

# Call for feedback on TEG report on EU Taxonomy

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

### Disclaimer:

This call for feedback is part of ongoing work by Directorate-general for financial stability, financial services and capital markets union, Directorate-general for environment, Directorate-general for climate action and Directorate-general for energy on sustainable finance, for which the European Commission has set up a [dedicated Technical expert group \(TEG\)](#).

This feedback process is not an official Commission consultation or document nor an official Commission position. Nothing in this feedback process commits the Commission nor does it preclude any policy outcomes.

In March 2018 the European Commission published its [action plan: financing sustainable growth](#). Action 1 of the Commission's action plan calls for the establishment of an EU classification system for sustainable activities, or Taxonomy. The European Commission followed through on this action in May 2018 with a [proposal for a regulation on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment](#) (taxonomy regulation).

In addition, a [technical expert group on sustainable finance \(TEG\)](#) was set up by the European Commission in July 2018 to assist in with the implementation of four key actions of the action plan, including the development of an EU taxonomy.

Within the framework of the proposed taxonomy regulation, the TEG has been asked to develop recommendations for technical screening criteria for economic activities that can make a substantial contribution to climate change mitigation or adaptation, while avoiding significant harm to the four other environmental objectives:

1. sustainable use and protection of water and marine resources;
2. transition to a circular economy, waste prevention and recycling;
3. pollution prevention control; and (4) protection of healthy ecosystems.

On 18 June 2019, the TEG published its [technical report on EU taxonomy](#). The report sets out the basis for a future EU taxonomy in legislation. The report contains:

- technical screening criteria for 67 activities across 8 sectors that can make a substantial contribution to **climate change mitigation**;
- a methodology and worked examples for evaluating substantial contribution to **climate change adaptation**;
- guidance and case studies for **investors preparing to use the taxonomy**.

This report builds on the [work that the TEG published in December last year](#) together with a call for feedback on the proposed criteria for these “first round” activities. The TEG has also engaged with over 150 additional experts in the past months to develop technical screening criteria for the ‘second round’ of climate change mitigation activities and climate change adaptation activities.

In addition to its technical report, the TEG has also published a [supplementary report on using the taxonomy](#). This provides investors and companies with a concise and clear explanation of why the taxonomy is needed, what it looks like, and its ease of use.

### **Call for feedback**

The TEG is inviting stakeholders to provide feedback on (parts of) its technical report through the online `q u e s t i o n n a i r e`.

Because of technical problems, the deadline for providing feedback is **extended at least until Monday 16 September 2019 23:59**. If the technical problems persist, a further extension will be considered.

In the online questionnaire, you will be able to select on which parts of the report you want to provide feedback to, including a selection of the 67 individual activities that make a substantial contribution to climate change mitigation and the different elements of each activity.

## Next steps

The TEG mandate has been extended until the end of this year. The TEG will use this time to:

- assess the feedback from stakeholders on its technical report;;
- refine and further develop some incomplete aspects of the proposed technical screening criteria for substantial contributions and avoidance of significant harm;
- develop further guidance on implementation and use of the taxonomy.

At the end of its mandate, the TEG will make further recommendations to the European Commission on the need to adjust and complement their work on an EU taxonomy.

The TEG's recommendations are designed to support the European Commission in the development of future delegated acts, as proposed in the taxonomy regulation.

---

**Please note:** In order to ensure a fair and transparent feedback 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 [ec-teg-sf@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ec-teg-sf@ec.europa.eu).

Useful documents and links:

- [More on EU taxonomy](#)
- [Technical report on EU taxonomy](#)
- [Supplementary report on using the taxonomy](#)
- [Specific privacy statement](#)

## 1. Information about you

---

\* Are you replying as:

- a private individual
- a private organisation or a company
- a public authority or an international organisation

\* Name of your organisation:

European Distribution System Operators (E.DSO)

Contact email address:

The information you provide here is for administrative purposes only and will not be published

henning.twickler@edsoforsmartgrids.eu

\* Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?

(If your organisation is not registered, [we invite you to register here](#), although it is not compulsory to be registered to reply to this feedback process. [Why a transparency register?](#))

- Yes  
 No

\* If so, please indicate your Register ID number:

952322311484-70

\* Type of organisation:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Academic institution                        | <input type="radio"/> Media                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Company, SME, micro-enterprise, sole trader | <input type="radio"/> Non-governmental organisation |
| <input type="radio"/> Consultancy, law firm                       | <input type="radio"/> Think tank                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Consumer organisation                       | <input type="radio"/> Trade union                   |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Industry association             | <input type="radio"/> Other                         |

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

Belgium

\* Field of activity (*if applicable*):

*at least 1 choice(s)*

- 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

\* Please specify your activity field(s) or sector(s):

Energy, electricity distribution

\* Sector (*if applicable*):

at least 1 choice(s)

- A Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- B Mining and quarrying
- C Manufacturing
- D Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply
- E Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities
- F Construction
- H Transportation and storage
- I Accommodation and food service activities
- J Information and communication
- K Financial and insurance activities
- L Real estate activities
- M Professional, scientific and technical activities
- N Administrative and support service activities
- O Public administration and defence; compulsory social security
- P Education
- Q Human health and social work activities
- Not applicable

## Important notice on the publication of responses

---

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

([see specific privacy statement](#))

- Yes, I agree to my response being published under the name I indicate (*name of your organisation /company/public authority or your name if your reply as an individual*)
- No, I do not want my response to be published

\* Contributions received through this survey will be reviewed by the TEG. Do you agree to be contacted by the TEG to clarify your response if necessary?

- Yes, I agree to be contacted by the TEG if necessary through the contact details I provided
- No, I do not want to be contacted by the TEG

## 2. Selection feedback

---

**This call for feedback covers the following parts of the technical report:**

- 1. Climate change mitigation activities**
- 2. Climate change adaptation**

### 3. Usability of the taxonomy

### 4. Future development of the taxonomy

**Please tick the relevant topics and/or sectors and activities to which you would like to provide feedback :**  
(You will be able to answer questions for the selected topics and/or sectors and activities)

## 1. Climate change mitigation activities

### Agriculture and forestry

- Growing of perennial crops
- Growing of non-perennial crops
- Livestock production
- Afforestation
- Rehabilitation, Restoration
- Reforestation
- Existing forest management

### Manufacturing

- Manufacturing of low carbon technologies
- Manufacture of Cement
- Manufacture of Aluminium
- Manufacture of Iron and Steel
- Manufacture of hydrogen
- Manufacture of other inorganic basic chemicals
- Manufacture of other organic basic chemicals
- Manufacture of fertilizers and nitrogen compounds
- Manufacture of plastics in primary form

### Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply

- Production of Electricity from Solar PV
- Production of Electricity from Concentrated Solar Power
- Production of Electricity from Wind Power
- Production of Electricity from Ocean Energy
- Production of Electricity from Hydropower
- Production of Electricity from Geothermal
- Production of Electricity from Gas Combustion
- Production of Electricity from Bioenergy
- Transmission and Distribution of Electricity
- Storage of Energy

- Manufacture of Biomass, Biogas or Biofuels
- Retrofit of Gas Transmission and Distribution Networks
- District Heating/Cooling distribution
- Installation and operation of Electric Heat Pumps
- Cogeneration of Heat/Cool and power from Concentrated Solar Power
- Cogeneration of Heat/Cool and power from Geothermal Energy
- Cogeneration of Heat/Cool and power from Gas Combustion
- Cogeneration of Heat/Cool and power from Bioenergy
- Production of Heating and Cooling from Concentrated Solar Power
- Production of Heating and Cooling from Geothermal Energy
- Production of Heating and Cooling from Gas Combustion
- Production of heating and cooling from Bioenergy
- Production of Heating and Cooling using Waste Heat

### **Water, Waste and Sewerage remediation**

- Water collection, treatment and supply
- Centralized wastewater treatment systems
- Anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge
- Separate collection and transport of non-hazardous waste in source segregated fractions
- Anaerobic digestion of bio-waste
- Composting of bio-waste
- Material recovery from waste
- Landfill gas capture and energetic utilization
- Direct Air Capture of CO<sub>2</sub>
- Capture of anthropogenic emissions
- Transport of CO<sub>2</sub>
- Permanent Sequestration of captured CO<sub>2</sub>

### **Transport**

- Passenger Rail Transport (Interurban)
- Freight Rail Transport
- Public transport
- Infrastructure for low carbon transport
- Passenger cars and commercial vehicles
- Freight transport services by road
- Interurban scheduled road transport
- Inland passenger water transport
- Inland freight water transport
- Construction of water projects

### **Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)**

- Data processing, hosting and related activities
- Data-driven solutions for GHG emissions reductions

## Buildings

- Construction of new buildings
- Renovation of existing buildings
- Individual renovation measures, installation of renewable on-site and professional, scientific and technical activities
- Acquisition of buildings

## 2. Climate change adaptation

- I want to provide feedback for this topic

## 3. Usability of the taxonomy

- I want to provide feedback for this topic

## 4. Future development of the taxonomy

- I want to provide feedback for this topic

*When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the Technical report on Taxonomy.*

*Please note that if you propose new boundaries, metrics or thresholds for an activity, you are requested to also provide additional information on the Do No Significant Harm assessment that might be affected by your proposal.*

**Please select the elements of the activity to which you would like to provide feedback:**

- Boundary of the activity
- Metric for substantial contribution criteria
- Threshold for substantial contribution criteria
- Do no significant harm criteria
- International applicability of activity criteria

*When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the Technical report on Taxonomy.*

*Please note that if you propose new boundaries, metrics or thresholds for an activity, you are requested to also provide additional information on the Do No Significant Harm assessment that might be affected by your proposal.*



# Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply - Transmission and Distribution of Electricity

---

When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the *Technical report on Taxonomy*.

Please note that if you propose new boundaries, metrics or thresholds for an activity, you are requested to also provide additional information on the Do No Significant Harm assessment that might be affected by your proposal.

**Please select the elements of the activity to which you would like to provide feedback:**

- Boundary of the activity
- Metric for substantial contribution criteria
- Threshold for substantial contribution criteria
- Do no significant harm criteria
- International applicability of activity criteria

**1. Should the boundaries, as set for the purposes of applying principles, metrics and thresholds of the activity, be different?**

- Yes
- No

**If yes, why and how?**  
**Please provide a brief rationale for the proposed change as well as links to published journals or articles as evidence.**

**Explanation:**

*3000 character(s) maximum*

Boundaries should be conveniently extended, comprising not only the construction and operation of networks but also the maintenance.

It should be complete, with full scope of DSO activities and taking into account the new position as independent market facilitator, comprising the delivery/infeed to/from customers or to other distributors.

**Links to evidence:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

## 2. Should a different metric be used?

- Yes
- No

**I f                    y e s ,                    w h y                    a n d                    h o w ?**  
**Please provide a brief rationale for the proposed change as well as links to published journals or articles as evidence.**

### Explanation:

*3000 character(s) maximum*

The emphasis on 'systems' rather than 'networks' is important. This includes the physical infrastructure (power lines, substations, storage facilities, etc.) as well as virtual grid assets (distributed flexibility, demand response). Investments into these virtual assets must also be acknowledged as sustainable investments, incl. necessary ICT/digital infrastructure investments.

Moreover, the metric in the current version of the report mentions equipment that increases controllability and observability as eligible assets. We recommend to specifically add smart meters in this regard.

DSOs are regulated entities and legally obliged to grant any requested connection, if this is technically and economically feasible, regardless of whether a power plant produces emissions or not. What is more, the emission level of the plant to be connected is beyond the control of operators. Therefore, the power line that connects a generation asset should not be treated the same as the asset.

It should also be kept in mind that several assets (emission-free or not) can be connected to one line, which makes it difficult to determine whether this line is 'sustainable' or not. The line is needed in any case for both the zero-emission as well as the conventional generation asset. One question that emerges in the current Taxonomy proposal is whether it is solely the connection line that would be considered 'unsustainable' or if this also applies to grid reinforcement in that area. Reinforcement should definitely be eligible under the Taxonomy since the usage cannot be allocated to one plant in a meshed grid.

Additionally, any requirement that a new connection is considered sustainable only if it allows demand side management is unjustified. It is not the responsibility of the system operator to decide whether the connected customer uses demand side response mechanisms.

We recommend to discard the distinction between systems deemed to be on track to full decarbonisation and those that are not.

Also, the Taxonomy should consider the eligibility of EV charging stations and electric infrastructure for public transport and the distribution infrastructure that supports them. It should equally consider the eligibility of new distribution grids and their renewals or extensions with the aim of reducing electrical losses and/or increasing efficiency.

Furthermore, we would like to highlight the meaning of sector coupling for achieving the European decarbonisation targets and to create a sustainable energy system.

### Links to evidence:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

E.DSO press release on Taxonomy: <https://www.edsoforsmartgrids.eu/may-7-council-wp-on-financial-services-e-dso-calls-for-recognition-of-dsos-in-sustainable-finance/>

### 3. Should the threshold be different?

- Yes
- No

**If yes, why and how?**  
**Please provide a brief rationale for the proposed change as well as links to published journals or articles as evidence.**

### Explanation:

*3000 character(s) maximum*

We suggest that all investments in T&D infrastructure shall be considered sustainable. If a threshold is applied, make clear the exclusion from the Taxonomy is for lines EXCLUSIVELY dedicated to directly connecting, or expanding existing direct connection to production plants that are more CO<sub>2</sub> intensive than 100 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh.

### Links to evidence:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

### 4. For the objectives where DNSH criteria have been identified, should these criteria be different?

- Yes
- No

**I f                    y e s ,                    w h y                    a n d                    h o w ?**

**Please provide a brief rationale for the proposed change as well as links to published journals or articles as evidence.**

**Explanation:**

*3000 character(s) maximum*

The list of criteria is generally very good, however, we would like to make a few remarks.

As far as point 5 (pollution) is concerned, we agree with the statement that PCBs should not be used. However, this should only apply to new equipment.

DSOs in Europe have started buying exclusively PCB-free transformers and putting in place actions to remove equipment with PCBs from their network a long time ago. However, in certain Member States, there are still some transformers in operation that might contain very low levels of PCBs and phasing them out immediately, or within a very short time, would lead to stranded assets, implying high costs while also being environmentally unsustainable as existing transformers would need to be replaced by new ones before their end of life.

Concerning point 6 (ecosystems), we believe that an environmental impact assessment for every individual power line might result in an excessive administrative burden. Therefore, we recommend limiting this to HV lines and to have a simplified environmental consultation procedure for MV lines.

**Links to evidence:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

E.DSO communication on PCBs in transformers: <https://www.edsoforsmartgrids.eu/edsos-views-on-the-recast-proposal-for-a-regulation-on-persistent-organic-pollutants/>

**5. Are there any additional objectives where DNSH criteria need to be identified to avoid significant harm?**

- Yes
- No

**6. Can the proposed criteria for substantial contribution and DNSH be used for activities outside the EU?**

- Yes
- No

**If not, please propose alternative wording that could be considered and a brief rationale for the proposed change.**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

This is a qualified 'yes' since geographical particularities must be taken into account.

*When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the Technical report on Taxonomy.*

*Please note that if you propose new boundaries, metrics or thresholds for an activity, you are requested to also provide additional information on the Do No Significant Harm assessment that might be affected by your proposal.*

**Please select the elements of the activity to which you would like to provide feedback:**

- Boundary of the activity
- Metric for substantial contribution criteria
- Threshold for substantial contribution criteria
- Do no significant harm criteria
- International applicability of activity criteria

*When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the Technical report on Taxonomy.*

*Please note that if you propose new boundaries, metrics or thresholds for an activity, you are requested to also provide additional information on the Do No Significant Harm assessment that might be affected by your proposal.*

**Please select the elements of the activity to which you would like to provide feedback:**

- Boundary of the activity
- Metric for substantial contribution criteria
- Threshold for substantial contribution criteria
- Do no significant harm criteria
- International applicability of activity criteria

*When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the Technical report on Taxonomy.*

- Do no significant harm criteria
- International applicability of activity criteria

*When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the Technical report on Taxonomy.*

*Please note that if you propose new boundaries, metrics or thresholds for an activity, you are requested to also provide additional information on the Do No Significant Harm assessment that might be affected by your proposal.*

**Please select the elements of the activity to which you would like to provide feedback:**

- Boundary of the activity
- Metric for substantial contribution criteria
- Threshold for substantial contribution criteria
- Do no significant harm criteria
- International applicability of activity criteria

*When responding to these questions please refer to the requirements for technical screening criteria as outlined in Article 14 of the [proposed Taxonomy regulation](#) and the principles for developing criteria as used by TEG and explained in the Technical report on Taxonomy.*

*Please note that if you propose new boundaries, metrics or thresholds for an activity, you are requested to also provide additional information on the Do No Significant Harm assessment that might be affected by your proposal.*

**Please select the elements of the activity to which you would like to provide feedback:**

- Boundary of the activity
- Metric for substantial contribution criteria
- Threshold for substantial contribution criteria
- Do no significant harm criteria
- International applicability of activity criteria

## 2. Climate change adaptation

---

**1. Do you consider that the qualitative criteria for adaptation apply equally to all sectors?**

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

**Please explain your answer:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

**2. Should the qualitative criteria be different?**

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

**If yes, why and how?**  
**Please provide a brief rationale for the proposed change as well as links to published journals or articles as evidence.**

**Explanation:**

*3000 character(s) maximum*

Criterion A1 of the adaptation screening criteria states that '[t]he economic activity must reduce all material physical climate risks to the extent possible and on a best effort basis'. We are fully aligned with this sentiment, however, it suggests a positive obligation on parties involved in the economic activity in question. 'Do no significant harm' implies a negative obligation on the party. Therefore the sentence should be rephrased accordingly: 'The economic activity must not increase material physical climate risks to the extent possible and on a best effort basis.'

Concerning criterion A3 on monitoring adaptation results, it is stated that '[t]he reduction of physical climate risks can be measured.' We caution that this might be difficult in certain cases.

Overall, we agree with the qualitative screening criteria for 'adaptation by' an economic activity (p. 41 of the report).

**Links to evidence:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

**3. Are the illustrative templates provided in the Technical report useful for indicating the potential application of the criteria?**

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

**Please explain what other information would be useful:**

*3000 character(s) maximum*

The identification of typical sensitivities is helpful, for example temperature-related, wind-related, water-related and solid mass-related.

The report includes the example of transmission lines, however, many of the points mentioned also apply to distribution lines that contribute to climate adaptation. Examples include: the use of cables rather than overhead lines to address adverse weather events (e.g. extreme cold); preventing wildfires from bringing down the grid by managing vegetation; smart devices, sensors and switches that detect network problems and restore power automatically.

Distribution activities should therefore be included in the "climate change adaptation" section. Increasing resistance to events caused by climate change will require significant investment expenditures, in particular for medium voltage network overhead lines (highly vulnerable to severe weather conditions), as well as activities related to ensuring its resilience (e.g. improvement of grid management systems in emergency situations).

E.DSO will publish a 'Sustainable Grid Charter' this year, containing a set of examples.

**4. Would any additional data or tools would improve the usability of the Adaptation qualitative screening criteria?**

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

**Are there areas of potential harm that TEG should consider for DNSH criteria for the activities that make a substantial contribution to adaptation objectives?**

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

**1. Do you expect to use the Taxonomy in your business activities in the short term (1-3 years) or long term (4 years or more)?**

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



**2. Can the Taxonomy be made more useful for disclosures related to your specific financial product? This question covers only financial products where disclosure obligations are foreseen by the Taxonomy proposal.**

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

**3. Can the Taxonomy be made more useful for your investment decisions in different asset classes?**

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

**4. Is it sufficiently clear when the entire activities of a company or other entity should be considered as Taxonomy eligible (revenues or turnover) and when only expenditures by companies or other entities should be considered Taxonomy eligible?**

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

**5. What practical tools or measures could be developed to facilitate the implementation of the taxonomy by financial actors?**

**Please specify what these tools would be used for and provide sufficient explanation on how they can help to implement the taxonomy:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

**6. What practical tools or measures could be developed to help non-financial companies assess what share of their economic activities is taxonomy-eligible?**

*3000 character(s) maximum*

## 4. Future development of the taxonomy

---

### 1. What economic activities that can make a substantial contribution to the climate change mitigation objective should next be considered for the Taxonomy?

*3000 character(s) maximum*

While we understand that the report at hand primarily focuses on climate change mitigation (and adaptation), we believe that the other four environmental objectives as defined in the draft Regulation (i.e. sustainable use and protection of water and marine resources; transition to a circular economy, waste prevention and recycling; pollution prevention and control; protection of healthy ecosystems) should not merely be treated as DNSH criteria and should therefore be considered next in the Taxonomy.

DSOs contribute also to these four environmental objectives, and investments contributing to their attainment must be recognised.

Moreover, we believe that a full-fledged taxonomy should be based on the ESG framework. The existing Taxonomy focuses merely on the environmental objectives which is understandable as these are crucial. However, social and governance aspects of sustainability should also be taken into account.

### 2. Should any of the economic activities included in the Technical report be reconsidered as regards their inclusion in the taxonomy?

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

### 3. For what economic activities should an illustrative template for substantial contribution to climate change adaptation be developed next?

*3000 character(s) maximum*

Electricity Distribution

#### Useful links

[More on EU taxonomy \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/sustainable-finance-teg-taxonomy\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/sustainable-finance-teg-taxonomy_en)

[Technical report on EU taxonomy \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/190618-sustainable-finance-teg-report-taxonomy\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/190618-sustainable-finance-teg-report-taxonomy_en)

[Supplementary report on using the taxonomy \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/190618-sustainable-finance-teg-repc-using-the-taxonomy\\_en\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/190618-sustainable-finance-teg-repc-using-the-taxonomy_en_en)

[Specific privacy statement \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/190705-sustainable-finance-teg-report-taxonomy-privac-statement\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/190705-sustainable-finance-teg-report-taxonomy-privac-statement_en)

Contact

[ec-teg-sf@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ec-teg-sf@ec.europa.eu)