

Call for feedback on the Platform on Sustainable Finance's draft proposal for an extended taxonomy to support economic transition

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Disclaimer:

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

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

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

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

As a permanent expert group of the Commission that has been established under Article 20 of the Taxonomy Regulation, the Platform has been tasked to advise the Commission on further developing the EU taxonomy, improving its usability and exploring its expansion to social objectives, activities that significantly harm environmental sustainability or activities that have no significant impact on environmental sustainability.

In October 2020, the Commission established the Platform with five working groups, including the [subgroup on negative and low impact activities](#). The subgroup has been tasked to advise the Commission on the development of the taxonomy with regard to economic activities that do not have a significant impact on environmental sustainability and economic activities that significantly harm environmental sustainability.

The environmental challenges we face put an immense task ahead of us: to transition to a low carbon, climate-resilient, and environmentally sustainable economy. The aim of sustainable finance policies is to help all economic actors navigate that transition with the urgency needed to avoid risks and meet climate and environmental goals.

The EU taxonomy creates a common definition and gives recognition to economic activities that make a substantial contribution to an environmental objective, while not doing significant harm to any other environmental objective and meeting minimum social safeguards. In this setting, the taxonomy framework already defines levels of 'significant harm'. Co-legislators mandated the Commission to explore whether this framework could be extended to further categories of environmental performance: activities that do significant harm and activities with no significant impact.

There are many ways in which the taxonomy framework could be extended. Those that make a substantial contribution without undermining any of the goals and while ensuring they are socially sustainable, are already recognised, as the transition could not succeed without having a lot more of such green activities. But a successful transition also means that actors that do not make a substantial contribution can also start and continue their transition, including taking valid and robust interim steps towards sustainability. The objective of this analysis is to explore how an extended taxonomy could help economic actors on this urgent environmental transition pathway, irrespective of what level of environmental performance they start from.

On 12 July 2021, the Platform published its [first draft proposal for an extended taxonomy to support economic transition](#). The report explores the main considerations behind the questions of this consultation. You are kindly invited to read that report before filling in this questionnaire.

Call for feedback

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

The deadline for providing feedback is Friday 27 August close of business.

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

Next steps

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

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

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

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

More information on

- [the call for feedback document](#)
- [the draft report on an extended taxonomy to support economic transition](#)
- [the publication of the 2 draft reports](#)
- [the Platform on Sustainable Finance](#)
- [sustainable finance](#)
- [the protection of personal data regime for this call for feedback](#)

About you

* I am giving my contribution as

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

* First name

Sebastien

* Surname

GODINOT

* Email (this won't be published)

sgodinot@wwf.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

WWF European Policy Office

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

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

1414929419-24

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

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

- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- United Kingdom
- Other country

Field of activity

*** Financial activity**

Please select as many answers as you like

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

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

Please select as many answers as you like

- Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- Mining and quarrying
- Manufacturing
- Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply
- Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities
- Construction
- Transportation and storage

- Accommodation and food service activities
- Information and communication
- Real estate activities
- Professional, scientific and technical activities
- Administrative and support service activities
- Public administration and defence; compulsory social security
- Education
- Human health and social work activities
- Other
- Not applicable

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

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

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

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

Your opinion

Question 1. Which environmental performance levels should the taxonomy distinguish, with a view to help the environmental transition?

Please select all of those that you would prioritise:

Please select as many answers as you like

- Substantial contribution
- Intermediate performance
- Significantly harmful - but can improve to sustainability
- Significantly harmful - but can improve not to do significant harm
- Significantly harmful - but cannot improve sufficiently to avoid doing no significant harm

- No significant impact

Question 2. How could policies ensure that recognising the transition from significantly harmful to intermediate performance will not slow down the transition to green activities (that evidence shows we need to accelerate)?

Please select all that you agree with:

Please select as many answers as you like

- Not relevant
- Distinguish different levels of environmental performance clearly throughout the taxonomy and in other instruments
- Recognise only improvements from and to a well-defined level of environmental performance, rather than recognising activities sitting in a given level of performance below substantial contribution
- Require continued improvement beyond the relevant investment plan
- Require associated entity level transition strategy to understand the credibility of the intermediate transition.
- Recognise multiple ways of transition depending on type of Technical Screening Criteria.
- Other safeguards would be needed

Question 3. Do you consider that recognising/naming the significant harm performance level would be important?

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

Question 3.1 Please select the answer you agree with:

- voluntary disclosures and guidance are sufficient
- voluntary reporting is not effective, the mandatory solution is needed urgently
- agree with the staged approach in the report to first work with voluntary disclosures/ guidance and in a later stage introduce mandatory reporting
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

'Significantly harmful' taxonomy

Question 4. In your view what would be the advantages and disadvantages of a ‘significantly harmful’ taxonomy as designed by the Platform (i.e. accompanied by an assessment of the existing and needed EU policy and legislative initiatives aimed at incentivising finance for urgent transition away from significantly harmful activities, for building climate-resilience and to support greening of the whole economy)?

Advantages – a ‘significantly harmful’ taxonomy would:

Please select as many answers as you like

- increase the transparency of environmental performance levels of activities
- improve the communication of transitions and transition plans on activity level
- help companies to develop strategies and investment plans for moving away from significantly harmful performance levels and meeting environmental objectives
- help markets define and develop instruments for financing the transition
- enhance risk management frameworks
- help policymakers to provide subsidies for decommissioning
- other

Please elaborate on your answer on the advantages of a ‘significantly harmful’ taxonomy. Could advantages be further enhanced? If so how?

1000 character(s) maximum

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

- The harmful taxonomy is absolutely necessary to clarify which activities exactly are counterproductive for the environment, because massive confusion prevails as of today.
- Defining the harmful taxonomy is a must to clarify the transition from harmful to fully sustainable, i.e. green. Such a transition is a must to reach the climate objectives from the Paris Agreement and all other environmental objectives (biodiversity, water, etc).
- The harmful taxonomy will also provide a very useful basis to better price environment-related financial risks (which are poorly priced to date and not priced at all in many cases, but do exist nonetheless).

Disadvantages – a ‘significantly harmful’ taxonomy would:

Please select as many answers as you like

- be a departure from the positive spirit of the green taxonomy
- negatively impact the ability of companies to raise finance for transition
- accelerate transition risks and risks creating “stranded asset by legislation”
- negatively impact banks with high shares of lending to certain companies both among retail customers and on the wholesale markets
- disadvantage EU companies vs non-EU jurisdiction
- increase complexity, reporting burden and affect usability of the taxonomy
-

other

Two types of significantly harmful activities

The report distinguishes two types of significantly harmful activities

- those that are 'always significantly harmful' (no technical option to transition to an environmental performance not causing significant harm)
- and those that can transition out of causing significant harm

Question 5. Do you agree with the following statements?

Please check all boxes that you agree with:

Please select as many answers as you like

- Always significantly harmful activities should be distinguished** from those activities that have a potential to transition out of significant harm
- Criteria should be added under the green taxonomy to **recognise as green the closure / decommissioning** for such always significantly harmful activities
- Mandatory reporting** on turnover from and capex/opex related to always significantly harmful activities should be introduced

Question 6. Do you consider recognising/naming the intermediate performance level useful to encourage mitigating significant harm?

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

Please explain your answer to question 6:

1000 character(s) maximum

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

The question is confusing:

- The intermediate category exists by default and should be named explicitly. Not naming it would leave stakeholders to give it the name(s) they want, creating confusion;
- In particular, some could call it 'transition' taxonomy or 'light green' taxonomy, which would be extremely confusing with the existing green taxonomy. This must be avoided;
- HOWEVER, it must be clear that this category is only a temporary step where necessary towards full sustainability: rapid alignment with the green taxonomy remains a must. To ensure this, continued improvement beyond the intermediate performance level must be required.

Only mitigating significant harm is NOT enough to ensure full sustainability. Focusing only on this aspect would create a major risk to slow down the necessary and extremely urgent transition towards full sustainability - which we know must be accelerated instead.

Question 7. For activities that are in the intermediate performance space (in between significant harm and substantial contribution):

a) should all turnover from such activities be recognised as intermediate turnover, and all opex as intermediate opex?

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

Please explain your answer to question 7. a):

1000 character(s) maximum

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

- The intermediate category exists by default. Not naming it would leave stakeholders to give it the name(s) they want, creating a lot of confusion;

- However, it must be clear that this category is only a temporary step where necessary towards full sustainability, i.e. only in the specific cases where it is difficult to impossible to reach immediately the green performance. Rapid alignment with the green taxonomy remains THE priority - especially for (i) harmful activities that could be retrofitted to reach the intermediate level BUT are unlikely to align with the green taxonomy in a timely way, and should rather be decommissioned in the first place not retrofitted, and (ii) new activities which could be green immediately.

Otherwise the intermediate category risks slowing down the necessary transition towards full sustainability. To ensure this, continued improvement beyond the intermediate performance level, as part of an entity-level transition strategy, must be required.

b) should all capex be recognised as 'intermediate capex' irrespective of whether or not it improves environmental performance of the activity and by how much?

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

Please explain your answer to question 7. b):

1000 character(s) maximum

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

We know we need to accelerate the transition towards full sustainability, i.e. rapid alignment with the green taxonomy. It must be clear that the intermediate category is only a temporary step towards full sustainability, otherwise it risks slowing down the necessary transition.

Stopping progress at the intermediate performance level and not targetting alignment with the green taxonomy as soon as possible will NOT align with the Paris Agreement and other EU and global environmental goals.

Therefore, continued improvement beyond the intermediate performance level, as part of an entity-level transition strategy, must be required.

Rapid alignment with the green taxonomy remains THE priority - especially for (i) harmful activities that could

be retrofitted to reach the intermediate level BUT are unlikely to align with the green taxonomy in a timely way, and should rather be decommissioned in the first place not retrofitted, and (ii) new activities which could be green immediately.

Intermediate transition

The report recommends to recognise 'intermediate transition', differentiated from green transition.

Question 8. What do you think are the essential conditions for recognising such intermediate transitions for activities that can make a substantial contribution to the given environmental objective:

Please select as many answers as you like

- a) that the activity reaches the intermediate performance level, in other words does not do significant harm to that particular environmental objective
- b) in addition, that the activity continues to improve its environmental performance in order to stay in that intermediate performance level and not to do significant harm even if in the future the criteria are tightened.
- c) in addition, that the activity continues to improve its environmental performance in order to reach substantial contribution (green) in the future
- d) in addition, that the activity does no significant harm to other environmental objectives
- e) in addition, that the activity does no significant harm to any of the other environmental objectives, with the exception of adaptation (because failing to meet the do no significant harm criteria to adaptation means only a harm on the activity itself)

You selected option c) in question 8.

The criteria for ensuring that the activity will improve to reach substantial contribution should include to:

Please select as many answers as you like

- have a transition plan in place
- set a deadline for the transition
- have the transition plan validated by the Board
- publish the transition plan
- audit the transition plan
- other

Please specify to what else should the criteria include, in relation with option c) in question 8.:

1000 character(s) maximum

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

In addition, there must be a very clear distinction between two plans that focus on a different level:

- (1) the activity-specific investment plan that focuses on a specific activity to improve its environmental performance;
- (2) the entity-level transition strategy, that is wider and longer-term. The Platform should also provide recommendations on both what should be included in the entity-level transition: notably, it should (i) be aligned with a 1.5°C climate scenario with no or limited overshoot; (ii) immediately stop any investment in new harmful activity, including buying existing ones or prolonging their lifetime; (iii) include the decommissioning of activities that won't reach full sustainability in a timely way (many activities will have to reach full sustainability way before 2050, e.g. power generation).

Question 9. Do you have other suggestions for extending the taxonomy framework for significantly harmful activities, intermediate performance, intermediate transition?

1000 character(s) maximum

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

We know we need to accelerate the transition towards full sustainability. Stakeholders should primarily focus on 'how to accelerate the transition to fully green activities' (including by decommissioning activities which won't be able to reach that level or too slowly). Focusing only on leaving/avoiding the harmful space is too limited and does not align with the Paris Agreement and other environmental goals.

This is why requiring continued improvement beyond the intermediate performance level, as part of an entity-level transition strategy, is so critical.

For that, the focus on CAPEX is critical to incentivise/require companies to spend capex on green activities, whether by creating new ones or by retrofitting existing ones: capex for intermediate activities should be limited to the specific cases where it is difficult to impossible to reach directly the green performance level. Finally, any new capex for harmful activities should be stopped immediately / banned.

'No significant (environmental) impact' taxonomy

Question 10. In your view what would be the advantages and disadvantages of a 'no significant (environmental) impact' taxonomy?

Check all that apply and add anything you think is missing:

Advantages – a 'no significant environmental impact' taxonomy would:

Please select as many answers as you like

- help the ESG analysis
- be beneficial for SME's to access finance
-

be beneficial for SME's to access green finance (if it can allow for / incentivise greening even within the NSI space, where there is such possibility)

- ensure banks can report green lending to SMEs and continue to develop these markets
- allow easier access to finance for larger companies in these sectors
- other

Please elaborate on your answer on the advantages of a 'no significant (environmental) impact' taxonomy. Could advantages be further enhanced? If so how?

1000 character(s) maximum

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

- The 'no significant environmental impact' (NSEI) taxonomy will be extremely relevant to differentiate many activities that are neither harmful nor intermediate nor green, i.e. won't have taxonomy criteria before long if at all.
- It will reassure such sectors that they are not harmful.
- NSEI activities will be extremely relevant for diversification purposes in financial products, while avoiding harmful activities: NSEI brings the certainty to do no environmental harm.

- Specific CAPEX approach for such NSEI activities: if capex focuses on activities that are necessary for the given NSEI activity and have criteria under the environmental taxonomy (e.g. green building, green food, green power and heat, green transport needed for a hospital or a school), they should be reported and counted as green capex. But revenues of NSEI activities should never be reported and counted as green.

- The wording of NSEI is not clear: 'not environmentally material' would be much clearer.

Disadvantages – a 'no significant environmental impact' taxonomy would:

Please select as many answers as you like

- be too complex to manage, as a framework
- imply burdensome reporting obligations
- risk disadvantaging 'no significant impact activities' vis-à-vis intermediate contribution activities that are likely to be more polluting
- other

Question 11. Can you give examples of activities which you think would be considered as NSI?

1000 character(s) maximum

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

- Many human health activities
- Many social work and personal care services
- Education (with a small caveat: if education is focused specifically on environmental issues, it should be

reported as a green activity)

- Many liberal professions
- Some cultural, arts, entertainment and recreation activities
- Some advisory services
- Some administrative and support service activities
- Some public administration and social security activities
- Other services activities
- Etc.

To progressively identify NSEI activities, the most relevant is to start by those which have the largest GDP share / largest amount of jobs.

Using NACE codes will help a lot to structure this work.

Question 12. If there was to be an extension of the taxonomy to address NSI activities, should it be a requirement for companies or investors wishing to report activities under the NSI taxonomy to first participate in an environmental labelling or certification scheme (such as [EMAS](#)) to validate minimum levels of environmental performance?

- Yes, reporting of activities should stay voluntary but conditional upon such a certification/labelling
- No, reporting of activities should stay voluntary but there should not be any certification/labelling as a condition
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your answer to question 12:

1000 character(s) maximum

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

The Q12 and proposed answers to Q12 are confusing. WWF believes that:

- Reporting of NSEI activities by non-financial and financial companies should be mandatory not voluntary.
- It should be voluntary to first participate in an environmental labelling or certification scheme (such as EMAS) to validate minimum levels of environmental performance.
- An exception could take place for the climate adaptation objective: it may be relevant that NSEI activities validate a minimum level of environmental performance for this specific objective. This should be further discussed by the Platform, together with relevant stakeholders having climate adaptation expertise.

Question 13. Do you consider it would be helpful if the Platform prepared non-binding guidance on NSI activities which could be published by the Commission for voluntary use by taxonomy users?

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

Question 13.1 If you consider it would be helpful, what should be the scope of such guidance, for instance in relation to minimum standards of environmental performance?

1000 character(s) maximum

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

The guidance should specify:

- Whether it is relevant to develop minimum standards of environmental performance, in particular for the climate adaptation objective;
- Which sectors and activities should be included in the NSEI taxonomy. To progressively identify NSEI activities, the most relevant is to start by those which have the largest GDP share / largest amount of jobs.
- The NACE codes for service activities should be further explored to structure this work.

WWF believes that this voluntary guidance should come first but should be followed by Level 1 amendments to require reporting of NSEI activities by non-financial and financial companies.

Question 14. Are you in favour of a phased approach where NSI could be recognised as a generic category (through guidance) without L1 change?

- Yes, it is a priority
- Yes but it should be done in future only
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your answer to question 14:

1000 character(s) maximum

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

Impact-wise the priority is to develop the harmful taxonomy: this should be done immediately by developing voluntary guidance, and then integrated in the regulation by 2023 through Level 1 amendments.

The NSEI taxonomy should be developed with the same approach as the harmful taxonomy: as soon as possible through voluntary guidance, and then integrated in the regulation through Level 1 amendments. But if it is deemed too challenging to develop both the harmful and the NSEI taxonomies at the same time, the NSEI taxonomy should be developed after the harmful taxonomy.

Question 15. Prior to any L1 change (if at all), do you consider that the Platform should recommend to include some NSI activities in the taxonomy by e.g. creating a generic category for 'green' service providers under the adaptation or other objectives?

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

Please explain your answer to question 15:

1000 character(s) maximum

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

The Q15 is confusing. WWF believes that:

- Critically, if some service activities are included under the green taxonomy, then they are NOT NSEI. They cannot be both NSEI and part of the green taxonomy: this would create a major confusion. Our capex proposal in Q10 provides a much clearer and consistent solution to incentivise NSEI activities to invest in green improvements: count the capex when spent in related green activities, but not the revenues of the NSEI activity itself.
- Specifically, it may be relevant to set up NSEI guidance so that NSEI activities validate a minimum level of environmental performance for climate adaptation. This should be further discussed by the Platform, together with relevant stakeholders having climate adaptation expertise (see Q12).
- More work is required by the Platform to categorise service providers: some are never green or harmful (NSEI), some can be green or harmful and need criteria (e.g. trade or finance services).

Additional information

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

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

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

Useful links

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contact

fisma-platform-sf@ec.europa.eu