IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

A Study On Sectoral Analysis Of Temporal Consistency And Variation In Business Responsibility And Sustainability Reporting (Brsr) Among Selected Indian Listed Companies

Dr. Roshni P Langrana

Assistant Professor, Sarvajanik College of Commerce & Computer Applications, Surat, India

ABSTRACT

The Business Responsibility and Sustainability Report (BRSR) is an initiative by the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) towards integrating sustainability and responsible business conduct into the corporate reporting framework. It is an attempt to align Indian disclosure requirements with global Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) standards and is in conformity with National Guidelines on Responsible Business Conduct (NGRBC), which outline nine principles guiding ethical, transparent, and sustainable business behavior. It enables stakeholders, investors, and regulators to assess the performance of companies beyond financial indicators. Hence, with the growing emphasis on BRSR disclosure, this research examines the temporal consistency and variation in disclosure practices across companies and sectors. The study had examined the companies from High-Carbon intensive and Low-Carbon intensive sectors across 9 principles of BRSR considering both essential and leadership indicators by using SEBI's BRSR Guidance Notes as the framework. A scoring mechanism was developed by allocating equal weightage to essential and leadership indicators for 9 BRSR principles. A sample of 24 listed companies was analyzed over a three-year period to evaluate their reporting patterns. Statistical tests such as Intra-Class Correlation, Kruskal Wallis H Test and Mann-Whitney U Test were applied. The findings revealed that there exists differences in reporting practices amongst the companies within both sectors but the High-Carbon intensive sector demonstrates the need for stronger and more transparent sustainability reporting practices particularly in environmental protection and customer value, given its higher environmental impact.

Key words: NGRBC, High-Carbon intensive, Low-Carbon intensive, sustainability reporting

I. INTRODUCTION

Corporate sustainability reporting, which has gained paramount importance in recent years, has made the stakeholders demand greater transparency regarding environmental, social and governance performance of companies. This has considerably changed the axiom of evaluating the corporate's performance solely on the basis of profitability. This had led to SEBI gradually strengthening the framework of non-financial disclosures for listed companies.

The evolution of Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) can be traced back to 2012 when Business Responsibility Report (BRR) was issued by SEBI, in line with National Voluntary Guidelines (NVGs) on Social, Environmental and Economic Responsibilities of Business in 2011, outlining the nine principles of business conduct. The Business Responsibility Reporting lacks comparability across companies due to its narrative and qualitative nature of disclosures. To account for these limitations, the Ministry of Corporate Affairs revised the National Voluntary Guidelines and issued National Guidelines on Responsible Business Conduct in 2019. In line with this, SEBI, in its circular dated 10th May 2021 issued Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting replacing the former Business Responsibility Report. It includes quantitative and measurable indicators and conforms to the global framework of Global Reporting Initiative. SEBI has also issued Guidance Notes in Annexure II providing detained explanations and disclosures required by companies for nine principles of BRSR.

The Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting was introduced from the financial year 2021-22 and it was voluntary for the companies to either opt for BRSR or continue reporting with BRR. From the year 2022-23, it was mandatory for top 1,000 listed companies (by market capitalization) to report according to BRSR. The nine principles of the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) framework are derived from the National Guidelines on Responsible Business Conduct (NGRBC) issued by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India and adopted by SEBI (2021). The brief description of 9 principles of BRSR is presented below:-

Principle 1 (Ethics, Transparency and Accountability): This principle emphasizes ethical and transparent decision-making, responsible governance, and disclosure of relevant information to stakeholders in order to foster trust and credibility.

Principle 2 (Sustainability in Products and Services): It promotes production and consumption of safe and sustainable goods and services by encouraging efficient use of resources, minimizing waste, and ensuring that the entire product life cycle is environment friendly.

Principle 3 (Employee Well-being): Companies are expected to safeguard physical and social well-being of employees by maintaining safe workplaces, promoting diversity and inclusion, ensuring fair remuneration, and offering opportunities for training, growth, and professional development.

Principle 4 (Stakeholder Responsiveness): Enterprises must identify and engage all stakeholders who are affected by their operations by timely communication, fair treatment, and active participation seeking their inputs on material issues.

Principle 5 (Respect for Human Rights): Businesses should protect and promote human rights across their operations and value chains by preventing any form of discrimination, child labour and ensuring equality, dignity and freedom for all individuals.

Principle 6 (Environmental Protection): This principle makes the companies recognise its responsibility to minimize their ecological footprint by conserving natural resources, managing emissions and waste, water discharge and conservation, encouraging renewable energy use, and contributing to the restoration of the environment.

Principle 7 (Responsible Policy Advocacy): The aim of this principle is to ensure transparent and ethical behaviour when public policies are advocated so that such activities are guided by national priorities rather than corporate interests.

Principle 8 (Inclusive Growth and Equitable Development): This principle expects companies to contribute towards inclusive growth by undertaking CSR projects for marginalised communities and reducing inequalities.

Principle 9 (Customer Value and Responsibility): Enterprises are expected to provide safe products, protect consumer data and privacy, address grievances promptly, and communicate truthfully to strengthen long-term consumer confidence.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Debnath et al. (2024) investigated sustainability reporting practices in Indian public and private sector banks in the post-merger, post-COVID FY2021–22 period under the BRSR regime, using binary coding scheme for selected public and private banks. The study finds that social disclosures dominate reporting practices, while environmental reporting is limited. Public sector banks are more conscious about environmental disclosures and governance indicators than private banks. Adoption of GRI standards remains low and NVG and BRR uptake is higher among public banks. The authors concluded that reporting practices in the Indian banking sector are still not uniform across ESG dimensions, highlighting the need for longitudinal studies.

Gupta et al. (2024) addressed the gap of quantitatively assessing the influence of BRSR on leadership messaging and CSR performance with special reference to the cement industry. The study employed content analysis of CEO and MD speeches to identify keyword patterns corresponding to the nine BRSR principles, during the pre- and post-BRSR periods. It concluded that sustainability disclosures have improved but the significant impact of BRSR on leadership narratives and CSR performance remained hidden.

Mehra Pragati (2024) employed a quantitative scoring model released by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI) by taking a sample of two companies each from the public and private energy sector namely NHPC and NTPC from public sector and Adani Group and TATA Power from private sector. The findings of the study reported significant differences in the sustainability reporting practices of the selected energy sector companies. Public sector companies have seemed to outperform private sector companies with respect to both environmental and social indicator.

Rajkannan Rajan (2025) has presented a comprehensive review of the evolution and implementation of SEBI's Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) framework in India between 2021 and 2025, emphasizing operational challenges. The study reported persistent challenges such as data management complexity, high financial costs, limited internal expertise, and the risk of greenwashing due to self-declared reporting. To address these, technological integration through AI, machine learning, blockchain and IoT for real-time data collection, third-party assurance to enhance credibility, capacity building and training to bridge skill gaps, and standardization to ensure comparability is required.

III. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Previous studies have highlighted the growing significance of sustainability reporting in enhancing corporate transparency and accountability which has been mandated by SEBI for listed companies in its Business Responsibility and Sustainability Framework. Most studies have examined disclosures at a single point of time, leaving scope for longitudinal research work. There also remains a scope to analyse the disclosure practices across specific sectors to account for environmental risks. Hence, the present study is a detailed analysis of compliances scores of companies from High-Carbon Intensive and Low-Carbon Intensive sectors taking into account the specific essential and leadership indicators with regard to each BRSR principle. The study has also focused on consistency of compliance scores over a period of 3 years (i.e. from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025). Moreover, an attempt was also made to find out differences in compliance scores within the sector and across the sectors. Together, it is a comprehensive analysis of nine principles of BRSR by highlighting both inter-company differences and intra-company stability.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

1. To evaluate the level of compliance of selected companies in High-Carbon intensive and Low-carbon intensive sectors to nine principles of the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) framework prescribed by SEBI.
2. To examine the temporal consistency of BRSR compliance scores of selected companies over a three-year period (i.e from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025).
3. To study intra-sectoral differences among selected companies within each sector for each BRSR principle.
4. To analyze inter-sectoral differences between High-Carbon intensive and Low-Carbon intensive sectors for each BRSR principle.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is a quantitative, longitudinal and comparative attempt to evaluate the compliance level of selected Indian listed companies to nine principles of Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting laid down by SEBI. SEBI, in its circular dated 10th May 2021, mandated top 1,000 listed Indian Companies to include Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting in their Annual Reports from F.Y. 2022-23 onwards. Given this regulatory requirement, study specifically examines the companies from High-Carbon Intensive and Low-Carbon Intensive sectors so as to evaluate that how consistently companies have disclosed the information pertaining to BRSR principles over three consecutive years i.e. 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 and the difference in compliance level between the companies. Secondary dataset of Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting of companies has been explored for this study. Based on judgemental sampling, two companies each from High-Carbon Intensive sectors such as Oil gas consumable fuels, Chemicals, Metals and mines, Construction, Power and Textile industries and from Low-Carbon intensive sectors such as Financial services, FMCG, Healthcare, Consumer services, IT and Telecommunication industries listed on Nifty 500 Index has been selected for the study. The final sample consist of 24 companies comprising 12 companies from High-Carbon Intensive and 12 companies from Low-Carbon Intensive sector (Appendix 1)

For each company, individual scores were computed for all nine BRSR principles by allocating equal weightage (50:50) to essential and leadership indicators outlined by SEBI. The scoring of companies' BRSR disclosures is based exclusively on the SEBI's BRSR Guidance Notes questions for each of the nine principles so as to ensure that the analysis remains focused on SEBI's core reporting framework and to maintain comparability across companies. (Appendix 2)

The questions in both essential and leadership indicators have been given equal weightage to calculate total score of each of these nine principles. The scores assigned were from 0 to 1, indicating "0" for no disclosure made, "0.5" for partial disclosure and "1" for full disclosure. Intraclass correlation has been used to check for the consistency across years in these compliance scores. Kruskal-Wallis test was applied to check the differences in these compliance scores amongst companies in each of the sectors and Mann-Whitney U test was applied to check the differences in compliance scores between these two sectors.

VI. HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

H_{01}: There is no significant temporal consistency in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{11}: There is significant temporal consistency in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{02}: There is no significant temporal consistency in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{12}: There is significant temporal consistency in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{03}: There is no significant difference in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{13}: There is significant difference in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{04}: There is no significant difference in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{14}: There is significant difference in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{05}: There is no significant difference in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.

H_{15}: There is significant difference in BRSR nine principles' compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.

VII. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1 Intra-Class Correlation of Compliance Scores of BRSR nine principles over a period of 3 years for companies under High-Carbon Intensive Sector.

Null Hypothesis	Intra-Class Coefficient	P-Value	Accepted /Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 1 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.854	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant consistency in Principle 2 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.886	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 3 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.839	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 4 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.810	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 5 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	-0.222	0.624	Accepted
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 6 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.738	0.004	Rejected

There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 7 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.770	0.002	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 8 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.915	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 9 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.881	0.000	Rejected

The individual company scores (in Appendix 3,4 and 5) indicated that no single company had uniformly outperformed others across all principles. Thus, Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was applied to evaluate the temporal consistency of these compliance patterns over period of 3 years for companies under the High-Carbon Intensive sector. In Table 1, results of Intra-Class Correlation Coefficient were presented with average measures coefficient for 3 years and p values for nine principles. The results indicated that all principles, except Principle 5, exhibited statistically significant ICC values. This has revealed that companies have maintained relatively consistent reporting for these principles. Moreover, majority principles have coefficients in the range of 0.75 to 0.90 which indicates good reliability across the years.

Table:2 Intra-Class Correlation of Compliance Scores of BRSR nine principles over a period of 3 years for companies under Low-Carbon Intensive Sector.

Null Hypothesis	**Intra-Class Coefficient**	**P-Value**	**Accepted /Rejected**
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 1 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.897	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 2 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.975	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 3 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.757	0.002	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 4 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.257	0.265	Accepted
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 5 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	-0.118	0.559	Accepted
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 6 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.809	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 7 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.951	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 8 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.862	0.000	Rejected
There is no significant temporal consistency in Principle 9 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.000	0.477	Accepted

Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was applied to evaluate the consistency of these compliance scores across years for companies under the Low-Carbon Intensive sector. In Table 2, results of Intra-Class Correlation Coefficient were presented with average measures coefficient for 3 years and p values for nine principles. The results indicated that all principles, except Principle 4,5 and 9, exhibited statistically significant values. This has revealed that companies have maintained relatively consistent disclosure practices for these principles. Moreover, majority principles have coefficients in the range of 0.75 to 0.90 which indicates good reliability across the years.

Table 3 Kruskal-Wallis H test of Compliance Scores of BRSR nine principles for companies under High-Carbon and Low-Carbon intensive sectors

High-Carbon Intensive Sector			Low-Carbon Intensive Sector		
Null Hypothesis	**P Value**	**Accepted/Rejected**	**Null Hypothesis**	**P Value**	**Accepted/ Rejected**
There is no significant difference in Principle 1 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.009	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 1 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.031	Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 2 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.019	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 2 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.001	Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 3 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.020	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 3 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector..	0.031	Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 4 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.020	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 4 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.189	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 5 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.572	Accepted	There is no significant difference in Principle 5 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.504	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 6 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.006	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 6 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.007	Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 7 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.039	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 7 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.002	Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 8 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.006	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 8 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.004	Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 9 compliance scores amongst companies in High-Carbon intensive sector.	0.011	Rejected	There is no significant difference in Principle 9 compliance scores amongst companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector.	0.443	Accepted

The Kruskal–Wallis H test was applied to examine whether there exist statistically significant differences in the compliance scores of companies within the High-Carbon Intensive and Low-Carbon Intensive sector with regard to nine BRSR principles. The results indicated that the p-values were less than 0.05 for Principles 1,2,3,4,6,7,8 and 9 under High-Carbon Intensive sector, signifying statistically significant differences among the companies. This suggests that the level of compliance with most of the BRSR principles varies considerably across firms operating in High Carbon-Intensive industries.

However, for Low-Carbon Intensive sector, the results of the test were significant for Principle 1,2,3,6,7 and 8. However, the results were statistically insignificant for Principles 4 and 5, implying that there is no significant difference in compliance scores among the companies for stakeholder responsiveness (Principle 4) and human rights protection (Principle 5). There exists a statistically insignificant difference among both the sectors for Principle 5, indicating a relatively consistent level of compliance to protection of human rights among companies in both the sectors.

The significant variation implies that while some companies have adopted stronger sustainability and governance practices, others lag behind, reflecting uneven progress toward responsible business conduct in both sectors.

Table 4 Mann-Whitney U test of Compliance Scores of BRSR nine principles for companies across High-Carbon Intensive and Low-Carbon Intensive sectors.

Null Hypothesis	P-Value	Accepted /Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 1 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.166	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 2 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.125	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 3 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.961	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 4 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.238	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 5 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.673	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 6 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.028	Rejected
There is no significant difference in Principle 7 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.266	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 8 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.643	Accepted
There is no significant difference in Principle 9 compliance scores across companies in High-Carbon Intensive sector and Low-Carbon Intensive sector.	0.022	Rejected

The results of Mann-Whitney U test have revealed that there exist significant differences in Principles 6 and 9 across companies in two sectors, indicating that the level of compliance for these principles varies meaningfully between the two sectors. This can be attributed to sector-specific regulatory practices. In contrast to this, no significant difference was observed for the remaining principles, implying that both sectors exhibit statistically similar compliance scores. This indicates a relatively uniform approach irrespective of the sector's carbon intensity.

VIII. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The study aimed to evaluate the compliance levels of disclosures required by listed companies to nine BRSR principles. For the purpose of the study, selected companies from the High-Cabon intensive sector as well as the Low-Carbon intensive sector were analysed across essential and leadership indicators of nine BRSR principles by scoring method. The results of Intra-Class Correlation revealed that there exists temporal consistency in disclosure practices during the period of 3 years for 8 out of 9 principles for companies within the High-Carbon intensive sector and 6 out of 9 principles for companies within the Low-Carbon intensive sector. This highlighted stability and reliability of reporting practices with respect to these principles across years. On the contrary, it was found that companies in High-Carbon intensive sector have not exhibited consistency to compliance with Principle 5 (Promotion of human rights) across the period of

3 years and companies in Low-Carbon intensive sector have not exhibited consistency to compliance with Principle 4 (Responsiveness to stakeholders), Principle 5 (Promotion of Human Rights) and Principle 9 (Customer value).

The results of the Kruskal Wallis test had notified that companies within High-Carbon Intensive sector differ significantly in their compliance scores for 8 out of 9 BRSR principles. This implies that the level of disclosure varies considerably within this sector. However, amongst Low-Carbon Intensive sector, companies differ significantly for 6 out of 9 principles. Moreover, results of Mann Whitney U test have confirmed that there exist sectoral differences in compliance scores with regard to Principle 6 (Environmental impact) and Principle 9 (Customer value).

Hence, it was found that disparities do exist among the companies within both sectors but the High-Carbon Intensive sector requires more focused attention and stronger regulatory interventions particularly in environmental protection and customer value, given its higher environmental impact. Focused regulatory and sector-specific sustainability frameworks, and enhanced corporate accountability are essential for bridging the existing gaps.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Debnath et al. (2024) CORPORATE SUSTAINABILITY REPORTING PRACTICES IN THE BANKING SECTOR: A GOVERNANCE IMPLICATION. Journal of Governance and Regulation, 13 (4), 167-177.
2. Gupta et al. (2024) Examining the Evolution of Leadership Speeches in India's Cement Sector Following BRSR Reporting. Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 4 (2), 2369-2380.
3. Mehra Pragati (2024) Scoring Sustainability Reports for Assessing Environmental and Social Dimension of Leading Energy Sector Companies. VEETHIKA-An International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 10(1), 1-6.
4. Rajkannan Rajan (2025) Evolving Corporate Sustainability Reporting Landscape in India: A Literature Review of SEBI's BRSR Framework (2021 - 2025). International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management, 3(7), 2402-2407.
5. ICAI (Background Material): Business Responsibility & Sustainability Reporting (Revised Edition) https://sustainability.icai.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Background-Material-on-Sustainability-Business-Responsibility-Sustainability-Reporting-BRSR-Revised-Edition-2024.pdf?utm
6. Ministry of Corporate Affairs (2019). National Guidelines on Responsible Business Conduct. Government of India. Retrieved from https://iica.nic.in/images/National-Guidelines-on-Responsible%20Business%20Conduct.pdf
7. Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2021). Guidance Note for Business Responsibility & Sustainability Reporting (Annexure II). https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/commondocs/may-2021/Business%20responsibility%20and%20sustainability%20reporting%20by%20listed%20entitiesAnnexure2_p.PDF

X. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Companies' Codes and their names from High-Carbon Intensive and Low-Carbon Intensive sectors.

High-Carbon Intensive sector		Low-Carbon Intensive Sector	
Company Code	**Company Name**	**Company Code**	**Company Name**
RIL	Reliance Industries Ltd	HDFCBANK	HDFC Bank
GSPL	Gujarat State Petronet Ltd	SBILIFE	SBI Life Insurance Co Ltd
GNFC	Gujarat Narmada Valley Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd	DABUR	Dabur India Ltd
PIDILIT	Pidilite Industries Ltd	UBL	United Breweries Ltd.
ADANIENT	Adani Enterprises Ltd	CIPLA	Cipla
TATASTEEL	Tata Steel Ltd	DRREDDY	Dr. Reddy's Laboratories
ULTRACEMO	UltraTech Cement Ltd	ABFRL	Aditya Birla Fashion & Retail Ltd
JKCEMENT	JK Cement Ltd	SAPPHIRE	Sapphire Foods India Ltd.
POWERGRID	Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd	TCS	Tata Consultancy Services Ltd
NHPC	NHPC Ltd	HCLTECH	HCL Technologies
VTL	Vardhman Textiles Ltd	BHARTIARTL	Bharti Airtel Ltd
PAGEIND	Page Industries Ltd	IDEA	Vodafone Idea Ltd

Appendix 2 Questions under essential and leadership indicators in each of BRSR nine principles (As per SEBI Guidance Notes)

Principles	Indicators	Questions
Principle 1 (Ethics, Transparency & Accountability)	**Essential**	Q2 Details of fines / penalties /punishment/ award/ compounding fees/ settlement amount Q4 Details of anti-corruption or anti-bribery policy
	Leadership	Q2 Processes to avoid/ manage conflict of interests involving members of the Board/ KMPs
Principle 2 (Sustainability in Products and Services)	**Essential**	Q2 Sustainable sourcing Q3 Processes in place to reclaim products for reuse, recycle and safe disposal of products at the end of life Q4 Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) plan
	Leadership	Q1 Life cycle assessment Q4 Recycled or reused input material as percentage of total input material Q6. Reclaimed products and their packaging materials (as percentage of products sold) for each product category
Principle 3 (Employee Well-being)	**Essential**	Q1Measures for well-being of employees and workers Q3Accessibility of workplaces Q5Return to work and Retention rates of permanent employees / workers that took parental leave Q8Details of Training imparted to the employees and workers on health & safety measures and on skill upgradation Q9Details of performance and career development review imparted to employees and workers Q10 Health and safety management system Q11 Details of safety related incidents Q12Measures taken by the entity to ensure a safe and healthy work place
	Leadership	Q3Rehabilitation and suitable employment of employees / workers
Principle 4 (Stakeholder Responsiveness)	**Essential**	Q1Process for identification of key stakeholders Q2Key stakeholder groups
	Leadership	Q2.Using stakeholder consultation to support the identification and management of environmental, and social topics. Q3Details of instances of engagement with and actions taken to address the concerns of vulnerable/marginalized groups
Principle 5 (Respect for Human Rights)	**Essential**	Q1Training on human rights issues and policies Q3 Details of remuneration/ salary/ wages (including differently abled) Q6 Disclosure of complaints made by employees and workers on sexual harassment, discrimination at workplace, Child Labour, Forced Labour/Involuntary Labour, Wages or other human rights related issues
	Essential	Q1Details of total energy consumption and energy intensity

Principle 6 (Environmental Protection)		Q2PAT scheme of the Government of India Q3Details of total water withdrawn, consumed and water intensity ratio Q4Zero Liquid Discharge policy Q5Disclosure of air emissions Q6Details of Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and GHG intensity Q8Details of waste generated, recycled & re-used and disposed off Q9Description of waste management practices Q11Details of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA)
	Leadership	Q1Break-up of the total energy consumed from renewable and non-renewable sources Q2Details of water discharged Q3Details of water withdrawn, consumed and discharged in areas of water stress Q4Scope 3 emissions Q5Impact on bio-diversity
Principle 7 (Responsible Policy Advocacy)	**Leadership**	Q1Details of public policy positions advocated by the entity
Principle 8 (Inclusive Growth and Equitable Development)	**Essential**	Q1Details of Social Impact Assessments (SIA) Q3Describe the mechanisms to receive grievances of the local community Q4Percentage of inputs directly sourced from MSMEs / small producers
	Leadership	Q2CSR projects undertaken in aspirational districts Q4Details of the benefits derived and shared from the intellectual properties owned or acquired by your company based on traditional knowledge shared Q6Details of beneficiaries of CSR Projects
Principle 9 (Customer Value & Responsibility)	**Essential**	Q4Details of instances of product recalls on account of safety issues
	Leadership	Q1Channels / platforms where information on goods and services of the business can be accessed

Appendix 3 BRSR Compliance Score of High Carbon Intensive Sector Companies for Financial Year 2022-2023

Co Code	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin 5	Prin 6	Prin 7	Prin 8	Prin 9	Total Score
RIL	100.00	83.33	100.00	100.00	50.00	82.22	25.00	100.00	100.00	740.56
GSPL	100.00	58.33	96.88	62.50	41.67	84.44	25.00	91.67	100.00	660.49
GNFC	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	80.00	0.00	83.33	100.00	513.33
PIDILIT	37.50	50.00	46.88	50.00	50.00	47.22	0.00	75.00	50.00	406.60
ADANIENT	100.00	41.67	100.00	100.00	50.00	70.00	0.00	83.33	100.00	645.00
TATASTEEL	100.00	91.67	100.00	87.50	50.00	97.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	776.39
ULTRACEMO	100.00	83.33	100.00	87.50	50.00	94.44	50.00	91.67	100.00	756.94
JKCEMENT	100.00	91.67	93.75	62.50	41.67	94.44	50.00	91.67	100.00	725.69
POWERGRID	50.00	33.33	50.00	50.00	50.00	47.22	0.00	50.00	50.00	380.56
NHPC	100.00	91.67	100.00	87.50	50.00	87.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	766.39
VTL	100.00	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	75.00	763.54
PAGEIND	87.50	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	75.00	750.00

Appendix 4 BRSR Compliance Score of High Carbon Intensive Sector Companies for Financial Year 2023-2024

Co Code	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin 5	Prin 6	Prin 7	Prin 8	Prin 9	Total Score
RIL	100.00	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	82.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	779.10
GSPL	100.00	91.67	100.00	62.50	50.00	95.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	740.83
GNFC	50.00	50.00	50.00	37.50	50.00	80.00	0.00	83.33	100.00	500.83
PIDILIT	37.50	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	77.22	0.00	58.33	50.00	423.06
ADANIENT	100.00	41.67	100.00	75.00	50.00	97.22	0.00	50.00	100.00	613.89
TATASTEEL	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	779.17
ULTRACEMO	100.00	100.00	96.88	75.00	41.67	97.22	50.00	83.33	100.00	744.10
JKCEMENT	87.50	83.33	96.88	100.00	50.00	94.44	50.00	100.00	100.00	762.15
POWERGRID	50.00	41.67	50.00	37.50	50.00	80.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	409.17
NHPC	100.00	91.67	100.00	100.00	50.00	97.22	25.00	100.00	100.00	763.89
VTL	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	791.67
PAGEIND	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	787.50

Appendix 5 BRSR Compliance Score of High Carbon Intensive Sector Companies for Financial Year 2024-2025

Co Code	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin 5	Prin 6	Prin 7	Prin 8	Prin 9	Total Score
RIL	75.00	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	82.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	754.10
GSPL	100.00	83.33	75.00	50.00	50.00	84.44	50.00	100.00	100.00	692.78
GNFC	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	97.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	784.72
PIDILIT	87.50	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	97.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	773.26
ADANIENT	100.00	41.67	100.00	87.50	50.00	90.00	50.00	66.67	100.00	685.83
TATASTEEL	100.00	91.67	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	783.33
ULTRACEMO	100.00	91.67	96.88	87.50	50.00	97.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	764.93
JKCEMENT	100.00	91.67	100.00	75.00	50.00	97.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	755.56
POWERGRID	50.00	41.67	50.00	50.00	50.00	80.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	421.67
NHPC	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	97.22	25.00	91.67	100.00	751.39
VTL	100.00	91.67	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	783.33
PAGEIND	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	800.00

Appendix 6 BRSR Compliance Score of Low-Carbon Intensive Sector Companies for Financial Year 2022-2023

Co Code	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin 5	Prin 6	Prin 7	Prin 8	Prin 9	Total Score
HDFCBANK	100.00	91.67	96.88	87.50	50.00	92.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	759.93
SBILIFE	100.00	100.00	96.88	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	784.38
DABUR	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	95.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	795.00
UBL	87.50	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	97.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	772.22
CIPLA	100.00	66.67	100.00	87.50	33.33	87.22	25.00	58.33	100.00	658.06
DRREDDY	100.00	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	788.54
ABFRL	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	84.44	0.00	66.67	100.00	688.61
SAPPHIRE	100.00	41.67	96.88	75.00	50.00	57.22	0.00	41.67	100.00	562.43
TCS	75.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	762.50
HCLTECH	100.00	100.00	96.88	62.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	759.38
BHARTIARTL	87.50	41.67	46.88	100.00	50.00	57.22	50.00	50.00	100.00	583.26
IDEA	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	800.00

Appendix 7 BRSR Compliance Score of Low-Carbon Intensive Sector Companies for Financial Year 2023-24

Co Code	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin 5	Prin 6	Prin 7	Prin 8	Prin 9	Total Score
HDFCBANK	100.00	75.00	96.88	75.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	738.54
SBILIFE	100.00	83.33	96.88	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	759.38
DABUR	100.00	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	796.88
UBL	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	97.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	784.72
CIPLA	100.00	75.00	100.00	75.00	50.00	95.00	25.00	91.67	100.00	711.67
DRREDDY	100.00	100.00	96.88	75.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	763.54
ABFRL	100.00	91.67	96.88	62.50	50.00	97.22	0.00	83.33	100.00	681.60
SAPPHIRE	100.00	41.67	90.63	100.00	50.00	77.22	0.00	41.67	100.00	601.18
TCS	75.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	97.22	50.00	100.00	100.00	772.22
HCLTECH	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	100.00	25.00	100.00	100.00	762.50
BHARTIARTL	100.00	50.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	77.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	715.76
IDEA	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	787.50

Appendix 8 BRSR Compliance Score of Low-Carbon Intensive Sector Companies for Financial Year 2024-25

Co Code	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin 5	Prin 6	Prin 7	Prin 8	Prin 9	Total Score
HDFCBANK	87.50	91.67	96.88	87.50	50.00	92.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	747.43
SBILIFE	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	791.67
DABUR	100.00	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	97.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	785.76
UBL	100.00	100.00	96.88	62.50	50.00	97.22	50.00	91.67	100.00	748.26
CIPLA	100.00	58.33	96.88	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	83.33	100.00	726.04
DRREDDY	100.00	100.00	96.88	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	776.04
ABFRL	87.50	83.33	100.00	75.00	41.67	89.44	0.00	91.67	100.00	668.61
SAPPHIRE	100.00	50.00	96.88	75.00	50.00	97.22	25.00	58.33	100.00	652.43
TCS	62.50	91.67	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	754.17
HCLTECH	100.00	100.00	96.88	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	796.88
BHARTIARTL	100.00	41.67	50.00	87.50	50.00	84.44	50.00	91.67	75.00	630.28
IDEA	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	50.00	100.00	50.00	91.67	100.00	779.17