

2024

GRESB Infrastructure Fund Standard

List of Changes

Following the [GRESB Standard Development Process](#) formalized in early 2022, the GRESB Foundation has reviewed and approved changes throughout 2023 aiming to develop, maintain and improve the GRESB Standard. The complete list of changes related to the 2024 Infrastructure Fund Standard is presented in this document.

For each change, information on background and purpose along with a description on scoring and reporting impact for participants are provided.

Member feedback is essential to the development of the Standards and these changes have been developed through extensive engagement with the GRESB Foundation as well as direct user feedback during the reporting year. Further comments on these changes and additional feedback to inform future changes are always welcome and can be shared anytime with GRESB via our [online helpdesk](#).

Climate resilience and opportunities (RM2)

Background and Purpose: The previous Standards only covered climate-related risks and did not address climate-related opportunities (CROs). CROs are a critical aspect of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) framework. Reflecting both risks and opportunities ultimately allows entities considering future climate scenarios to understand the full potential outcomes of their activities, and to align more closely with the TCFD. The GRESB Foundation recommended the Infrastructure Standards better incorporate CROs to increase alignment with TCFD.

During 2023 the inaugural International Sustainability ISSB Standards—IFRS S1 and IFRS S2— were published. The IFRS S1 and S2 align with and supersede TCFD. By incorporating CROs this year the Standards also align closer to IFRS. IFRS will be reviewed in future years in terms of even closer alignment, rather than TCFD.

Additionally, it was identified that the list of available transition and physical climate scenarios required an update to include the new 'Shared Socioeconomic Pathways' (SSP).

Description of Change: Scope of indicator *RM2 Climate resilience* is now expanded to also cover climate-related opportunities along with textual clarification. The list of physical and transition scenario options is updated to include new SSP scenarios.

Scoring Impact: Indicator RM2 is now worth 0.5 point, through a reallocation of scoring weight from existing Risk Management indicators (See Annex 1 for full score distribution).

Reporting Impact: Participants are required to incorporate resilience into their climate strategy and provide a description on how the entity does so in light of any climate-related risks and opportunities. Participants are now able to select the new SSP-RCP pathways if they use them in their Physical and/or Transition Risk scenario analysis.

RM2 Climate resilience

Does the entity's climate strategy incorporate?

1 Yes

Describe the resilience of the organization's strategy.

Does the process of evaluating the resilience of the entity's strategy involve the use of scenario analysis?

Yes

Select the scenarios that are used (multiple answers possible)

Transition scenarios

IEA SDS

IEA B2DS

IEA NZE2050

IPR FPS

- NGFS Current Policies
- NGFS Nationally determined contributions
- NGFS Immediate 2C scenario with CDR
- NGFS Immediate 2C scenario with limited CDR
- NGFS Immediate 1.5C scenario with CDR
- NGFS Delayed 2C scenario with limited CDR
- NGFS Delayed 2C scenario with CDR
- NGFS Immediate 1.5C scenario with limited CDR
- SBTi
- TPI
- SSP1-1.9
- SSP1-2.6
- SSP4-3.4
- SSP5-3.4OS
- SSP2-4.5
- SSP4-6.0
- SSP3-7.0
- SSP5-8.5
- Other____
- Physical scenarios
 - RCP2.6
 - RCP4.5
 - RCP6.0
 - RCP8.5
 - SSP1-1.9
 - SSP1-2.6
 - SSP4-3.4
 - SSP5-3.4OS
 - SSP2-4.5
 - SSP4-6.0
 - SSP3-7.0
 - SSP5-8.5
 - Other____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

0.5 points, G

Climate-related Opportunities Identification (RM3.5)

Background and Purpose: As described above for RM2 in detail, this change is to better incorporate climate-related opportunities (CROs) and alignment with TCFD and IFRS.

Description of Change: Given there are existing indicators in the assessment (RM3.1 and RM3.3) covering Physical Climate Risk (PCR) Identification and Transition Risk (TR) Identification it was determined that the new indicator should follow the same format and reflect similar content from the TCFD framework, but in relation to CROs.

Scoring Impact: Indicator RM3.5 is now worth 0.5 points, through a reallocation of scoring weight from existing Risk Management indicators (See Annex 1 for full score distribution).

Reporting Impact: The indicator will be scored in the same way as the corresponding 'identification' indicators relating to PCR and TR, with full marks awarded for the existence of a process for identifying CROs. If entities do state they have a process to identify CROs, they then select the elements covered in that process and whether any opportunities were identified.

RM3.5 Climate-related Opportunities Identification

Does the entity have a systematic process for identifying climate-related opportunities that could have a material financial impact on the entity?

1 Yes

Select the elements covered in the opportunities identification process (multiple answers possible)

Resource Efficiency

Has the process identified any opportunities in this area?

Yes

Select the opportunity(s) which the entity can utilize is exposed (multiple answers possible)

- Use of more efficient modes of transport
- Use of more efficient production and distribution processes
- Use of recycling
- Move to more efficient buildings
- Reduced water usage and consumption
- Other: _____

No

Energy Source

Has the process identified any opportunities in this area?

Yes

Select the opportunity(s) to which the entity can utilize (multiple answers possible)

- Use of lower-emission sources of energy
- Use of supportive policy incentives
- Use of new technologies
- Participation in carbon market
- Shift toward decentralized energy generation
- Other: _____

No

Products and Services

Has the process identified any opportunities in this area?

Yes

Select the opportunity(s) which the entity can utilize (multiple answers possible)

- Development and/or expansion of low emissions goods and services
- Development of climate adaptation and insurance risk solutions
- Development of new products or services through R&D and innovation
- Ability to diversify business activities
- Shift in consumer preferences
- Other: _____

No

Markets

Has the process identified any opportunities in this area?

Yes

Select the opportunity(s) which the entity can utilize (multiple answers possible)

- Access to new markets
- Use of public-sector incentives
- Access to new assets and locations needing insurance coverage
- Other: _____

No

Resilience

Has the process identified any opportunities in this area?

Yes

Select the opportunity(s) which the entity can utilize (multiple answers possible)

- Participation in renewable energy programs and adoption of energy efficiency measures
- Resource substitutes/diversification
- Other: _____

No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

Describe the entity's processes for prioritizing opportunities.

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

0.5 points, G

New indicator 'Climate-related Opportunities Impact Assessment' (RM3.6)

Background and Purpose: As described above for RM2 in detail, this change is to better incorporate climate-related opportunities and alignment with TCFD and IFRS.

Description of Change: Given there are existing indicators in the assessment (RM3.2 and RM3.4) covering Physical Climate Risk (PCR) Impact Assessment and Transition Risk (TR) Impact Assessment it was determined that the new indicator should follow the same format and reflect similar content from the TCFD framework, but in relation to CROs.

Scoring Impact: Indicator RM3.6 is now worth 0.5 points, through a reallocation of scoring weight from existing Risk Management indicators (See Annex 1 for full score distribution).

Reporting Impact: The indicator will be scored in the same way as the corresponding 'impact assessment' indicators relating to PCR and TR, with full marks awarded for the existence of a process to assess the impact of CROs. If entities do state they have a process to assess the impact of CROs, they then select the elements covered in that process and whether any material impacts were identified.

RM3.6 Climate-related opportunities impact assessment

Does the entity have a systematic process to assess the material financial impact of climate-related opportunities on the business and/or financial plannings of the entity?

1 Yes

Select the elements covered in the impact assessment process (multiple answers possible)

Resource efficiency

Has the process concluded that there were any material impacts as a result of identified opportunities to the entity in this area?

Yes

Indicate which impacts are deemed material to the entity (multiple answers possible)

Reduced operating costs (e.g., through efficiency gains and cost reductions)

Increased production capacity, resulting in increased revenues

Increased value of fixed assets (e.g., highly rated energy efficient buildings)

Benefits to workforce management and planning (e.g. Improved health and safety, employee satisfaction) resulting in lower costs

Other: _____

No

Energy Source

Has the process concluded that there were any material impacts as a result of identified opportunities to the entity in this area?

Yes

Indicate which impacts are deemed material to the entity (multiple answers possible)

Reduced operational costs (e.g., through use of lowest cost abatement)

Reduced exposure to future fossil fuel price increases

Reduced exposure to GHG emissions and therefore less sensitivity to changes in cost of carbon

Returns on investment in low-emission technology

Increased capital availability (e.g., as more investors favor lower-emissions producers)

Reputational benefits resulting in increased demand for goods/services

Other: _____

No

Products and Services

Has the process concluded that there were any material impacts as a result of identified opportunities to the entity in this area?

Yes

Indicate which impacts are deemed material to the entity (multiple answers possible)

Increased revenue through demand for lower emissions products and services

Increased revenue through new solutions to adaptation needs (e.g., insurance risk transfer products and services)

Better competitive position to reflect shifting consumer preferences, resulting in increased revenues

Other: _____

No

Markets

Has the process concluded that there were any material impacts as a result of identified opportunities to the entity in this area?

Yes

Indicate which impacts are deemed material to the entity (multiple answers possible)

Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets (e.g., partnerships with governments, development banks)

Increased diversification of financial assets (e.g., green bonds and infrastructure)

Other: _____

No

Resilience

Has the process concluded that there were any material impacts as a result of identified opportunities to the entity in this area?

Yes

Indicate which impacts are deemed material to the entity (multiple answers possible)

Increased market valuation through resilience planning (e.g., infrastructure, land, buildings)

Increased reliability of supply chain and ability to operate under various conditions

Increased revenue through new products and services related to ensuring resiliency

Other: _____

No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found _____

Describe how the entity's processes for identifying, assessing, and managing opportunities are integrated into its overall risk management.

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

0.5 points, G

Introduction of evidence validation for all climate risk and opportunity indicators (RM3.1-3.6)

Background and Purpose: In prior years the GRESB assessment manually validated climate risk indicators through the use of an open text box where participants would describe the methodology for identifying transition and physical risks as well as respective impact assessments. However, validating the open text box was deemed inadequate to thoroughly ascertain the intricacies of the process.

Description of Change: Evidence of all climate risk (and new climate-based opportunity) indicators are now part of manual validation.

Scoring Impact: The evidence is manually validated and acts as a score multiplier. It is assigned a status of "Accepted", "Partially accepted" or "Rejected".

Reporting Impact: No reporting impact. Participants were required to provide evidence for all climate risk indicators.

Scoring climate-related senior decision maker (LE4)

Background and Purpose: Given that climate has been noted as the most important ESG issue to address by the GRESB Foundation, it was also determined that responsibility for climate-related objectives should be as important as other topic-specific related objectives in the Standards, such as DEI.

Description of Change: The selection of a senior decision maker for 'Climate-related risks and opportunities' alongside an indication of what level that decision maker sits within the organisation is now scored.

Scoring Impact: The checkbox will receive 1/5 of the overall indicator's points, reweighted from the more general ESG option within this indicator.

Reporting Impact: Full marks will be awarded for this section of the indicator if an entity indicates they have a senior decision maker responsible for 'Climate-related risks and opportunities' and can select at what level that person sits at within the organisation.

LE4 Individual responsible for ESG, climate-related, and/or DEI objectives

Does the entity have a senior decision-maker accountable for ESG issues, climate-related issues, and/or DEI?

Yes

3/5 ESG

Provide the details for the most senior decision-maker:

Name: _____

Job title: _____

The individual's most senior role is as part of:

- 1 Board of directors
- 1 C-suite level staff/Senior management
- 1 Fund/portfolio managers
- 1 Investment committee
- 1 Other: _____

1/5 Climate-related issues

Provide the details for the most senior decision-maker:

Name: _____

Job title: _____

The individual's most senior role is as part of:

- 1 Board of directors
- 1 C-suite level staff
- 1 Fund/portfolio managers
- 1 Investment committee
- 1 Other: _____

1/5 Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)

Provide the details for the most senior decision-maker on DEI

Name: _____

Job title: _____

The individual's most senior role is as part of

- 1 Board of directors
- 1 C-suite level staff/Senior management
- 1 Investment Committee
- 1 Fund/portfolio managers
- 1 Other: _____

Describe the process of informing the most senior decision-maker on the ESG, climate-related, DEI and/or Health and Safety performance of the entity (maximum 250 words)

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Removal of 'Non-financial consequences' for personnel ESG performance (LE5)

Background and Purpose: The Standard previously inquired about ESG performance targets for personnel having both financial and non-financial consequences in indicator *LE5 Personnel ESG performance targets*. The concept of a non-financial consequence is deemed to lack strictness, can be subject to personal interpretation and often confuses participants for supporting those in their uploaded evidence.

Description of Change: The Standard no longer rewards participants for including ESG factors with non-financial consequences, such as written or verbal recognition, in the annual performance targets of personnel. As such, the "Non-financial consequences" section is removed from indicator LE5.

Scoring Impact: The indicator will retain the same weight in the assessment, and the entirety of the 'non-financial consequences' score will be added to the 'financial consequences' portion of the indicator.

Reporting Impact: Participants are no longer required to report on "Non-financial consequences" in indicator LE6.

LE5 Does the entity include ESG factors in the annual performance targets of personnel?

Does performance against these targets have predetermined consequences? (multiple answers possible)

Yes

- 1 Financial consequences

Select the personnel to whom these factors apply (multiple answers possible):

- 2/4 All other employees
- 3/4 Asset managers
- 3/4 Board of directors
- 3/4 C-suite level staff/Senior management
- 2/4 Dedicated staff on ESG issues
- 2/4 ESG managers
- 2/4 External managers, contractors or service providers
- 2/4 Fund/portfolio managers
- 2/4 Investment analysts
- 2/4 Investment committee
- 2/4 Investor relations
- 1/4 Other: _____

Non-financial consequences

Select the personnel to whom these factors apply (multiple answers possible):

- All other employees
- Asset managers
- Board of directors
- C-suite level staff

- Dedicated staff on ESG issues
- ESG managers
- External managers or service providers
- Fund/portfolio managers
- Investment analysts
- Investment committee
- Investor relations
- Other: _____

No

No

2.84 points, G

Annex 1

Scoring Weight Redistribution for Risk Management Indicators

Indicator	Scoring weights (p)	
	2023 GRESB Standard	2024 GRESB Standard
RM1.1	4.9	4.15
RM1.2	4.9	4.15
RM2	0	0.5
RM3.1	0.5	0.5
RM3.2	0.5	0.5
RM3.3	0.5	0.5
RM3.4	0.5	0.5
RM3.5	N/A	0.5
RM3.6	N/A	0.5
RM Total	11.8	11.8