GIST IMPACT

Summary

Methodology

Nature and Biodiversity



Nature Value at Risk

Get in Touch

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Key Features

Precalculated coverage of ~19,000 listed companies across 19 ecosystem services

Hazard × Vulnerability × Exposure, following NGFS, ECB and GFI research

Output, Revenue and EBITDA at Risk for own operations and supply chain

Supports TNFD-aligned analysis and ESRS E4 and E3 disclosure on dependencies and risk

Introduction

Businesses depend on nature. Water supply, pollination, flood control and healthy soils are inputs to production, and where the ecosystems that provide them are degraded, output is at risk — in a company's own operations and in its supply chain.

GIST Impact's **Nature Value at Risk** (NVaR) methodology quantifies that risk. It enables users to:

- Identify where the pressures on ecosystem services, and the condition of the ecosystems that supply them, make disruption most severe.
- Assess how far a sector in a given country depends on each service, and how well that country can absorb its loss.
- Map a company's activity across countries and sectors, for its own operations and its upstream supply chain.
- Estimate the share of output, revenue and EBITDA exposed under severe but plausible ecosystem-service disruption.

The methodology follows the nature-risk approach established by Ranger et al. for the NGFS (2023), the European Central Bank (2025) and the Green Finance Institute (2024). It quantifies nature-related physical risk.



Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Methodology Foundations

The GIST Impact Nature Value at Risk methodology estimates the share of a company's economic output that may be impaired under severe but plausible disruption of ecosystem services, across its direct operations and its upstream supply chain.

A precalculated database covers around 19,000 public listed companies across the 19 ecosystem services for which hazard indicator data is currently available, out of the 25 mapped by the ENCORE framework. Direct scoring covers 99.73% of revenue exposure in the GIST Impact company universe.

The methodology is the same whether it is applied to public equities through the precalculated database or to private companies and custom portfolios through on-demand analysis. The difference is the starting point for the exposure data, not the computation.

The Risk Equation

NVaR follows a standard risk-assessment structure. Each component is assessed for a **geosector** — a country × sector pair — and for each ecosystem service:

- **Hazard**: the potential severity of ecosystem-service disruption at a location, reflecting both the pressures acting on the service and the condition of the ecosystems that supply it.
- **Vulnerability**: how sensitive a sector in a given country is to that disruption, combining its dependency on the service, the availability of substitutes, the country's resilience and the Output Volatility Bound.
- **Exposure**: the share of a company's productive activity located in the geosector.

Hazard and Vulnerability combine into the **NVaR coefficient**: a dimensionless intensity giving the output exposed to disruption per unit of activity in a geosector under severe conditions. Multiplied by the company's exposure, it gives **Output at Risk** — the share of the company's output exposed.

$$\text{Output at Risk} = \text{NVaR Coefficient} \times \text{Exposure}$$

$$\text{NVaR Coefficient} = \frac{}{\text{Hazard} \times \text{Vulnerability}}$$

The coefficient is company-independent, so it is computed once across the whole geosector × ecosystem-service space and reused as company exposure data changes. The structure means exposure is high only when every condition is met: the location faces meaningful hazard, the sector depends heavily on the service, the service cannot easily be substituted, the country has limited resilience, and the sector's Output Volatility Bound allows material disruption.



Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Hazard

Hazard is assessed per ecosystem service and per geography, on a 0–1 severity scale where 0 means no potential disruption and 1 the maximum. Each service has its own hazard module, built from indicators specific to the pressures on that service, and every module combines two elements:

- **Threats**: the pressures on the service. **Baseline stressors** are chronic conditions that impair the service today — water stress, nutrient loading, pollution. **Degradation drivers** are processes actively worsening supply — deforestation, land conversion, resource extraction.
- **Ecosystem condition**: the functional capacity of local ecosystems, measured by the Biodiversity Intactness Index (BII), reflecting both its current state and its trend.

$$\text{Hazard} = \text{Threat} \times \text{Condition Modifier}$$

The **Condition Modifier** rises as condition declines, so a given level of threat produces a higher hazard score where ecosystems are degraded and less able to buffer it; intact ecosystems moderate the threat but never cancel it.

Threat indicators are normalised to a common scale on which higher means more threat, and combined within each service. Where an indicator is missing for a country, the combination uses those that are available, preserving global coverage without imputation. The hazard approach follows Ranger et al. and ECB Occasional Paper No. 380, adapted for a modular, per-service construction.

Land-Cover Stratification

Rather than assigning one national average to every sector, ecosystem condition is differentiated by the type of land each sector's activity occupies, giving sub-country granularity without site-level data. A forestry company in Brazil is therefore not scored on the same condition as an urban services firm.

Ecosystem Service Modules

Most modules use the standard structure; a number depart from it where the service demands. Water Supply blends acute water shortage with water quality, Flood Control works from riverine and coastal flood exposure, and Climate Regulation — where destabilisation is global — differentiates countries through ecosystem condition alone. Biomass Provisioning and Nursery Habitat are computed per sub-service.

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Hazard

Ecosystem Service	Type	Hazard Construction
Water Supply	Provisioning	Acute water shortage damped by storage capacity, combined with water quality
Pollination	Regulating	Pesticide risk, biome protection and crop ozone damage
Flood Control	Regulating	Riverine and coastal flood exposure, combined as independent events
Climate Regulation	Regulating	Common global baseline; country differentiation from ecosystem condition
Local Climate Regulation	Regulating	Forest pressure, integrity and protection, and land-use flux pillars
Dilution by Atmosphere	Regulating	Ambient burden, emissions pressure and receptor stress pillars
Air Filtration	Regulating	Ozone exposure over biodiversity areas and croplands; NOx and SO_2 trends
Biomass Provisioning	Provisioning	Per sub-service: crops, grazing, livestock, aquaculture, wood, wild fish, wild animals and plants
Genetic Material	Provisioning	Red List Index and six protection-system indicators
Noise Attenuation	Regulating	Forest and land-cover change, biome protection, BII state and trend
Nursery Habitat	Regulating	Per sub-service: terrestrial and freshwater, and marine
Rainfall Regulation	Regulating	Forest loss, landscape integrity, biome protection, land-cover change
Sensory Mediation	Regulating	Human sensory (airborne, waste) and ecosystem sensory domains
Soil Quality Regulation	Regulating	Nitrogen management, phosphorus surplus, pesticide risk, crop yield gap
Soil Retention	Regulating	Forest loss and integrity, tree cover change, land-cover change
Solid Waste Remediation	Regulating	Waste generated, controlled and recycled
Water Flow Regulation	Regulating	Forest loss, groundwater decline and variability, seasonal supply variability, dam storage
Water Purification	Regulating	Wastewater generated, collected, treated and reused
Biological Control	Regulating	Pesticide risk, Red List Index, forest integrity, land-cover change, biome protection

Vulnerability

Vulnerability measures how disruption of an ecosystem service translates into business impact for a given sector and country, on a 0–1 scale. A vulnerability of 0.3 means that even under maximum hazard, at most 30% of output per unit of activity in that geosector is exposed to disruption of that service. Following Ranger et al. and the ECB, it decomposes into dependency, substitutability and resilience, anchored to the Output Volatility Bound:

$$\text{Vulnerability} = \text{Dependency} \times (1 - \text{Substitutability}) \times \text{Resilience Modifier} \times \text{Output Volatility Bound}$$

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Vulnerability

The four terms combine multiplicatively, so a zero in any one of them — a sector with no dependency on a service, for instance — zeroes vulnerability entirely, whatever the other factors.

Dependency is sourced from ENCORE (UNEP-WCMC, June 2024), which rates how far each sector relies on each service, on six levels from None and Very Low to Very High. ENCORE publishes against ISIC Rev. 4, and the ratings are crosswalked to NACE Rev. 2.1. Because the ratings are qualitative, converting them to numbers is an interpretive choice. Two mappings are supported — an exponential mapping that concentrates differentiation where consequences are most severe, and a linear mapping that keeps lower ratings materially weighted and is closer to the calibration in the Ranger papers — and each run names its mapping explicitly.

Substitutability — whether the service can be replaced by technology, alternative inputs or trade — enters as a reduction factor. In this version it is set to zero for all 25 ENCORE services: a deliberately conservative assumption that retains the full dependency signal. Some services have partial substitutes, such as irrigation for natural water supply, so actual vulnerability may be lower than modelled for them.

Resilience is the readiness component of the ND-GAIN Country Index (2023), covering economic, governance and social readiness. It enters as a partial reduction, so that higher readiness lowers vulnerability but never removes it. Geographies without a direct score are gap-filled with the mean of their World Bank income group, and flagged as such.

Output Volatility Bound

Dependency, substitutability and resilience say how sensitive a sector is on a 0–1 scale; the **Output Volatility Bound** says how large a severe but plausible disruption can be. It is the most of a geosector's output that a severe shock is taken to impair, set from a high percentile of historical downside output variability — the production-ceiling calibration of Ranger et al. (NGFS 2023; ECB 2025; GFI 2024).

- **Direct operations** use firm-level revenue variability by sector group and region: national aggregates are smoothed by diversification within a sector, and understate the downside an individual company faces.

- **Upstream supply chains** use the global sector-aggregate values of Ranger et al. (2023), computed from World Bank national value-added over 1992–2022, because diversification across suppliers makes aggregate variability the better bound.

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Output Volatility Bound

The direct bound is read from the downside tail of observed year-on-year revenue declines in long-run firm-level data. It is estimated for peer groups defined by sector group and region, falling back to the sector-group value where a peer group has too few observations.

The **severity percentile** sets how far into the downside tail the bound is read. The 99th percentile — roughly a one-in-a-hundred down year for the peer group — is the high-severity default behind the production results and keeps the calibration aligned with Ranger et al. The 95th percentile, roughly one in twenty, is supported as a sensitivity alternative. Within any single run every bound uses the same percentile, so severities stay consistent across cells and both channels.

Exposure

Hazard and vulnerability describe how severe the risk would be for a location and sector; exposure answers how much of the company's productive activity is actually there. Geosector exposure combines two dimensions of company data as a cross product, giving weights that sum to one:

- **Sector shares**: the fraction of revenue in each sector, at NACE Rev. 2.1 Level 4 — 651 sector codes across the economy — from segment revenue disclosures and business activity descriptions, disaggregated with structural priors where a company reports more broadly.

- **Country shares:** the fraction of operations in each country, derived from operational signals such as energy use, emissions and headcount rather than from where revenue is recognised.

Country shares follow where production happens, not where revenue is recognised: a manufacturer producing in Vietnam and selling in the United States is exposed to Vietnamese ecosystem services. Regional disclosures are disaggregated to countries, and the allocation source behind every company-country exposure is published with the outputs.

The two dimensions are combined as a cross product. Implausible sector-country combinations are removed and their share reallocated within the company's valid operations, and where more granular sector-geography data is available, it supersedes the approximation.

Because the NVaR coefficient varies sharply across geosectors, the quality of this apportioning is a primary determinant of output quality. Two companies with the same revenue and sector mix can have very different NVaR profiles if their operations sit in different places; the outputs reflect where and in what a company operates, not its absolute size.

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Upstream Supply Chain

A company with low-hazard operations can still carry material exposure through its suppliers. Upstream exposure is traced with multi-regional input-output (MRIO) analysis on EXIOBASE v3 (Stadler et al., 2018): 49 regions × 163 sectors, or 7,987 geosectors. The **Leontief inverse** captures the complete supply chain across every tier, not just direct suppliers; it is normalised into fractional shares of each consuming geosector's upstream requirements, with self-supply removed so the direct and upstream channels do not overlap.

1

Map to MRIO Space

NACE Level 4 sectors and ISO3 countries are mapped to EXIOBASE sectors and regions.

2

Compute Upstream Coefficients

Supplier coefficients are weighted by their share of each consuming geosector's supply chain.

3

Apply Exposure Weights

The company's geosector weights give upstream Output at Risk.

Upstream results can be attributed to individual supplier countries and sectors for hotspot analysis. EXIOBASE's Rest-of-World regions are disaggregated to named countries, immaterial supplier contributions are consolidated, and implausible geosectors are filtered out.

Mapping 651 NACE sectors onto 163 EXIOBASE sectors pools sub-sectors with different dependency profiles. The production default applies a conservative concordance, and a **Concordance Quality Metrics** table publishes, for every entity and service, the range of upstream Output at Risk the mapping could imply and a 0–1 concordance confidence score.

Dimension	Direct	Upstream
Risk locus	Company's own operations	Company's supply chain
Exposure source	Company sector and country data	MRIO-derived supply chain structure
Sector resolution	NACE Level 4 (651 sectors)	MRIO (163 sectors)
Geographic resolution	ISO3 country	ISO3 country via disaggregation (200+ countries)
Output Volatility Bound	Firm-revenue variability	Global sector-aggregate variability

Each channel takes its own Output Volatility Bound. The two channels are reported separately because they imply different risk responses and different degrees of company control. Combined views are derived by summing like-for-like direct and upstream rows.



Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Scoring and Aggregation

Applying a company's exposure weight to the NVaR coefficient gives Output at Risk at the most granular level: one value per company × geosector × ecosystem service × channel. Company totals are the sum across geosectors, which is valid because geosector weights do not overlap.

Ecosystem services are different. Water supply disruption, pollination decline and soil degradation can all affect the same unit of production, so summing them would overstate exposure. NVaR therefore reports two complementary statistics across the services relevant to each geosector:

- **Mean-service exposure (ess_mean)**: the average Output at Risk across the services with material exposure in the geosector — the headline metric, as used on the NVaR Data Portal.
- **Dominant-service exposure (ess_max)**: the largest single-service Output at Risk, identifying the dominant disruption pathway. A wide gap to ess_mean points to one dominant pathway; close values point to exposure spread across services.

Both are reported separately for the direct and upstream channels, and both are subject to the Output Volatility Bound, which also acts as a row-level consistency bound so that no summary implies disruption beyond the selected severity. Service × geosector combinations contributing negligibly to entity-wide Output at Risk are consolidated into a single non-material row.

Exposure Metrics

The core output, **Output at Risk**, is a dimensionless fraction: the share of a company's output exposed under severe ecosystem-service disruption. For sectors with a clean physical output — manufacturing, agriculture, extractives — it reads as a share of physical output; for services, finance or real estate, as a share of operational capacity. It is translated into currency on two bases:

- **Revenue at Risk**: Output at Risk × entity revenue, allocated to geosectors with the same exposure weights — the annual revenue exposed under severe disruption, for top-line concentration analysis, peer comparison and portfolio aggregation.
- **EBITDA at Risk:** a sector-calibrated translation to operating earnings. A sector-specific transmission coefficient captures the response of earnings to lost output, so EBITDA at Risk can exceed Revenue at Risk. Where reported EBITDA is negative or unrepresentatively low, the base is imputed from the sector-median margin.

These are **NVaR Exposure Metrics**, calibrated to severe conditions. They are not realised losses, expected losses, provisions or forecasts, nor a portfolio-return VaR.

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Worked Example — AgroCo

AgroCo is a hypothetical global agribusiness with $50 billion in annual revenue. Its direct operations span two sectors — non-perennial crop agriculture and vegetable oils processing — in two countries. The example follows two ecosystem services, water purification and pollination, through each step.

	Exposure Weight		
Sector	USA	India	Total
Crop agriculture	40%	25%	65%
Oils processing	20%	15%	35%
Total	60%	40%	100%

Hazard and vulnerability. India faces higher hazard than the USA for both services, reflecting greater pressures and more degraded ecosystems, and hazard differs slightly by sector within each country because cropland and industrial land have different condition profiles. For water purification both sectors have Very High dependency, so vulnerability varies with country resilience — India's lower readiness leaves more of its vulnerability in place — and with each sector group's Output Volatility Bound.

	Water Purification				
Geosector	Hazard	Vulnerability	NVaR Coefficient	Exposure	Output at Risk
USA × crop agriculture	Moderate	Moderate	Lower	0.40	10.7%
India × crop agriculture	High	High	Higher	0.25	13.0%
USA × oils processing	Moderate	Moderate	Lower	0.20	5.9%
India × oils processing	High	High	Higher	0.15	7.2%
Company total					36.8%

India drives more risk per unit of activity — its NVaR coefficients are roughly twice those of the USA — but the USA's larger exposure share partly compensates: India contributes 20.2% to the company total and the USA 16.6%. Pollination tells a different story — crop agriculture has High dependency, but oils processing has none, so its direct exposure to pollination disruption is zero. Any pollination risk it carries arrives through agricultural suppliers, in the upstream channel.

Geosector	Water Purification	Pollination	ess_max	ess_mean
USA × crop agriculture	10.7%	6.0%	10.7%	8.3%
India × crop agriculture	13.0%	6.9%	13.0%	9.9%
USA × oils processing	5.9%	0.0%	5.9%	5.9%
India × oils processing	7.2%	0.0%	7.2%	7.2%
Company total	36.8%	12.9%	36.8%	31.3%

ess_mean averages only the services with non-zero exposure in each geosector: pollination counts for crop agriculture but not for oils processing, which has no pollination dependency, giving a company total of 31.3%. Water purification dominates in every geosector, so ess_max equals its total of 36.8%; the gap shows AgroCo's exposure is concentrated in one disruption pathway, so water purification dependency is the lever to address in engagement. Applied to revenue on the headline ess_mean basis, Revenue at Risk is 31.3% × $50 billion = **$15.7 billion** of annual revenue exposed under severe disruption ($18.4 billion on the ess_max basis) — with India contributing disproportionately to its share of the operational footprint.

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Data Sources

NVaR draws on several categories of input data. The architecture accommodates substitution of providers as better data becomes available without changing the core methodology. Indicators that would have been relevant but carry non-commercial licences — Bioclimatic Ecosystem Resilience, Protected Areas Representativeness and the Species Habitat Index — are excluded; a sensitivity analysis confirmed the remaining protection indicators give stable coverage.

Data Category	Role	Sources
Threat indicators	Pressures on each ecosystem service	WRI Aqueduct 4.0; Copernicus CAMS; Hansen et al. (2013) and Global Forest Watch; World Risk Report 2025; FAO FAOSTAT and AQUASTAT; GRACE/GRACE-FO; Jones et al. (2021); World Bank What a Waste; Copernicus C3S and ESA CCI
Protection and integrity	Adequacy of protection systems	IBAT (WDPA, Key Biodiversity Areas, IUCN Red List); Grantham et al. (2020)
Ecosystem condition	Functional capacity and trend	Biodiversity Intactness Index (PREDICTS, Natural History Museum); MODIS MCD12Q1 v061 land cover
Sector dependency	Reliance of each sector on each service	ENCORE (UNEP-WCMC, June 2024 update)
Resilience	Country readiness to absorb disruption	ND-GAIN Country Index (2023); World Bank income groups
Output Volatility Bound	Severity of plausible disruption	Firm-level revenue data, 1994–2024; Ranger et al. (2023) / World Bank WDI sector aggregates, 1992–2022
Exposure	Company activity by geosector	Company disclosures — segment revenue, assets, emissions, headcount; EXIOBASE v3.8 allowability constraints
Supply-chain linkages	Upstream transmission	EXIOBASE v3.8.2 (Stadler et al., 2018); FAO and World Bank weights for Rest-of-World disaggregation

The precalculated database is refreshed monthly. Hazard and vulnerability coefficients are refreshed as new environmental data becomes available — typically annually — and company exposure is updated in line with company disclosures, at least annually. Each run records its source vintages and run parameters, so any change between updates can be traced to refreshed coefficients, changed company exposure or a documented methodology change.



Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Applications

Corporate and business users can see which countries, sectors and suppliers concentrate their nature-related exposure, prioritise action on the dependency that dominates it — as water purification does for AgroCo — and trace where supply-chain risk originates by supplier country and sector.

Financial-services users can screen portfolios for exposure to ecosystem-service disruption, compare companies against sector and geographic peers, target engagement at the companies and services that drive a portfolio's exposure, and use EBITDA at Risk as an operating-earnings lens in credit and covenant analysis.

The outputs support TNFD-aligned analysis and disclosure on dependencies and physical risks under ESRS E4 Biodiversity and ecosystems, with water-related services also relevant to ESRS E3 Water and marine resources.

Considerations

Spatial granularity: many hazard indicators are country-level. Land-cover stratification differentiates within a country, but not to individual sites.

Cross-product exposure: geosector weights assume a company's sector mix and geography are independent, which can over- or under-state exposure for geographically specialised companies.

Conservative assumptions: substitutability is set to zero for every service, and the Output Volatility Bound is calibrated on revenue declines from any cause. Company-specific adaptation is not captured.

Coverage: where hazard data is missing — chiefly smaller jurisdictions and offshore territories — exposure is left unscored rather than imputed, understating the exposure base.

Stress, not loss: the outputs are exposure under severe conditions, not probability-weighted losses.

As such, GIST Impact publishes the provenance of every exposure allocation, upstream concordance bounds and sensitivity variants, so every output can be traced to the inputs and run parameters behind it.



Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist

Product / methodology name	Version	Date
Nature Value at Risk (NVaR)	Version 1.0	15 October 2026

This checklist sets out the disclosures required under Article 23 and Annex III, point 1, and Article 24 and Annex III, point 2, of Regulation (EU) 2024/3005, as specified by Delegated Regulation (EU) 2026/871. Sections A to D follow the order prescribed in the Annex to the Delegated Regulation; Section E follows the order of Annex III, point 2.

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
Section A – Disclosures on the rating product (Annex III, point 1)				
A.1	**Annex III 1(f) / Art. 3(1) Del. Reg.**	Objective of the rating; whether it assesses risks, impacts, double materiality or other dimensions; in case of double materiality, the proportion of risk and impact materiality. Del. Reg.: (a) description of risks covered; (b) description of impacts covered; (c) how materiality of risks and impacts is considered under double materiality, where applicable; (d) description of other materiality dimensions, if any.	Risk only (single, financial materiality). NVaR assesses nature-related physical risk: the share of a company's economic output, revenue and EBITDA exposed under severe-but-plausible disruption of 19 ecosystem services (e.g. water supply, pollination, flood control, soil quality), across direct operations and upstream supply chains. Impacts: Not assessed – NVaR does not measure a company's impacts on nature. Double materiality: NVaR covers the financial-materiality dimension of double materiality only: nature-related physical risk arising from company dependencies on ecosystem services. Impact materiality is not assessed, so no proportion between the two applies. NVaR outputs are inputs to a user's own double materiality assessment and do not replace it. Other dimensions: None. Transition risk (regulatory, policy and market shifts) is out of scope for the current version.	Methodology Document: p. 2 (Introduction); p. 3 (Methodology Foundations); p. 9 (Scoring and Aggregation – Exposure Metrics)
A.2	**Annex III 1(g) / Art. 3(2) Del. Reg.**	Scope: single E, S or G factor, aggregated rating, or specific aspects (e.g. transition risks). Del. Reg.: (a) what is covered within E, S and G and which factors are aggregated, if any; (b) specific aspects covered.	Single E factor only – nature-related physical risk arising from company dependencies on ecosystem services (outside-in). No S or G factors are covered and no factors are aggregated. Results are reported separately for direct operations and upstream supply chains, per ecosystem service.	Methodology Document: p. 3 (Methodology Foundations); p. 8 (Upstream Supply Chain)
A.3	**Annex III 1(h)**	For aggregated ESG ratings: weighting of the E, S and G categories and explanation of the weighting method. If not aggregated: negative statement.	Not applicable – NVaR is not an aggregated ESG rating. It covers the E factor only (nature-related physical risk), so no E, S and G weighting is applied.	Methodology Document: p. 13 (Appendix – ESMA Disclosure Checklist, A.2)
A.4	**Annex III 1(i)**	Topics covered within E, S and G and whether they correspond to the topics of the sustainability reporting standards under Article 29b of Directive 2013/34/EU (ESRS).	E only – 19 ecosystem services from the ENCORE framework (e.g. water supply, water flow regulation, pollination, flood control, soil quality, soil retention, biological control, climate regulation, air filtration). Partially corresponds to ESRS: aligns with ESRS E4 Biodiversity and ecosystems (dependencies on ecosystem services and related physical risks), with water-related services also relevant to ESRS E3 Water and marine resources. S and G topics are not covered.	Methodology Document: p. 2 (Key Features); p. 12 (Applications)
A.5	**Annex III 1(j)**	Whether the rating is expressed in absolute or relative terms.	Absolute – Output at Risk (fraction of output, 0–1); Revenue at Risk and EBITDA at Risk (currency); underlying Hazard and Vulnerability scores (0–1 scale). No relative rating is assigned; users can benchmark relative to NACE Level 4 sector, geography or portfolio peers using the published outputs.	Methodology Document: p. 9 (Scoring and Aggregation – Exposure Metrics); p. 10 (Worked Example – AgroCo)

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
A.6	Annex III 1(o) / Art. 3(3) Del. Reg.	If the E factor is covered: whether the rating considers the Paris Agreement or other relevant international agreements. Del. Reg.: (a) which agreements are considered, information to identify them, and why they are relevant; (b) whether alignment of commitments with these agreements is assessed.	No – NVaR is a physical nature-risk exposure metric and does not assess alignment of company commitments with the Paris Agreement or other international agreements. The methodology is grounded in the NGFS (2023), ECB (2025) and Green Finance Institute (2024) nature-risk frameworks and supports TNFD-aligned analysis.	Methodology Document: p. 2 (Introduction); p. 12 (Applications)
A.7	Annex III 1(p) / Art. 3(3) Del. Reg.	If the S and G factors are covered: whether the rating considers relevant international agreements. Same elements as A.6.	Not applicable – NVaR does not cover S or G factors.	Methodology Document: p. 13 (Appendix – ESMA Disclosure Checklist, A.2)
Section B – General disclosures on methodologies (Annex III, point 1)				
B.1	Annex III 1(a) / Art. 4(1) Del. Reg.	Overview of methodologies and changes, whether backward- or forward-looking, time horizon. Del. Reg.: (a) name of the methodology; (b) types of rated items; (c) validity period of the rating, where applicable; (d) list and overview of relevant models and key assumptions, where applicable; (e) measures and procedures to ensure data quality and reliability; (f) ranking system: meaning of each rating category for absolute and relative values, interpretation, and for relative values the reference (sector, geography, peer group, other); (g) date of the most recent update and description of changes compared with the previous version.	Name and version: Nature Value at Risk (NVaR), Version 1.0. Rated items: Public listed companies (precalculated database, ~19,000 companies); private companies and custom portfolios via on-demand analysis using the same methodology. Portfolio results are bottom-up aggregations of company-level results. Rating is backward-looking / current-state – Hazard reflects current baseline environmental conditions from historical and current datasets, and the Output Volatility Bound is calibrated from historical firm-level revenue declines (1994–2024). Time Horizon: Single-period (annual) stress view under baseline conditions; no forward emission or nature pathways are modelled. Validity period: values remain valid until the next production run (database refreshed monthly). Models and key assumptions: Output at Risk = Hazard (service-specific threats amplified by ecosystem condition) × Vulnerability (ENCORE dependency, substitutability set to zero, ND-GAIN resilience, Output Volatility Bound at the 99th/95th percentile) × Exposure (NACE L4 sector shares × operational country shares; upstream via EXIOBASE v3 MRIO), per geosector and ecosystem service. Components combine multiplicatively, first-order only, with no feedback or cascading effects. Data quality: QA on every production run – coverage reporting, geosector plausibility checks, provenance fields and upstream concordance-confidence metrics (see E.12). Ranking system: No rating categories – outputs are continuous values. Output at Risk of 0.03 means up to 3% of company output is exposed under severe conditions. Not relative to a reference group. Last update and changes: Not applicable – Version 1.0 is the first release of the methodology, so there is no previous version against which changes are described. Latest production run: 13 October 2026 (reporting year 2024). Supporting Policy Document: (i) ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure; (ii) AI Usage Policy for ESG Rating Activities	Methodology Document: pp. 3-9 (Methodology Foundations to Scoring and Aggregation); p. 11 (Data Sources); Separate Policy Documents

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
B.2	Annex III 1(b) / Art. 4(2) Del. Reg.	Industry classification used. Del. Reg.: (a) name of the issuing body; (b) name and version of the classification; (c) publicly accessible link to official documentation, where available.	GIST Impact uses a selection of industry classification systems depending on the dataset and use case; in every instance, the classification is clearly specified. These classification systems include the NACE Rev 2.1 activity-level classification (651 Level 4 activities rolling up to 22 Level 1 high-level sections), as well as a proprietary classification system comprising 57 sectors. GIST Impact provides crosswalks to other recognised classification systems such as ISIC or NAICS where required. Further information on NACE Rev 2.1 can be found here. Further information on the GIST Impact classification system can be found here.	Methodology Document and ESMA Disclosure Checklist
B.3	Annex III 1(c) / Art. 4(3) Del. Reg.	Overview of data sources, including whether data derive from sustainability statements under Directive 2013/34/EU or disclosures under Regulation (EU) 2019/2088, and whether sources are public or non-public; overview of data processes, estimation of missing input data and frequency of data updates. Del. Reg.: description of engagement with rated items or issuers and how input from that engagement is taken into account.	Directive 2013/34/EU: Yes, GIST Impact uses information disclosed under Directive 2013/34/EU of the European Parliament as amended by Directive 2022/2464 ("CSRD") as a data source for its ESG ratings. This includes a diverse range of publicly disclosed data sources including non-financial and sustainability reporting aligned with Directive 2013/34/EU, together with complementary voluntary frameworks. CSRD disclosures provide meaningful insight into entity-level sustainability governance, strategy, policies, targets and performance, as well as each entity's own assessment of its material impacts, risks and opportunities. GIST Impact integrates these inputs with other publicly available data sources to build a comprehensive view of corporate sustainability across environmental, social and governance dimensions. GIST Impact's methodology leverages non-financial reporting across all sectors aligned to Directive 2013/34/EU, enabling consistent assessment across investee and corporate portfolios regardless of financial services status. This approach ensures broad applicability and robustness across our ESG ratings products. Regulation (EU) 2019/2088: No. GIST Impact does not source information from SFDR reports under Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 (SFDR). SFDR disclosures operate at the fund level, which assess entities rather than funds. Our primary data sources are entity-level disclosures published directly by companies — including annual reports, sustainability reports (including those prepared under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), Directive (EU) 2022/2464, and its underlying European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS), where applicable), and financial reports. Where a portfolio or fund management company itself forms part of GIST Impact's rated universe, GIST Impact continues to rely on that entity's own sustainability or annual report rather than any SFDR disclosure it may separately produce or be subject to as a financial market participant.	Methodology document and ESMA Disclosure Checklist

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
B.4	Annex III 1(e) / Art. 4(4) Del. Reg.	Whether and to what extent the methodologies are based on scientific evidence. Del. Reg.: process for identifying relevant scientific evidence, where applicable.	Yes – NVaR is built on the Hazard × Vulnerability × Exposure framework established by Ranger et al. (NGFS, 2023), ECB Occasional Paper No. 380 (2025) and the Green Finance Institute (2024). Inputs are drawn from peer-reviewed and institutional sources, including ENCORE (UNEP-WCMC), ND-GAIN, the Biodiversity Intactness Index (Natural History Museum), WRI Aqueduct 4.0, GRACE satellite data, Global Forest Watch (Hansen et al., 2013) and EXIOBASE v3 (Stadler et al., 2018). Process: indicators are selected per ecosystem service for their relevance to that service's supply dynamics, documented against the reference frameworks, and tested for sensitivity where substitutions are needed (e.g. when non-commercially licensed indicators were excluded). Evidence is reviewed under the ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure.	Methodology Document: p. 3 (Methodology Foundations); pp. 4-6 (Hazard; Vulnerability); p. 11 (Data Sources)
B.5	Annex III 1(k)	Use of artificial intelligence in data collection or rating, including current limitations and risks, where applicable. If no AI is used: negative statement.	Refer GIST Impact AI Usage Policy for ESG Rating Activities	Separate Policy Document
Section C – Limitations of data sources, methodologies and information (Annex III, point 1)				
C.1	Annex III 1(m) / Art. 5 Del. Reg.	Limitations of data sources and methodologies. Del. Reg.: limitations regarding (a) availability or coherence of data; (b) completeness, timeliness and accuracy of information; (c) inclusion of assumptions, proxies and data estimates.	(a) Availability/coherence: Many hazard metrics are available only at country level (land-cover stratification provides some sub-country differentiation). Hazard data is missing for some smaller jurisdictions and offshore territories (e.g. Bermuda, Cayman Islands, BVI); such exposure is left unscored rather than imputed (direct scoring covers 99.73% of revenue exposure). ENCORE dependency ratings are not geographically specific. (b) Completeness, timeliness and accuracy: Source vintages differ (e.g. ND-GAIN 2023, ENCORE June 2024, environmental data accessed February 2026) and coefficients are refreshed typically annually, so they may lag current conditions. Upstream exposure is an MRIO-based approximation of supplier geography and sector. (c) Assumptions, proxies and estimates: Geosector exposure assumes sector mix and geography are independent; substitutability is conservatively set to zero; revenue volatility from any cause proxies ecosystem-service-driven output volatility; Revenue at Risk assumes proportionality; resilience gaps are filled with income-group means.	Methodology Document: p. 12 (Considerations); p. 4 (Hazard); p. 6 (Vulnerability); p. 11 (Data Sources)

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
C.2	**Annex III 1(q) / Art. 5 Del. Reg.**	Limitations of the information available to the ESG rating provider. Same elements (a) to (c) as C.1.	(a) Availability/coherence: GIST Impact relies on publicly disclosed company information; companies often report geography as regional aggregates or by revenue rather than operational footprint, and multi-tier supply chains are not disclosed, so upstream exposure is modelled. (b) Completeness, timeliness and accuracy: Company-specific adaptation, resilience investments and risk-management practices are not consistently disclosed and are therefore not reflected; asset-level location data is not available at scale. Exposure data is updated in line with company disclosures (at least annually). (c) Assumptions, proxies and estimates: Time-series data specific to ecosystem-service disruptions is lacking, so calibration uses all-cause revenue volatility. Some relevant indicators (e.g. BER, PAR, SHI) are excluded because of non-commercial licensing restrictions; a sensitivity analysis confirmed that the remaining protection indicators give stable coverage.	Methodology Document: p. 7 (Exposure); p. 8 (Upstream Supply Chain); p. 11 (Data Sources); p. 12 (Considerations)
Section D – Disclosures on the organisation of the ESG rating provider (Annex III, point 1)				
D.1	**Annex III 1(d) / Art. 6(1) Del. Reg.**	Ownership structure of the applicant. Del. Reg.: chart of ownership links with all parent undertakings and subsidiaries, showing, where applicable, whether any of them carries out activities under Article 16(1) or provides other services under Article 16(6) of Regulation (EU) 2024/3005.	GIST Impact Netherlands B.V. will submit a detailed organisational ownership structure chart to ESMA. The chart will also be made available (upon request) via the GIST Impact website.	Separately provided to ESMA

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
D.2	**Annex III 1(l) / Art. 6(2) Del. Reg.**	General information on fee criteria and business/payment model. Del. Reg.: (a) how fee criteria ensure fair, reasonable, transparent and non-discriminatory fees (Article 27); (b) subscription, issuer-pays, combined or other model; (c) description of the business model and share of total annual turnover from each model; (d) where applicable, how fees for non-ESG-rating services affect ESG rating fees, with a description of those services.	Fees for ESG rating services are determined based on transparent criteria, including data scope, coverage, and service level, and are entirely independent of rating outcomes. All ESG rating products are offered exclusively either on (i) a User-paid subscription basis or (ii) an Issuer-paid model. Clients — such as investors, asset managers, or corporates — engage GIST Impact through subscription or contractual arrangements under which no fee is linked to, or contingent upon, the outcome or content of any ESG rating; GIST Impact has also established a dedicated Pricing Policy (publicly available on the GIST Impact website). ESG Ratings and data products are determined solely through the consistent application of defined methodologies, and are never affected by existing or potential business relationships with rated entities, including where GIST Impact also delivers direct data and analytics services to corporates and investors: where such clients also sit within their rated universe, this engagement is operationally and methodologically independent, and does not influence, inform, or modify our rules-based scoring for any product (under the Issuer-paid model). GIST Impact does not enter into contingent fee arrangements tied to ESG rating outcomes, and its compensation structures are fully independent of the assigned ratings. All fees charged to clients are fair, transparent, and non-discriminatory.	Separate Policy document

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
D.3	**Annex III 1(n) / Art. 6(3) Del. Reg.**	Main risks of conflicts of interest and mitigating measures. Del. Reg.: areas of activities, services or organisational structures posing the greatest risk of conflicts of interest.	GIST Impact has adopted a Group-level Conflict of Interest Policy for ESG Rating Activities (the "COI Policy") that establishes the governance framework, principles, and procedures for the identification, prevention, management, and mitigation of conflicts of interest arising in connection with ESG Rating activities conducted by GIST Impact Netherlands B.V. The COI Policy is adopted at Group level and applies to GIST Advisory Switzerland S.A., including its UK branch, and its subsidiaries, including GIST Impact Netherlands B.V. and GIST Advisory Private Limited (collectively, "GIST Impact"), to the extent that any such entity, function, or individual supports, participates in, or may otherwise influence ESG Rating activities conducted by GIST Impact Netherlands B.V. GIST Impact has established internal policies and procedures to ensure our independence and mitigate potential conflicts of interest that may arise from our ownership structure or group-level interests, as well as from any parties or rated entities that may influence our rating activities. We ensure the independence of our rating activities, including from political and economic constraints. GIST Impact's ESG Rating activities operate according to a rules-based methodology grounded in data and science. GIST Impact operates two business models, namely (i) a User-paid model and (ii) an Issuer-paid model. Under the User-paid model, which generates the majority of its revenue, ESG ratings and analytics built from publicly available sources are delivered on a subscription basis. Under the Issuer-paid model, GIST Impact charges rated entities fees for ESG analytics built from publicly available sources; where applicable, these are supplemented by limited data provided by that entity, solely to support the entity's own independent assessment of risks and opportunities within its operations. These analytics are data products only. In the course of Issuer-paid engagements, GIST Impact does not advise any entity on how to improve the ESG rating issued to it under the User-paid model, or on its public disclosures with a view to improving that ESG rating. Issuer-paid activities are kept separate from User-paid ESG rating activities, and information generated through Issuer-paid engagements is not used as an input to, and does not inform, the datasets, methodologies, or ratings provided under the User-paid model. Where clients of GIST Impact's data or analytics services also sit within its rated universe, such engagement is operationally and methodologically independent and does not influence ESG Ratings. Across both models, GIST Impact does not enter into contingent fee arrangements tied to rating outcomes, its compensation structures are independent of the ratings assigned, and all fees are fair, transparent, and non-discriminatory.	Separate Policy document

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
			…The COI Policy is designed to ensure that ESG Rating activities are conducted in accordance with the general principles set out in Article 15 of Regulation (EU) 2024/3005, including the principles of independence, integrity, transparency, and impartiality in the provision of ESG Ratings. The Policy forms part of the broader governance framework applicable to GIST Impact Netherlands B.V. and is intended to safeguard the independence, objectivity, integrity, and impartiality of its ESG Rating activities and to ensure that potential and actual conflicts of interest are appropriately identified, assessed, managed, and mitigated. The Conflict-of-Interest Policy for ESG Rating Activities is publicly available on the GIST Impact website.	
Section E – Disclosures to users, rated items and issuers (Annex III, point 2; Article 24)				
E.1	**Annex III 2(a)(i)**	Scientific evidence and assumptions on which the ratings are based, where applicable.	See B.4 and B.1. Key assumptions: severe-but-plausible stress calibrated at the 99th percentile of historical downside output variability (95th supported as well); degraded ecosystem condition amplifies, but never cancels, the base threat; country resilience partially reduces vulnerability but never removes it; ENCORE ratings converted using an exponential or linear mapping (recorded per run); substitutability set to zero; components combine multiplicatively, first-order only, with no feedback or cascading effects, in a single-period view.	Methodology Document: p. 4 (Hazard); pp. 5-7 (Vulnerability; Output Volatility Bound); p. 12 (Considerations)
E.2	**Annex III 2(a)(ii)**	Key performance indicators per E, S and G factor and weighting method.	E only. KPIs: Output at Risk (0–1), Revenue at Risk and EBITDA at Risk, reported per ecosystem service and for direct and upstream channels, with ess_mean (headline, mean across services with material exposure) and ess_max (dominant ecosystem service) summaries. Supporting indicators: Hazard score, Vulnerability score, NVaR coefficient (K) and geosector exposure weights. Weighting: No E/S/G weighting. Hazard threat indicators are combined within each service, equally weighted by default with service-specific exceptions; geosectors are weighted by exposure share; ecosystem services are combined using the mean and maximum approaches, not a weighted sum, to avoid double-counting.	Methodology Document: p. 9 (Scoring and Aggregation); p. 10 (Worked Example — AgroCo); p. 5 (Hazard – Ecosystem Service Modules)
E.3	**Annex III 2(a)(iii)**	For aggregated ratings: result for each E, S and G category in a form ensuring comparability. If not aggregated: negative statement.	Not applicable – NVaR is not an aggregated ESG rating; it covers the E factor only.	Methodology Document: p. 13 (Appendix – ESMA Disclosure Checklist, A.2)

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
E.4	**Annex III 2(a)(iv) / Art. 7(2) Del. Reg.**	Deficiencies in the methodologies and remedial measures. Del. Reg.: deficiencies related to the use of pre-determined statistical or algorithmic systems.	Deficiencies: (i) country × sector cross-product may over- or under-state exposure for geographically specialized companies; (ii) many hazard metrics are country-level; (iii) substitutability is not differentiated; (iv) company-specific adaptation is not captured; (v) outputs are stress-conditional exposure, not probability-weighted loss. Algorithmic/statistical: NVaR is a deterministic, rules-based pipeline. Output Volatility Bounds are statistically estimated per sector group × region, subject to minimum-observation thresholds with fallback to the pooled sector group; some indicators use percentile scaling relative to the global dataset, so scores can shift as the dataset updates; the NACE → EXIOBASE concordance introduces upstream uncertainty. Remedial measures: min/mean/max upstream bounds and concordance confidence are published; sensitivity variants (95th vs 99th percentile; linear vs exponential mapping) are supported.	Methodology Document: p. 12 (Considerations); p. 7 (Output Volatility Bound); p. 8 (Upstream Supply Chain)
E.5	**Annex III 2(a)(v) / Art. 8(1) Del. Reg.**	Methodology review policies. Del. Reg.: (a) review process and frequency; (b) conditions triggering a review; (c) stakeholder consultation during reviews, where applicable; (d) process for assessing the impact of revisions on ratings; (e) criteria for a material change.	GIST Impact reviews its ESG Rating methodologies on an ongoing basis, and at least annually, to ensure that they remain accurate, relevant, robust, and aligned with applicable regulatory requirements and evolving market standards. GIST Impact has established a dedicated Board-approved ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure, which sets out the governance framework and processes for the review, assessment, and, where appropriate, revision of its ESG Rating methodologies. The ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure is publicly available on the GIST Impact website.	Separate Policy Document
E.6	**Annex III 2(a)(vi)**	Where a rating is up- or downgraded due to material changes in methodology, models, key assumptions or data sources (including estimates): reasons and impact. Rating-specific.	Not applicable for this release – Version 1.0 is the first release of the methodology, so no outputs have been revised due to material methodology changes. NVaR does not assign rating categories; where future material changes in methodology, models, key assumptions or data sources materially change results, GIST Impact will disclose the reasons and impact under the ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure, distinguishing coefficient updates from changes in company exposure.	Separate Policy Document
E.7	**Annex III 2(a)(vii) / Art. 8(2) Del. Reg.**	Date of last revision of the methodology. Del. Reg.: version number of the methodology. (Cross-reference: B.1(g))	Methodology version: Version 1.0 (first release). Date of last revision: Not applicable – Version 1.0 is the first release; latest production run 13 October 2026. See B.1(g).	Methodology Document: p. 14 (Appendix – ESMA Disclosure Checklist, B.1)
E.8	**Annex III 2(a)(viii)**	If the E factor is covered: whether and to what extent the rating correlates with the percentage of taxonomy alignment under Regulation (EU) 2020/852 or is aligned with other international agreements, and explanation of material deviations. (Cross-reference: A.6)	No – NVaR does not measure, and has not been tested for correlation with, the percentage of EU Taxonomy alignment under Regulation (EU) 2020/852. It measures physical nature-risk exposure rather than alignment of activities with Taxonomy criteria. See A.6 on international agreements.	Methodology Document: p. 14 (Appendix – ESMA Disclosure Checklist, A.6)

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
E.9	**Annex III 2(b)(i) / Art. 7(1) Del. Reg.**	A more detailed explanation of data sources used, including whether public or non-public, whether subject to assurance engagement, and whether derived from the sustainability reporting standards developed pursuant to Articles 19a and 29b of Directive 2013/34/EU concerning sustainable economic activities and disclosure of information pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2020/852 and Regulation (EU) 2019/2088, including whether and how information on companies' transition plans derived from such sustainability reporting standards is used. Del. Reg.: methods used to collect any non-public data.	See response to B3 above. To add, GIST Impact's ESG Ratings Products draw on publicly available data sources, including corporate disclosures (annual reports, sustainability/ESRS reports, regulatory filings), government and multilateral databases, other public datasets, and third-party specialised data vendors via contractual arrangements. The specific data sources relied upon for a given ESG Rating Product are identified in the applicable Methodology documents. Where actual, reported, or verified data is unavailable or incomplete, GIST Impact applies documented estimation techniques to fill data gaps. Any such estimation is clearly flagged as such within the underlying dataset and Methodology documentation, distinguishing estimated values from disclosed or verified figures. Data quality is governed through a combination of automated and manual controls, including source validation, completeness checks, outlier detection, and periodic review of data providers and input taxonomies, as set out in GIST Impact's internal data quality assurance procedures. Access to underlying data is restricted on a role-based basis and subject to audit trails. Update frequency is governed by GIST Impact's ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure (publicly available on the GIST Impact website), under which data and methodologies are reviewed on both annual and/or periodic event-driven basis (as required) — including in response to new or revised regulatory standards, material developments in data sources or analytical techniques, material feedback from rated entities, clients, or regulators, changes to data providers or input taxonomies, identified errors, or changes to product scope — with methodology reviews conducted at least annually in line with Regulation (EU) 2024/3005.	Methodology Document and ESMA Disclosure Checklist
E.10	**Annex III 2(b)(ii)**	Use of estimates and sector averages, where applicable, and explanation of the underlying methodology.	Yes. Estimates are used where disclosure is incomplete: sector revenue is disaggregated to NACE L4 using business-activity information and industry priors; country shares use structural priors and peer-group composition, and regional aggregates are disaggregated to countries; upstream exposure is modelled via EXIOBASE MRIO. Sector averages: EBITDA at Risk applies a sector-median margin where company EBITDA is negative or unrepresentatively low; Output Volatility Bounds fall back to the sector-group value where peer cells lack sufficient observations; ND-GAIN gaps use World Bank income-group means. Estimated values are flagged through provenance fields; missing hazard data is left unscored rather than imputed.	Methodology Document: p. 7 (Exposure); p. 6 (Vulnerability – Resilience); p. 9 (Scoring and Aggregation – EBITDA at Risk)

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
E.11	Annex III 2(b)(iii) / Art. 8(3) Del. Reg.	Principles for data updates and revision of historical data; date of last data update (rating-specific). Del. Reg.: measures ensuring accuracy and consistency of the data revision process.	Principles: Precalculated database refreshed monthly; Hazard and Vulnerability coefficients refreshed as new environmental data becomes available (typically annually); company exposure updated in line with disclosures (at least annually). Changes between updates are attributable to either refreshed coefficients or changed company exposure. Date of last data update: 13 October 2026 (reporting year 2024). Accuracy and consistency: Each run records source vintages and run parameters (tail percentile, dependency mapping, concordance variant) in fixture manifests; a single percentile is applied across all cells and channels within a run; every output can be traced to its source vintages and run parameters. Revision of historical data follows the ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure.	Methodology Document: p. 11 (Data Sources); Separate Policy Document
E.12	Annex III 2(b)(iv)	Data quality controls, their frequency and the remediation process in case of issues.	Controls: Automated QA on every production run (monthly) – company-level coverage reporting (scored vs unscored exposure), flagging of material coverage gaps, geosector plausibility constraints, dependency-matrix validation, data-cleaning rules and minimum-observation thresholds for calibration data, and upstream concordance-confidence metrics. Remediation: Coverage gaps are left unscored rather than imputed and monitored by Production QA, which adds hazard sources or documented proxy mappings as they become available; identified errors trigger review under the ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure.	Methodology Document: p. 11 (Data Sources); p. 8 (Upstream Supply Chain – Concordance Quality Metrics); Separate Policy Document
E.13	Annex III 2(b)(v)	Steps taken to address limitations of data sources, where applicable. (Cross-reference: C.1, C.2)	See C.1 and C.2. Steps include: NACE Level 4 sector granularity; multi-source operational apportioning (energy, emissions, water, headcount, assets, revenue); land-cover stratification for sub-country hazard differentiation; re-normalising over available indicators rather than imputing; transparent coverage and provenance reporting; published upstream concordance bounds; and sensitivity variants.	Methodology Document: p. 12 (Considerations); p. 4 (Hazard – Land-Cover Stratification); p. 7 (Exposure)
E.14	Annex III 2(c)	Engagement with rated items or issuers, including whether on-site inspections or visits were carried out and their frequency, where applicable.	In accordance with Article 15(12) of Regulation (EU) 2024/3005, GIST Impact operates a pre-issuance notification process, providing the rated entity access to the dataset underlying their ESG rating at least two full working days prior to publication, for the limited purpose of identifying factual errors. Upon request and free of charge, GIST Impact will provide, along with the underlying dataset, the industry classification applied, data sources used, data processing methodology (including any estimation techniques), and update frequency — solely to allow correction of factual errors. Feedback is reviewed and any resulting actions documented by the Oversight Function; such engagement is strictly limited to factual accuracy and does not permit rated entities to influence GIST Impact's methodologies, assumptions, weighting, or rating outcomes, consistent with GIST Impact's Conflict of Interest Policy for ESG Rating Activities (publicly available on the GIST Impact website). GIST Impact does not provide rated entities access to the ESG rating it plans on distributing.	Separate Policy Document

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Appendix — ESMA Disclosure Checklist (continued)

Ref.	Criterion (Annex III / Del. Reg. reference)	Required content	GIST Impact response	Reference (Methodology Document Section or Page Number)
E.15	Annex III 2(d)	For unsolicited ratings: clearly visible notice in the rating, including whether the rated item or a related third party was informed in advance, whether it participated in the rating process, and whether the provider had access to management and relevant internal documents. Rating-specific.	See above response. To add, For unsolicited assessments, GIST Impact's ESG assessments are based on rule-based methodologies that primarily use publicly available company data, estimation models, and scientifically supported models. GIST Impact does not have Rating Analysts engaging directly with rated entities for the purpose of influencing or determining individual ESG assessments. Accordingly, the methodologies do not rely on data obtained through direct engagement with rated entities, nor are the rules-based methodologies adapted or modified to change the assessment of an individual company. GIST Impact may also be directly engaged by corporates and investors to undertake bespoke analysis or data provision services for their own specific purposes. Such direct engagement work is operationally and methodologically independent from GIST Impact's rules-based ESG assessments. Analysis, data, or intelligence generated through direct engagement with a corporate or investor client is not integrated into GIST Impact's underlying databases, nor does it inform, modify, or influence the rules-based assessments applied to that entity or any other entity within GIST Impact's products. The separation of these engagement streams ensures that direct work with clients does not compromise the integrity or consistency of GIST Impact's rules-based methodology across its products.	Refer Conflict of Interest Policy for ESG Rating Activities
E.16	Annex III 2(e)	Explanation of the AI methodology used in data collection or the rating process, where applicable. (Cross-reference: B.5)	Refer GIST Impact AI Usage Policy for ESG Rating Activity	Separate Policy Document
E.17	Annex III 2(f)	Where important new information on a rated item may affect the rating: how it has been taken into account and whether the rating has been amended. Rating-specific.	Refer response to E5 and the ESG Ratings & Methodologies Review Procedure	Separate Policy Document

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.

Disclaimer

This Methodology Document is a public version prepared in accordance with the disclosure requirements set out under Regulation (EU) 2024/3005 of the European Parliament ("Regulation"). This Document is provided for informational purposes only. Certain proprietary parameters, data calibrations, and computational techniques have been withheld to protect trade secrets pursuant to Article 15(13) of the Regulation. All contents of this document are protected under intellectual property laws and may not be exploited, reproduced, distributed, modified, assigned, or transformed in any form without the explicit and express consent of GIST Impact.

This Document may be updated, revised or withdrawn from time to time to reflect changes in applicable law, regulatory guidance, market practice, scientific developments, data availability or methodological enhancements.

Copyright © 2026 GIST Impact. All rights reserved.