

Proposed 2025 Amendments to Climate and Assurance Standards

Survey response 37

Company Name

Individual

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

No

Please give a reason for your answer

AP 4, AP 5, AP 7 should not be extended as this information is very important for a CRE to measure and understand as without this information of scope 3 emissions it is difficult for a CRE to understand all of their climate risks and opportunities. I do support extending AP 8 for a further two years.

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

No

Please give a reason for your answer

There is no need to extend AP 2. 15(b) of NZ CS 1 states that if an entity is unable to quantitative information, it must explain why. This shows that there is already enough flexibility in the climate standards for an entity if they can't disclose quantitative financial impact information and can disclosure why this is the case. The anticipated financial impacts is some of the most critical information that a CRE and a reader of the climate statement will get and therefore it is important this is not delayed any further.

Any other comments

Continual extending of adoption provisions risks undermining the Aotearoa New Zealand Climate Standards and should only be done in cases where it is absolutely necessary, the extensions proposed fail to meet this test, apart from extending the assurance of scope 3.