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<tr>
<th>Time</th>
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Value Reporting Foundation Updates
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Bryan Esterly | Chief Technical Officer, SASB Standards
At COP26, IFRS Foundation announced:

1. Formation of the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB)

2. Consolidation with CDSB (completed Feb 2022) & Value Reporting Foundation (June 2022)

3. Publication of climate and general disclosure prototype requirements
Prototype requirements published

Climate-related Disclosures

General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Information

- Recommendations from TRWG to ISSB
- ISSB considering as part of initial work programme
- Exposure drafts expected in H1 2022.
What happens to SASB Standards?

**SASB STANDARDS**
- Starting point for industry-specific requirements. Need to go through full ISSB due process on timeline TBD.

**SASB STANDARDS ADVISORY GROUP**
- Transition to support the ISSB standard-setting process

**SASB STANDARDS INVESTOR ADVISORY GROUP**
- Strategic advice to the ISSB
- Advocacy for the ISSB Standards
- Participation in standard development process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPOINTMENTS</strong></td>
<td>Remaining ISSB members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULTATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Climate and general disclosure standards exposure drafts, work plan and future priorities (due process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVISORY GROUPS</strong></td>
<td>Finalise advisory group structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSOLIDATION</strong></td>
<td>Complete consolidation with Value Reporting Foundation (June 2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
<td>Implement multi-location approach for global footprint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advice to report preparers

- Continue applying the <IR> Framework and SASB Standards
- Get familiar with the prototypes – indication of direction of travel
- Be ready to share your views – public consultation on exposure drafts
- Plan to engage in ISSB Standards development on an ongoing basis.
Standard-Setting Agenda Overview

March 2, 2022

Lynn Xia | Director of Research – SASB Standards
Evolving the SASB Standards to meet market needs

Active research and standard-setting projects are driven by market feedback and evolving evidence.

Research Projects
Determines if standard setting is necessary/appropriate by assessing the financial impacts of a sustainability issue impacting companies.

- Human Capital
- Internationalization
- Content Moderation

Standard-Setting Projects
A standard-setting project is subject to due process and is a defined and scoped project likely to result in updates to the standards content.

- Monitoring Industries & Issues
- INITIATE Standard-Setting Project
- Preliminary Deliberations
- PROPOSE Standards Update
- Public Comment Period
- Exposure Draft Deliberations
- ISSUE Standards Update
- Post-Implementation Review

- Systemic Risk in Asset Mgmt
- Tailings Management

- Raw Material Sourcing in Apparel
  - Conceptual Framework*
  - Rules of Procedure*

- * Update of core governance documents

- Plastics Risks & Opportunities
- Content Governance in Internet
- Alternative Products in Food & Bev
- Renewable Energy in Elec. Utilities
- Human Capital: Diversity, Equity & Inclusion
- GHG Emission in Marine Transportation

Learn more at: https://www.sasb.org/standard-setting-process/current-projects/
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## Progress Standard-setting Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard-setting Project</th>
<th>Current Project Status</th>
<th>1H 2022 Target Timeline*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Materials Sourcing in Apparel</td>
<td>Development of final update</td>
<td>Issue Standard update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics Risks &amp; Opportunities</td>
<td>Exposure draft development</td>
<td>Complete exposure draft &amp; basis for conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Governance in Internet Media Services Industry</td>
<td>Exposure draft development</td>
<td>Complete exposure draft &amp; basis for conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Products in Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Exposure draft development</td>
<td>Complete exposure draft &amp; basis for conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other standard-setting projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renewable Energy in Electric Utilities</td>
<td>Continue research &amp; preliminary deliberations</td>
<td>Continue market consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GHG Emissions in Marine Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human Capital: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tentative schedule; may change depending on additional research and deliberations.

Learn more at: [https://www.sasb.org/standard-setting-process/current-projects/](https://www.sasb.org/standard-setting-process/current-projects/)
Raw Materials Sourcing in Apparel

Standard-Setting Project Update

March 2, 2022

Taylor Reed | Associate Director of Research
Keertana Anandraj | Associate Analyst
Raw Materials Sourcing in Apparel

Problem Statement

Market input suggests that the current metrics provide insufficient guidance that may lead to inconsistent calculations and in turn, less comparable disclosures for users. Additionally, market input and staff research suggest that there are opportunities to improve the completeness of the metrics and further align the metrics with existing industry approaches.

Project Objective

Improve the comparability, completeness, and alignment of two metrics:

• **CG-AA-440a.1**: Description of environmental and social risks associated with sourcing priority raw materials.

• **CG-AA-440a.2**: Percentage of raw materials third-party certified to an environmental and/or social sustainability standard, by standard.
Project Timeline

- **Targeted Consultation Period**
  - Launched: February 2020

- **Exposure Draft Development**
  - 90-day Exposure Draft Public Comment Period
    - Public Comments Analysis
    - Final Standard Update

- **Research & Consultation**
Session Objectives

Review Additional Consultation Findings
Discuss Proposed Revisions to Technical Protocol
Next Steps
# Exposure Draft Recommended Revising Metrics & TPs

## Current Metric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Materials Sourcing</th>
<th>Description of environmental and social risks associated with sourcing priority raw materials</th>
<th>Discussion and Analysis</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>CG-AA-440a.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Proposed Metric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Materials Sourcing</th>
<th>(1) List of priority raw materials; for each priority raw material: (2) environmental and/or social factor(s) most likely to threaten sourcing, (3) discussion on business risks and/or opportunities associated with social and/or environmental factors, and (4) management strategy for addressing business risks and opportunities</th>
<th>Discussion and Analysis</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>CG-AA-440a.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# Exposure Draft Recommended Revising Metrics & TPs

## Current Metric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Materials Sourcing</th>
<th>Percentage of raw materials third-party certified to an environmental and/or social sustainability standard, by standard</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Percentage (%) by weight</th>
<th>CG-AA-440a.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Proposed Metric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Materials Sourcing</th>
<th>(1) Amount of priority raw materials purchased, by material, and (2) amount of each priority raw material that is third-party certified to a social and/or environmental standard, by standard</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Metric tons (t)</th>
<th>CG-AA-440a.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Public Comments Highlighted Sourcing Location

Roughly half of respondents emphasized sourcing location as an important element of disclosure.
Staff Pursued Additional Research & Consultation on Sourcing Location

Given the widespread market support for supplemental guidance on sourcing location, staff pursued the following tasks:

- Disclosure analysis to better understand the feasibility of disclosure on the issue
- Market consultations with companies, investors, and subject matter experts to gain market input and understand if there’s a middle ground on the issue
Consultation Feedback on Traceability/Sourcing Location

Investor Consultation Findings

- Country-of-origin is useful information in further understanding risks (e.g., magnitude) associated with sourcing.
- Investors were sympathetic to the challenges faced by companies to achieve traceability to raw materials suppliers (i.e., tier 4 suppliers).

Company Consultation Findings

- Some apparel companies, (e.g. luxury brands) can trace materials to the farm level, but most are unable to due to the complex nature of the supply chain. Challenges include:
  - Cotton from multiple farms/countries is typically mixed when ginned which hinders traceability.
  - Some companies rely on external vendors to source materials rather than bringing this function in-house and vetting suppliers themselves.
  - No viable technology to facilitate traceability at scale to this level of the supply chain.
Consultation Feedback on Traceability/Sourcing Location

- Emphasized the difficulty associated with traceability
- Highlighted issue as priority for companies within the industry
- Suggested some companies are apprehensive to disclose traceability information due to reputational repercussions
- Recommended clarifying key terms (e.g., “tier 4”)
- Recommended revising technical protocol to enhance alignment with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD Due Diligence Guidance
Supplemental Revisions to Proposed Changes

Redline aims to address public comments on sourcing location/country-of-origin

Proposed Supplemental Revisions

For each priority raw material, the entity shall discuss its management strategy for addressing business risks and opportunities associated with environmental and/or social factors most likely to threaten its ability to source priority raw materials.

4.1 Relevant strategies may include, but are not limited to:

4.1.1 Enhancing supply chain visibility and traceability to raw materials suppliers (i.e., tier 4) through due diligence practices, research into traceability or use of traceability systems, technology, supplier screening, and/or supplier audits or certifications, and/or a list of countries from which the entity sources each priority raw material.

Rationale

- Supplemental revisions build upon the draft language exposed to the public in June 2021 and do not represent a significant shift in terms of guidance.

- Proposed redline changes aim to address investor interest by helping drive more detailed disclosure on traceability to tier 4 suppliers and country-of-origin for priority raw materials.

- Topic summary and quantitative metric remain unchanged
Proposed Next Steps

1. Staff’s view is that this supplemental revision does not need additional exposure as additional research and consultation did not uncover any new information or options that significantly altered the proposed changes put forth in the exposure draft.

2. Staff plans to proceed with preparing the final standards update and basis to be released in 1H 2022.
Discussion Points with the Board

- Does the Board agree with Staff’s supplemental revisions to the qualitative metric?

- Does the Board view need to re-expose the supplemental revisions through an additional public comment period?
Raw Materials Sourcing in Apparel

Taylor Reed – taylor.reed@thevrf.org
Associate Director of Research
Plastics Risks & Opportunities in Chemicals Industry

Standard-Setting Project Update

March 2, 2022

Tory Yoshida | Analyst
Taylor Reed | Associate Director of Research
Session Objectives

Review Proposed Changes in the Exposure Draft
Key Areas of Research & Findings
Plastics Risks & Opportunities in Chemicals Industry

Standard-setting Project

Problem Statement

Intensifying focus on the externalities of plastics use has contributed to an escalating regulatory environment and shifting customer demand for packaging. These risks and opportunities do not appear to be fully captured in the existing Pulp & Paper and Chemicals Standards, but there is reason to believe they could be deemed financially material.

Project Objective

Evaluate if single-use plastics issue should be reflected in Chemicals Standard looking at the full lifecycle impact and what metrics would be decision useful and actionable by the investors and chemicals companies.

(It was decided on July 2021 Board Meeting to remove Pulp & Paper Industry from the project scope)
Target exposure draft completion: 2022 Q2
Overview of Proposed Changes in the Exposure Draft
Update Overview on the Project

Scope Change

- The original project scope included the Pulp & Paper Industry, but it was decided on July 2021 Board Meeting to remove Pulp & Paper Industry from the scope.

Proposal of Topic Addition

- At the July 2021 Board Meeting, Board Members discussed the addition of a new standalone disclosure topic (Management of Single-Use Plastics) rather than merging with the existing "Product Design for Use-Efficiency" disclosure topic.

Proposal of Metrics Addition

- The new proposed topic contains four new metrics focused on the management of single-use plastics and bio-alternatives.
Chemicals Industry in the Plastics Value Chain

**Description**
- **Raw Material Extraction/Production**: Extraction of fossil fuels
- **Primary Plastics Products**: Process raw materials to polymers/resins
- **Plastic Products Manufacturing**: Manufacture end-products
- **Consumption/Use**: Usage of the end-product
- **Disposal and End-of-Life Treatment**: Landfilled, recycled, or incinerated

**Types of Industry Involved**
- **Chemicals**: Oil & Gas, Agricultural, etc.
- **Containers & Packaging**: Consumer Goods, Apparel/Textile, etc.
- **Consumers**: Industry Involved
- **Waste Management**: All Applicable Industries
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**Proposed Disclosure Topic: Management of Single-Use Plastics**

### Plastic Products

**Benefits**
- Long useful lives
- Resource efficiency

**Risks**
- Environmental impact concerns (i.e., end of life disposal, resource consumption)

### External Pressure

**Regulatory**
- Major movement by China, US, EU, and Canada

**Social & Economical**
- Companies and consumers’ interest in lifecycle impact of plastic packaging is increasing

### Chemical Companies

**Risks**
- Declining demand
- Potential fees or taxes
- Regulatory risks

**Opportunities**
- Generate new market opportunities
- Avoid risks of product obsolescence
## Proposed Metrics for Management of Single-Use Plastics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED DISCLOSURE TOPIC</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACCOUNTING METRICS</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>UNIT OF MEASURE</th>
<th>METRIC #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Single-Use Plastics</td>
<td>Percentage of revenue from products sold for use in the manufacture of single-use plastics</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of (1) revenue, (2) research and development expenditures, and (3) capital expenditures associated with products and/or business activities which are intended to reduce the environmental impacts associated with single-use plastics throughout the product lifecycle</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of total raw material consumption used in the manufacture of single-use plastics which is (1) virgin fossil fuel (hydrocarbon) content, (2) recycled content, and (3) renewable/biomass content</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of business activities intended to reduce the environmental impacts of single-use plastic for each key phase of the product lifecycle: (a) upstream/production, (b) use-phase/transportation, (c) end of life</td>
<td>Discussion and Analysis</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Rationale on Percentage of Revenue Metric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric #1</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of revenue from products sold for use in the manufacture of single-use plastics</strong></td>
<td>Understand corporate exposure to the dynamic developments associated with the management of single-use plastics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Companies that fail to develop products which meet the shifting regulatory and demand environment could be at risk of lower volumes and lost market share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues are a key channel of financial impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale on Percentage of Revenues, R&D and Capex Metric

**Metric #2**

- Percentage of (1) revenue, (2) research and development expenditures, and (3) capital expenditures associated with products and/or business activities which are intended to reduce the environmental impacts associated with single-use plastics throughout the product lifecycle.

**Purpose**

- (1) Company’s position to capitalize on potential opportunities
- (2) & (3) Commitment and strategy associated with environmental impacts associated with single-use plastics

**Background**

- Revenues, R&D, and CapEx are key channels for financial impact
- Revenues
  - Companies that meet regulatory and demand environment have potential for higher revenue, market share, and price premium
- R&D and CapEx
  - Mentioned by PRI/Ellen MacArthur Foundation engagement guide notes
Rationale on Raw Materials Metric

Metric #3

- Percentage of total raw material consumption used in the manufacture of single-use plastics which is (1) virgin fossil fuel (hydrocarbon) content, (2) recycled content, and (3) renewable/biomass content

Purpose

- Company’s positioning to meet regulatory demands and help customers meet their targets

Background

- Some government mandates incorporate certain levels of recycled plastic raw materials in plastic production
- Customers such as Coca-Cola and Pepsi have pledged to use recycled materials for packaging
- PRI/Ellen MacArthur Foundation engagement guide flags this as an area for possible engagement
Rationale on Qualitative Metric

Metric #4
• Discussion of business activities intended to reduce the environmental impacts of single-use plastic for each key phase of the product lifecycle: (a) upstream/production, (b) use-phase/transportation, (c) end of life

Purpose
• Provide decision useful insights of environmental impact mitigation activities associated with single-use plastics

Background
• Enhance completeness of disclosures by including disclosure guidance on the activities that may not be appropriately expressed in quantitative metrics alone
Key Areas of Research & Findings
Areas of Research

Following research areas were investigated to further guide the foundation of the proposed metrics:

1. Refining the definition of single-use plastics

2. Appropriate terminology for companies in the chemicals industry
1) Refining the Definition of Single-Use Plastics

Issues for research included:

- Aligning with existing definitions in regulation, disclosure efforts, industry terms, etc.
- Making the definition internationally applicable
Single-use Plastics Definition

Sources of Single-Use Plastics Definition

- EU Directive
- UN Environment Programme
- Natural Resources Defense Council

Proposed Definition

Single-use plastics:

Products made wholly or partly from plastics and are typically intended to be used once, for a short period of time before being disposed of.

Examples of single-use plastics include grocery bags, food packaging, beverage bottles, straws, containers, cups, and cutlery.

The scope excludes plastics used to produce durable goods with a useful life more than one year, such as components to appliances and transportation vehicles.
2) Appropriate Terminology for Companies in the Chemicals Industry

Issues for research included:

• Terminology appropriateness; staff analyzed disclosures from 53 companies, only four explicitly used “single-use plastics” term

• Feasibility to connect polymers/resins to the production of single-use plastics
Plastics Value Chain

Chemicals companies lie upstream and manufacture input components for production of single-use plastics.

- **Raw Material Extraction/Production**: Extraction of fossil fuels
- **Primary Plastics Products**: Process raw materials to polymers/resins
- **Plastic Products Manufacturing**: Manufacture end-products
- **Consumption/Use**: Usage of the end-product
- **Disposal and End-of-Life Treatment**: Landfilled, recycled, or incinerated

**Types of Industry Involved**
- **Chemicals**
- **Containers & Packaging, Consumer Goods, Apparel/Textile, Industrial Machinery, Construction, etc**
- **Consumers**
- **Waste Management, All Applicable Industries**

**Description**
- Extraction of fossil fuels
- Process raw materials to polymers/resins
- Manufacture end-products
- Usage of the end-product
- Landfilled, recycled, or incinerated
Chemicals Companies and Single-Use Plastics Waste

55% of global plastic packaging waste was produced by 20 companies active in chemicals industry.

Source: Minderoo Foundation, 2019
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**Polymers to Connect Single-Use Plastics Exposure**

There are five primary polymers that make up almost three quarters of the plastics on the market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polymers/Resins</th>
<th>Example End Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High density polyethylene (HDPE)</strong></td>
<td>Cleaning products, personal hygiene bottles, milk jugs, shopping bags, pipes, insulation, bottle caps, protective helmets, and street furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-density polyethylene (LDPE)</strong></td>
<td>Plastic bags, trays and lids, computer hardware and playgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polyethylene terephthalate (PET)</strong></td>
<td>Drinks packaging (soft drink, water bottles), cleaning products, cooking oil bottles, packaging trays and fleece clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polypropylene (PP)</strong></td>
<td>Bottles, caps, food containers/packaging, straws, snack and candy wrapping, microwavable container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)</strong></td>
<td>Clothing, pipes, flooring, vinyl records and cables, building and construction material, pipes, window frames, floor and wall covering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Considerations**

- Each polymer/resin can have multiple end-usage applications
- It may be challenging for chemicals companies to accurately track their products’ usage or connect their revenue or spending to single-use plastics products
Research Findings for Terminology

Research suggests “polymers/resins” terminology alone may not be sufficient to represent their association with single-use plastics for chemicals companies.

The term, “single-use plastics,” may be more appropriate, but staff plans to gather additional market input to evaluate and finalize the terminology to ensure the proposed metrics are cost-effective, comparable, and representationally faithful.
Next Steps

• Finalization of exposure draft and basis for conclusion
Board Discussion

• Do you agree with the direction staff has proposed for this project?
## Appendix

Issues to gain further market input on to further refine proposed metrics

### Decision Usefulness vs. Cost Effectiveness

- Single-point vs. range data
- Absolute value vs. percentage data
- Disclosure of both R&D and CapEx data
- Revenue vs. volume data

### Representational Faithfulness

- Isolating single-use plastics from R&D and CapEx
- Raw materials focusing on single-use plastics vs. all plastics

### Comparability

- Share of whole company vs. business unit
## Appendix

### Single-use plastics definition sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU Directive</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Single-use plastics</td>
<td>“Single-use plastic products include a diverse range of commonly used fast-moving consumer products that <strong>are discarded after having been used once for the purpose for which they were provided</strong>, are rarely recycled, and are prone to becoming litter.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Environment Programme</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Single-use plastics</td>
<td>“Single-use plastics - often also referred to as disposable plastics, are commonly used plastic packaging including <strong>items intended to be used only once before they are thrown away or recycled</strong>, e.g., grocery bags, food packaging, bottles, straws, containers, cups, cutlery, etc.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council</td>
<td>US (has offices in India and China)</td>
<td>Single-use plastics</td>
<td>“Put simply, single-use plastics are goods that are made primarily from fossil fuel–based chemicals (petrochemicals) and are <strong>meant to be disposed of right after use—often, in mere minutes</strong>. Single-use plastics are most commonly used for packaging and serviceware, such as bottles, wrappers, straws, and bags.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI/Ellen MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Single-use packaging</td>
<td>“Packaging that is designed to be <strong>used once before disposal</strong>.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix

Only four companies out of 53 stated single-use plastics in their disclosure (2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Details from Corporate Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrien</td>
<td>- Acknowledge single-use plastics is a global concern and trying to reduce plastic packaging or increase its reuse and recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recycling program Cleanfarms, that collect variety of used agricultural packaging and recycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal DSM</td>
<td>- Acknowledge they need to achieve meeting demand without using single-use disposal products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Making contribution to develop circular bio-based economy. For Engineering Materials business, they aim to offer “portfolio of alternatives that contain at least 25% recycled or bio-based content by 2030”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symrise AG</td>
<td>- Stated a goal to phase out from the use of single-use plastics in Germany bye end of 2020 and all sites before mid-2021 by recycling recyclable plastics and making packaging materials sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinseo</td>
<td>- Community recycling activity for single-use plastics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plastics Risks and Opportunities in Chemicals Industry

Tory Yoshida – Analyst (tory.yoshida@thevrf.org)

Taylor Reed – Associate Director of Research (taylor.reed@thevrf.org)
Content Governance in the Internet Media & Services Industry

Standard-Setting Project Update

March 2, 2022

Sam Wallace | Analyst, Technology & Communications Sector Lead
Session Objectives

Recap of proposed new Standard structure

Overview of proposed metrics: ‘content governance table’

Discussion of proposed metric: company content governance expenses

Discussion of proposed metric: global approach to content governance
Content Governance in the Internet Media & Services Industry

Standard-setting project

The risks around the dissemination and moderation of user-generated content are not fully accounted for by the Internet Media & Services (IM) Standard.

This project aims to expand the scope of disclosure for companies that operate user-generated content platforms and develop new metrics that capture relevant risks and opportunities.
Project Timeline
Target project completion: 2022 Q2

- **2020 Q3**: Preliminary Research & Consultation Materials Development
- **2021 Q1**: Targeted Consultation Period
- **2022 Q1**: Exposure Draft Development

Timeline:
- 2020 Q3
- 2020 Q4
- 2021 Q1
- 2021 Q2
- 2021 Q3
- 2021 Q4
- 2022 Q1
- 2022 Q2
## Proposed New Structure for the IM Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Angle</th>
<th>Current Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>Data Privacy, Advertising Standards &amp; Freedom of Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement requests for user data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't requests for content removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of expression - platform content removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful content - content moderation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful content - content shaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proposed New Structure*

- ADD Content Governance Topic; REVISE scope of Privacy Topic
- **Revised Topic:** Data Privacy & Advertising Standards
- **New Topic:** Content Governance & Freedom of Expression
Proposed Metrics

Draft concepts sent to reviewers
# New Proposed Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Governance &amp; Freedom of Expression</td>
<td>Description of approach to content moderation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of approach to content ranking and recommendations, and how these systems account for harmful or potentially harmful content</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content moderation metrics table: (1) content items removed, (2) percentage of removed content discovered proactively, (3) percentage of content removals appealed by users, (4) percentage of appealed content restored, (5) average user views of removed content</td>
<td>Number, Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of (1) operating costs and (2) research and development expenses associated with business activities intended to prevent the dissemination of harmful and illegal content</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of countries where localized content moderation experts are employed</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative metrics**

**Content moderation table**

**Key metrics for Board review and discussion**

---

March 2, 2022, SASB Standards Board Meeting
## Qualitative Metrics

### Content Moderation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metric</th>
<th>Rationale / concept to be measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of approach to content moderation</td>
<td>What are the company's policies regarding content moderation, i.e., what rules or principles does it follow for determining which content is allowed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the company's strategy for reviewing and removing user-generated content?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Content Shaping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metric</th>
<th>Rationale / concept to be measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of approach to content ranking and recommendations, and how these systems account for harmful or potentially harmful content</td>
<td>How does the company determine what users see on its platforms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do these mechanisms interact with harmful or potentially harmful content?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Content Moderation Table

Staff proposes metrics grouped by harmful content category and presented in a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metric</th>
<th>Rationale / concept to be measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content items removed</td>
<td>Provides a rough idea of the scale of the company’s content removal efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of removed content discovered proactively</td>
<td>How much content a company discovers on its own vs. how much is flagged by users. Provides an indication of the company’s reliance on artificial intelligence vs. human moderators, centralized vs. community moderation approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content removals appealed by users</td>
<td>Indicates whether the company has an appeals process, while also providing insight into the degree to which users are pushing back on the company’s content moderation actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage restored after appeal</td>
<td>Similar to rationale for appeals metric, while also indicating the extent to which the company’s initial removal processes “got it wrong”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average user views of removed content</td>
<td>How good is the platform at removing offending content before it appears in the feeds of users? Provides additional context: without this metric, all removals are counted equally, regardless of whether a content item was viewed 1 time or 100 million times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION TOPIC 1

Is the Board supportive of a metric capturing company spending on content governance, and does the Board have any feedback on how to structure this metric?

Proposed metric: Percentage of (1) operating costs and (2) research and development expenses associated with business activities intended to prevent the dissemination of harmful and illegal content

Pros
- Reflects investor interest
- Provides context when interpreting other metrics
- Creates a metric that is correlated to the scale of company investment

Challenges
- Some companies may consider this to be confidential information
- Defining boundaries of expenses to include is challenging
- Smaller platforms may be sensitive to comparison with larger competitors
Does the Board have suggestions on how to capture the global nature of content moderation risks?

**Relevance**
- Several of the worst examples of real-world harm have occurred in developing countries and areas of conflict
- Many types of harmful/illegal content can only be understood with local language and cultural context
- Companies have traditionally expanded into new markets before setting up localized content moderation systems
- Severe reputational harm can come from places where companies make little money

**Challenges**
- Sensitive information that companies may be reluctant to disclose
- Little in the way of existing disclosures
- Difficult to capture with quantitative metrics; qualitative metrics may lead to boilerplate disclosures
DISCUSSION TOPIC 2

Option 1: Qualitative Disclosure

Sample metric: Description of approach to managing global risks related to harmful and illegal content

Possible structure:
• Focus on “high risk” countries, regions or conflict areas
• Highlight internal policies, practices and procedures in place

Pros
• More opportunity for nuance and explanation in disclosure
• May be more adaptable for platforms of different types

Challenges
• Risk of generating boilerplate disclosures given sensitivity of topic
• Question of whether disclosures would provide comparable and decision-useful information
DISCUSSION TOPIC 2

Option 2: Detailed Quantitative Disclosure

Sample metric: Number of content moderation specialists employed in each language supported by platform operations

Alternative sample metrics:
- Percentage of moderators dedicated to enforcing content policy, broken out by languages supported by the entity
- User-to-moderator ratio, broken out by languages supported by the entity

Pros
- Detailed information could be particularly decision-useful
- Full disclosure may be more representationally faithful
- Actionable metric for companies

Challenges
- May not be cost-effective for companies to report
- Companies may consider this to be confidential information
Option 3: Aggregated Quantitative Metric

Sample metric: Number of languages supported by content moderation operations

Alternative sample metrics:
- Number (list) of countries where content moderation experts are employed
- Number (list) of key issue areas supported by content moderation experts

Pros
- Compromise that is less burdensome or confidential for companies while still providing quantitative information

Challenges
- Could sacrifice representational faithfulness while still being sensitive for companies to disclose
- May set the bar too low for disclosure on this key issue
What concerns does the Board have with pursuing each of the three options detailed above?

Which of these three options does the Board recommend pursuing?
Next Steps

1. Gather and incorporate Board and additional market feedback

2. Prepare exposure draft and basis for conclusions
Content Governance in the Internet Media & Services Industry
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