

ESG: WHAT'S WORKING & WHAT'S NOT

Meanwhile...

The evidence is becoming clear: does ESG 'work'? For *most* ESG practices, unfortunately no.

There are 3 ESG objectives: ① Values-alignment; Financial: ②a outperformance + ②b risk management; ③ Impact/outcomes

1 2b ESG integration 

- Contribution to financial performance extremely limited or neutral
- Risk tool, but materiality is situational
- Has the industry completed ESG integration?

Impact investment

- Most impact funds today are impact-aligning, not impact-enabling
- Focus on 'intentionality'
- Increasing regulatory scrutiny

1 2b Climate Change

- Most climate investment solutions not supported by climate/finance evidence: carbon footprinting, portfolio temperature, net zero initiatives, Paris-alignment; sometimes characterized as 'dangerous'; most don't contribute to climate action
- Increasing awareness of need for public policy (e.g. carbon taxes, regulation)
- TCFD is a good framework; some useful risk management approaches

1 2b Disclosures / Data

- SFDR, Taxonomy are *labelling* investments, not changing how investments are made, or redirecting capital (*enabling*)
- Most ESG data is not investment-relevant
- Limited use in risk management
- Supports risk management, but no theory of change

1 2a Active Ownership / Engagement 

- Broadly recognized in academic literature as contributing to better investment decisions & making companies more sustainable
- Enhances corporate governance
- Required by laws / regulations / fiduciary duty

1 Blended finance 3

- (Government interventions mobilize private capital; structured finance)
- Small-scale, but growing
- Focus on solving problems, 'additionality'

3 Public Policy

- Government policy 'works' but focus is often on private sector initiatives that signal that government involvement is not needed (e.g. SFDR, taxonomy)

1 ESG Funds

- In the aggregate, do not outperform; individual funds may outperform (but, is it attributable to ESG factors?)
- No contribution to outcomes
- More regulatory scrutiny of financial performance and impact claims

1 Divestment

- No evidence of better risk management, solving societal problems, or contribution to performance (often the opposite)

Academics & Media
Steady stream of papers & articles analyzing what's 'working' in ESG

Regulatory Scrutiny
"ESG Police" units established by regulators in US, France, Denmark
Increasing scrutiny on ESG / impact claims
First misselling lawsuits, regulatory reviews

ESG Professionals
Are starting to come around to the evidence-based view, speaking up on LinkedIn, in Responsible-Investor, conferences

Active Ownership but...

- *Stewardship*: holding corporate management to account, monitoring corporate performance, capital (re)allocation
- Integrated into investment functions
- *Incorporating* ESG, not revolving around ESG

Impact/Blended finance but...

- Focus on *enabling investments*, like blended finance (government interventions mobilize private capital)
- Need to help create market to be visible / successful here

How to do the stuff that works, well

Public Policy, but...

- Investors supporting governments in creating policies to address ESG, SDG issues, climate
- Proactively contributing to meaningful financial industry regulations

Disclosures / Data, but...

- Focus on data and disclosure that *enables* better investment decision-making and active ownership
- Don't confuse quantification with understanding, or with causation

Climate Change, but...

- Focus on scenario analysis for risk management; effective active ownership; and supporting governments & effective public policy
- Invest in new technologies, renewable energy, EM infrastructure, e.g. through blended finance

This presents investors with 3 options in terms of ESG strategy:

"Run With The Herd": focus on red/yellow

"Embrace the Complexity": focus on green

"Keep Our Heads Down": stay on sidelines

Pros	Cons
① Safety in numbers	① Greenwashing claims likely
② Business opportunities now	② Not in line with research, facts
③ Easier to explain	③ Possible conflict fiduciary duty
	④ Resource-intensive, costly

Pros	Cons
① In line w/ science & fiduciary duty	① Minority industry view, today
② True thought leadership	② Harder to explain
③ Distinctive	③ Requires more involvement of investment / risk teams
④ Future business opportunities	

Pros	Cons
① Avoid scrutiny	① Cannot eliminate risks entirely
	② No ESG business opportunities
	③ Conflict with fiduciary duty?
	④ Silent on important industry theme