Q7: **What is your experience with the multiple capitals approach in integrated reports?**

We are preparing our first integrated report. We have used values based reporting (and thinking) in our company since its inception and have found the translation to capitals relatively easy. The relationship capital seems like a particularly large capital for our company and we generally consider it in two subsets - customers and others. We've struggled the most with the concept of manufactured capital and have translated this to mean capability for our organisation. We've no experience applying financial values to any of these capitals.

Q8: **What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve this aspect of implementation?**

At present, the capitals are open to a wide interpretation of what each means to each company. This may lead to inconsistency between companies which may or may not be a problem.
Q9: Q2(a) What is your experience with connectivity in integrated reports as an indication of integrated thinking and/or enabler of enhanced decisions?

I think that reporting on all the connectivity often results in the reports getting tied up in knots or indications are shown which are so high level as to be of little value.

Q10: Q2(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve this aspect of implementation?

more guidance should be given as to the degree of detail which is recommended. Is saying that one activity is connected to three capitals sufficient or should you describe exactly how? And if so, how do you do this in a concise manner?

PAGE 4: Key stakeholders’ legitimate needs and interests

Q11: Q3(a) What is your experience with the identification, in integrated reports, of key stakeholders’ legitimate needs and interests and how those needs and interests are considered and addressed?

I think each company has their own stakeholder engagement methodology and it can sometimes be hard to do this justice within the confines of a concise report.

Q12: Q3(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve this aspect of implementation?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 5: Materiality and value creation

Q13: Q4(a) What is your experience with the Framework’s definition of materiality, in particular: • Application of the value creation lens? • Use of different time periods to identify material matters?

We’ve tried to produce our first report with reference to these time frames - we’ve struggled with the short, medium and long terms definitions. We use the value creation lens and have taken this to mean more than just financial value.

Q14: Q4(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve this aspect of implementation?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 6: Conciseness

Q15: Q5(a) What is your experience with the conciseness of integrated reports?

Looking at a number of reports they don’t appear to be all that concise. Given all the requirements of the framework, conciseness is very difficult to achieve.

Q16: Q5(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve this aspect of implementation?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 7: Business model – outputs and outcomes
Q17: Q6(a) What is your experience with the reporting of business model information, particularly outputs and outcomes?

The description of the business model in the framework is very light and doesn't provide much guidance as to what is expected or would be of value. There have been a variety of interpretations by companies some of which provide comprehensive descriptions but are overwhelming and others which are so brief as to be almost meaningless.

Q18: Q6(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve this aspect of implementation?

More clarification on what should be, and should not be, included in the business model. Clarify if it contains, at its heart, a classic business model or it is in fact, a value creation model rather than a business model.

PAGE 8: Those charged with governance / Framework identification

Q19: Q7(a) What is your experience with whether reports: (i) identify the involvement of those charged with governance, and (ii) indicate that they are presented in accordance with the Framework? What are the implications of excluding such information?  
Respondent skipped this question

Q20: Q7(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve these aspects of implementation?  
Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 9: Other Guiding Principles

Q21: Q8(a) What is your experience with the application of these remaining three Guiding Principles in integrated reports?  
Respondent skipped this question

Q22: Q8(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve these aspects of implementation?  
Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 10: Other Content Elements

Q23: Q9(a) What is your experience with how these remaining Content Elements are reported in integrated reports?  
Respondent skipped this question

Q24: Q9(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve these aspects of implementation?  
Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 11: Other quality issues

Q25: Q10(a) Aside from any quality issues already raised in Q1-Q9, what is your experience with the quality of integrated reports?  
Respondent skipped this question
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q26: Q10(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve this aspect of implementation?</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27: Q11(a) What is your experience with enablers, incentives or barriers to Framework implementation not covered by other questions, including the extent to which they apply particularly to: • Specific jurisdictions? • Large or small organizations? • Private, public or non-profit sectors? • Different stages of Framework implementation?</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28: Q11(b) What, if anything, should be done and by whom to improve these aspects of implementation?</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>