



Snapshot ESG Corp

Advanced · ESG Compliance Report

FISCAL YEAR 2025 · REPORT ID snapshot

§ 1.1 COMPANY IDENTITY

Industry	Technology
Company size	Medium (50-250 employees)
Location	United States
Contact	esg@snapshot.example

§ 1.2 ESG SCORES · E/S/G COMPOSITE points of 100

	PILLAR	SCORE (0-100)	STATUS
E	Environmental	61.5	Good
S	Social	77.8	Good
G	Governance	100.0	Excellent

OVERALL · COMPOSITE **78.8** grade B+ (Good)

§ 1.3 INDUSTRY BENCHMARK Technology

Competitive position: **Average Performer**. This company sits at the 60th percentile of the Technology sector benchmark (industry average 77.3/100).

	PILLAR	YOUR SCORE	INDUSTRY AVG	DELTA
E	Environmental	61.5	72.5	-11.0
S	Social	77.8	78.3	-0.5
G	Governance	100.0	81.2	+18.8

§ 2.1 DISCLOSURE FRAMEWORKS COVERED

strong framework coverage

Coverage is mapped against 4 frameworks: **GRI, SASB, TCFD, UN SDGs**. Aggregate coverage across the mapped set is 87.5%, rated **Strong Framework Coverage**. Framework-by-framework detail follows below.

§ 2.2 FRAMEWORK-BY-FRAMEWORK COVERAGE

% mapped

	FRAMEWORK	COVERAGE	STATUS
01	GRI	100.0%	Fully covered
02	TCFD	75.0%	Partially covered
03	UN_SDGs	100.0%	Fully covered
04	SASB	75.0%	Partially covered

§ 2.3 GRI DISCLOSURE INDEX

metrics → standards

	STANDARD	DISCLOSURE	METRICS COVERED
01	GRI 302: Energy 2016	302-1: Energy consumption	Energy (MWh), Renewable %
02	GRI 303: Water 2018	303-5: Water consumption	Water usage (m ³)
03	GRI 305: Emissions 2016	305-1: Direct GHG emissions	Carbon (Scope 1 & 2)
04	GRI 306: Waste 2020	306-3, 306-4: Waste generated	Waste, Recycling rate
05	GRI 401: Employment 2016	401-1: New hires and turnover	Total employees, Turnover
06	GRI 404: Training 2016	404-1: Training per employee	Training hours / employee
07	GRI 405: Diversity 2016	405-1: Diversity indicators	Gender balance, Board diversity
08	GRI 102: General 2016	102-18: Governance structure	Board size, Independence %
09	GRI 205: Anti-corruption 2016	205-2: Anti-corruption training	Training programs
10	GRI 418: Privacy 2016	418-1: Privacy compliance	GDPR/CCPA status

§ 3 ADVANCED TCFD · CLIMATE DISCLOSURES

strategy + risk +
metrics

The sub-sections below fulfill TCFD's Strategy, Risk Management, and Metrics & Targets recommendations. Scenario analysis and a full Scope 1–3 inventory provide the baseline required for formal disclosure. Fields left blank in the customer submission render as em-dash; nothing is fabricated.

§ 3.1 CLIMATE RISK ASSESSMENT

physical +
transition

	RISK TYPE	ASSESSMENT	EXPOSURE
P.1	Physical · flood risk	Medium – exposure in two coastal offices	Low-Medium
P.2	Physical · extreme weather	High – wildfire season in West Coast HQ	Significant
T.1	Transition · carbon pricing	\$72,000/year	Material
T.2	Transition · regulatory costs	\$125,000/year	Material

§ 3.2 SCENARIO ANALYSIS · 2°C / 4°C

financial impact

	SCENARIO	REVENUE IMPACT	CAPITAL REQUIRED	ANNUAL COST
2C	2°C · Paris-aligned pathway	-2.4%	\$380,000	in CapEx
4C	4°C · high-warming pathway	-6.8%	–	\$95,000/yr

§ 3.3 COMPLETE GHG INVENTORY

tCO₂e per scope

	SCOPE	TCO ₂ E	% OF TOTAL
S1+2	Scope 1 & 2 · direct + purchased energy	1,850.5	38.5%
S3	Scope 3 · value chain	2,950.0	61.5%
TOTAL · GHG INVENTORY		4,800.5	100.0%

§ 3.4 TARGETS · NET-ZERO & INTERIM

reduction pathway

Net-zero target year	2045
2030 interim target	Reduce Scope 1+2 by 42% by 2030
Baseline year	2022
Required annual reduction	5.2% per year

Disclosure note. This Advanced Tier report includes TCFD-aligned disclosures across all four recommended pillars. For regulated filings, pair this assessment with third-party verification of the underlying data.

§ 4.1 KEY INSIGHTS

7 observations

-
- 01 Good renewable energy progress at 42.5%. Consider reaching 70%+ for industry leadership.
 - 02 Carbon intensity (0.44 tons CO₂/MWh) is moderate. Optimization opportunities exist.
 - 03 Pay equity is well-maintained within acceptable range.
 - 04 Strong board independence: 5 of 7 directors (71%) are independent.
 - 05 Excellent board diversity: 3 of 7 directors (43%) are women.
 - 06 Whistleblower protection demonstrates commitment to transparency.
 - 07 Data privacy compliance meets regulatory requirements.
-

§ 4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

1 actions

-
- 01 Reduce carbon intensity from 0.44 to <0.30 through energy efficiency and fuel switching.
Potential score gain: ~7 points.
-

§ 5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL METRICS · DETAIL

as reported

Carbon emissions	1,850.5 tCO _{2e}
Energy consumption	4,200.0 MWh
Renewable energy share	42.5%
Water usage	8,500.0 m ³
Waste generated	120.0 tons
Waste recycled	63.0%

§ 5.2 SOCIAL METRICS · DETAIL

workforce +
community

Total employees	180
Women representation	41.0%
Minority representation	28.0%
Pay equity ratio	0.97
Training hours / employee	22.0 hrs
Employee turnover	12.5%
Community investment	\$45,000

§ 5.3 GOVERNANCE METRICS · DETAIL

board + policy

Board size	7
Independent directors	5 of 7 (71.4%)
Women on board	3 of 7 (42.9%)
Ethics policy	Yes
Whistleblower policy	Yes
Anti-corruption training	Yes
Data privacy compliance	Yes

§ 6.1 SCORING METHODOLOGY

weighted
composite

The overall score of **78.8** points (grade **B+ (Good)**) is the weighted composite ($E \times 0.35$) + ($S \times 0.35$) + ($G \times 0.30$) of the three pillar sub-scores. Pillar scores at this reporting period: Environmental **61.5**, Social **77.8**, and Governance **100.0**.

§ 6.2 CATEGORY COMPONENTS · POINT ALLOCATION

per pillar

Environmental · renewable energy share	30 pts
Environmental · waste recycling	25 pts
Environmental · carbon intensity	25 pts
Environmental · water efficiency	20 pts
Social · gender diversity	25 pts
Social · minority representation	20 pts
Social · pay equity	30 pts
Social · employee development	15 pts
Social · retention	10 pts
Governance · board independence	25 pts
Governance · board diversity	20 pts
Governance · policy framework	55 pts

§ 6.3 INDUSTRY BENCHMARKS · DATA SOURCE

normalized

Industry averages are derived from aggregated ESG performance data across Technology sector companies. Where applicable, benchmarks are normalized on a per-employee or per-revenue basis so companies of different sizes can be compared within the same sector.

§ 6.4 SCOPE & PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT

disclaimers

Data basis. This assessment reflects data provided by Snapshot ESG Corp and applies industry-standard scoring frameworks. Results are calibrated against published sector benchmarks

and recognized ESG disclosure standards. For regulatory filings, we recommend pairing this assessment with third-party data verification.

Framework alignment. Mappings to GRI, SASB, TCFD, and UN SDG frameworks are based on current published standards. Formal certification against any framework requires separate engagement with the respective framework bodies.

Benchmark context. Industry averages represent aggregated sector trends and may not capture sub-sector, regional, or company-size nuances. Interpret the percentile as directional rather than precise.

Recommended next steps. This report is designed for internal ESG performance assessment, identification of improvement priorities, stakeholder communication, audit preparation, and supply-chain assessments. For investor-grade disclosures or regulatory filings, supplement with additional documentation and third-party verification as appropriate.