

Proposed 2025 Amendments to Climate and Assurance Standards

Survey response 68

Company Name

NZME Limited

Should AP 4, AP 5, AP 7 and AP 8, which relate to the disclosure and assurance of scope 3 GHG emissions, be extended?

Yes - By four or more years

Please give a reason for your answer

The compliance cost for this is high, there is limited to no stakeholder interest in regard to many companies, reporting of these metrics does little to actually make a difference.

Should AP 2, which relates to anticipated financial impacts, be extended?

Yes - By four or more years

Please give a reason for your answer

Any anticipated financial impacts are long term, many years out, there is limited information available to anticipate these impacts. There are many other potential financial impacts that exist for organisations that are not disclosed as there is not enough information to make an informed estimate. These proposed climate anticipated financial impacts are very uncertain in regard to timing and amount, therefore in assessment is largely a guess based on one potential future and could vary significantly.

Any other comments

The cost burden of the current proposals on smaller entities is extreme and places the organisation at a competitive disadvantage to competitor companies that are not required to report but virtue of their size or ownership structure.