

# Financial Services

## ESG Evaluation Key Sustainability Factors

Submit Your Feedback  
Online | Email

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Lai Ly**  
Sustainable Finance  
Paris  
+33 1 4075 2597  
[lai.ly@spglobal.com](mailto:lai.ly@spglobal.com)

**Florence Devevey**  
Sustainable Finance  
Paris  
+33 1 4075 2501  
[florence.devevey@spglobal.com](mailto:florence.devevey@spglobal.com)

**Michael T Ferguson**  
Sustainable Finance  
New York  
+1 212 438 7670  
[michael.ferguson@spglobal.com](mailto:michael.ferguson@spglobal.com)



---

**S&P Global**  
Ratings

## Approach

Our key sustainability factors identify the most material environmental and social risks assessed in our ESG Evaluation. We assess the materiality<sup>1</sup> of those risks across the industry’s value chain and reflect them in the weighting of our environmental and social factors. We also provide the quantitative indicators<sup>2</sup> used to assess an entity’s performance relative to its industry peers on each of those factors. For further information, please refer to our [“Environmental, Social, And Governance Evaluation: Analytical Approach.”](#)

## Scope

The financial services sector encompasses a wide variety of companies. The scope of this document covers the banks, insurance, and asset management subsectors. In this report, we use the terms "financial services" or "FS" to refer to these subsectors.





## Material Environmental Risks

**Climate change:** Banks, insurers, and asset managers are largely exposed to climate change issues, both transition and physical risks, due to their role as financiers of the economy. We anticipate those risks to be proportional to the impact of climate change on the economy. Although a risk, it also offers business opportunities for new financial products and services promoting a greener economy. That said, while FS companies have good expertise in managing their traditional risks and leveraging opportunities, they currently lack standardized data, methodology, and human resources to effectively address climate-related issues. Insurers, because of their expertise in insuring climate-related risks, have been relatively more aware and better equipped in this area. In general, asset managers have also been catching up relatively well, mainly thanks to a more focused business model and their demanding institutional clients who are requesting innovative climate-related investment solutions.

## Environmental Factors: Weighting And KPIs

We place a strong emphasis in our ESG Evaluation on the environmental impact financed (i.e., funded, insured, and/or invested in) by FS companies, because any direct impact from their own operations is generally limited. The higher weight on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reflects a relatively larger exposure to this factor for most financed sectors. The equal weight to the other three factors reflects a relatively lower exposure but equally important environmental challenges facing the economy.

We use both qualitative and quantitative indicators to inform our opinion on an entity’s management of its environmental impact relative to its industry average. Our qualitative analysis focuses on the effective integration of environmental factors into the lending/investing/insurance underwriting processes, and whether this results in actual and comprehensive measures, such as financing/insuring restrictions, engagement with clients/investee companies, or targeted green products and services. The main quantitative performance indicators are listed below.

Factor	Weight	Key performance indicators	Other performance indicators
 <b>Greenhouse gas emissions</b>	40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of most carbon intensive sectors* in the financed portfolio (% total amount financed)</li> <li>– Share of companies/assets assessed on GHG criteria/engaged with on GHG or climate related themes§</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of green products and services targeting GHG or climate change-related issues (% total amount financed/% insurance revenue)</li> </ul>
 <b>Water</b>	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of most water intensive sectors* of the financed portfolio (% total amount financed)</li> <li>– Share of companies/assets assessed on water criteria/engaged with on water related themes§</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of green products and services targeting water-related issues (% total amount financed/% insurance revenue)</li> </ul>
 <b>Waste and pollution</b>	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of most waste intensive sectors* of the financed portfolio (% total amount financed)</li> <li>– Share of companies/assets assessed on waste criteria/engaged with on waste related themes§</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of green products and services targeting waste and pollution-related issues (% total amount financed/% insurance revenue)</li> </ul>
 <b>Land use and biodiversity</b>	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of sectors most exposed to biodiversity risks* of the financed portfolio (% total amount financed)</li> <li>– Share of companies/assets assessed on biodiversity criteria/engaged with on biodiversity related themes§</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of green products and services targeting land use and biodiversity-related issues (% total amount financed/% insurance revenue)</li> </ul>

\*Sectors with exposure above the global average across sectors and geographies.

§As number and % total corporate suppliers, clients, and investee companies.

## Material Social Risks





**Customers:** FS companies serve a large number and various categories of customers. Therefore, they depend greatly on customer satisfaction and trust, and on effective customer management to maintain their franchises. Conduct issues with retail customers, especially at banks and insurers, such as the occurrence of potential discriminatory practices, mis-selling, lack of transparency, or fraudulent activities, can undermine customer trust and damage reputation and finances. Technological issues and cybersecurity could disrupt customers' access to online services and raise concerns over the treatment of personal data. There has been mounting regulation in recent years to strengthen cyber systems and ensure fair treatment of customers, such as the TCF (Treating Customers Fairly) principles of the U.K. Financial Conduct Authority.

**Workforce:** The heavy dependence of FS companies on skilled labor resources poses significant social risks that continue to test their human capital management skills. Fierce competition, increasing use of automation, artificial intelligence, and digitalization bring new challenges and force FS companies to adjust business models and workforce management. This includes continuous training to reskill employees on new roles, products, or regulations, and fair treatment of employees, especially in cases of downsizing or reorganization. As they also outsource and offshore a growing number of functions to reduce costs, responsible management of their supply chains is becoming more important. Insurers and asset managers rely more extensively on third-party distributors to sell products; hence, making sure their distributors apply similar ESG principles as they do is critical, yet complex. Another challenge for the FS sector is to attract and retain talent, especially programmers and cyber risk experts, as well as the younger generation.

## Social Factors: Weighting And KPIs

Our assessment of the social profile in our ESG Evaluation is balanced between social issues occurring in own operations and the rest of the value chain. We put more emphasis on both customer engagement and workforce and diversity because we expect those factors to remain more material for FS. Treating employees and customers fairly and effectively managing the impacts of changing business models on the workforce and customers are key challenges for the FS companies. As financiers of the economy, they also play a significant role in communities, primarily by promoting financial inclusion.

In our ESG Evaluation, we use qualitative and quantitative indicators to inform our opinion on an entity's management of its social impact relative to the industry average. Qualitative analysis focuses on the effective integration of social factors into the lending/investing/insurance underwriting processes, and whether this results in actual and comprehensive measures such as financing/insuring restrictions, engagement with clients, or ESG products and services with social targets. The main quantitative performance indicators are listed below.

Factor	Weight	Key Performance Indicators	Other performance indicators
 <b>Customer engagement</b>	35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Customer satisfaction metrics</li> <li>– Comprehensiveness of data privacy policies (number of policies)</li> <li>– Number of complaints on data privacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of companies assessed on customer criteria/engaged with on customer related themes§</li> </ul>
 <b>Workforce and diversity</b>	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Voluntary and involuntary turnover rate (%)</li> <li>– % of woman in senior management positions, and in revenue-generating functions</li> <li>– Training hours/employee versus employees filling internal roles (% of roles filled by employees)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of companies assessed on workforce criteria/engaged with on workforce related themes§</li> <li>– ESG products and services targeting workforce related issues (% total amount financed/% insurance revenue)</li> </ul>
 <b>Communities</b>	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Philanthropic contributions by category (% of total contributions)</li> <li>– Inclusive banking/investment/insurance products (% of total amount financed/% insurance revenue)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of companies assessed on communities criteria/engaged with on communities related themes§</li> </ul>
 <b>Safety management</b>	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Absenteeism rate (% of total days scheduled)</li> <li>– Comprehensiveness of occupational health and safety (OH&amp;S) oversight measures (number of measures)</li> <li>– Share of most safety intensive sectors* of the financed portfolio (% total amount financed)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share of companies assessed on safety criteria/engaged with on safety related themes§</li> <li>– ESG products and services targeting safety related issues % total amount financed/% insurance revenue)</li> </ul>

\*Sectors with exposure above the global average across sectors and geographies.

§As number and % total corporate suppliers, clients, and investee companies.

## Material Governance Risks

**Cyber security:** Banks, insurers, and asset managers are heavily reliant on IT systems, using digitization (or computer processing of information) extensively. Growing use of data mining and artificial intelligence (AI), and the digitalization of business models have brought significant efficiency gains and facilitated financial access. However, this has exposed FS companies to the risk of IT infrastructure failures, cyber attacks, and new and quickly evolving risks, such as AI-related ones (e.g., privacy, opacity, unintended bias, and unemployment, to name a few). The resulting business disruptions, loss of information, and data privacy issues could subject companies to high and unpredictable costs and reputational risks, given the large number of customers and business partners involved. Several analyses, such as the IMF Working Paper dated August 2017 - Cyber Risk, Market Failures, and Financial Stability - have shown that cyber incidents affecting FS companies could evolve into a systemic cyber crisis, given FS companies' role in ensuring financial stability. Preparing to manage such risks to ensure business continuity remains an important challenge in this sector.

**Business ethics:** Although they apply to most sectors, issues related to business ethics are highly material to our ESG Evaluation for FS companies, given their role in financing the economy and in ensuring financial stability. Some banks have been involved in serious controversies related to, for example, mis-selling of financial products and failures of controls to identify and prevent money laundering, tax evasion, or other unlawful activities. The resulting financial and reputational damage of such instances can be significant and spread over several years. Despite this, some banks are still struggling to implement fully effective business ethics policies, as highlighted by the recurrence of serious controversies. Insurers can face scrutiny over opaque terms in insurance contracts and even claims of mis-selling or other abusive practices, such as delaying claims settlements. Although traditionally not considered to be particularly susceptible to financial crimes, insurance companies may be increasingly vulnerable to such activities, given criminals' mounting sophistication. At the extreme, serious misconduct could undermine confidence in FS companies, thus threatening financial stability. Therefore in our ESG Evaluation, we pay particular attention to the remuneration structures and practices at FS companies to ensure pay does not encourage excessive risk taking.

## Governance Factors

We consider four key entity-specific factors in our ESG Evaluations (structure and oversight, code and values, transparency and reporting, and financial and operational risks) to determine whether the entity is actively and effectively managing its exposure to governance risks and opportunities. The governance factors are common to all sectors. Please refer to our [“Environmental, Social, And Governance Evaluation: Analytical Approach.”](#)

## Submit Feedback

You can submit your feedback [online](#) or by [email](#).

Please specify which sector you are commenting on when submitting feedback.

We would particularly like to hear from you regarding:

1. Which risks are missing or not relevant?
2. Which KPIs are missing, could be enhanced, or are not relevant?
3. What views do you have on the suggested factor weights for the environmental and social analysis?
4. Do you have additional feedback on this document?

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Events and issues are material for the ESG Evaluation when in our view they could meaningfully affect the entity's business operations, cash flows, legal or regulatory liabilities, access to capital, reputation, or relationships with key stakeholders and society more generally, either directly or through its value chain (upstream or downstream).

<sup>2</sup> Some may be produced using different methodologies and scopes.

## Related Research

- [The ESG Risk Atlas: Sector And Regional Rationales And Scores](#), July 22, 2020
- [Our Updated ESG Risk Atlas And Key Sustainability Factors: A Companion Guide](#), July 22, 2020
- [Environmental, Social, And Governance Evaluation: Analytical Approach](#), June 17, 2020
- [How We Apply Our ESG Evaluation Analytical Approach: Part 2](#), June 17, 2020

## Analytical Contacts

### Bruno Bastit

Sustainable Finance  
Madrid  
bruno.bastit  
@spglobal.com

### Corinne Bendersky

Sustainable Finance  
New York  
corinne.bendersky  
@spglobal.com

### Florence Devevey

Sustainable Finance  
Paris  
florence.devevey  
@spglobal.com

### Noémie de la Gorce

Sustainable Finance  
London  
noemie.delagorce  
@spglobal.com

### Bernard de Longevialle

Sustainable Finance  
Paris  
bernard.delongevialle  
@spglobal.com

### Thomas Englerth

Sustainable Finance  
New York  
thomas.englerth  
@spglobal.com

### Michael Ferguson

Sustainable Finance  
New York  
michael.ferguson  
@spglobal.com

### Bertrand Jabouley

Sustainable Finance  
Singapore  
bertrand.jabouley  
@spglobal.com

### Lai Ly

Sustainable Finance  
Paris  
lai.ly  
@spglobal.com

### Jesus Palacios

Sustainable Finance  
Mexico  
jesus.palacios  
@spglobal.com

### Dennis Sugrue

Insurance Rating  
London  
dennis.sugrue  
@spglobal.com

### Emmanuel Volland

Bank Rating  
Paris  
emmanuel.volland  
@spglobal.com

Copyright © 2021 by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC. All rights reserved.

No content (including ratings, credit-related analyses and data, valuations, model, software or other application or output therefrom) or any part thereof (Content) may be modified, reverse engineered, reproduced or distributed in any form by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC or its affiliates (collectively, S&P). The Content shall not be used for any unlawful or unauthorized purposes. S&P and any third-party providers, as well as their directors, officers, shareholders, employees or agents (collectively S&P Parties) do not guarantee the accuracy, completeness, timeliness or availability of the Content. S&P Parties are not responsible for any errors or omissions (negligent or otherwise), regardless of the cause, for the results obtained from the use of the Content, or for the security or maintenance of any data input by the user. The Content is provided on an "as is" basis. S&P PARTIES DISCLAIM ANY AND ALL EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR USE, FREEDOM FROM BUGS, SOFTWARE ERRORS OR DEFECTS, THAT THE CONTENT'S FUNCTIONING WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED OR THAT THE CONTENT WILL OPERATE WITH ANY SOFTWARE OR HARDWARE CONFIGURATION. In no event shall S&P Parties be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental, exemplary, compensatory, punitive, special or consequential damages, costs, expenses, legal fees, or losses (including, without limitation, lost income or lost profits and opportunity costs or losses caused by negligence) in connection with any use of the Content even if advised of the possibility of such damages.

Credit-related and other analyses, including ratings, and statements in the Content are statements of opinion as of the date they are expressed and not statements of fact. S&P's opinions, analyses and rating acknowledgment decisions (described below) are not recommendations to purchase, hold, or sell any securities or to make any investment decisions, and do not address the suitability of any security. S&P assumes no obligation to update the Content following publication in any form or format. The Content should not be relied on and is not a substitute for the skill, judgment and experience of the user, its management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions. S&P does not act as a fiduciary or an investment advisor except where registered as such. While S&P has obtained information from sources it believes to be reliable, S&P does not perform an audit and undertakes no duty of due diligence or independent verification of any information it receives. Rating-related publications may be published for a variety of reasons that are not necessarily dependent on action by rating committees, including, but not limited to, the publication of a periodic update on a credit rating and related analyses.

To the extent that regulatory authorities allow a rating agency to acknowledge in one jurisdiction a rating issued in another jurisdiction for certain regulatory purposes, S&P reserves the right to assign, withdraw or suspend such acknowledgment at any time and in its sole discretion. S&P Parties disclaim any duty whatsoever arising out of the assignment, withdrawal or suspension of an acknowledgment as well as any liability for any damage alleged to have been suffered on account thereof.

S&P keeps certain activities of its business units separate from each other in order to preserve the independence and objectivity of their respective activities. As a result, certain business units of S&P may have information that is not available to other S&P business units. S&P has established policies and procedures to maintain the confidentiality of certain non-public information received in connection with each analytical process.

S&P may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P's public ratings and analyses are made available on its Web sites, [www.standardandpoors.com](http://www.standardandpoors.com) (free of charge), and [www.ratingsdirect.com](http://www.ratingsdirect.com) (subscription), and may be distributed through other means, including via S&P publications and third-party redistributors. Additional information about our ratings fees is available at [www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees](http://www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees).

STANDARD & POOR'S, S&P and RATINGSDIRECT are registered trademarks of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC.