

# The last-minute GRESB biodiversity checklist

Five checks to run before you submit.

Submissions close July 1

If this is your first GRESB submission, the biodiversity questions are an easy place to lose points or leave a weak answer behind. They are also one of the few sections where a few minutes of attention right now can change your result. None of the checks below take long, and all of them are easy to miss when you are rushing to the deadline.

## 1 Answer the nature strategy question (RM7)

GRESB asks whether you have a plan for nature and biodiversity. It sits in the management section and is often labelled RM7. In 2026 it is optional and earns no points, which makes it easy to skip. Answer it anyway. Investors read this section, and GRESB has signalled that nature is moving toward being scored in future cycles.

**Watch out:** a one-line answer that just says yes, we have a plan. Use the space to explain how your buildings rely on nature, how they affect it, the risks, and the opportunities.

## 2 Claim biodiversity everywhere it scores

There is no single biodiversity score, and no net habitat gain metric. Biodiversity is a selectable option inside several scored indicators, so it is easy to leave points unclaimed. You can only select these honestly if something real sits behind them.

INDICATOR	WHERE IT LIVES	WHAT YOU SELECT
PO1	Environmental policy	Biodiversity and habitat
RA1	Portfolio risk assessments	Biodiversity and habitat
TC3	Tenant fit-out program	Biodiversity and green space
RM4.1	Acquisition due diligence	Biodiversity and habitat

**Watch out:** naming biodiversity in one place and forgetting the others. Tick the box in every indicator it applies to.

## 3 Point to something real, not a policy

When you explain your nature plan, point to something actually happening at your buildings. Reviewers trust evidence more than promises, and they are asking for it more each year. If the only thing you can point to is a written policy, your answer is weak. That is worth knowing now, not after you submit.

**Watch out:** having only a written policy to show. Note the gap now and treat it as the thing to fix before next year.

#### 4 Make sure your proof belongs to you

Any document you attach as evidence should clearly show that the data is about your buildings or your entity. This sounds obvious, but it is a common reason proof gets discounted. Before you attach a file, ask whether a reviewer could tell, at a glance, that it applies to you.

**Watch out:** a general company-wide letter. It is weaker than a document tied to the specific assets you are reporting on.

#### 5 Check that your answers agree

Your biodiversity answers do not sit alone. Read them next to what you said about tenant engagement and building certifications. A story that holds together across the whole assessment reads stronger than one good section that quietly contradicts another. This is a five-minute read-through.

**Watch out:** a biodiversity answer that contradicts another section. Small mismatches make a submission look rushed.

### The five checks at a glance

CHECK	WHY IT MATTERS	WATCH OUT FOR
Answer RM7, even though it is unscored	Investors read it and it is expected to be scored soon	A one-line yes, we have a plan
Claim biodiversity everywhere it scores	It scores across PO1, RA1 and TC3, not one metric	Leaving it unticked where it applies
Point to a real program, not a policy	Reviewers trust evidence over promises	Having only a written policy to show
Make sure your proof clearly belongs to you	Evidence that does not map to you gets discounted	A generic company-wide letter
Check your answers agree with each other	A coherent story reads stronger	A biodiversity answer that contradicts another section

#### Before next year

If check three stung, the problem is not your writing. It is that you had nothing real to point to. There was no ongoing program at your buildings producing nature data, so the best you could do was describe intent.

That is the gap to close before the next cycle, when nature moves closer to being scored. A living program at the building, like a managed beehive, produces biodiversity data as a normal part of running. Pollinator diversity, habitat health, and participation trends accumulate on their own, so next year you are pointing to evidence instead of a policy.

You can submit this year with what you have. Just know what to build before you do it again.