionally validated certification schemes is provided in Appendix of the Reference Guide.

## 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)

- Integrative design process
- To exceed relevant energy codes or standards
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Common energy efficiency measures include (multiple answers possible)

- Air conditioning
- Commissioning
- Energy modeling
- Lighting
- Occupant controls
- Space heating
- Ventilation
- Water heating
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Operational energy efficiency monitoring (multiple answers possible)

- Energy use analytics
- Post-construction energy monitoring for on  
Average years: \_\_\_\_\_
- Sub-meter
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

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

NC7.1

Yes

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

Biofuels

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

Geothermal

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

Hydro

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

Solar/photovoltaic

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

Wind

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

NC7.2

Yes

The entity's definition of "net-zero energy" includes:

- Net Zero Site Energy
- Net Zero Source Energy
- Net Zero Energy Costs
- Net Zero Energy Emissions
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The entity uses net-zero energy code/standard:

- National/local green building council standard, specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- National/local government standard, specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- International standard, specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

No



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

NC8

Yes

The entity promotes water conservation through (multiple answers possible)

Requirements for planning and design include (multiple answers possible)

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

**UPLOAD**

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

Common water efficiency measures include (multiple answers possible)

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

Operational water efficiency monitoring (multiple answers possible)

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

No

Not applicable

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

NC9

Yes

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

Management and construction practices (multiple answers possible)

Construction waste signage

Education of employees/contractors on waste management

Incentives for contractors for recovering, reusing and recycling building materials

Targets for waste stream recovery, reuse and recycling

Waste management plans

Waste separation facilities

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

On-site waste monitoring (multiple answers possible)

Hazardous waste monitoring

Non-hazardous waste monitoring

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

No

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

NC10.1

Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

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

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

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

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

No

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

NC10.2

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

Contractors provide update reports on environmental and social aspects during construction

External audits by third party

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

Name of the organization

Internal audits

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

Weekly/monthly (on-site) meetings and/or ad hoc site visits

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

Yes

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

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

Health Impact Assessment

Integrated planning process

Other planning process: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

Access to spaces for active and passive recreation

Active design features

Commissioning

Daylight

Indoor air quality monitoring

Indoor air quality source control

Natural ventilation

Occupant controls

Provisions for active transport

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Occupant education

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

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

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

No

Not applicable

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

NC12.1

Yes

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

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

No

Not applicable

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

NC12.2

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

Injury rate: \_\_\_\_\_

Explain the injury rate calculation method (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

Fatalities: \_\_\_\_\_

Near misses: \_\_\_\_\_

Other metrics: \_\_\_\_\_

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

No

**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)

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

No

NC13

**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?**

Yes

The entity's process includes (multiple answers possible)

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

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

**UPLOAD**

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

No

NC14