

Another Acronym: ESG

Key Takeaways

- ESG is a widely used acronym for environmental, social, and governance issues in business and finance.
- There is no universally agreed-upon definition of what constitutes ESG. Investors and other stakeholders consider a wide-ranging array of topics as part of ESG.
- In the ESG realm, there is an ongoing debate about what is material in determining which ESG factors a firm should target and disclose to investors.
- Proponents of ESG disclosures in SEC filings argue that investors might positively perceive a company including additional ESG disclosures, which could result in positive financial results for the company.
- Inconsistent disclosure standards make it harder for investors to measure a firm's performance on ESG issues.
- In March 2021, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) created a Climate and ESG Task Force in the Division of Enforcement tasked with proactively identifying ESG-related misconduct.
- In July 2021, SEC Chair Gary Gensler noted investors are demanding more information on climate change and asked SEC staff to develop a rule proposal for mandatory disclosure of climate risks. *Farm Bureau continues to advocate against this proposal. (Refer to the SEC Climate Disclosure policy development backgrounder).*

Questions

1. **Should a consistent definition for sustainability exist?**
2. **Do you make decisions based off ESG scores?**
3. **Do companies you interact with make business decisions to increase ESG scores?**

Background

This policy development backgrounder is adapted from the [Congressional Research Service Report: "Introduction to Financial Services: Environmental, Social, and Governance \(ESG\) Issues."](#)

ESG is a widely used acronym for environmental, social, and governance issues in business and finance. Corporate governance—concerns about how companies should be managed—has evolved over time to include, arguably, a wider array of issues encompassing ESG. Some consider ESG factors to be an integral part of discussions about sustainability. According to one definition, sustainability at the financial services level is “an approach that creates long-term shareholder value through managing opportunities and risks that derive from economic, environmental and social developments.”

There is no universally agreed-upon definition of what constitutes ESG. Investors and other stakeholders consider a wide-ranging array of topics as part of ESG. The discussion below on the characteristics and risks regarding ESG is not definitive and is meant to illustrate some of the perceived risks of either addressing or ignoring various ESG factors.

Characteristics and Risks

Environmental

Investors and stakeholders may examine a firm's impact on the environment. Some consider the interaction with the environment to be a form of capital— the stock of natural resources. Environmental risks include declining biodiversity; pollution; resource scarcity; and potential climate change impacts, including increasingly frequent and severe floods, hurricanes, and forest fires. For individual firms, ignoring environmental risks could potentially harm their reputations, endanger employees, and imperil physical operations, which could lead to costly litigation. For other firms and communities, addressing environmental risks might cause economic harm, with diminished access to natural resources and the need to either physically relocate or seek alternative production inputs at a higher cost and diminished profits.

Social

Social factors encompass a firm's effects on its various stakeholders, such as consumers, employees, suppliers, contractors, and the local and broader communities. Risks include potential infringement on the rights of others, gender- or ethnicity-based discrimination when hiring or promoting employees, failure to monitor supplier and contractor pay, handling of customer data in a nontransparent and nonsecure way, political spending, and investing in projects or sectors which could be considered objectionable to specific segments of society. Companies handling these risks poorly might experience effects similar to environmental risks, such as the inability to attract quality employees and exposure to costly litigation.

In addition, when making investment decisions, some stakeholders might consider certain business operations or funding of certain entities in various areas to be unacceptable, including tobacco, gun manufacturing, private prison industries, abortion providers, and gambling. On the other hand, other stakeholders might consider any limitations placed on their right to operate or fund such lawful entities an infringement of their rights.

Governance

A firm's self-governance and integrity when conducting business may raise questions. The policies, processes, and controls implemented by a firm help to define its self-governance and impact on various stakeholders. A firm's integrity is measured by whether it avoids corruption and bribery and engages with individuals and other firms which may pose a reputational risk to the firm.

If a corporation chooses not to address governance issues, the associated risks could include harm to its consumers and an environment leading to criminal activity and corporate reputational harm, potentially resulting in firm failure. Firm failure negatively affects stakeholders— employees may lose their jobs, suppliers might not be paid, and local governments may receive less tax revenue. Some examples are Enron (2001 bankruptcy), WorldCom (2002 bankruptcy), and MF Global (2011 bankruptcy). Recently, the fake account scandal at Wells Fargo Bank harmed its clients, resulted in the removal of many key executives, and prompted regulators to restrict the bank's growth.

Materiality and ESG

The disclosure of material information is an important accounting principle. The notion of materiality is at the center of SEC-regulated disclosure requirements. Materiality is deemed to be information that a reasonable investor would deem important in determining whether to purchase a security. In the ESG realm, there is an ongoing debate about what is material in determining which ESG factors a firm should target and disclose to investors. Discussion around what constitutes materiality is similar to discussion about what constitutes ESG—companies have discretion over what to include in both. Some proponents of ESG disclosure have stated focusing on financial materiality would be most helpful to investors.

Financial materiality and ESG outcomes vary by firm. Focusing on specific ESG factors at one firm or industry may lead to different outcomes than focusing on the same factors at another firm or industry. For example, improving fleet fuel efficiency at a company transporting goods could improve its financial results while benefitting air quality. Applying the same set of ESG factors to a data warehouse might not make sense; in that instance, lowering the cost of electricity (which could depend on the relative cost of fossil fuels versus renewable energy) would probably be more relevant.

Investors and other stakeholders might want to consider if a company is following the existing minimum federal and local statutory requirements. In addition, stakeholders might want to consider if a company's ESG issues can be addressed through the existing regulatory regime—for example, all employers are subject to hiring and employment practices based on Equal Employment Opportunity Commission requirements and workplace safety based on Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements.

Policy Issues

Proponents of ESG disclosures in SEC filings argue investors might positively perceive a company including additional ESG disclosures, which could result in positive financial results for the company. ESG disclosures could help address long-term risks. Increased disclosure could also benefit firms if it results in lower cost of capital, with comparable disclosures across peer groups. Critics argue existing regulations already address many ESG issues, and the status quo—required disclosure when information is material; otherwise, voluntary disclosure at the firm's discretion—is appropriate.

Critics further argue mandatory reporting of ESG factors based on an inflexible standard could be time-intensive and costly for companies and may be of minimal use if it is not material or comparable with reporting by peer companies. Such critics believe companies should focus on shareholder value, and some ESG proposals would distract from the goal.

Consistency of disclosures is another area of concern. Public companies discuss ESG-related issues in the Management Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) section of their annual financial reports. Any ESG issues discussed in the MD&A section are generally not subject to an independent audit. Some studies have found that many companies report on ESG issues, but the information published by the companies is not standardized, and investors can suffer from "information overload."

Inconsistent disclosure standards make it harder for investors to measure a firm's performance on ESG issues. Standardizing the disclosure requirements by industry could help investors and firms compare peer groups. In this context, some have criticized the 2010 SEC climate guidance for resulting in inadequate and inconsistent climate-related disclosures.

SEC and ESG

Since the beginning of 2021, the SEC has expanded its focus on climate- and ESG-related risks and disclosures. Agency actions in this context include:

- In March 2021, the agency created a Climate and ESG Task Force in the Division of Enforcement tasked with proactively identifying ESG-related misconduct.
- In July 2021, SEC Chair Gary Gensler noted investors are demanding more information on climate change and asked SEC staff to develop a rule proposal for mandatory disclosure of climate risks. *Farm Bureau continues to advocate against this proposal. (Refer to the SEC Climate Disclosure policy development backgrounder).*
- In August 2021, Gensler asked his staff to recommend new human-resource-based corporate disclosures ranging from “workforce turnover, skills and development training, compensation, benefits, workforce demographics including diversity, and health and safety.”
- In September 2021, Gensler asked his staff to review current practices and consider recommendations about whether fund managers should disclose criteria underlying when their funds call themselves “green” and “sustainable” and the like.
- In October 2021, Gensler announced the SEC would be requiring public companies to provide investors with “consistent, comparable, and decision-useful ESG-related disclosures.” In this context, the SEC’s 2021 RegFlex agenda describes potential future SEC rulemakings.

Congress and ESG

Congressional interest in ESG matters is reflected in various bills introduced in the 117th Congress. For example, the House passed H.R. 1187, which would, among other things, require publicly traded companies to periodically disclose information concerning ESG performance metrics. H.R. 2570 and S. 1217 would require the disclosure of a firm’s risk management strategies related to the physical risks and transition risks posed by climate change, among other things.

Policy

Government Regulations

Excessive government regulations strangle the productive capacity of our nation and waste our resources. Government agencies often make rules and regulations by administrative decree. Unfortunately, regulations by different agencies of government frequently conflict. All rules published in the Federal Register should undergo Congressional review and approval before final implementation. Too often elected representatives relinquish their decision-making responsibilities to regulators or designated boards