KING'S BUSINESS SCHOOL

THE CAPCO INSTITUTE JOURNAL OF FINANCIAL TRANSFORMATION

SOCIAL

ESG: Right thesis, wrong data

JASON SAUL | PHYLLIS KURLANDER COSTANZA

ESG

#56 NOVEMBER 2022

CAPCO

a wipro company

THE CAPCO INSTITUTE

JOURNAL OF FINANCIAL TRANSFORMATION

RECIPIENT OF THE APEX AWARD FOR PUBLICATION EXCELLENCE

Editor
Shahin Shojai, Global Head, Capco Institute

Special Advisory Editor
Igor Filatotchev, Professor of Corporate Governance and Strategy, King's College London

Advisory Board
Michael Ethelston, Partner, Capco
Anne-Marie Rowland, Partner, Capco
Bodo Schaefer, Partner, Capco

Editorial Board
Franklin Allen, Professor of Finance and Economics and Executive Director of the Brevan Howard Centre, Imperial College London and Professor Emeritus of Finance and Economics, the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
Philippe d'Arvisenet, Advisor and former Group Chief Economist, BNP Paribas
Rudi Bogni, former Chief Executive Officer, UBS Private Banking
Bruno Bonati, Former Chairman of the Non-Executive Board, Zuger Kantonalbank, and President, Landis & Gyr Foundation
Dan Breznitz, Munk Chair of Innovation Studies, University of Toronto
Urs Birchler, Professor Emeritus of Banking, University of Zurich
Géry Daeninck, former CEO, Robeco
Jean Dermine, Professor of Banking and Finance, INSEAD
Douglas W. Diamond, Merton H. Miller Distinguished Service Professor of Finance, University of Chicago
Elroy Dimson, Emeritus Professor of Finance, London Business School
Nicholas Economides, Professor of Economics, New York University
Michael Enthoven, Chairman, NL Financial Investments
José Luis Escrivá, President, The Independent Authority for Fiscal Responsibility (AIReF), Spain
George Feiger, Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Executive Dean, Aston Business School
Gregorio de Felice, Head of Research and Chief Economist, Intesa Sanpaolo
Allen Ferrell, Greenfield Professor of Securities Law, Harvard Law School
Peter Gomber, Full Professor, Chair of e-Finance, Goethe University Frankfurt
Wilfried Hauck, Managing Director, Statera Financial Management GmbH
Pierre Hillion, The de Picciotto Professor of Alternative Investments, INSEAD
Andrei A. Kirilenko, Reader in Finance, Cambridge Judge Business School, University of Cambridge
Mitchel Lenson, Former Group Chief Information Officer, Deutsche Bank
David T. Llewellyn, Professor Emeritus of Money and Banking, Loughborough University
Donald A. Marchand, Professor Emeritus of Strategy and Information Management, IMD
Colin Mayer, Peter Moores Professor of Management Studies, Oxford University
Pierpaolo Montana, Group Chief Risk Officer, Mediobanca
John Taysom, Visiting Professor of Computer Science, UCL
D. Sykes Wilford, W. Frank Hipp Distinguished Chair in Business, The Citadel

CONTENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL

09 **The impact of impact funds: A global analysis of funds with impact-claim**
Lisa Scheitza, Research Associate, School of Business, Economics and Social Sciences, University of Hamburg
Timo Busch, Professor, Chair for Management and Sustainability, School of Business, Economics and Social Sciences, University of Hamburg, and Center for Sustainable Finance and Private Wealth, University of Zurich
Johannes Metzler, Graduate, School of Business, Economics and Social Sciences, University of Hamburg

15 **Why Switzerland is one of the leading hubs for sustainable finance and how to support this further**
August Benz, Deputy CEO and Head Private Banking and Asset Management, Swiss Bankers Association (SBA)
Alannah Beer, Sustainable Finance Associate, Swiss Bankers Association (SBA)

19 **Towards net zero for APAC emerging markets: A problem-solving approach for financial institutions**
Edwin Hui, Executive Director, Capco
Shelley Zhou, Managing Principal, Capco

28 **Understanding the key challenges and opportunities in creating climate transition pathways**
Rakhi Kumar, Senior Vice President of Sustainability Solutions and Business Integration, Office of Sustainability, and co-chair of the Climate Transition Center, Liberty Mutual Insurance
Kelly Hereid, Director of Catastrophe Research, Liberty Mutual Insurance
Victoria Yanco, Sustainability Consultant, Liberty Mutual Insurance

37 **Seeing ESG through a U.S. Lens**
Marina Severinovsky, Head of Sustainability – North America, Schroders

41 **Structuring sustainable finance products**
Veronique J. A. Lafon-Vinais, Associate Professor of Business Education, Department of Finance, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

SOCIAL

51 Bringing the "S" back to ESG: The roles of organizational context and institutions
Igor Filatotchev, Professor of Corporate Governance and Strategy, King's College London
Chizu Nakajima, Professor of Law, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, University of London and ESG Integration Research and Education Center, University of Osaka
Günter K. Stahl, Professor of International Management, and Director, Centre for Sustainability Transformation and Responsibility (STaR), Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Vienna)

61 How could social audits be improved? A problem with the "S" in ESG reporting
Minette Bellingan, Representative Director, CPLB
Catherine Tilley, Lecturer in Business Ethics & Sustainability, King's Business School

69 The rise of ESG and the impact on the trade lifecycle
Marcus Fleig, Senior Consultant, Capco
Vincent Schrom, Associate, Capco

79 ESG: Right thesis, wrong data
Jason Saul, Executive Director, Center for Impact Sciences, Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, and co-founder, Impact Genome Project
Phyllis Kurlander Costanza, Former Head of Social Impact, UBS, and CEO, UBS Optimus Foundation

85 ESG – the good, the bad, the ugly
Sarah Bidinger, Senior Consultant, Capco
Ludovic Zaccaron, Consultant, Capco

93 Finding the Return on Sustainability Investments
Tensie Whelan, Clinical Professor for Business and Society and founder and Director, Center for Sustainable Business, Stern School of Business, New York University
Elyse Douglas, Senior Scholar, Center for Sustainable Business, Stern School of Business, New York University
Chisara Ehiemere, Senior Research Lead, Return on Sustainability Investment (ROSI™), Center for Sustainable Business, Stern School of Business, New York University

102 SEC human capital disclosures and DEI in financial services
Caitlin Stevens, Senior Consultant, Capco
Lindsay Moreau, Social Impact Advisor

110 Wealthy individuals: Not to be overlooked when thinking ESG investment strategy
Ylva Baeckström, Senior Lecturer in Banking & Finance, King's Business School
Jeanette Carlsson Hauff, Senior Lecturer, School of Business, Administration and Law, University of Gothenburg
Viktor Elliot, Senior Lecturer, School of Business, Administration and Law, University of Gothenburg

GOVERNANCE

119 Enabling systematic engagement through index investing
David Harris, Global Head of Sustainable Finance Strategy, London Stock Exchange Group
Arne Staal, Group Head of Indexes and Benchmarks, London Stock Exchange Group, and CEO, FTSE Russell
Sandrine Soubeyran, Director in Global Investment Research, FTSE Russell, London Stock Exchange Group

127 Implications of Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) in European private markets stakeholder conversations
Vincent Triesschijn, Global Head ESG and Sustainable Investing, ABN AMRO Bank N.V.,
Eric Zuidmeer, Senior Advisor Private Equity, ABN AMRO Bank N.V.

133 Climate conduct and financial services: Tomorrow's mis-selling scandal?
Lauren Farrell, Associate, Capco

141 Decentralizing sustainability – why and how to do it
Catharina Belfrage-Sahlstrand, Group Head of Sustainability and Climate Action, Handelsbanken
Richard Winder, U.K. Head of Sustainability, Handelsbanken

147 Redesigning data assimilation and sourcing strategies
George Georgiou, Managing Principal, Capco

157 The sustainability-linked loan – concept, development, outlook
Roland A. J. Mees, Professor of Practice of Business Ethics, University of Groningen and Director of Sustainable Finance, ING Wholesale Banking

168 Insights into successful ESG implementation in organizations
Armando Castro, Associate Professor, The Bartlett School of Sustainable Construction, University College London (UCL)
Maria Gradillas, Senior Researcher, Department of Management, Technology and Economics, ETH Zürich

177 Engagement as a pathway to a healthier ESG outlook for financial institutions
Krishna Uttamchandani, Associate, Capco

182 How is ESG reshaping the alternative investment business?
Florence Anglès, Managing Principal, Capco

DEAR READER,

Welcome to edition 56 of the Capco Institute Journal of Financial Transformation, produced in partnership with King's Business School and dedicated to the theme of ESG – environmental, social and governance.

We all recognize that transformation towards a green economic system via sustainable finance is needed, welcome and inevitable. Our clients have a crucial role to play here. Acknowledging the scope and complexity of the evolving ESG landscape, we are perfectly positioned to prepare them for the ESG era.

With climate change accelerating and generating physical events on an unprecedented scale, governments and societies are considering measures to mitigate carbon emissions via net zero initiatives. The focus is firmly on greater sustainability and more equitable policies in response to shifting public attitudes. ESG considerations are reshaping investment risks on the one hand, and opening the way for green financing and sustainable technologies and innovations on the other.

This edition of the Journal examines all three pillars – environmental, social, and governance, highlighting efforts by regulators and practitioners to create a unified approach.

Moving forward, compliance with emerging ESG standards will be a critical differentiator for long-term business success. Data will also play a critical role in delivering the transparency and insights required to validate the ESG credentials of businesses, and investment strategies. Advances in areas such as machine learning, artificial intelligence and cloud technologies will be key to establishing a future model of sustainable finance.

This edition draws upon the knowledge and experience of world-class experts from both industry and academia, covering a host of ESG topics and innovations including the value of tracking Return on Sustainability Investment (ROSI) and the importance of moving away from purely external risks to addressing issues that can have positive commercial and societal impacts.

I hope that that the research and analysis within this edition will prove valuable for you as you shape your own ESG strategies, policies, and innovation.

Thank you to all our contributors and thank you for reading.

Lance Levy, **Capco CEO**

ESG: RIGHT THESIS, WRONG DATA

JASON SAUL | Executive Director, Center for Impact Sciences, Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, and co-founder, Impact Genome Project

PHYLLIS KURLANDER COSTANZA | Former Head of Social Impact, UBS, and CEO, UBS Optimus Foundation

ABSTRACT

In this article, we argue that there is a need to move away from the outdated ESG regime that focuses on external risks for a corporation to one that addresses intrinsic issues that can have positive commercial and societal impacts. The current ESG inputs reflect administrative data points or checklists that align with socially responsible standards, policies, and codes of conduct. However, when corporations focus on societal impacts that are **intrinsic** to their business, ESG can be a powerful predictor of financial return. The future of ESG depends on producing a new generation of **ESG 2.0** data that reliably measures the link between societal impacts and corporate **intrinsic** value. To get there, three key innovations are needed: (1) adoption of a standardized taxonomy of societal impacts, (2) establishment of an ESG 2.0 "intrinsicality" map, and (3) extension of measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) to "S".

1. INTRODUCTION

ESG has been called "socialist" by Milton Friedman,[1] a "scam" by Elon Musk,[2] a "mirage" by Bloomberg,[3] and an "unholy mess" by the Economist.[4] Friedman argued that corporations sacrifice their bottom lines when they focus on purely "extrinsic" social responsibilities. That may be true.

But what Friedman and other critics fail to realize is that not all social and environmental impacts are purely extrinsic to business. When corporations focus on societal impacts that are "intrinsic" to their business, ESG can be a powerful predictor of financial return.

The controversy around ESG stems not from a flawed investment thesis but rather from flawed data. What ESG investors want is data that measures the impact of ESG factors on corporate financial performance. Instead, what investors have today is a list of perfunctory ESG statistics regarding management policies, operating principles, and adherence to codes of conduct.

2. ESG 1.0

Today's ESG reporting frameworks (let's call it "ESG 1.0") were conceived in the mid-1990s by activist organizations like RobecoSAM, KLD, AccountAbility, and GRI. These frameworks were designed to disclose evidence of bad corporate behavior (e.g., damaging the environment, inhumane employee treatment, mishandling personal data). ESG 1.0 data covers issues like child labor, human rights violations, anti-bribery and corruption policies, waste disposal, and board diversity.

As a result, most ESG data focuses on compliance with codes of conduct and ethical guidelines. The ESG "inputs" are administrative data points or checklists that align with socially responsible standards, policies, and codes of conduct. Rating agencies typically derive an "ESG score" from these data, aggregating a company's results on different dimensions of ethics compliance and sustainability disclosures.

[1] https://nyti.ms/2l0pRDe
[2] https://bit.ly/3f72BZe
[3] https://bloom.bg/3dBLTkn
[4] https://econ.st/3fbGhOb

ESG 1.0 data was never designed to help investors and analysts improve financial returns or evaluate societal impact. Since it was intended to help watchdogs assess whether companies were doing bad things, trying to advance sustainable investing with ESG 1.0 data is like trying to bake bread with stale yeast. As HBR puts it: "Many ESG measures already very effectively capture inputs, but they presume causality – that adding women to top management teams, say, will produce better outcomes. But measures that capture inputs (such as the numbers of women on those teams) don't capture outcomes (such as decision making that reflects diverse perspectives) and impacts (such as the social value created by such decisions)."[5]

In other words, where ESG 1.0 falls short is its focus on "input" data instead of "impact" data. The controversy arises when investors try to stretch ESG 1.0 input data to evaluate whether ESG strategies have a material impact on the business or society.

3. IMMATERIAL MATERIALITY

For the past 20 years, the ESG data industry was built on a concept called "materiality", which is a fancy way of saying "what really matters". Materiality governs the scope and content of how ESG data is collected and ratings are constructed. Yet it has become somewhat of an existential crisis for ESG, resulting in a conceptual tug-of-war between two different versions of materiality: what matters to auditors and what matters to investors.

Auditors are more risk-oriented and think of materiality in terms of regulatory compliance, legal exposure, employee conditions, executive compensation, anti-bribery and corruption, ethical violations, and the like. On the other hand, investors are typically more impact-oriented and care about risk and **positive** value creation data. The SEC defines investor materiality: as "a substantial likelihood that [key facts] would have been viewed by the reasonable investor as having significantly altered the total mix of information made available."[6] In other words, what is "material" is what investors say matters to them.

Yet over those 20 years, ESG investors have been evolving their views of "what really matters". While some investors view ESG materiality primarily in terms of risk, most are now focused on impact – both financial and societal impact. As a result, the total mix of information that investors demand must evolve too.

Financial returns are still paramount for most investors. But what ESG has taught us is that "non-financial" factors are increasingly driving financial performance. In fact, according to Ocean Tomo research, intangible factors now account for 90 percent of the market value of S&P 500 companies (up from 17 percent in 1975).[7] And a big part of that type of intangible value these days derives from ESG strategies such as: sustainable innovation, employee productivity, social equity, corporate partnerships, license to operate, supply chain productivity, competitive advantage, customer-brand purpose connection, economic stability, financial inclusion, etc.

McKinsey researchers identified five key linkages between ESG and corporate value creation:

- **Top-line growth:** attracting customers with more sustainable products
- **Cost-reductions:** lower energy consumption
- **Regulatory and legal interventions:** great strategic freedom and subsidies
- **Productivity uplift:** attract better talent and boost employee motivation
- **Investment and asset optimization:** better capital allocation for long-term return on investment (ROI).[8]

All of this really has nothing to do with socialism, political agendas, or "woke" thinking. It has to do with data that directly and quantifiably impact a company's bottom line. Much of the controversy around ESG can be boiled down to the problems inherent with the ESG 1.0 data regime: it does not measure impact (either on society or the bottom line) and it is too distal, or long-term oriented. The ESG movement is handicapped by its data. Another way to interpret the criticism from those that argue that ESG is "too political" or "activist" is that ESG 1.0 data is falling short of making a true business case for environmental, social, and governance impacts. And they are not entirely wrong.

[5] https://bit.ly/3C260li

[6] S.C. Industries v. Northway, Inc., 426 U.S. 438, 449 (1976); see Basic, Inc. v. Levinson, 485 U.S. 224 (1988) (as the Supreme Court has noted, determinations of materiality require "delicate assessments of the inferences a 'reasonable shareholder' would draw from a given set of facts and the significance of those inferences to him...." TSC Industries, 426 U.S. at 450).

[7] https://bit.ly/2l5xZog

[8] https://mck.co/3LyB3rO

According to Andrew Ang of Blackrock: "ESG data that do meet [certain] criteria can be incorporated in signals alongside more traditional financial data … The frontier of factor research is to incorporate ESG data into the factor definitions themselves."[9] For example, Ang points out that green patents are patents filed under fields corresponding to U.N. Sustainable Development Goals: "If a company can deliver clean water or renewable energy, these goals are not only for society but also represent attractive commercial opportunities. We can incorporate green intangible value (falling into "E" of ESG) alongside more traditional value measures (like earnings yields or cashflow-to-enterprise value) to construct an ESG-friendly portfolio capturing the value factor."[10]

4. ESG 2.0: FROM MATERIALITY TO "INTRINSICALITY"

There may be a better standard than materiality to govern ESG data.

In 2011, Dartmouth Professor Kusum Ailawadi tested "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" ESG value propositions with a sample of retail grocery store customers. Ailawadi defined extrinsic ESG benefits as "related to broader social good but not related to the customer's direct exchange with the firm (such as environmental friendliness or community support)." In contrast, intrinsic ESG benefits were defined as those that "pertain to the customer's direct exchange with the firm (such as fair treatment of employees and locally-sourced products)."[11]

Not surprisingly, the researchers found that the largest segment of customers (60 percent) financially rewarded retailers for intrinsic ESG benefits, while extrinsic ESG benefits decreased their likelihood of shopping at that store.

That is because consumers perceived extrinsic ESG benefits as taking up company resources that could otherwise improve customer value. In other words, customers respond positively when ESG is directly tied to their commercial experience (i.e., the store employees serving them or the locally sourced products they purchase). Whereas their response is negative when the ESG is not directly relevant to their shopping experience (i.e., general environmental friendliness or charitable support by the retailer).

Many investors feel the same way about ESG. A reasonable investor would expect corporate ESG activities with strong intrinsic value to benefit the company financially. In contrast, companies that score high on extrinsic ESG ratings may not perform as well. And research backs this up.

A study by Mozaffar Khan, George Serafeim, and Aaron Yoon found that companies with strong ratings on strategically "material" (i.e., intrinsic) sustainability issues significantly outperform firms that have poor ratings. Unsurprisingly, they found that "environmental issues tend to be more material for the nonrenewable resources and transportation sectors, governance and product-related issues tend to be more material for the financial sector, and social issues tend to be more material for the healthcare, services, and the technology and communications sectors."[12]

The evidence is clear: companies that do well at disclosing extrinsic ESG risks (meaning score higher on today's ESG 1.0 ratings) do not perform better financially. This does not necessarily prove that ESG is a flawed investment strategy. It proves that ESG 1.0 data is not correlated with financial performance. Indeed, it is a tough argument to make that "not having child labor in your factories" is a good predictor of whether your company will outperform the market. If, instead, companies were able to report data on their intrinsic ESG impacts, this might be more relevant to investors and more fulfilling to the promise of ESG as an investment thesis.

The trouble is that measuring "intrinsic value" is not easy.

5. HOW DO WE GET TO ESG 2.0?

The future of ESG depends on producing a new generation of ESG 2.0 data that reliably measures the link between societal impacts and corporate intrinsic value.

So, what will it take to realize an ESG 2.0 data regime? To get there, the field needs three key innovations:

Step 1: Adopt a standardized taxonomy of societal impacts

ESG 1.0 has lots of data taxonomies – primarily using "inputs" or administrative data. In ESG 2.0, what matters are outcomes – changes in status, condition, or behavior for employees,

[9] https://bit.ly/3DGxz4z
[10] https://bit.ly/3LxN7JM
[11] https://bit.ly/3dz6Hsl
[12] https://bit.ly/3C0o2nV

customers, and the community. Companies need to report their contributions to these outcomes – social determinants of health, racial equity, financial inclusion, education, housing, improved water access, etc. While these may seem hard to define and measure, many concepts we never thought were quantifiable are now widely accepted as measurable.

We can do the same on the social side. Granted, there are far more outcomes to standardize, but as we have done it for issues like healthcare, measuring the quality adjusted life years (QALY), we can do that across all social outcomes, and indeed we have.

A standardized taxonomy of societal impacts will enable all companies to tag and report their ESG activities by outcomes, which investors can use to determine the overall societal impact of a firm and the intrinsic value of those impacts. One example is the Impact Genome Project – a publicly funded initiative to standardize the coding for all of the world's social outcomes.[13]

Step 2: Establish an ESG 2.0 "intrinsicality" map

Today's ESG 1.0 data agencies like the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) and S&P ratings use "materiality maps" to evaluate the relative importance of ESG data to companies (see Figure 1).[14] Unfortunately, these materiality maps are almost exclusively focused on extrinsic value (i.e., according to S&P, the most financially material ESG impacts are "climate transition risk" and "waste transparency").

To get to ESG 2.0, we need "intrinsic value maps" that identify the environmental, social, and governance impacts that significantly contribute to corporate value creation. As McKinsey noted above, intrinsic value is defined as ESG strategies that contribute to value creation in one of five ways: top-line growth, cost reductions, regulatory and legal interventions, productivity uplift, and investment and asset optimization.[15] An intrinsic value map would chart the range of social and environmental impacts against those five value-creating outcomes.

> *"In the ESG 2.0 world, intrinsic value for firms is only created if impacts are verifiably achieved."*

Step 3: Extend measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) to "S"

Currently, the only reliable (i.e., third-party verified) data in the ESG 1.0 world is in the "E" column.

For example, there is broad acceptance of how to measure carbon removal. And there is an infrastructure for the "E" or environmental world where environmental impacts are standardized, reported, and verified by carbon registries (e.g., Verra and the Gold Standard). And even that could use some better standardization and data integrity.

In the ESG 2.0 world, intrinsic value for firms is only created if impacts are verifiably achieved. Simply donating money, operating "feel good" programs, and producing glossy "SDG" reports cannot prove to investors that outcomes were achieved. Without verifying societal impacts, investors cannot bank on any potential intrinsic value that would flow from those activities. ESG 2.0 requires the level of rigor used for "E" to be extended to cover impacts in "S".[16]

ESG investment analysts and rating agencies can then assess the materiality and strategic value of each company's impact data (going far beyond the binary approach of ESG 1.0 materiality). In addition to ESG 1.0 data, investment analysis need data that informs these questions:

- Are the company's ESG impacts extrinsic or intrinsic?
- How significantly do the ESG impacts contribute to corporate performance?
- How credible are the ESG impact claims?
- How does this company's ESG impact compare to its competitors?

---

[13] www.impactgenome.org [note: one of the authors, Jason Saul, is the co-founder of this initiative]
[14] https://bit.ly/3f3ZYY2
[15] https://mck.co/3SkQm9R
[16] See "Fixing The "S" in ESG," published in SSIR – https://bit.ly/3qTN6ql

Figure 1: Example of an ESG materiality map for the ABC sector



Source: S&P Global Ratings, Materiality Map, May 18, 2022

ESG 2.0 may seem futuristic, but we are closer than you think. ESG 2.0 is happening now.

One of the big advances in the field of impact is in the area of impact data standardization and verification. The Impact Genome Project has created a global coding standard for 132 common societal outcomes. The Impact Genome also serves as the world's first impact registry. Companies, nonprofits, and government agencies can report their impacts to the Impact Genome using a standardized taxonomy and have their impact claims independently verified, priced, and benchmarked.

Analysts, assurance firms, investors, and other stakeholders can review these impacts and factor them into decision-making and investment models to explore positive commercial benefits.

This is only just the beginning.

There are many other exciting ESG 2.0 developments afoot, including the G7's Impact Task Force Report on Impact Accounting,[17] the World Wellbeing Movement, Harvard Business School's Impact-Weighted Accounts initiative,[18] and its affiliated International Foundation for Valuing Impacts,[19] to name a few.

The power of ESG as a force for making a measurable positive impact on society while improving a corporation's value is inevitable. But without the right data, the virtue of this movement is being called into question. The right call to action for ESG advocates is not to fight the criticism with indignancy, but to embrace it and evolve with more credible and compelling data.

[17] https://bit.ly/3dt5q6F
[18] https://bit.ly/3DNzLHA
[19] https://bit.ly/3UtbbSgmake

6. CONCLUSION

ESG 1.0 is under fire – which is not entirely unjustified. The time has come to evolve and harness the true power of ESG for both companies and society.

What ESG 1.0 taught us is that non-financial issues, such as societal ones, play a critical role in a company's financial performance. Yet, until we stop focusing solely on extrinsic factors and prioritizing only internal policies and procedures, we will not capture the value ESG has to offer.

Study after study shows us that the extrinsic ESG factors may in fact negatively affect the bottom line, whereas intrinsic efforts that are relevant or material to a company result in better performance. That is where ESG 2.0 comes in.

But to get to where ESG 2.0 can take us, we need to shift from the current box-ticking exercise to developing robust and reliable data that enables companies to report their actual societal outcomes and assess that impact on corporate performance. That means, we need a common taxonomy of societal impact, to replace extrinsic materiality maps for intrinsic value maps, and highlight the "S" in ESG.

This is all eminently possible. And we are closer than we think.

© 2022 The Capital Markets Company (UK) Limited. All rights reserved.

This document was produced for information purposes only and is for the exclusive use of the recipient.

This publication has been prepared for general guidance purposes, and is indicative and subject to change. It does not constitute professional advice. You should not act upon the information contained in this publication without obtaining specific professional advice. No representation or warranty (whether express or implied) is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in this publication and The Capital Markets Company BVBA and its affiliated companies globally (collectively “Capco”) does not, to the extent permissible by law, assume any liability or duty of care for any consequences of the acts or omissions of those relying on information contained in this publication, or for any decision taken based upon it.

ABOUT CAPCO

Capco, a Wipro company, is a global technology and management consultancy specializing in driving digital transformation in the financial services industry. With a growing client portfolio comprising of over 100 global organizations, Capco operates at the intersection of business and technology by combining innovative thinking with unrivalled industry knowledge to deliver end-to-end data-driven solutions and fast-track digital initiatives for banking and payments, capital markets, wealth and asset management, insurance, and the energy sector. Capco's cutting-edge ingenuity is brought to life through its Innovation Labs and award-winning Be Yourself At Work culture and diverse talent.

To learn more, visit www.capco.com or follow us on Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, LinkedIn Instagram, and Xing.

WORLDWIDE OFFICES

APAC
Bangalore
Bangkok
Gurgaon
Hong Kong
Kuala Lumpur
Mumbai
Pune
Singapore

EUROPE
Berlin
Bratislava
Brussels
Dusseldorf
Edinburgh
Frankfurt
Geneva
London
Munich
Paris
Vienna
Warsaw
Zurich

NORTH AMERICA
Charlotte
Chicago
Dallas
Hartford
Houston
New York
Orlando
Toronto
Tysons Corner
Washington, DC

SOUTH AMERICA
São Paulo

WWW.CAPCO.COM

CAPCO
a wipro company

ABOUT KING'S BUSINESS SCHOOL

King's Business School, the ninth and newest faculty at King's College London, opened in 2017. It is accredited by AACSB and EQUIS and was rated one of the top 10 business schools for research in the U.K. based on the Research Excellence Framework 2021. It is rated fifth in the U.K. for Business Studies by the Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide. Based in the heart of London, the School is part of an internationally renowned research-intensive university with a track-record of pioneering thinking and the limitless energies of the city's businesses, policy-makers, entrepreneurs and change-makers to draw on. The School's commitment to drive positive change is at the heart of its research and education.

KING'S BUSINESS SCHOOL