



Public consultation regarding the Review of the Insurance Disclosures under article 8 of the Taxonomy Regulation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

INSTRUCTIONS

EIOPA welcomes comments on the **Consultation Paper on the review of insurance disclosures under the Disclosure Delegated Act under the EU Taxonomy framework**.

Comments are most helpful if they: respond to the question stated, where applicable; contain a clear rationale; and describe any alternatives EIOPA should consider.

Please send your comments to EIOPA via EU Survey by **12 August 2026**.

Contributions not provided via EU Survey or after the deadline will not be processed. In case you have any questions please contact Ursula.Bordas@eiopa.europa.eu and sergio.delgado_cuello@eiopa.europa.eu

Publication of responses

Your responses will be published on the EIOPA website unless: you request to treat them confidential, or they are unlawful, or they would infringe the rights of any third-party. Please, indicate clearly and prominently in your submission any part you do not wish to be publicly disclosed. EIOPA may also publish a summary of the survey input received on its website.

Please note that EIOPA is subject to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 regarding public access to documents and EIOPA's rules on public access to documents.

Declaration by the contributor

By sending your contribution to EIOPA you consent to publication of all non-confidential information in your contribution, in whole/in part – as indicated in your responses, including to the publication of the name of your organisation, and you thereby declare that nothing within your response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent the publication.

Data protection

Please note that personal contact details (such as name of individuals, email addresses and phone numbers) will not be published. EIOPA, as a European Authority, will process any personal data in line with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725. More information on how personal data are treated can be found in the privacy statement at the end of this material.

PRIVACY STATEMENT RELATED TO PUBLIC ONLINE CONSULTATIONS AND SURVEYS

Introduction

1. The European Insurance and Occupational Pension authority (EIOPA) is committed to protecting individuals' personal data in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2018/17251 (*Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC, OJ L 295, 21.11.2018, p. 39–98*, further referred to as “the EUDP Regulation”).
2. In line with Articles 15 and 16 of the EUDP Regulation, this privacy statement provides information to the data subjects relating to the processing of their personal data carried out by EIOPA.

Purpose of the processing of personal data

3. Personal data is collected and processed to manage online public consultations EIOPA launches, and to conduct online surveys, including via online platform EUSurvey (*For more information on the processing of personal data in EUSurvey, please see the [dedicated privacy statement](#)*), and to facilitate further communication with participating stakeholders (e.g., when clarifications are needed on the information supplied or for the purposes of follow-up discussions that the participating stakeholders may agree to in the context of the consultations or surveys).
4. The data will not be used for any purposes other than the performance of the activities specified above. Otherwise you will be informed accordingly.

Legal basis of the processing of personal data and/or contractual or other obligation imposing it

5. The legal basis for this processing operation are the following:
 - Regulation (EU) 1094/2010, and notably Articles 8, 10, 15, 16, 16a, 29 and 71 thereof
 - EIOPA's Public Statement on Public Consultations
 - EIOPA's Handbook on Public Consultations

6. In addition, in accordance with Article 5(1)(a) of the EUDP Regulation, processing is lawful as it is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest.

Controller of the personal data processing

7. EIOPA's controller responsible for the processing of personal data is the Executive Director.

8. Address and email address of the controller:

Westhafen Tower, Westhafenplatz 1

60327 Frankfurt am Main

Germany

DataController@eiopa.europa.eu

Contact detail of EIOPA's Data Protection Officer (DPO)

9. Westhafen Tower, Westhafenplatz 1, 60327 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

dpo@eiopa.europa.eu

Types of personal data collected

10. The following personal data might be processed:

- Personal details (e.g. name, contact details: e.g. email address, phone number).
- Employment details (company and job title).

Recipients/processors of the personal data collected

11. Data will be collected and disclosed to the relevant staff members part of the Department/Unit in charge of the consultation/surveys and also to other EIOPA's staff on a need-to-know basis (e.g IT staff, security officer).

Retention period

12. Personal data collected are kept by until the finalisation of the project the public consultation or the survey relate to.

13. The personal data collected in EUSurvey are deleted from EUSurvey as soon as the period to provide answers elapsed.

Transfer of personal data to a third country or international organisations

14. No personal data will be transferred to a third country or international organisation. The service provider is located in the European Union.

Automated decision-making

15. No automated decision-making including profiling is performed in the context of this processing operation.

What are the rights of the data subject?

16. Data subjects have the right to access their personal data, receive a copy of them in a structured and machine-readable format or have them directly transmitted to another controller, as well as request their rectification or update in case they are not accurate. Data subjects also have the right to request the erasure of their personal data, as well as object to or obtain the restriction of their processing.

17. Where processing is based solely on the consent, data subjects have the right to withdraw their consent to the processing of their personal data at any time.

18. Restrictions of certain rights of the data subject may apply, in accordance with Article 25 of the EUDP Regulation.

19. For the protection of the data subjects' privacy and security, every reasonable step shall be taken to ensure that their identity is verified before granting access, or rectification, or deletion.

20. Should the data subjects wish to exercise any of the rights provided in paragraphs 16 and 17 above, please contact EIOPA's DPO (dpo@eiopa.europa.eu).

Who to contact if the data subjects have any questions or complaints regarding data protection?

21. Any questions or complaints concerning the processing of the personal data can be addressed to the internal data Controller (dpo@eiopa.europa.eu) or EIOPA's DPO (dpo@eiopa.europa.eu).

22. Alternatively, the data subjects can have recourse to the **European Data Protection Supervisor** (www.edps.europa.eu) at any time, **as provided in Article 63 of the EUDP Regulation**.

About the respondent

* Please indicate the desired disclosure level of the responses you are submitting,

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Public
- ☐ Confidential
- ☐ Partly confidential

If you selected "Partly confidential", please indicate clearly any part of the response you do not wish to be publicly disclosed.

* Stakeholder name

European Contact Group

* Stakeholder type

Minimum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Insurance undertaking
- ☐ NGO
- ☐ Think-tank
- ☐ Academic organisation

- ☒ Auditor firm
- ☐ Consultancy
- ☐ Consumer association
- ☐ Other

* Contact person (Name and Surname)

Kees-Jan de Vries

* Contact person (e-mail)

kees-jan.de.vries@pwc.com

Consultation questions

Underwriting KPI

Q1. Do you agree that the proposed revisions improve the decision-usefulness of Taxonomy disclosures while reducing reporting burden for insurance undertakings?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

The underwriting KPI has proved difficult to apply and interpret. In particular, the relationship between taxonomy-eligible or taxonomy-aligned activities and insurance underwriting is not always straightforward. Insurance may support transition and climate resilience even where the insured activity itself is not currently taxonomy-aligned. Conversely, a narrow KPI may fail to capture the broader role insurers play in enabling adaptation, risk management and resilience.

We therefore support EIOPA's proposals on the revisions of the underwriting KPI and to develop it into an adaptation underwriting KPI. In particular, limiting the denominator to those lines of business that have the ability to be eligible and aligned would improve the relevance of the KPI.

We also support the proposal to keep the "split premium" approach, as only the share of premiums relating to the insurance of climate-related risks provides benefits for climate change adaptation. As most insurers were able to implement appropriate methodologies, we support retaining the existing guidance.

Q2. Do you agree with renaming the current underwriting KPI to "Adaptation Underwriting KPI" to better reflect its scope?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐

Partially

☐ Not applicable

Please explain

Refer to Q1.

Q3. Do you support to keep the “split premium” approach for the Adaptation Underwriting KPI?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please provide reason

Refer to Q1.

Q4. Do you agree with the proposal to limit the denominator of the alignment and eligibility ratios to the 8 Eligible Lines of Business?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Explain why

Refer to Q1.

Q5. For the numerator of the eligibility ratio, do you agree with the proposed standardisation of determination of eligibility?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Explain why

Green Insured Activities KPI

Q.6 Do you support the introduction of a “Green Insured Activities KPI” measuring exposure to Taxonomy-aligned counterparties or assets?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☒ Not applicable

Please provide reasons for your answer.

More time is needed in order to assess this proposal. We remain available to engage with the ESAs and to provide practical insights based on our experience.

Q.6. If you selected yes:

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ a) Do you consider that the KPI should be applied on a voluntary or mandatory basis?
- ☐ b) Do you consider that the introduction of such a KPI should be deferred to the longer term?

Please provide reasons for your answer.

Q.7 Should this KPI complement or replace the current KPI over time?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

Q.8 Do you support the methodology for the Green Insured Activities KPI?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

If you selected "No", what alternative calculation approaches would work better to identify the Taxonomy-alignment of insured companies and objects?

Other simplifications

Q.9 Do you agree with simplifying the Investment KPI by removing the breakdowns for gas and nuclear activities?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

--

Q.10 Do you agree with removing the combined KPI (weighted average of underwriting and investment KPIs)?
Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

We support reconsidering the combined KPI. Combining investment and underwriting information into a single metric may reduce clarity rather than improve it. Users are likely to analyse an insurer's investment portfolio and underwriting activities separately, because they represent different business activities, risk profiles and channels of environmental impact.

We therefore recommend removing the combined KPI and replacing it with a clearer presentation that separately distinguishes investment-related and underwriting-related taxonomy information. We also support an introduction of a clear basis for selection between investment-related and underwriting-related KPIs for investors to meet their own disclosure requirements.

Q.11 Do you support the introduction of an executive summary (dashboard) containing key Taxonomy and ESRS indicators in the Annual Report?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

Cross-sectoral issues: Use of OpEx for the Investment KPI and group reporting

Use of OpEx

Q.12 Bearing in mind that OpEx is not included in the current disclosure template for insurance undertakings' Investment KPI, could the OpEx KPI of investee companies become relevant for voluntary reporting by insurance undertakings, in combination with the CapEx KPI?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

In our opinion, demand for the OpEx KPI should not be artificially created by requiring financial undertakings to expand their reporting beyond turnover and CapEx KPIs. We agree with the assessments of the ESAs that a deletion of the OpEx KPI (and subsequently no new OpEx-related KPI for financial undertakings be introduced) would be desirable.

Group reporting

Q13. The ESAs are proposing to remove the weighted average for group reporting. Do you agree that, in cases where a single KPI figure is required (such as for investment KPIs or investments made by financial products disclosed under SFDR), the KPI of the main business of the group should be used?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please explain

If not, what alternative methodology would you propose?

Q.14 Do you agree that computing group level KPIs for mixed groups as currently described in the FAQs of the Third Commission Notice poses challenges?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

If not, please explain how the identified issues could be solved in practice.

Group-level reporting is one important area for clarification. Current requirements can create uncertainty particularly for groups with mixed financial and non-financial activities or activities in multiple financial sectors. We repeat our comment from past consultations that a weighted average KPI is not useful as it artificially combines different concepts. We therefore support the proposal to remove the guidance which is not rooted in the legal text but solely in the non-binding FAQs.

We recommend that the revised framework should:

- clarify at which level of consolidation taxonomy disclosures should be provided;
- avoid overly granular duplicative entity-level and group-level disclosures;
- provide clear rules for mixed groups;
- avoid as much as possible creating inconsistencies between prudential, accounting and sustainability reporting perimeters.

Q.15 Do you have comments on the common principles based on which possible solutions have been developed by the ESAs?

Q.16 Do you see specific challenges on how to determine the group main reporting regime or prevalent business of a mixed group or financial conglomerate?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

Please provide examples if relevant.

Please explain

If not, please explain how the identified issues could be solved in practice.

Q.17 Do you support introducing a 10% materiality threshold based on the turnover generated by the other businesses a mixed group engages in?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ Not applicable

If not, please explain why.

Q.18 Do you think that the proposal regarding sub-group level disclosures would provide a sufficiently transparent depiction of the Taxonomy profile of a mixed group?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

☐

Yes



No



Partially



Not applicable

Please explain your views on the different criteria identified.

Q19. What are your views on the types of disclosures which should be required for the other activities businesses?

Do you think that the full templates should be disclosed to enable easier comparability with undertakings engaging in similar activities or would you support lighter disclosures?

Please explain.



Contact

ursula.bordas@eiopa.europa.eu