

# Consultation on the renewed sustainable finance strategy

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

This consultation is also available in [German](#) and [French](#).

On 11 December 2019, the European Commission adopted its [Communication on a European Green Deal](#), which significantly increases the EU's climate action and environmental policy ambitions.

**A number of levers will need to be pulled in order to build this growth strategy, starting with enshrining the climate-neutrality target in law.** On 4 March 2020, the European Commission proposed a [European Climate Law](#) to turn the political commitment of climate-neutrality by 2050 into a legal obligation. This follows the [European Parliament's declaration of a climate emergency](#) on 28 November 2019 and the [European Council conclusions of 12 December 2019](#), endorsing the objective of achieving a climate-neutral EU by 2050.

**The ongoing COVID-19 outbreak in particular shows the critical need to strengthen the sustainability and resilience of our societies and the ways in which our economies function.** This is necessary to, above all, minimise the risk of similar health emergencies in the future, which are more likely to occur as climate and environmental impacts escalate. In parallel, it will be paramount to ensure the resilience and capacity of our societies and economies to resist and recover from such emergencies. The COVID-19 outbreak underscores some of the subtle links and risks associated with human activity and biodiversity loss. Many of the recent outbreaks (e.g. SARs, MERS, and avian flu) can be linked to the illegal trade in, and consumption of, often endangered wild animal species. Furthermore, experts suggest that degraded habitats coupled with a warming climate may encourage higher risks of disease transmission, as pathogens spread more easily to livestock and humans. Therefore, it is important – now more than ever – to address the multiple and often interacting threats to ecosystems and wildlife to buffer against the risk of future pandemics, as well as preserve and enhance their role as carbon sinks and in climate adaptation.

## Financing the European Green Deal and increasing the financial resilience of the economy, companies and citizens

**Above all, the transition to a sustainable economy will entail significant investment efforts across all sectors, meaning that financing frameworks, both public and private, must support this overall policy direction:** reaching the current 2030 climate and energy targets alone would already require additional investments of approximately €260 billion a year by 2030. And as the EU raises its ambition to cut emissions, the need for investment

will be even larger than the current estimate. In addition, significant investments in the upskilling and reskilling of the labour force will be necessary to enable a just transition for all. Hence, the scale of the investment needs goes well beyond the capacity of the public sector. Furthermore, if the climate and biodiversity crises are to be successfully addressed and reversed before potentially dangerous tipping points are reached, much of the investment needs to happen in the next 5-10 years. In this context, a more sustainable financial system should also contribute to mitigate existing and future risks to wildlife habitats and biodiversity in general, as well as support the prevention of pandemics - such as the COVID-19 outbreak.

**In this context, the European Green Deal Investment Plan – the Sustainable Europe Investment Plan – announced on 14 January 2020 aims to mobilise public investment and help to unlock private funds** through the **EU budget** and associated instruments, notably through the InvestEU programme. Combined, the objective is to mobilise at least €1 trillion of sustainability-related investments over the next decade. In addition, for the next financial cycle (2021-2027) the **External Investment Plan (EIP) and the European Fund for Sustainable Development Plus (EFSD+)** will be available for all partner countries with a new External Action Guarantee of up to €60 billion. It is expected to leverage half a trillion Euros worth of sustainable investments. Lastly, the **European Investment Bank (EIB)** published on 14 November 2019 its new climate strategy and Energy Lending Policy, which notably sets out that the EIB Group will align all their financing activities with the goals of the Paris Agreement from the end of 2020. This includes, among other measures, a stop to the financing of fossil fuel energy projects from the end of 2021.

**However, the financial system as a whole is not yet transitioning fast enough.** Substantial progress still needs to be made to ensure that the financial sector genuinely supports businesses on their transition path towards sustainability, as well as further supporting businesses that are already sustainable. It will also mean putting in place the buffers that are necessary to support de-carbonisation pathways across all European Member States, industries that will need greater support, as well as SMEs.

**For all of these reasons, the European Green Deal announced a Renewed Sustainable Finance Strategy.** The renewed strategy will build on the 10 actions put forward in the [European Commission's initial 2018 Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth](#), which laid down the foundations for channelling private capital towards sustainable investments.

**As the EU moves towards climate-neutrality and steps up the fight against environmental degradation, the financial and industrial sectors will have to undergo a large-scale transformation, requiring massive investment**. Progress has already been made, but efforts need to be stepped up. Building on the achievements of the Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth, the current context requires a more comprehensive and ambitious strategy. **The Renewed Sustainable Finance Strategy will predominantly focus on three areas::**

1. **Strengthening the foundations for sustainable investment by creating an enabling framework, with appropriate tools and structures.** Many financial and non-financial companies still focus excessively on short-term financial performance instead of their long-term development and sustainability-related challenges and opportunities.
2. **Increased opportunities to have a positive impact on sustainability for citizens, financial institutions and corporates.** This second pillar aims at maximising the impact of the frameworks and tools in our arsenal in order to “finance green”.
3. **Climate and environmental risks will need to be fully managed and integrated into financial institutions and the financial system as a whole,** while ensuring social risks are duly taken into account where relevant. Reducing the exposure to climate and environmental risks will further contribute to “greening finance”.

## Objectives of this consultation and links with other consultation activities

**The aim of this consultation, available for 14 weeks (until 15 July), is to collect the views and opinions of interested parties in order to inform the development of the renewed strategy.** All citizens, public authorities,

including Member States, and private organisations are invited to contribute. Given the diversity of topics under consultation, stakeholders may choose to provide replies to some questions only. Section I (covering questions 1-5) is addressed to all stakeholders, including citizens, while Section II (covering questions 6-102) requires a certain degree of financial and sustainability-related knowledge and is primarily addressed at experts.

**This consultation builds on a number of previous initiatives and reports**, as well as complementing other consultation activities of the Commission, in particular:

- The [final report of the High-Level Expert Group on Sustainable Finance](#) (2018);
- The [EU Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth](#) (2018);
- The [communication of the Commission on 'The European Green Deal'](#) (2019);
- The [communication of the Commission on 'The European Green Deal Investment Plan'](#) (2020);
- The [reports published by the Technical Expert Group on sustainable finance \(TEG\)](#) with regard to an EU taxonomy of sustainable activities, an EU Green Bond Standard, methodologies for EU climate benchmarks and disclosures for benchmarks and guidance to improve corporate disclosure of climate-related information.

**This consultation also makes references to past, ongoing and future consultations**, such as the [public consultation and inception impact assessment on the possible revision of the non-financial reporting directive \(NFRD\)](#), the inception impact assessment on the review of the Solvency II Directive or the future consultation on investment protection.

---

**Please note:** In order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact [fisma-sf-consultation@ec.europa.eu](mailto:fisma-sf-consultation@ec.europa.eu).

More information:

- [on this consultation](#)
- [on the consultation document](#)
- [on sustainable finance](#)
- [on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

## About you

---

\* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech

- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Academic/research institution            | <input type="radio"/> EU citizen                          | <input type="radio"/> Public authority |
| <input type="radio"/> Business association                     | <input type="radio"/> Environmental organisation          | <input type="radio"/> Trade union      |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Company/business organisation | <input type="radio"/> Non-EU citizen                      | <input type="radio"/> Other            |
| <input type="radio"/> Consumer organisation                    | <input type="radio"/> Non-governmental organisation (NGO) |  |

\* First name

Kamila

\*

## Surname

PIOTROWSKA

## \* Email (this won't be published)

kp@iogp.org

## \* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

IOGP - International Association of Oil & Gas Producers

## \* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

## Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

3954187491-70

## \* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |                                      |  |                                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan    | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya         | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands  | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania        | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria        | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau         | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |

- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- São Tomé and Príncipe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland

- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
  
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
  
- Cambodia
  
- Cameroon
  
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
  
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
  
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
  
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
  
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
  
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
  
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
  
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
  
- Tokelau
- Tonga
  
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
  
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
  
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States

- |  |                                  |   |  |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands          | <input type="radio"/> Japan      | <input type="radio"/> Philippines                                 | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia                         | <input type="radio"/> Jersey     | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands                            | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros                          | <input type="radio"/> Jordan     | <input type="radio"/> Poland                                      | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo                            | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal                                    | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands                     | <input type="radio"/> Kenya      | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico                                 | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica                       | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati   | <input type="radio"/> Qatar                                       | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire                    | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo     | <input type="radio"/> Réunion                                     | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia                          | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait     | <input type="radio"/> Romania                                     | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba                             | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia                                      | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao                          | <input type="radio"/> Laos       | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda                                      | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus                           | <input type="radio"/> Latvia     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy                            | <input type="radio"/> Yemen                                |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia                          | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis                       | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe                             |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark                          | <input type="radio"/> Liberia    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia                                 |  |

\* Field of activity or sector (if applicable):

*at least 1 choice(s)*

- Accounting
- Auditing
- Banking
- Credit rating agencies
- Insurance
- Pension provision
- Investment management (e.g. hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds, securities)



- Market infrastructure operation (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
- Social entrepreneurship
- Other
- Not applicable

\* Please specify your activity field(s) or sector(s):

Energy

\* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

**Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

**Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

## Section I. Questions addressed to all stakeholders on how the financial sector and the economy can become more sustainable

---

**Question 1. With the increased ambition of the European Green Deal and the urgency with which we need to act to tackle the climate-related and environmental challenges, do you think that:**

- major additional policy actions are needed to accelerate the systematic sustainability transition of the EU financial sector.
- incremental additional actions may be needed in targeted areas, but existing actions implemented under the Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth are largely sufficient.
- no further policy action is needed for the time being.

- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 2. Do you know with sufficient confidence if some of your pension, life insurance premium or any other personal savings are invested in sustainable financial assets?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 3. When looking for investment opportunities, would you like to be systematically offered sustainable investment products as a default option by your financial adviser, provided the product suits your other needs?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 4. Would you consider it useful if corporates and financial institutions were required to communicate if and explain how their business strategies and targets contribute to reaching the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

- Yes, corporates
- Yes, financial institutions
- Yes, both
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 5. One of the objectives of the European Commission’s 2018 Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth is to encourage investors to finance sustainable activities and projects.**

**Do you believe the EU should also take further action to:**

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)	Don't know / No opinion
Encourage investors to engage, including making use of their voting rights, with companies conducting environmentally harmful activities that are not in line with environmental objectives and the EU-wide trajectory for greenhouse gas emission reductions, as part of the European Climate Law, with a view to encouraging these companies to adopt more sustainable business models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discourage investors from financing environmentally harmful activities that are not in line with environmental objectives and the EU-wide trajectory for greenhouse gas emission reductions, as part of the European Climate Law	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Section II. Questions targeted at experts

---

The following section asks further technical and strategic questions on the future of sustainable finance, for which a certain degree of financial or sustainability-related expertise may be useful. This section is therefore primarily addressed at experts.

### **Question 6. What do you see as the three main challenges and three main opportunities for mainstreaming sustainability in the financial sector over the coming 10 years?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

#### Opportunities:

- Collective leadership and globally coordinated action are essential in sustainable finance. The EU has the opportunity to create an advanced and high-quality policy framework, shaping regulatory frameworks in other jurisdictions.
- Harmonization of definitions and methodologies: there are currently various definitions and methodologies in EU countries that can generate confusion for investors. Harmonizing them would increase their uptake and create a coherent level playing field within the financial sector. The TCFD recommendations could help facilitate this process.
- More opportunities for transitional activities: sustainable finance has to increase investments in "transitional activities" to reach the objective of climate neutrality.

#### Challenges:

- A lack of coherence between sustainable finance legislation and other EU energy and climate legislation could hamper the development of sustainability in the financial sector. Since not all countries will likely follow the EU's path, companies based in Europe with global operations may need to operate in a very complex environment.
- An excessively narrow approach to sustainability definitions, in particular the EU Taxonomy, excluding several sectors and economic activities could limit the mainstreaming of sustainability in the financial sector. Therefore, the EU Taxonomy should adopt an inclusive approach.
- Sustainability is difficult to measure due to the range of existing definitions, the variation in methods for determining its criteria, lack of comparability. The absence of transparency in methodologies to determine sustainability is also a major challenge that needs to be addressed. Moreover, sustainability definitions and methodologies are not fixed and evolve. There is a risk to develop EU legal definitions that will quickly become outdated without being able to adapt sufficiently to future needs. Rigid definitions may not reflect changing investor needs over time.

### **Question 7. Overall, can you identify specific obstacles in current EU policies and regulations that hinder the development of sustainable finance and the integration and management of climate, environmental and social risks into financial decision-making?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

There are at present obstacles that will hinder the development and mainstreaming of sustainable finance. First of all, there is a lack of coherence between sustainable finance related pieces of legislation, notably the EU Taxonomy, and other EU energy and climate policy measures. For example, the upcoming technical screening criteria for the EU Taxonomy should be in line with the Electricity Regulation and with the Renewable Energy Directive (REDII). Such inconsistencies create uncertainties over Taxonomy-eligible investments and can contribute to the stagnation, or stopping of, future investments. Ensuring alignment between different pieces of EU legislation is crucial to preserving much-needed policy coherence to provide investors with regulatory stability and predictability. Moreover, there is a lack of alignment among the different EU sustainable finance instruments in their approach to inclusiveness and technological neutrality. A technology-neutral approach to policy support and Life-Cycle Assessment (LCA) are essential to driving cost-efficient emissions reductions.

Sustainable Finance should create a predictable and flexible framework for investment incentives. The EU Taxonomy, as currently designed by the TEG, does not allow for a flexible approach and overlooks the role and the potential of the transitional activities. Financing transitional activities that are intended to enable significant improvements towards decarbonisation, reduction in environmental footprint, or improved resource efficiency in key sectors of the economy will be crucial in achieving the EU's objective of climate neutrality. Focusing on the most sustainable sectors could have a limited impact on this ambitious EU objective and may not provide incentives for high-emitting industries and companies to lower their emissions.

**Question 8. The transition towards a climate neutral economy might have socio-economic impacts, arising either from economic restructuring related to industrial decarbonisation, because of increased climate change-related effects, or a combination thereof. For instance, persons in vulnerable situations or at risk of social exclusion and in need of access to essential services including water, sanitation, energy or transport, may be particularly affected, as well as workers in sectors that are particularly affected by the decarbonisation agenda.**

**How could the EU ensure that the financial tools developed to increase sustainable investment flows and manage climate and environmental risks have, to the extent possible, no or limited negative socio-economic impacts?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As Member States have different starting points in the energy transition requiring a different level of investment needs, IOGP believes that a just and fair transition should balance environmental, social and economic goals. Therefore, while developing sustainable finance tools, in particular the EU Taxonomy, the specific characteristics of various sectors and needs of Member States should be taken into account. The same applies to the different impact that sustainable finance tools will have on various economic sectors. The EU Taxonomy should be flexible enough to promote the different investments required by each Member State - this is particularly true for the much-needed switch from coal to gas in Europe. Moreover, the high EU

ambitions on climate policy create the carbon leakage risk of European industries which could lead to negative socio-economic implications. Therefore, the EU should develop financial tools focused on early-stage, pre-commercial technologies enabling the industrial transition, such as Carbon Capture Use and Storage (CCUS), hydrogen solutions and low-carbon gases (e.g. bio-methane, blends of gases). Also, it is essential to note that the production of sustainable goods and services will be the largest if investments can be made at the lowest marginal cost for every “unit of sustainability”. Taking this approach could create a holistic benefit in ensuring production cost kept to the lowest level, also in an international (competitive) context.

**Question 9. As a corporate or a financial institution, how important is it for you that policy-makers create a predictable and well-communicated policy framework that provides a clear EU-wide trajectory on greenhouse gas emission reductions, based on the climate objectives set out in the European Green Deal, including policy signals on the appropriate pace of phasing out certain assets that are likely to be stranded in the future?**

- 1 - Not important at all
- 2 - Rather not important
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather important
- 5 - Very important
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 9.1 What are, in your view, the mechanisms necessary to be put in place by policy-makers to best give the right signals to you as a corporate or a financial institution?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Regulatory stability & predictability is an essential precondition for mobilising investment and minimising the risk profile of low-carbon projects. However, we believe that the policy framework should be technologically neutral. Explicit endorsement should be given to any technology with the potential to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. No technology or activity that has the potential to contribute a combination of avoided abatement costs should be ruled out upfront. We, therefore, challenge the concept of “stranded assets”, which we view as not wholly consistent with the desire to be technology-neutral and not factual but rather speculative. Ultimately the goal is to lower carbon emissions by any technology possible. We recommend the Commission to use market-based policy signals such as EU ETS to help operators decide to comply or buy allowances for high fossil fuel CO<sub>2</sub> emission assets that may be stranded in the future. This makes for an inclusive and technology-neutral approach under the EU ETS cap.

Some may regard gas infrastructure as possible future stranded assets. However, the existing gas transmission and distribution networks support the integration of renewable energy both in an electric form (e.g. via power-to-gas technologies) & gaseous form (biomethane, hydrogen, synthetic methane) into the energy system. Such networks also support significant GHG emissions reductions from fuel switching or

merit order optimisation in industry, power generation, heating, and transport. The transition from natural gas to renewable and decarbonised gas relies on the possibility to connect production units to the grid and final customers. Gas pipelines and transmission systems can also be modified to transport hydrogen and potentially CO<sub>2</sub>. Moreover, as recognised by the IPCC (<https://www.ipcc.ch/>), there are different pathways to the energy transitions. What can be considered as a stranded asset in a specific pathway, might be deemed functional, enabling for the transition in another.

**Question 10. Should institutional investors and credit institutions be required to estimate and disclose which temperature scenario their portfolios are financing (e.g. 2°C, 3°C, 4°C), in comparison with the goals of the Paris Agreement, and on the basis of a common EU-wide methodology?**

- Yes, institutional investors
- Yes, credit institutions
- Yes, both
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 11 Corporates, investors, and financial institutions are becoming increasingly aware of the correlation between biodiversity loss and climate change and the negative impacts of biodiversity loss in particular on corporates who are dependent on ecosystem services, such as in sectors like agriculture, extractives, fisheries, forestry and construction. The importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services is already acknowledged in the EU Taxonomy.**

However, in light of the growing negative impact of biodiversity loss on companies' profitability and long-term prospects (see for instance [The Nature of Risk - A Framework for Understanding Nature-Related Risk to Business](#), WWF, 2019), as well as its strong connection with climate change, do you think the EU's sustainable finance agenda should better reflect growing importance of biodiversity loss?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 12. In your opinion, how can the Commission best ensure that the sustainable finance agenda is appropriately governed over the long term at**

## **the EU level in order to cover the private and public funding side, measure financial flows towards sustainable investments and gauge the EU's progress towards its commitments under the European Green Deal and Green Deal Investment Plan?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The Commission should adopt a transparent approach and include all sectors of the economy, in particular, industry/the 'real economy', in the legislative decision-making process. An excellent opportunity to apply these principles will be the upcoming Platform on Sustainable Finance, which will replace the Technical Expert Group on sustainable finance (TEG) and assist the Commission in the further development of the EU Taxonomy Regulation's secondary legislation. IOGP, among other stakeholders, has already expressed concerns on the TEG composition. We believe that the development of all delegated acts (stemming from the EU Taxonomy Regulation) should be transparent and inclusive, and we welcome any opportunity to be part of the discussion. We also believe that the future Platform on Sustainable Finance should have broad and comprehensive representation including, e.g. the industry/the 'real economy' representatives (from manufacturing, energy, transport). This inclusive approach would ensure that all relevant expertise is available for the further development of the Taxonomy and concerning practical implications of these developments. IOGP would be happy to act as a member of the Platform and provide expertise to the development of future delegated acts. The Platform should be in a position to develop its own views on the Taxonomy. While building on the tremendous amount of work done already, it should also, independently from the TEG, come to a view of how a taxonomy can be an effective and cost-efficient instrument to meet overall objectives. This is important also because the Platform will need to continue the TEG work when devising the EU Taxonomy, in particular missing NACE codes and the activities that have not been covered yet like CCU.

## **Question 13. In your opinion, which, if any, further actions would you like to see at international, EU, or Member State level to enable the financing of the sustainability transition? Please identify actions aside from the areas for future work identified in the targeted questions below (remainder of Section II), as well as the existing actions implemented as part of the European Commission's 2018 Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth.**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Sustainable finance is being internationally mainstreamed at different speeds and in different ways that reflect local circumstances. For this reason, it is essential to consider a global perspective in the development of criteria for sustainable activities and investments. A global switch from coal to natural gas could lead to significant near term GHG emissions reductions internationally. According to the IEA, up to 1 200 Mt of CO<sub>2</sub> could be abated globally in the short term by switching from coal to existing gas-fired plants (<https://www.iea.org/reports/the-role-of-gas-in-todays-energy-transitions>).

With many companies having a set of global activities, a consideration of, and alignment with existing and established international initiatives (i.e. International Platform on Sustainable Finance) will ensure



harmonized and effective implementation of sustainability objectives. An international level-playing field will be necessary to limit carbon leakages to jurisdictions with laxer sustainable finance rules. Moreover, the EU should be a leader in global actions aiming at ensuring a flexible correlation of financial sector activities with the climate policy needs. Overall, the EU should seek to leverage its sustainable ambitions to create advantages for all sectors of the EU economy on the global field. Within the EU, there is a need to consider the specific and various circumstances of Member States.

## 1. Strengthening the foundations for sustainable finance

---

In order to enable the scale-up of sustainable investments, it is crucial to have sufficient and reliable information from financial and non-financial companies on their climate, environmental and social risks and impacts. To this end, companies also need to consider long-term horizons. Similarly, investors and companies need access to reliable climate-related and environmental data and information on social risks, in order to make sound business and investment decisions. Labelling tools, among other measures, can provide clarity and confidence to investors and issuers, which contributes to increasing sustainable investments. In this context, the full deployment of innovative digital solutions requires data to be available in open access and in standardised formats.

### 1.1 Company reporting and transparency

In its [Communication on the European Green Deal](#), the Commission recognised the need to improve the disclosure of non-financial information by corporates and financial institutions. To that end, the Commission committed to reviewing the **non-financial reporting directive (NFRD)** in 2020, as part of its strategy to strengthen the foundations for sustainable investment. A [public consultation](#) is ongoing for that purpose.

The political agreement on the Regulation on establishing a framework to facilitate sustainable investment ('Taxonomy Regulation') places **complementary reporting requirements on the companies that fall under the scope of the NFRD**.

In addition to the production of relevant and comparable data, it may be useful to ensure open and centralised access not only to company reporting under the NFRD, but also to relevant company information on other available ESG metrics and data points (please also see the dedicated section on sustainability research and ratings 1.3). To this end, a **common database** would ease transparency and comparability, while avoiding duplication of data collection efforts. The Commission is developing a common European data space in order to create a single market for data by connecting existing databases through digital means. Since 2017, Commission Directorate General for Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union (DG FISMA) has been assessing the prospects of using Distributed Ledger Technologies (including blockchain) to federate and provide a single point of access to information relevant to investors in European listed companies ([European Financial Transparency Gateway - EFTG](#)).

**Question 14. In your opinion, should the EU take action to support the development of a common, publicly accessible, free-of-cost environmental data space for companies' ESG information, including data reported under the NFRD and other relevant ESG data?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 14.1 If yes, please explain how it should be structured and what type of ESG information should feature therein:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

A flexible ESG data space could be beneficial. Currently, the lack of an ESG data space has resulted in numerous private entities collecting and selling ESG data to users. This approach creates concerns as the data could be misclassified or misused outside the context in which it was provided. This practice also contributes to the inconsistencies of data across entities, risking misleading comparisons. As there is currently a proliferation of reporting standards in ESG reporting, IOGP recognises the potential added value of setting up a specific and dedicated mechanism to ensure alignment as long as it is well designed and a high level of flexibility is secured. In fact, any ESG data space would need to allow for a flexible approach to accommodate the diverse ESG data disclosed by different companies, and the posting of data should not be mandatory. Disclosures should focus on material and relevant information to enable responsible investment analysis and sustainable investment decisions. Material issues vary greatly based upon a company's size, legal, financial reporting obligations, operating locations and customer base, among other factors.

As a consequence, ESG information is usually disclosed in a variety of formats: quantitative and qualitative information, charts, diagrams and infographics, interactive infographics on web-based-only disclosure, tables and organigrams. For a common EU ESG data space to be created, it would be essential to guarantee its flexibility to enable companies of all sectors to represent their material information adequately without biases for any industry. At the same time, it is crucial that the data providers do not experience a significant additional administrative burden (and associated costs), nor targeted biases for specific industries. In this regard, there should first be given consideration to existing reporting frameworks.

**Question 15. According to your own understanding and assessment, does your company currently carry out economic activities that could substantially contribute to the environmental objectives defined in the Taxonomy Regulation<sup>1</sup>?**

<sup>1</sup> The six environmental objectives are climate change mitigation and adaptation, sustainable use and protection of water and marine resources, transition to a circular economy, pollution prevention and control, protection and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 15.1 If yes, once the EU Taxonomy is established (end-2020 for climate change mitigation and adaptation – Assuming that for climate change mitigation and adaptation, it would be based on the recommendations of the TEG for the EU Taxonomy), how likely is it that you would use the taxonomy**

## for your business decisions (such as adapting the scope and focus of your activities in order to be aligned with the EU Taxonomy)?

- 1 - Not likely at all
- 2 - Not likely
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Likely
- 5 - Very likely
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 15.2 If necessary, please explain your response to question 15.1:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As IOGP is a trade association, it does not carry out any economic activity. Yet, our members are involved in economic activities that could contribute to the environmental objectives of the EU Taxonomy.

It is important to note that the technical screening criteria of the EU Taxonomy have not yet been defined and implemented. For this reason, it is premature to predict the likelihood of usability. As the development of technical screening criteria for the first two delegated acts (climate change mitigation and adaptation) is a highly complex and technical exercise, experts from the relevant industries reflected in the Technical Expert Group on sustainable finance (TEG) publication are consulted. This will minimise inconsistencies, ensure that workable proposals are translated into practice and increase the probability of usability. In fact, the initial review of the final TEG report shows that the Taxonomy Regulation is highly complex and can result in significant efforts for a (global) company with different businesses and/or overlapping activities to assess its economic activities (globally) against the taxonomy criteria to classify them as EU-Taxonomy eligible. It is critical that sufficient time is given to companies to implement the requirements of the Taxonomy Regulation once the relevant delegated acts are finalised.

## 1.2 Accounting standards and rules

Financial accounting standards and rules can have a direct impact on the way in which investment decisions are made since they form the basis of assessments that are carried out to evaluate the financial position and performance of real economy and financial sector companies. In this context, there is an ongoing debate around whether existing financial accounting standards might prove challenging for sustainable and long-term investments. In particular, some experts question whether existing impairment and depreciation rules fully price in the potential future loss in value of companies that today extract, distribute, or rely heavily on fossil fuels, due to a potential future stranding of their assets.

Recognising the importance of ensuring that accounting standards do not discourage sustainable and long-term investments, as part of the [2018 Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth](#), the Commission already requested the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG) to explore potential alternative accounting treatments to fair value measurement for long-term investment portfolios of equity and equity-type instruments. [EFRAG issued its advice to the Commission](#) on 30 January 2020. Following this advice, [the Commission has requested the IASB](#) to consider the re-introduction of re-cycling through the profit or loss statement of profits or losses realised upon the disposal of equity instruments measured at fair value through other comprehensive income (FVOCI).

**Question 16. Do you see any further areas in existing financial accounting rules (based on the IFRS framework) which may hamper the adequate and timely recognition and consistent measurement of climate and environmental risks?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **1.3 Sustainability research and ratings**

A variety of sustainability-related assessment tools (ratings, research, scenario analysis, screening lists, carbon data, ESG benchmarks, etc.) are offered by specialised agencies that analyse individual risks and by traditional providers, such as rating agencies and data providers. In the autumn of 2019, the Commission launched a study on the market structure, providers and their role as intermediaries between companies and investors. The study will also explore possible measures to manage conflicts of interest and enhance transparency in the market for sustainability assessment tools. The results are due in the autumn of 2020. To complement this work, the Commission would like to gather further evidence through this consultation.

**Question 17. Do you have concerns on the level of concentration in the market for ESG ratings and data?**

- 1 - Not concerned at all
- 2 - Rather not concerned
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather concerned
- 5 - Very concerned
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 17.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 17:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Over the last years, there has been a wave of mergers and acquisition in the ESG rating market, with both positive and negative effects. On the one hand, consolidation means stronger entities with more likely survival in the long-term, leading to the creation of respectable players investors can trust. This could positively contribute to the production of more standardized data. On the other hand, the concentration of supply in ESG rating markets could be harmful to the quality of the research, because the lack of competition reduces the incentives of existing agencies to conduct high-quality audits and may increase the potential for collusive behaviour. Whether an ESG rating is reliable in a concentrated or non-concentrated market is more likely to be related to the level of the corporate governance of the agencies, the ethics, independence and

professionalism.

When ESG rating agencies are merged or acquired by financial companies or companies offering consulting services, possible conflicts of interest may arise.

**Question 18. How would you rate the comparability, quality and reliability of ESG *data* from sustainability providers currently available in the market?**

- 1 - Very poor
- 2 - Poor
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Good
- 5 - Very good
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 18.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 18:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The main characteristic of ESG data supply chains is the lack of standardisation and the proliferation of private initiatives which each have their own methodologies and opinions of what is to be considered as “sustainable”. Moreover, ESG rating agencies are not sufficiently transparent when it comes to the methodological and conceptual choices they make when they produce their ratings. The fact that ESG rating agencies sometimes reach opposite conclusions in certain categories regarding one and the same company necessarily leads to uncertainty and confusion about ESG in general, and ESG performance of specific companies in particular. ESG ratings differ because rating companies adopt different definitions of ESG performance and different metrics/approaches to measuring ESG performance. In some cases, it is challenging to understand the underlying parameters of ESG ratings fully. High-quality ESG ratings ideally give companies feedback about how their ESG policies and performances are perceived and in which areas there is still room for improvement. If companies do not understand the way ratings are developed and on which precise criteria they are based, the ratings will have little added value. Improved transparency would allow investors to understand the current divergences between ESG ratings better and adapt their investment decisions accordingly.

**Question 19. How would you rate the quality and relevance of ESG *research* material currently available in the market?**

- 1 - Very poor
- 2 - Poor
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Good
- 5 - Very good
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Question 19.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 19:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

ESG research material currently available varies widely in scope, focus and quality. Varying scope and focus is not necessarily a concern, although it requires users to appreciate the difference in the context of how these materials are used. However, we have concerns about the perceived lack of specialization of the analysts. This may result in sub-optimum research outcomes due to a lack of understanding of complex interdependencies that exist in the oil and gas sector. Designing scope and questionnaires for high-quality research requires expertise in the respective sector(s) and understanding of activities in the sector(s). Poor quality research may result in ratings that do not adequately reflect companies' performance.

**Question 20. How would you assess the quality and relevance of ESG *ratings* for your investment decisions, both ratings of individual Environmental, Social or Governance factors and aggregated ones?**

	1 (very poor quality and relevance)	2 (poor quality and relevance)	3 (neutral)	4 (good quality and relevance)	5 (very good) and relevance)	Don't know / No opinion
Individual	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aggregated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Question 20.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 20:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Companies face a critical workload resulting from numerous questionnaires on their ESG policies. Each ESG rating agency has its own evaluation methodologies, which are not always sufficiently transparent, making it difficult for companies (and other stakeholders, including investors) to understand the conclusions these agencies reach on ESG performances. Because of the overall lack of convergence between ESG ratings and their likely impact on investment, the Commission should consider imposing minimum transparency requirements on ESG rating agencies. Moreover, ESG rating agencies should be required to adopt a code of conduct which they apply and report upon according to the “comply or explain” principle. ESG rating agencies should also be subject to a regulatory oversight regime inspired by the one governing credit rating agencies. Lastly, the Commission should address the conflict of interest arising from the fact that some ESG rating agencies offer companies paid consulting services, whether directly or indirectly via third parties recommended by them. Companies perceive these practices as sources of potential or actual conflicts of interest. Conflicts of interest might arise as well when banks and other financial institutions acquire ESG rating agencies since the same entity is allowed to provide ESG ratings and credit services at the same time. A harmonised EU standard could create an added value if designed well, and a high level of flexibility is secured.

Actions in this regard should be coordinated with the revision of the NFRD. The non-financial information companies are required to publish according to EU legislation, should be enough to satisfy investors and other stakeholders, including rating agencies.

## Question 21. In your opinion, should the EU take action in any of these areas?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 21.1 If yes, please explain why and what kind of action you consider would address the identified problems.

### In particular, do you think the EU should consider regulatory intervention?

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Companies face a critical workload resulting from numerous questionnaires on their ESG policies. Each ESG rating agency has its own evaluation methodologies, which are not always sufficiently transparent, making it difficult for companies (and other stakeholders, including investors) to understand the conclusions these agencies reach on ESG performances. Because of the overall lack of convergence between ESG ratings and their likely impact on investment, the Commission should consider imposing minimum transparency requirements on ESG rating agencies. Moreover, ESG rating agencies should be required to adopt a code of conduct which they apply and report upon according to the “comply or explain” principle.



ESG rating agencies should also be subject to a regulatory oversight regime inspired by the one governing credit rating agencies. Lastly, the Commission should address the conflict of interest arising from the fact that some ESG rating agencies offer companies paid consulting services, whether directly or indirectly via third parties recommended by them. Companies perceive these practices as sources of potential or actual conflicts of interest. Conflicts of interest might arise as well when banks and other financial institutions acquire ESG rating agencies since the same entity is allowed to provide ESG ratings and credit services at the same time. A harmonised EU standard could create an added value if designed well, and a high level of flexibility is secured.

Actions in this regard should be coordinated with the revision of the NFRD. The non-financial information companies are required to publish according to EU legislation, should be enough to satisfy investors and other stakeholders, including rating agencies.

## 1.4 Definitions, standards and labels for sustainable financial assets and financial products

The market for sustainable financial assets (loans, bonds, funds, etc.) is composed of a wide variety of products, offered under various denominations like 'green', 'SDG', 'transition', 'ESG', 'ethical', 'impact', 'sustainability-linked', etc. While a variety of products allows for different approaches that can meet the specific needs and wishes of those investing or lending, it can be difficult for clients, in particular retail investors, to understand the different degrees of climate, environmental and social ambition and compare the specificities of each product. Clarity on these definitions through standards and labels can help to protect the integrity of and trust in the market for sustainable financial products, enabling easier access for investors, **companies**, and savers.

As set out in the [2018 Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth](#), the Commission services started working on:

1. developing possible technical criteria for the [EU Ecolabel scheme to retail funds, savings and deposits](#), and
2. establishing an EU Green Bond Standard (EU GBS).

The Commission also committed to specifying the content of the **prospectus** for green bond issuances to provide potential investors with additional information, within the framework of the Prospectus Regulation.

### EU Green Bond Standard

The Technical Expert Group on Sustainable Finance (TEG) put forward a report in June 2019 with 10 recommendations for how to create an EU Green Bond Standard (EU GBS). This was completed with a usability guide in March 2020, as well as with an updated proposal for the standard (see Annex 1).

The TEG recommends the creation of an official voluntary EU GBS building on the EU Taxonomy. Such an EU Green Bond Standard could finance both physical assets and financial assets (including through covered bonds and asset-backed securities), capital expenditure and selected operating expenditure, as well as specific expenditure for sovereigns and sub-sovereigns. The standard should in the TEG's view exist alongside existing market standards.

The overall aim of the EU GBS is to address several barriers in the current market, including reducing uncertainty on what is green by linking it with the EU Taxonomy, standardising costly and complex verification and reporting processes, and having an official standard to which certain (financial) incentives may be attached. The TEG has recommended that oversight and regulatory supervision of external review providers eventually be conducted via a centralised system organised by ESMA. However, as such a potential ESMA-led supervision would require legislation and therefore take time, the TEG suggests the set-up of a market-based, voluntary interim registration process for verifiers (the Scheme) of EU Green Bonds for a transition period of up to three years.

Below you will find four questions in relation to the EU GBS. **A separate dedicated consultation with regards to a Commission initiative for an EU Green Bond Standard will be carried out in the future.** Please note that questions relating to green bond issuances by public authorities are covered in section 2.7 and questions on additional incentives can be found in section 2.6.

**Question 22. The TEG has recommended that verifiers of EU Green Bonds (green bonds using the EU GBS) should be subject to an accreditation or authorisation and supervision regime. Do you agree that verifiers of EU Green Bonds should be subject to some form of accreditation or authorisation and supervision?**

- Yes, at European level
- Yes, at a national level
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 22.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 22:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 23. Should any action the Commission takes on verifiers of EU Green Bonds be linked to any potential future action to regulate the market for third-party service providers on sustainability data, ratings and research?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 23.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 23:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 24. The EU GBS as recommended by the TEG is intended for any type of issuer: listed or non-listed, public or private, European or international. Do you envisage any issues for non-European issuers to follow the proposed standard by the TEG?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 24.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 24:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

### **Prospectus and green bonds**

**Question 25. In those cases where a prospectus has to be published, do you believe that requiring the disclosure of specific information on green bonds in the prospectus, which is a single binding document, would improve the consistency and comparability of information for such instruments and help fight greenwashing?**

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 25.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 25:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 26. In those cases where a prospectus has to be published, to what extent do you agree with the following statement: “Issuers that adopt the EU GBS should include a link to that standard in the prospectus instead of being subject to specific disclosure requirements on green bonds in the prospectus”?**

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 26.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 26:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

### **Other standards and labels**

Already now, the Disclosure Regulation defines two categories of sustainable investment products: those promoting environmental or social characteristics and those with environmental or social objectives, the latter being defined as ‘sustainable investments’. Both types of products have to disclose their use of the EU Taxonomy, for the environmental portion of the product.

**Question 27. Do you currently market financial products that promote environmental characteristics or have environmental objectives?**

- Yes
- No

- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 28. In its final report, the High-Level Expert Group on Sustainable Finance recommended to establish a minimum standard for sustainably denominated investment funds (commonly referred to as ESG or SRI funds, despite having diverse methodologies), aimed at retail investors.**

**What actions would you consider necessary to standardise investment funds that have broader sustainability denominations?**

- No regulatory intervention is needed
- The Commission or the ESAs should issue guidance on minimum standards
- Regulatory intervention is needed to enshrine minimum standards in law
- Regulatory intervention is needed to create a label
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 29. Should the EU establish a label for investment funds (e.g. ESG funds or green funds aimed at professional investors)?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 29.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 29:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Before introducing new labels, we recommend, as a first step, to finalise the rules on the upcoming Ecolabel, assess its functioning, usability by the financial market players, and the achievement of the desired objectives.

**Question 30. The market has recently seen the development of sustainability-linked bonds and loans, whose interest rates or returns are dependent on the company meeting pre-determined sustainability targets. This approach is different from regular green bonds, which have a green use-of-proceeds approach.**

## Should the EU develop standards for these types of sustainability-linked bonds or loans?

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 30.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 30:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The sustainability-linked bond is a new product that has the potential to bring more issuers into sustainable finance, allow more financings to incorporate sustainability, and create investable assets for a greater portion of the investing community. Many issuers are unable to issue a green bond (or another type of activity-based sustainable finance product) because they cannot identify sufficient expenditures on business activities connected to sustainability. Sustainability-linked bonds overcome this obstacle because they rely on a different way of connecting the financing to sustainability. Green bonds look at how the proceeds will be used and do not involve contractual consequences related to sustainability. In contrast, sustainability-linked bonds do not restrict how the proceeds will be used, but link one of the critical terms of the transaction — the interest rate — to sustainability performance targets. So issuers with lower levels of sustainability spending requirements, including those at the beginning of their sustainability transition and those for which their sustainability improvements will come from divestments, can access the sustainable finance bond market. For sustainability-linked bonds to gain a foothold in the financial system, it is essential to guarantee its flexibility. In fact, some investors may want downside protection in case a target is not met. Other investors may wish to offer better terms in exchange for an issuer meeting its targets. Some other investors may prefer sustainability-linked bonds' focus on outcomes (as opposed to spending). Investors will inevitably have diverse preferences for what constitutes more attractive terms, and sustainability-linked bonds open up a new field for innovation and value creation.

For this reason, we recommend not to develop a standard for these types of bonds since it could limit its flexibility, restrict the number of issuers and investors and hamper the expansion of this vital instrument.

### Question 31: Should such a potential standard for target-setting sustainability-linked bonds make use of the EU Taxonomy as one of the key performance indicators?

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
-

5 - Strongly agree

Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **Question 31.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 31:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As the EU Taxonomy Regulation has not yet been put into practice, it is essential to monitor the implementation of legislation and its impact on financial markets, before considering its compatibility with, and transferability to, other areas. We recommend the Commission not to establish a standard for sustainability-linked bonds. However, if this standard were to be introduced, we discourage the use of the EU Taxonomy in this context. In fact, the EU Taxonomy needs to be thoroughly impact assessed to make sure it is 'fit for purpose' for these instruments. The rather inflexible approach of the EU Taxonomy as proposed by the Technical Expert Group on sustainable finance (TEG) would limit the much-needed flexibility of these instruments, hindering its uptake in the market. There are also several inconsistencies and inaccuracies within the TEG report which create uncertainties over EU Taxonomy-eligible investments. Also, the limited coverage of sectors under the EU Taxonomy could exclude some sectors from using sustainability-linked bonds if a standard were introduced using the EU Taxonomy.

Sustainability-linked bonds are an appropriate instrument to finance "transitional activities", which help economic activities for which there is no immediate low-carbon solution to lower their emissions, contributing to efforts to reach the objective of climate neutrality. The scarce attention is given by the TEG to "transitional activities", and the excessively stringent criteria proposed by the TEG make the Taxonomy a classification unsuitable for the development of sustainability-linked bonds.

We also observe that some investors (e.g. AXA) have developed the concept of 'transition bonds' for carbon-intensive companies that are actively decarbonising but cannot issue green bonds. Others follow this pathway (Source: <https://www.ipe.com/esg/transition-bonds-questions-of-transition/10044480.article>).

**Question 32. Several initiatives are currently ongoing in relation to energy-efficient mortgages (see for instance the work of the EEFIG (Energy Efficiency Financial Institutions Group set by the EC and the United Nations Environment Program Finance Initiative or UNEP FI) on the financial performance of energy efficiency loans or the energy efficient mortgages initiatives) and green loans more broadly. Should the EU develop standards or labels for these types of products?**

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 33. The Climate Benchmarks Regulation creates two types of EU climate benchmarks - 'EU Climate Transition' and 'EU Paris-aligned' - aimed at investors with climate-conscious investment strategies. The regulation also requires the Commission to assess the feasibility of a broader 'ESG**

**b e n c h m a r k ' .**

**Should the EU take action to create an ESG benchmark?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 34. Beyond the possible standards and labels mentioned above (for bonds, retail investment products, investment funds for professional investors, loans and mortgages, benchmarks), do you see the need for any other kinds of standards or labels for sustainable finance?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **1.5 Capital markets infrastructure**

The recent growth in the market for sustainable financial instruments has raised questions as to whether the current capital markets infrastructure is fit for purpose. Having an infrastructure in place that caters to those types of financial instruments could support and further enhance sustainable finance in Europe.

**Question 35. Do you think the existing capital market infrastructure sufficiently supports the issuance and liquidity of sustainable securities?**

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 36. In your opinion, should the EU foster the development of a sustainable finance-oriented exchange or trading segments that caters specifically to trading in sustainable finance securities and is better aligned with the needs of issuers?**

- Yes
- No



- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 36.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 36:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

### Question 37. In your opinion, what core features should a sustainable finance–oriented exchange have in order to encourage capital flows to ESG projects and listing of companies with strong ESG characteristics, in particular SMEs?

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## 1.6 Corporate governance, long-termism and investor engagement

To reflect long-term opportunities and risks, such as those connected to climate change and environmental degradation, **companies and investors need to integrate long-term horizons** and sustainability in their decision-making processes. However, this is often difficult in a context where market pressure and prevailing corporate culture prompt corporate managers and financial market participants to focus on near-term financial performance at the expense of mid- to long-term objectives. Focusing on short-term returns without accounting for long-term implications may lead to underperformance of the corporation and investors in the long-term, and, by extension, of the economy as a whole. In this context, investors should be driving long-termism, where this is relevant, and not pressure companies to deliver short-term returns by default.

The ongoing COVID-19 outbreak in particular underscores that companies should prioritise the long term interests of their stakeholders. Many companies in the EU have decided to prioritise the interests of key stakeholders, in particular employees, customers and suppliers, over short-term shareholder interest (The [European Central Bank also recommended on 27 March 2020](#) that significant credit institution refrain from distributing dividend so that “they can continue to fulfil their role to fund households, small and medium businesses and corporations” during the COVID-19

economic shock). These factors contribute to driving long-term returns as they are crucial in order to maintain companies' ability to operate. Therefore, institutional investors have an important role to play in this context. As part of action 10 of the [Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth](#), in December 2019 the European Supervisory Authorities delivered reports, the European Supervisory Authorities delivered reports in December 2019 ([ESMA report](#), [EBA report](#) and [EIOPA report](#)) that had the objective of assessing evidence of undue short-term pressure from the financial sector on corporations. They identified areas within their remit where they found some degree of short-termism and issued policy recommendations accordingly. For instance, they advise the adoption of longer-term perspectives among financial institutions through more explicit legal provisions on sustainability.

**Question 38. In your view, which recommendation(s) made in the ESAs' reports have the highest potential to effectively tackle short-termism?**

**Please select among the following options:**

- Adopt more explicit legal provisions on sustainability for credit institutions, in particular related to governance and risk management
- Define clear objectives on portfolio turn-over ratios and holdings periods for institutional investors
- Require Member States to have an independent monitoring framework to ensure the quality of information disclosed in remuneration reports published by listed companies and funds (UCITS management companies and AIFMs)
- Other

**Question 39. Beyond the recommendations issued by the ESAs, do you see any barriers in the EU regulatory framework that prevent long-termism and/or do you see scope for further actions that could foster long-termism in financial markets and the way corporates operate?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

The [Shareholder Rights Directive II](#) states that directors' variable remuneration should be based on both financial and non-financial performance, where applicable. However, there is currently no requirement regarding what the fraction of variable remuneration should be linked to, when it comes to non-financial performance.

**Question 40. In your view, should there be a mandatory share of variable remuneration linked to non-financial performance for corporates and financial institutions?**

- Yes
-

No

- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 41. Do you think that a defined set of EU companies should be required to include carbon emission reductions, where applicable, in their lists of ESG factors affecting directors' variable remuneration?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

The Shareholder Rights Directive II introduces transparency requirements to better align long-term interests between institutional investors and their asset managers.

**Question 42. Beyond the Shareholder Rights Directive II, do you think that EU action would be necessary to further enhance long-term engagement between investors and their investee companies?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 43. Do you think voting frameworks across the EU should be further harmonised at EU level to facilitate shareholder engagement and votes on ESG issues?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 44. Do you think that EU action is necessary to allow investors to vote on a company's environmental and social strategies or performance?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Questions have been raised about whether passive index investing could lower the incentives to participate in corporate governance matters or engage with companies regarding their long term strategies.

**Question 45: Do you think that passive index investing, if it does not take into account ESG factors, could have an impact on the interests of long-term shareholders?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

To foster more sustainable corporate governance, as part of action 10 of the [2018 action plan Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth](#) the Commission launched a [study on due diligence](#) (i.e. identification and mitigation of adverse social and environmental impact in a company's own operations and supply chain), which was published in February 2020. This study indicated the need for policy intervention, a conclusion which was supported by both multinational companies and NGOs. Another study on directors' duties and possible sustainability targets will be finalised in Q2 2020.

**Question 46. Due regard for a range of 'stakeholder interests', such as the interests of employees, customers, etc., has long been a social expectation vis-a-vis companies. In recent years, the number of such interests have expanded to include issues such as human rights violations, environmental pollution and climate change.**

**Do you think companies and their directors should take account of these interests in corporate decisions alongside financial interests of shareholders, beyond what is currently required by EU law?**

- Yes, a more holistic approach should favour the maximisation of social, environmental, as well as economic/financial performance.
- Yes, as these issues are relevant to the financial performance of the company in the long term.
- No, companies and their directors should not take account of these sorts of interests.
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 47. Do you think that an EU framework for supply chain due diligence related to human rights and environmental issues should be developed to ensure a harmonised level-playing field, given the uneven development of national due diligence initiatives?**

- Yes
- No

- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 48. Do you think that such a supply chain due diligence requirement should apply to all companies, including small and medium sized companies?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 48.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 48:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Response to Q47:

IOGP members are actively identifying and responding to their human rights risks per the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs). Respecting human rights is an essential part of corporate culture, and IOGP members are regularly and continuously improving their efforts in this space. While there is still room for improvement, companies have made significant strides in the uptake of the UNGPs and the progress achieved by the mix of soft-law and voluntary standards should not be undermined. Also, there is a proliferation of calls for regulation in corporate responsibility in the EU/EEA, including for mandatory due diligence. We encourage alignment across these EU/EEA initiatives to support companies to respect human rights. However, we feel that the answer does not necessarily lie in mandatory due diligence laws.

We understand the European Commission is currently assessing the development of a proposal for due diligence requirements and, as IOGP members support transparency and sharing best practices, we look forward to contributing to the debate on this matter.

## 2. Increasing opportunities for citizens, financial institutions and corporates to enhance sustainability

---

**Increased opportunities need to be provided to citizens, financial institutions and corporates in order to enable them to have a positive impact on sustainability.** Citizens can be mobilised by providing them with opportunities to invest their pensions and savings sustainably or by using digital tools to empower them to make their communities, their homes and their businesses more resilient. Financial institutions and corporates can increase their contribution to sustainability if the right policy signals and incentives are in place. Furthermore, international cooperation and the use of sustainable finance tools and frameworks in developing countries can help build a truly global response to the climate and environmental crisis.

**As part of the European Green Deal, the Commission has launched a European Climate Pact** to bring together regions, local communities, civil society, businesses and schools in the fight against climate change, incentivising behavioural change from the level of the individual to the largest multinational, and to launch a new wave of actions. A consultation on the European Climate Pact is open until 27 May 2020 in order to better identify the areas where the Commission could support and highlight pledges as well as set up fora to work together on climate action (including possibly on sustainable finance).

## 2.1 Mobilising retail investors and citizens

Although retail investors today are increasingly aware that their own investments and deposits can play a role in achieving Europe's climate and environmental targets, they are not always offered sustainable financial products that match their expectations. In order to ensure that the sustainability preferences of retail investors are truly integrated in the financial system, it is crucial to help them to better identify which financial products best correspond to these preferences, providing them with user-friendly information and metrics they can easily understand. To that end, the European Commission will soon publish the amended delegated acts of MIFID II and IDD, which will require investment advisors to ask retail investors about their sustainability preferences.

**Question 49. In order to ensure that retail investors are asked about their sustainability preferences in a simple, adequate and sufficiently granular way, would detailed guidance for financial advisers be useful when they ask questions to retail investors seeking financial advice?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 49.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 49:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 50. Do you think that retail investors should be systematically offered sustainable investment products as one of the default options, when the provider has them available, at a comparable cost and if those products meet the suitability test?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 51. Should the EU support the development of more structured actions in the area of financial literacy and sustainability, in order to raise awareness and knowledge of sustainable finance among citizens and finance professionals?**

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## **2.2 Better understanding the impact of sustainable finance on sustainability factors**

**While sustainable finance is growing, there are questions on how to measure and assess the positive impact of sustainable finance on the real economy.** Recently, tools have been developed that can be used to approximate an understanding of the climate and environmental impact of economic activities that are being financed. Examples of such tools include the EU Taxonomy, which identifies under which conditions economic activities can be considered environmentally sustainable, use-of-proceeds reporting as part of green bond issuances, or the Disclosure Regulation, which requires the reporting of specific adverse impact indicators.

Yet, an improved understanding of how different sustainable financial products impact the economy may further increase their positive impact on sustainability factors and accelerate the transition.

**Question 52. In your view, is it important to better measure the impact of financial products on sustainability factors?**

- 1 - Not important at all
- 2 - Rather not important
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather important
- 5 - Very important
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 53: Do you think that all financial products / instruments (e.g. shares, bonds, ETFs, money market funds) have the same ability to allocate capital to sustainable projects and activities?**

- Yes
- No
-

Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## 2.3 Green securitisation

Securitisation is a technique that converts illiquid assets, such as bank loans or trade receivables, into tradeable securities. As a result, banks can raise fresh money as well as move credit risk out of their balance sheets, thereby freeing up capital for new lending. Securitisation also facilitates access to a greater range of investors, who can benefit from the banks' expertise in loan origination and servicing, thereby diversifying risk exposure. Green securitisations and collaboration between banks and investors could play an important role in financing the transition as banks' balance sheet space might be too limited to overcome the green finance gap. The EU's new securitisation framework creates a specific framework for high-quality Simple, Transparent and Standardised (STS) securitisations, together with a more risk-sensitive prudential treatment for banks and insurers.

**Question 54. Do you think that green securitisation has a role to play to increase the capital allocated to sustainable projects and activities?**

- 1 - Not important at all
- 2 - Rather not important
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather important
- 5 - Very important
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 54.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 54:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 55: Do the existing EU securitisation market and regulatory frameworks, including prudential treatment, create any barriers for securitising 'green assets' and increasing growth in their secondary market?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant



**Question 56. Do you see the need for a dedicated regulatory and prudential framework for ‘green securitisation’?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## **2.4 Digital sustainable finance**

The ongoing COVID-19 outbreak is highlighting the key role of digitalisation for the daily personal and professional lives of many Europeans. However, it has also revealed how digital exclusion can exacerbate financial exclusion – a risk that needs to be mitigated.

Digitalisation is transforming the provision of financial services to Europe's businesses and citizens As shown in the [Progress Report of the UN Secretary-General's Task Force on Digital Financing of the Sustainable Development Goals \(SDGs\)](#), digital finance brings a wide array of opportunities for citizens worldwide by making it easier to make payments, save money, invest, or get insured. However, digital finance also brings new risks, such as deepening the digital divide. It is therefore paramount to ensure that the potential of digitalisation for sustainable finance is fully reaped, while mitigating associated challenges appropriately. In this context, the Commission has launched a consultation dedicated to digital finance.

In the area of sustainable finance, technological innovation such as Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning can help to better identify and assess to what extent a company's activities, a large equity portfolio, or a bank's assets are sustainable. The application of Blockchain and the Internet of Things (IoT) may allow for increased transparency and accountability in sustainable finance, for instance with automated reporting and traceability of use of proceeds for green bonds.

**Question 57. Do you think EU policy action is needed to help maximise the potential of digital tools for integrating sustainability into the financial sector?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

In particular, digitalisation has the potential to empower citizens and retail investors to participate in local efforts to build climate resilience. For instance, [M-Akiba](#) is a Government of Kenya-issued retail bond that seeks to enhance financial inclusion for economic development. Money raised from issuance of M-Akiba is dedicated to infrastructural development projects, both new and ongoing.

**Question 58. Do you consider that public authorities, including the EU and Member States should support the development of digital finance solutions that can help consumers and retail investors to better channel their money to finance the transition?**

- Yes
-

No

- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 59. In your opinion, should the EU, Member States, or local authorities use digital tools to involve EU citizens in co-financing local sustainable projects?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## 2.5. Project Pipeline

The existing project pipeline (availability of bankable and investable sustainable projects) is generally considered to be insufficient to meet current investor demand for sustainable projects. Profitability of existing business models plays a role, with some projects (e.g. renewable energy), being more bankable than others (e.g. residential energy efficiency). Identifying the key regulatory and market obstacles that exist at European and national level will be key in order to fix the pipeline problem. Please note that questions relating to incentives are covered in section 2.6.

**Question 60. What do you consider to be the key market and key regulatory obstacles that prevent an increase in the pipeline of sustainable projects?**

**Please list a maximum of 3 for each:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- If the EU Taxonomy screening criteria are adopted in the current form of the TEG report, there may be inconsistencies with the Clean Energy Package. These inconsistencies could create uncertainties over taxonomy-eligible investments and could contribute to the stagnation, or stopping of, future investments.
- Inadequate attention to “transitional activities” in the EU Taxonomy. Overly stringent thresholds will limit the number of activities considered taxonomy-aligned.
- It is essential that EU policies provide predictability and security for investors and real economy actors as their decisions are based on long-term investment cycles.

**Question 61. Do you see a role for Member States to address these obstacles through their NECPs (National Energy and Climate Plans)?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 61.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 60 and provide details:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs) are an appropriate tool to pursue an integrated industrial decarbonisation roadmap and to coordinate the finance mix of public (national and EU) and private sources. While the Commission aims for a homogenous approach throughout the EU, the NECPs show that it is important to take into account the specific characteristics and needs of different Member States with their different trajectories in the energy transition. EU countries have different starting points entailing varying investment needs. Europe's transition to a cleaner society will neither take one single form nor will it all happen in one day. Above all, no one should be left behind. This principle, which should drive the development of sustainable finance, is particularly relevant for the EU Taxonomy, whose criteria, activities and thresholds should be fully assessed by the Member States before their application. While for some Member States the role of natural gas in the transition could be less relevant, in several countries natural gas will play a crucial role to lower emission and in particular to shift away from coal. In fact, natural gas was assessed positively by 14 Member States in their NECPs (<https://www.oilandgaseurope.org/news/iogp-assessment-of-national-energy-and-climate-plans/>) Moreover, in May 2020, 9 Member States signed a non-paper (<https://www.euractiv.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/05/Non-paper-Role-of-gas-in-climate-neutral-Europe-Final.pdf>) on the role of natural gas in a climate-neutral Europe to highlights the significant role of natural gas in replacing solid fossil fuels and integrating renewable and decarbonised gases into the energy system.

**Question 62. In your view, how can the EU facilitate the uptake of sustainable finance tools and frameworks by SMEs and smaller professional investors?**

**Please list a maximum of 3 actions you would like to see at EU-level:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 63. The transition towards a sustainable economy will require significant investment in research and innovation (R&I) to enable rapid commercialisation of promising and transformational R&I solutions, including possible disruptive and breakthrough inventions or business m o d e l s .**

**How could the EU ensure that the financial tools developed to increase**

## sustainable investment flows turn R&I into investable (bankable) opportunities?

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The EU should focus its financing activities on early-stage, pre-commercial low-carbon technologies enabling the energy transition. To turn sustainable investments into bankable opportunities, it is necessary to guarantee a steady and consistent level of funding during the R&I phase. Investments in large-scale demonstration projects are vital, together with the development of the necessary infrastructure. A notable example is that of Carbon Capture Use and Storage (CCUS), whose large-scale deployment is considered integral to reaching climate neutrality, as acknowledged by the IEA, in the IPCC 1.5°C Special Report and the European Commission’s Communication “A Clean Planet for All”. In this regard, we would like to offer the following recommendations based on experience on the NER300 programme and the ETS Innovation Fund:

- o Priority should be given to large projects with a considerable CO2 abatement potential. For the funding programmes to be more effective, they should be focused on fewer impactful projects rather than spreading funds across too many projects.
- o There should not be restrictive funding limits to a specific project.
- o Different EU funding programmes should be made compatible to be able to cumulate different funding options.
- o International cooperation should be bolstered to allow cross-learning with projects outside the EU. EU funding should also be eligible for projects that are developed partially or entirely outside the EU.
- o The level of funding support should mirror the development of technologies as they progress along the technology learning curve, i.e. support level should be adjusted downwards as technologies become more mature and more economical.

### Question 64. In particular, would you consider it useful to have a category for R&I in the EU Taxonomy?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 65. In your view, do you consider that the EU should take further action in:

	Yes	No	Don't know / No opinion
Bringing more financial engineering to sustainable R&I projects?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assisting the development of R&I projects to reach investment-ready stages, with volumes, scales, and risk-			

return profiles that interest investors (i.e. ready and bankable projects that private investors can easily identify)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better identifying areas in R&I where public intervention is critical to crowd in private funding?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring alignment and synergies between Horizon Europe and other EU programmes/funds?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conducting more research to address the high risks associated with sustainable R&I investment (e.g. policy frameworks and market conditions)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identifying and coordinating R&I efforts taking place at EU, national and international levels to maximise value and avoid duplication?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitating sharing of information and experience regarding successful low-carbon business models, research gaps and innovative solutions?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increasing the capacity of EU entrepreneurs and SMEs to innovate and take risks?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Question 65.1 If necessary, please explain your answers to question 65:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

'Research and Innovation' (R&I) is essential for Europe to build a prosperous, sustainable economy and should be at the heart of policies. – Fostering a culture of innovation will boost jobs, economic growth and social inclusion. R&I is a crucial pillar of a stable long-term European industrial strategy to ensure the development of Europe-based smart, innovative and sustainable processes, services and products – as well as to maximise European industry's competitiveness worldwide. The European industry's competitive edge is strongly connected to its R&I developments and capacities. Facing fierce competition from other global regions, Europe needs to exploit its strength through increased R&I efforts, to stay at the forefront of R&I and maintain its industrial leadership globally.

For these reasons, IOGP would support a potential R&I category in the EU Taxonomy if constituted by practical, flexible and inclusive definitions. All low-carbon technologies should be eligible for any R&I funding option.

We also encourage the Commission to assess the Industry4Europe Coalition recommendations: [https://www.industry4europe.eu/assets/Uploads/Publications/Industry4Europe\\_Joint-Paper\\_November-2019.pdf](https://www.industry4europe.eu/assets/Uploads/Publications/Industry4Europe_Joint-Paper_November-2019.pdf) (pages 14-19)

## 2.6 Incentives to scale up sustainable investments

**While markets for sustainable financial assets and green lending practices are growing steadily, they remain insufficient to finance the scale of additional investments needed to reach the EU's environmental and climate action objectives**, including climate-neutrality by 2050. For instance, companies' issuances of sustainable financial assets (bonds, equity) and sustainable loans currently do not meet investors' increasing interest. The objective of the European Green Deal Investment Plan, published on 14 January 2020, is to mobilise through the EU budget and the associated instruments at least EUR 1 trillion of private and public sustainable investments over the coming decade. The purpose of this section is to identify whether there are market failures or barriers that would prevent the scaling up of sustainable finance, and if yes what kinds of public financial incentives could help rectify this.

**Question 66. In your view, does the EU financial system face market barriers and inefficiencies that prevent the uptake of sustainable investments?**

- 1 - Not functioning well at all
- 2 - Not functioning so well
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Functioning rather well
- 5 - Functioning very well
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 66.1 If necessary, please explain your answers to question 66:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 67. In your view, to what extent would potential public incentives for issuers and lenders boost the market for sustainable investments?**

- 1 - Not effective at all
- 2 - Rather not effective
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather effective
- 5 - Very effective
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 68. In your view, for *investors* (including retail investors), to what extent would potential financial incentives help to create a viable market for sustainable investments?**

- 1 - Not effective at all
- 2 - Rather not effective
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather effective
- 5 - Very effective
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Please specify the reasons for your answer (provide if possible links to quantitative evidence) and the category of investor to whom it should be addressed (retail, professional, institutional, other):**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 69. In your view, should the EU consider putting in place specific incentives that are aimed at facilitating access to finance for SMEs carrying out sustainable activities or those SMEs that wish to transition?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## **2.7 The use of sustainable finance tools and frameworks by public authorities**

**Even though the potential scope of sustainable finance is broad, it is often viewed as being only confined to the ambit of private financial flows within capital markets.** Nevertheless, the boundary between public and private finance is not always strict and some concepts that are generally applied to private finance could also be considered for the public sector, such as the EU Taxonomy. This is recognised in the [European Green Deal Investment Plan](#) and the [Climate Law](#), where the Commission committed to exploring how the EU Taxonomy can be used in the context of the European Green Deal by the public sector, beyond InvestEU. The InvestEU programme, proposed as part of the EU's Multiannual Financial Framework 2021 – 2027, combines public and private funding and once the taxonomy is in place (from end-2020 onwards) will serve as a test case for its application in public sector-related spending.

**Question 70. In your view, is the EU Taxonomy, as currently set out in the [report of the Technical Expert Group on Sustainable Finance](#), suitable for use by the public sector, for example in order to classify and report on green expenditures?**

- Yes
- Yes, but only partially
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 70.1 Please explain why you consider that it is not suitable for use by public authorities, and how those reasons could be best addressed in your view:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As the EU Taxonomy Regulation has not yet been put into practice, it is essential to monitor the implementation of legislation and its impact on financial markets, before considering its compatibility with, and transferability to, other areas. The EU Taxonomy needs to be thoroughly impact assessed to make sure it is 'fit for purpose' for the public sector. The market share of economic activities which are taxonomy-aligned needs to be investigated to ensure compatibility with the goals of public authorities. When drafting the EU Taxonomy Regulation's delegated acts, the Commission should consider those excessively stringent criteria proposed by the TEG bring the risk of creating a niche market which is not suitable for public investments. The Commission should, therefore, ensure in the delegated acts that all economic activities with a potential to lower emissions are considered in the EU Taxonomy. Secondly, there are several inconsistencies (for example lack of alignment with the existing legislation like the RED II) and inaccuracies within the TEG report which create uncertainties over EU Taxonomy-eligible investments. Thirdly, the current scope of the EU Taxonomy is limited with several NACEs code not covered. The limited scope of the EU Taxonomy might reduce the range of activities recipient of public investments. The same reasoning goes for transitional activities which, for some Member States, are crucial, but are not fully covered by the EU Taxonomy. Any forthcoming framework in this regard should reflect the technology neutrality principle and set flexible criteria according to the level of activity's contribution to transition strategy goals.

**Question 71. In particular, is the EU Taxonomy, as currently set out in the [report of the Technical Expert Group on Sustainable Finance](#), suitable for use by the public sector in the area of green public procurement?**

- Yes
- Yes, but only partially
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant



**Question 71.1 If "no" or "yes, but only partially", please explain why and how those reasons could be best addressed in your view:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As the EU Taxonomy Regulation has not yet been put into practice, it is essential to monitor the implementation of legislation and its impact on financial markets, before considering its compatibility with, and transferability to, other areas. The EU Taxonomy needs to be thoroughly impact assessed to make sure it is 'fit for purpose' for green public procurement. The market share of economic activities which are taxonomy-aligned needs to be investigated to ensure compatibility with the goals of public authorities. The excessively stringent criteria proposed by the TEG bring the risk of creating a niche market which is not suitable for public investments. Additionally, there are several inconsistencies and inaccuracies within the TEG report which create uncertainties over EU Taxonomy-eligible investments.

Given different starting points for climate and decarbonisation policies across Member States and the intricate features of climate neutrality strategies, any attempt at picking winners would be detrimental and counterproductive for the overall EU objective. Technology neutrality, when adapted to national specificities, will ensure cost-effective and sustainable emission cuts without damaging EU competitiveness.

**Question 72. In particular, should the EU Taxonomy<sup>2</sup> play a role in the context of public spending frameworks at EU level, i.e. EU spending programmes such as EU funds, Structural and Cohesion Funds and EU state aid rules, where appropriate?**

---

<sup>2</sup> The six environmental objectives set out in the Taxonomy Regulation are the following: (1) climate change mitigation, (2) climate change adaptation, (3) sustainable use and protection of water and marine resources, (4) transition to a circular economy, (5) pollution prevention and control, (6) protection and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems.

- Yes, the taxonomy with climate and environmental objectives set out in the Taxonomy Regulation
- Yes, but only if social objectives are incorporated in the EU Taxonomy, as recommended by the TEG, and depending on the outcome of the report that the Commission must publish by 31 December 2021 in line with the review clause of the political agreement on the Taxonomy Regulation
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 72.1 If necessary, please explain your answers to question 72:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As the EU Taxonomy Regulation has not yet been put into practice, it is essential to monitor the implementation of legislation and its impact on financial markets, before considering its compatibility with, and transferability to, other areas. As highlighted by the different National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs) submitted by Member States to the Commission, the starting points, needs, and decarbonisation trajectories vary significantly across the EU. The EU Taxonomy needs to be technologically neutral and flexible to accommodate the different trajectories defined in the NECPs. The EU Taxonomy needs to be thoroughly impact assessed to make sure it is 'fit for purpose' for the public sector. The market share of economic activities which are EU taxonomy-aligned needs to be investigated to ensure compatibility with the goals of public authorities. The excessively stringent criteria proposed by the TEG bring the risk of creating a niche market which is not suitable for public investments. Additionally, there are several inconsistencies and inaccuracies within the TEG report which create uncertainties over EU Taxonomy-eligible investments.

**Question 73. Should public issuers, including Member States, be expected to make use of a future EU Green Bond Standard for their green bond issuances, including the issuance of sovereign green bonds in case they decide to issue this kind of debt?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## **2.8 Promoting intra-EU cross-border sustainable investments**

In order to attract and encourage cross-border investments, a range of investment promotion services have been put in place by public authorities. Investment promotion services include for instance information on the legal framework, advice on the project, such as on financing, partner and location search, support in completing authorisations and problem-solving mechanisms relating to issues of individual or general relevance. In some cases specific support is provided for strategic projects or priority sectors.

**Question 74. Do you consider that targeted investment promotion services could support the scaling up of cross-border sustainable investments?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## **2.9 EU Investment Protection Framework**

To encourage long-term sustainable investments in the EU, it is essential that investors are confident that their investments will be effectively protected throughout their life-cycle in relation to the state where they are located. The EU investment protection framework includes the single market fundamental freedoms, property protection from expropriation, the principles of legal certainty, legitimate expectations and good administration which ensure a stable and predictable environment, including remedies and enforcement in national courts. These elements can have an

impact on cross-border investment decisions, especially for long-term investments. While a separate consultation on investment protection will take place soon, the purpose of this section is to investigate whether the above-mentioned factors have an impact on sustainable projects in particular, such as for instance for long-term infrastructure and innovation projects necessary for the EU's industrial transition towards a sustainable economy.

### **Question 75. Do you consider that the investment protection framework has an impact on decisions to engage in cross-border sustainable investment?**

**Please choose one of the following:**

- Investment protection has **no impact**
- Investment protection has **a small impact** (one of many factors to consider)
- Investment protection has **medium impact** (e.g. it can lead to an increase in costs)
- Investment protection has **a significant impact** (e.g. influence on scale or type of investment)
- Investment protection is a factor that can have **a decisive impact** on cross-border investments decisions and can result in cancellation of planned or withdrawal of existing investments
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## **2.10 Promoting sustainable finance globally**

The global financial challenge posed by climate change and environmental degradation requires an **internationally coordinated**. To complement the work done by the Network of Central Banks and Supervisors for Greening the Financial system (NGFS) on climate-related risks and the Coalition of Finance Ministers for Climate Action mainly on public budgetary matters and fiscal policies, **the EU has launched together with the relevant public authorities from like-minded countries the [International Platform on Sustainable Finance \(IPSF\)](#)**. The purpose of the IPSF is to promote integrated markets for environmentally sustainable investment at a global level. It will deepen international coordination on approaches and initiatives that are fundamental for private investors to identify and seize environmentally sustainable investment opportunities globally, in particular in the areas of taxonomy, disclosures, standards and labels.

### **Question 76. Do you think the current level of global coordination between public actors for sustainable finance is sufficient to promote sustainable finance globally as well as to ensure coherent frameworks and action to deliver on the Paris Agreement and/or the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?**

- 1 - Highly insufficient
- 2 - Rather insufficient
- 3 - Neutral

- 4 - Rather sufficient
- 5 - Fully sufficient
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 76.1 What are the main missing factors at international level to further promote sustainable finance globally and to ensure coherent frameworks and actions?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Global coordination is currently insufficient and should be improved in particular to deliver a common language on sustainable finance. We are witnessing a worldwide proliferation of standards, benchmarks and labels, which are difficult to compare. This is particularly evident in ESG data reporting with a multitude of private initiatives which each have their own methodologies and opinions of what is to be considered as “sustainable”. The lack of transparency in the methodologies that are deployed by ESG rating agencies to produce their ratings makes their comparison complicated.

IOPF recommends the enhancement of international cooperation and dialogue. The International Platform on Sustainable Finance (IPSF) launched by the European Union together with relevant authorities from Argentina, Canada, Chile, China, India, Kenya and Morocco is a suitable means to achieve a coherent framework on sustainable finance. Still, there is a need to recognise regional differences, and it is crucial that all sectors/industries are represented in the IPFS if it is decided to involve industry representatives.

**Question 77. What can the Commission do to facilitate global coordination of the private sector (financial and non-financial) in order to deliver on the goals of the Paris Agreement and/or SDGs?**

**Please list a maximum of 3 proposals:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- The European Commission’s future Platform on Sustainable Finance created by Article 20 of the EU Taxonomy Regulation should include the representatives of the real economy, including from the manufacturing, industry and energy sectors.
- Dialogue and exchange of best practices on the International Platform on Sustainable Finance (IPSF) should be increased.
- Voluntary initiatives to reduce GHG emissions (like OGCI and Methane Guiding Principles) should be considered by the European Commission while developing future policies.

**Question 78. In your view, what are the main barriers private investors face when financing sustainable projects and activities in emerging markets and developing economies?**

## Please select all that apply:

Please select as many options as you like.

- Lack of internationally comparable sustainable finance frameworks (standards, taxonomies, disclosure, etc.)
- Lack of clearly identifiable sustainable projects on the ground
- Excessive (perceived or real) investment risk
- Difficulties to measure sustainable project achievements over time
- Other

**Question 79. In your opinion, in the context of European international cooperation and development policy, how can the EU best support the mobilisation of international and domestic private investors to finance sustainable projects and activities in emerging markets and developing countries, whilst avoiding market distortions?**

## Please provide a maximum of 3 proposals:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

EU policies should allow for cooperative approaches and international transfers of mitigation outcomes. This would enable the financing of sustainable projects and activities while helping countries to meet their climate pledges faster and more cost-effectively. Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcomes (ITMOs) also assist capacity building for emissions and sinks accounting, underpinning the success of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). Addressing climate change requires commitment from all emitters worldwide. A globally consistent, meaningful carbon price would avoid carbon leakage and maintain a level playing field. In the absence of a global carbon price, closer coordination of climate policies in NDCs would help mitigate distortions. Allowing international carbon credit generation and trading improves the cost-effectiveness of global emission reductions. IOGP stresses the importance of international cooperation to achieve climate ambitions, in particular by effective implementation of Article 6 of the Paris Agreement. COP26 will offer an excellent opportunity for the EU to showcase its continued commitment to a global approach, and the EU should redouble efforts to a successful negotiation despite challenges posed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

**Question 80. How can EU sustainable finance tools (e.g. taxonomy, benchmarks, disclosure requirements) be used to help scale up the financing of sustainable projects and activities in emerging markets and/or developing economies?**

**Which tools are best-suited to help increase financial flows towards and within these countries and what challenges can you identify when implementing them?**

**Please select among the following options:**

- All EU sustainable finance tools are already suitable and can be applied to emerging markets and/or developing economies without any change
- Some tools can be applied, but not all of them
- These tools need to be adapted to local specificities in emerging markets and /or developing economies
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 80.1 Please explain how you think these tools could be adapted:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The definition of “sustainable/green activity” may have different meanings in various national contexts. Moreover, there are different legal frameworks in different jurisdictions, e.g. different requirements on what companies need to report in terms of ESG information. Therefore, a significant degree of flexibility in the definition should be allowed to capture diverse circumstances. This could be provided through, e.g. creating a category of “transitional activities” with its own specific Technical Screening Criteria (TSC) reflecting its transitional nature. There is no silver bullet to combat climate change. All technologies reducing GHG emissions in all economic activities will need to be considered to deliver on the Paris Agreement goals and will be necessary for the energy transitions across the globe.

**Question 81. In particular, do you think that the EU Taxonomy is suitable for use by development banks, when crowding in private finance, either through guarantees or blended finance for sustainable projects and activities in emerging markets and/or developing economies?**

- Yes
- Yes, but only partially
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **3. Reducing and managing climate and environmental risks**

---

Climate and environmental risks, including relevant transition risks, and their possible negative social impacts, can have a disruptive impact on our economies and financial system, if not managed appropriately. Against this background, the three European supervisory authorities (ESAs) have each developed work plans on sustainable finance<sup>3</sup>. Building, among others, on the ESAs' activities further actions are envisaged to improve the management of climate and environmental risks by all actors in the financial system. In particular, the political agreement on the Taxonomy Regulation tasks the Commission with publishing a report on the provisions required for extending its requirements to activities that do significantly harm environmental sustainability (the so-called "brown taxonomy").

---

<sup>3</sup> More information on the ESAs' activities on sustainable finance is available on the authorities' websites. See in particular [ESMA's strategy](#), [EBA Action Plan](#), and [EIOPA's dedicated webpage](#).

### 3.1 Identifying exposures to harmful activities and assets and disincentivising environmentally harmful investments

**Question 82. In particular, do you think that existing actions need to be complemented by the development of a taxonomy for economic activities that are most exposed to the transition due to their current negative environmental impacts (the so-called "brown taxonomy") at EU level, in line with the review clause of the political agreement on the Taxonomy Regulation?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 82.1 If no, please explain why you disagree:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We recognise the EU Taxonomy Regulation contains a review clause to assess activities with negative impact. However, our industry recommends avoiding any brown listing that would harm the potential of several low-carbon technologies to contribute to the objective of reducing CO2 emissions. The EU Taxonomy should adopt an inclusive approach that considers all different technologies/activities and sectors that are contributing to the energy transition. The explicit endorsement should be given to any technology with the potential to reduce CO2 emissions. No technology or activity that has the potential to reduce abatement costs should be ruled out upfront. As energy companies provide products that underpin the whole economy while providing solutions to mitigate climate change like hydrogen and CCUS, it is essential to include the oil & gas industry in the EU Taxonomy. Classifying boundaries is not straightforward and may lead to unintended consequences. For example, putting in place overly narrowly defined boundaries risks exclusion of some activities that could develop and improve low-carbon technologies applied in their field of activity in the upcoming years. This approach would limit the uptake of new technologies and the decarbonisation potential (also of other sectors, who could utilise these developments). This approach might

be particularly challenging for some Member States which rely more than others on transitional activities, as highlighted in the NECPs submitted to the Commission (<https://www.oilandgaseurope.org/news/iogp-assessment-of-national-energy-and-climate-plans/>).

**Question 83: Beyond a sustainable and a brown taxonomy, do you see the need for a taxonomy which would cover all other economic activities that lie in between the two ends of the spectrum, and which may have a more limited negative or positive impact, in line with the review clause of the political agreement on the Taxonomy Regulation?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **3.2 Financial stability risk**

The analysis and understanding of the impact of climate-related and environmental risks on financial stability is improving, thanks in particular to the work done by supervisors and central banks (see for instance the [Network of Central Banks and Supervisors for Greening the Financial System \(NGFS\)](#)), regulators and research centres. However, significant progress still needs to be made in order to properly understand and manage the impact of these risks.

**Question 84. Climate change will impact financial stability through two main channels: physical risks, related to damages from climate-related events, and transition risks, related to the effect of mitigation strategies, especially if these are adopted late and abruptly. In addition, second-order effects (for instance the impact of climate change on real estate prices) can further weaken the whole financial system.**

**What are in your view the most important channels through which climate change will affect your industry?**

**Please select all that apply:**

Please select as many options as you like.

- Physical risks
- Transition risks
- Second-order effects
- Other



**Question 85. What key actions taken in your industry do you consider to be relevant and impactful to enhance the management of climate and environment related risks?**

**Please identify a maximum of 3 actions taken in your industry**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The oil and gas industry strives to reach and maintain the highest standard of safety. IOGP provides a forum for its members to promote cooperation, consistency and effectiveness in every aspect of health, safety, the environment, security, social responsibility, engineering, efficiency and operations. During the years, IOGP has collaborated with other associations and developed several standards and guidelines to lower climate and environment-related risks. For example, IOGP and IPIECA developed the Operating Management System Framework for controlling risk and delivering high performance in the oil and gas industry. The Framework offers an integrated approach and the flexibility to address some or all of a wide range of risks, impacts or threats related to occupational health and safety; environmental and social responsibility; process safety, quality and security.

Moreover, IOGP together with IPIECA and API have developed since 2005 Guidance on Sustainability Reporting, which provides practical advice for companies across ESG reporting. The fourth edition was published in March 2020 (<https://www.ipieca.org/our-work/sustainability-reporting/sustainability-reporting-guidance/>). This Guidance aims for continuous improvement of sustainability reporting and performance across the sector as it provides a robust, industry-developed framework to help companies shape the structure and content of their sustainability reporting that reflects current expectations on non-financial reporting by investors and civil society. It supports companies across the oil & gas industry globally to improve the quality and consistency of their sustainability reporting, providing better comparability of information.

**Question 86. Following the financial crisis, the EU has developed several new macro-prudential instruments, in particular for the banking sector (CRR /CRDIV), which aim to address systemic risk in the financial system.**

**Do you consider the current macro-prudential policy toolbox for the EU financial sector sufficient to identify and address potential systemic financial stability risks related to climate change?**

- 1 - Highly insufficient
- 2 - Rather insufficient
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather sufficient
- 5 - Fully sufficient
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Insurance prudential framework

Insurers manage large volumes of assets on behalf of policyholders and they can therefore play an important role in the transition to a sustainable economy. At the same time, insurance companies have underwriting liabilities exposed to sustainability risks. In addition, the (re)insurance sector plays a key role in managing risks arising from natural catastrophes through risk-pooling and influencing risk mitigating behaviour. The [Solvency II Directive](#) sets out the prudential framework for insurance companies. The Commission requested [technical advice from the European Insurance and Occupation Pensions Authority \(EIOPA\)](#) on the integration of sustainability risks and sustainability factors in Solvency II. [The Commission also mandated EIOPA](#) to investigate whether there is undue volatility of liabilities in the balance sheet or undue impediments to long-term investments, as part of the 2020 Review of Solvency II. The Commission also mandated EIOPA to investigate whether there is undue volatility of their solvency position that may impede to long-term investments, as part of the 2020 Review of Solvency II. EIOPA is expected to submit its final advice in June 2020.

In September 2019, [EIOPA already provided an opinion on sustainability within Solvency II](#). EIOPA identified additional practices that should be adopted by insurance companies to ensure that sustainability risks are duly taken into account in companies' risk management.

On that basis, the Commission could consider clarifications of insurers' obligations as part of the review of the Solvency II Directive. Stakeholders will soon be invited to comment on the Commission's inception impact assessment as regards the review. The Commission will also launch a public consultation as part of the review.

### **Question 87. Beyond prudential regulation, do you consider that the EU should take further action to mobilise insurance companies to finance the transition and manage climate and environmental risks?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Banking prudential framework

In the context of the last CRR/D review, co-legislators agreed on three actions aiming at integrating ESG considerations into EU banking regulation:

- a mandate for the EBA to assess and possibly issue guidelines regarding the inclusion of ESG risks in the supervisory review and evaluation process (SREP) (Article 98(8) CRD);
- a requirement for large, listed institutions to disclose ESG risks (Article 449a CRR) (note that some banks are also in the scope of the NFRD);
- a mandate for the EBA to assess whether a dedicated prudential treatment of exposures related to assets or activities associated substantially with sustainability objectives would be justified (Article 501c CRR).

Because the work on ESG risks was at its initial stages, co-legislators agreed on a gradual approach to tackling those risks. However, given the new objectives under the European Green Deal, it can be argued that the efforts in this area need to be scaled up in order to support a faster transition to a sustainable economy and increase the resilience of physical assets to climate and environmental risks. Integrating sustainability considerations in banks' business models requires a change in culture which their governance structure needs to effectively reflect and support.

**Question 88. Do you consider that there is a need to incorporate ESG risks into prudential regulation in a more effective and faster manner, while ensuring a level-playing field?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 89. Beyond prudential regulation, do you consider that the EU should:**

- 1. take further action to mobilise banks to finance the transition?**
- 2. manage climate-related and environmental risks?**

- Yes, option 1. or option 2. or both options
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 90. Beyond the possible general measures referred to in section 1.6, would more specific actions related to banks' governance foster the integration, the measurement and mitigation of sustainability risks and impacts into banks' activities?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **Asset managers**

Traditionally, the integration of material sustainability factors in portfolios, with respect to both their selection and management, has considered only their impact on the financial position and future earning capacity of a portfolio's holdings (i.e., the 'outside-in' or 'financial materiality' perspective). However, asset managers should take into account also the impact of a portfolio on society and the environment (i.e., the 'inside-out' or 'environmental/social materiality' perspective). This so-called "double materiality" perspective lies at the heart of the [Disclosure Regulation](#), which makes it clear that a significant part of the financial services market must consider also their adverse impacts on sustainability (i.e. negative externalities).

**Question 91. Do you see merits in adapting rules on fiduciary duties, best interests of investors/the prudent person rule, risk management and internal structures and processes in sectorial rules to directly require them to**

## consider and integrate adverse impacts of investment decisions on sustainability (negative externalities)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Pension providers

Pension providers' long-term liabilities make them an important source of sustainable finance. They have an inherently long-term approach, as the beneficiaries of retirement schemes expect income streams over several decades. Compared with other institutions, pension providers' long-term investment policies also make their assets potentially more exposed to long-term risks. Thus far, the issues of sustainability reporting and ESG integration by EU pension providers have been taken up in the areas of institutions for occupational retirement provision (IORPs) ("Pillar II" - covered at EU level by the [IORP II Directive](#)) and private voluntary plans for personal pensions ("Pillar III" – covered at EU level by the [PEPP Regulation](#)) already in 2016 and 2017 respectively. The Commission will review the IORP II Directive by January 2023 and report on its implementation and effectiveness.

However, according to a [stress test on IORPs run by EIOPA in 2019](#) and assessing for the first time the integration of ESG factors in IORPs' risk management and investment allocation, only about 30% of IORPs in the EU have a strategy in place to manage ESG-related risks to their investments. Moreover, while most IORPs claimed to have taken appropriate steps to identify ESG risks to their investments, only 19% assess the impact of ESG factors on investments' risks and returns<sup>3</sup>. Lastly, the study provided a preliminary quantitative analysis of the investment portfolio (with almost 4 trillion Euros of assets under management, the EEA's Institutions for Occupational Retirement Provision (IORPs) sector is an important actor on financial markets.) which would indicate significant exposures of the IORPs in the sample to business sectors prone to high greenhouse gas emissions.

In 2017, the Commission established a High level group of experts on pensions to provide policy advice on matters related to supplementary pensions. [In its report, the group recommended](#) that the EU, its Member States and the social partners further clarify how pension providers can take into account the impact of ESG factors on investment decisions and develop cost-effective tools and methodologies to assess the vulnerability of EU pension providers to long-term environmental and social sustainability risks. The group also pointed out that, in the case of IORPs which are collective schemes, it might be challenging to make investment decisions reconciling possibly diverging views of individual members and beneficiaries on ESG investment. Moreover, in 2019, EIOPA issued an opinion on the supervision of the management of ESG risks faced by IORPs.

---

<sup>3</sup> The analysis shows that the preparedness of pension schemes to integrate sustainability factors is widely dispersed and seems correlated to how advanced national frameworks were. IORP II directive sets minimum harmonisation and was expected to be transposed in national law by January 2019 (and hence could not necessarily be expected to be implemented by end-2018 for the EIOPA survey for the 2019 stress test).

## Question 92. Should the EU explore options to improve ESG integration and reporting above and beyond what is currently required by the regulatory framework for pension providers?

- Yes
- No
-

Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 93. More generally, how can pension providers contribute to the achievement of the EU's climate and environmental goals in a more proactive way, also in the interest of their own sustained long-term performance? How can the EU facilitate the participation of pension providers to such transition?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 94. In view of the planned review of the IORP II Directive in 2023, should the EU further improve the integration of members' and beneficiaries' ESG preferences in the investment strategies and the management and governance of IORPs?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **3.3 Credit rating agencies**

[Regulation 1060/2009](#) requires credit rating agencies (CRAs) to take into account all factors that are 'material' for the probability of default of the issuer or financial instrument when issuing or changing a credit rating or rating outlook. This covers also ESG factors. According to [ESMA's advice on credit rating sustainability issues and disclosure requirements](#), the extent to which ESG factors are being considered can vary significantly across asset classes, based on each CRA's methodology.

Following the [2018 Action Plan on Financing Sustainable Growth](#), in response to concerns about the extent to which ESG factors were considered by CRAs, ESMA adopted guidelines on disclosure requirements for credit ratings and rating outlooks. [ESMA's Guidelines on these disclosure requirements](#) will become applicable as of April 2020. Pursuant to the guidelines, CRAs should report in which cases ESG factors are key drivers behind the change to the credit rating or rating outlook. Consequently, the current landscape will change in the coming months. The Commission services intend to report on the progress regarding disclosure of ESG considerations by CRAs in 2021.

**Question 95. How would you assess the transparency of the integration of ESG factors into credit ratings by CRAs?**

- 1 - Not transparent at all
- 2 - Rather not transparent

- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather transparent
- 5 - Very transparent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 95.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 95:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Credit ratings agencies are increasingly reflecting ESG considerations in their ratings. A sufficient level of transparency around the credit rating actions is necessary to enable users to understand the main reasons for the rating. In the "Guidelines on Disclosure Requirements Applicable to Credit Ratings", ESMA has noted an inconsistent level of disclosure of ESG integration factors between CRAs ([https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/esma33-9-320\\_final\\_report\\_guidelines\\_on\\_disclosure\\_requirements\\_applicable\\_to\\_credit\\_rating\\_agencies.pdf](https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/esma33-9-320_final_report_guidelines_on_disclosure_requirements_applicable_to_credit_rating_agencies.pdf)).

IOGP believes that CRAs should disclose in a consistent and structured way when and how ESG factors are considered as vital elements in credit ratings and their materiality.

**Question 96. How would you assess the effectiveness of the integration of ESG factors into credit ratings by CRAs?**

- 1 - Not effective at all
- 2 - Rather not effective
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Rather effective
- 5 - Very effective
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 96.1 If necessary, please explain your answer to question 96:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In the ESMA Technical Advice to the European Commission on Sustainability Considerations in the credit rating market, CRAs noted that there is still a degree of inconsistency in how they are able to account for the consideration of each factor ([https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/esma33-9-321\\_technical\\_advice\\_on\\_sustainability\\_considerations\\_in\\_the\\_credit\\_rating\\_market.pdf](https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/esma33-9-321_technical_advice_on_sustainability_considerations_in_the_credit_rating_market.pdf)). For example, most CRAs highlighted that the relevance of governance factors to an entity's creditworthiness, and what constitutes governance factors were well understood. As a result, it is easier to assess where these factors have been considered and had an impact on their credit ratings on an ex-post basis. However, this level of understanding is not necessarily replicated for environmental or social factors. An overly prescriptive approach mandating ESG consideration could dilute the focus of credit ratings

assessment of creditworthiness, with implications for investors who rely on credit ratings for assessing credit risk. On the other hand, drawing too much attention to the ESG consideration could lead to investors misinterpreting credit ratings as they would develop a view on the sustainability of an entity only based on this type of information, as stated by the ESMA Technical Advice.

**Question 97. Beyond the guidelines, in your opinion, should the EU take further actions in this area?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 97.1 If yes, please specify what kind of action you consider would address the identified problems. In particular should the EU consider regulatory intervention?**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As outlined by the ESMA Technical Advice, it could be useful to update the CRA Regulation's disclosure provisions. This update could provide a more consistent level of transparency around how CRAs are considering ESG factors in their assessments and ensure the CRA regulatory framework is aligned with ESG developments.

Additionally, the EU should encourage best practices to ensure that CRAs publish information about rating definitions, criteria, methodologies and procedures so that issuers can retrace the steps an agency took to arrive at its decision.

### **3.4. Natural capital accounting or “environmental footprint”**

Internal tools, such as the practice of natural capital accounting, can help inform companies' decision-making based on the impact of their activities on sustainability factors. **Natural capital accounting or “environmental footprinting”** has the potential to feed into business performance management and decision-making by explicitly mapping out impacts (i.e. the company's environmental footprint across its value chain) and dependencies on natural capital resources and by placing a monetary value on them. In order to ensure appropriate management of environmental risks and mitigation opportunities, and reduce related transaction costs, the Commission will support businesses and other stakeholders in developing standardised **natural capital accounting** practices within the EU and internationally.

**Question 100. Are there any specific existing initiatives (e.g. private, public or other) you suggest the Commission should consider when supporting more businesses and other stakeholders in implementing standardised natural capital accounting/environmental footprinting practices within the EU and internationally?**

- Yes

- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 98.1 If yes, please list a maximum of 3 initiatives:**

*2000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Response to Question Are there any specific existing initiatives (e.g. private, public or other) you suggest the Commission should consider when supporting more businesses and other stakeholders in implementing standardised natural capital accounting/environmental footprinting practices within the EU and internationally?:

We would like to draw the European Commission's attention to the initiative called the Natural Capital Coalition (<https://naturalcapitalcoalition.org/>) which is an international collaboration that unites leading enterprises and organizations under a shared vision of a world that conserves and enhances natural capital. The Coalition developed the Natural Capital Protocol, a decision making framework that enables organizations to identify, measure and value their direct and indirect impacts and dependencies on natural capital. Understanding the complex and dynamic relationships that organizations have with the health of natural assets and the ecosystem services they provide enables organizations to make more informed decisions with benefits for their businesses as well as communities, society, the broader economy and the natural world. Without an understanding of their impacts and dependencies on natural capital, many decision-makers will be at risk of making decisions that are inefficient, ineffective or counterproductive.

**3.5. Improving resilience to adverse climate and environmental impacts**

*(Please note that the Commission is also preparing an upgraded EU Adaptation Strategy. A dedicated public consultation will be launched soon).*

**Climate-related loss and physical risk data**

Investors and asset owners, be they businesses, citizens or public authorities, can better navigate and manage the increased adverse impacts of a changing climate when given access to decision-relevant data. Although many non-life insurance undertakings have built up significant knowledge, most other financial institutions and economic actors have a limited understanding of (increasing) climate-related physical risks.

A wider-spread and more precise understanding of current losses arising from climate- and weather-related events is hence crucial to assess macro-economic impacts, which determine investment environments. It could also be helpful to better calibrate and customise climate-related physical risk models needed to inform investment decisions going forward, to unlock public and private adaptation and resilience investments and to enhance the resilience of the EU's economy and society to the unavoidable impacts of climate change.

**Question 99. In your opinion, should the European Commission take action to enhance the availability, usability and comparability of climate-related loss and physical risk data across the EU?**

- Yes



- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Financial management of physical risk

According to a [report by the European Environmental Agency, during the period of 1980-2017](#), 65% of direct economic losses from climate disasters were not covered by insurance in EU and EFTA countries, with wide discrepancies between Member States, hazards and types of policyholders. The availability and affordability of natural catastrophe financial risk management tools differs widely across the EU, also due to different choices and cultural preferences with regards to ex-ante and ex-post financial management in case of disasters. While the financial industry (and in particular the insurance sector) can play a leading role in managing the financial risk arising from adverse climate impacts by absorbing losses and promoting resilience, [EIOPA has warned that insurability is likely to become an increasing concern](#). Measures to maintain and broaden risk transfer mechanisms might hence require (potentially temporary) public policy solutions.

Furthermore, the ongoing COVID-19 outbreak is highlighting the growing risk arising from pandemics in particular, which will become more frequent with the reduction of biodiversity and wildlife habitat. [UNEP's Frontiers 2016 Report on Emerging Issues of Environment Concern](#) shows that such diseases can threaten economic development.

In this context, social and catastrophe bonds could play a crucial role: the former to orient use of proceeds towards the health system (e.g. IFFIM first vaccine bond issued in 2006), and the latter to broaden the financing options that are available to insurers when it comes to catastrophe reinsurance. Such instruments would help mobilise the broadest possible range of private finance alongside public budgets to contribute to the resilience of the EU's health and economic systems, via prevention and reinsurance.

### **Question 100. Is there a role for the EU to promote more equal access to climate-related financial risk management mechanisms for businesses and citizens across the EU?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **Question 101. Specifically with regards to the insurability of climate-related risks, do you see a role for the EU in this area?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **Question 102. In your view, should investors and / or credit institutions, when they provide financing, be required to carry out an assessment of the potential long-term environmental and climate risks on the project, economic activity, or other assets?**

-

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Additional information

---

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document(s) here.

Please be aware that such additional information will not be considered if the questionnaire is left completely empty.

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

### Useful links

[More on this consultation \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-sustainable-finance-strategy\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-sustainable-finance-strategy_en)

[Consultation document \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-sustainable-finance-strategy-consultation-document\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-sustainable-finance-strategy-consultation-document)

[More on sustainable finance \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/sustainable-finance\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/sustainable-finance_en)

[Specific privacy statement \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-sustainable-finance-strategy-specific-privacy-statement\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-sustainable-finance-strategy-specific-privacy-statement_en)

[More on the Transparency register \(http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en\)](http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en)

### Contact

fisma-sf-consultation@ec.europa.eu

