



Rainbow washing the SDGs away

For use in Australia only

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have been broadly embraced by financial institutions. This is a positive move, and timely too. The 2019 Edelman Trust Barometer^{1G} indicates that the finance industry remains the least trusted business sector and is often, quite rightly, blamed for failing to address the great social and environmental challenges of our time.

In this environment, the SDGs offer a unique opportunity, some might say life raft, to align the purpose of finance with globally agreed sustainable development objectives. The United Nations (UN) itself argues that finance must play a critical role in closing a funding gap in developing countries, estimated to be USD2.5 – 3 trillion per year between now and 2030².

This shift is supported by client demand, with Morningstar reporting a ‘Record-Shattering Year for Sustainable Investing’³ in 2019. With this has come a proliferation of funds that claim to invest sustainably, with many linking their investment objectives to the SDGs. Indeed, even ‘mainstream’ investors, like large pension funds and sovereign (state-owned) wealth funds have sought to map their investments to the goals.

Running hard on quicksand – investors are struggling to validate and articulate SDG contributions

The embrace by investors of the SDGs is not without its issues and carries significant risks. Unlike other responsible investment approaches, the SDGs were not designed as a private investment framework, nor are there agreed disclosure requirements or minimum standards. To make matters worse, the information that investors rely on to make decisions related to the SDGs is even sketchier than it is for other environmental, social and governance (ESG) factors, with the Ethical Corporation⁴ and Oxfam⁵ among others finding that SDG reporting by companies is weak and given to ‘greenwashing’^G, or ‘rainbow washing’^G.

There are several issues we have seen with different external fund reporting:

1. Lack of balance, where case studies of positive SDG impacts are not balanced with risks and issues the company faces.
2. Lack of portfolio disclosure, so clients and stakeholders are left to rely on high level ESG metrics and case studies.
3. Simplistic and overly-broad approaches to tagging company contributions which can lead to misaligned and inappropriate stock inclusions.
4. A lack of information on the approach and processes, both where qualitative judgments are required or where quantitative approaches fail to acknowledge data issues and gaps.

For example, we hold Nestlé in our Worldwide Leaders strategy and believe the company is moving in the right direction in terms of access to nutrition, supply chains and packaging, but readily acknowledge risks from bottled water, plastic packaging and responsible sourcing. We provide this detail via our [interactive portfolio map](#). We often say that there is no such thing as a perfect company, but too often we see the positives expressed without the negatives for large, complex and evolving companies like Nestlé.

It is one thing to have omissions from disclosures that are properly addressed through the investment process. However, we have also seen instances where companies are included in SDG labelled funds when we believe they do not deserve to be. For example, pharmaceutical companies like AbbVie who have faced criticism for drug pricing and rate poorly in the [Access to Medicine Index](#)^G across most areas. The company has also faced controversies over elaborate kickback^G schemes for doctors and engaged in extensive litigation to prevent competition from generics for their Humira drug, which is technically, although not practically, off-patent.

Companies like AbbVie are sometimes simplistically tagged with SDG 3 – Good Health and Well-being. However, as this example shows, it is important to look deeper at a company’s business practices.



Examples like these also underline the importance of focusing on the 174 targets rather than take a broad view on the 17 goals, which in some applications can capture the majority of companies. Even socially useful and ethical companies should not be tagged with SDGs if they do not in fact contribute to the underlying targets.

The critique in this article is not about individual fund’s investment choices, but rather the inability for clients and prospective clients to understand what choices are being made and why. Even well intended approaches in this regard risk a fund’s reputation and further reducing public confidence in the whole industry.

What can fix this problem?

We believe that a principles-based framework is required - one which can help improve the credibility of SDG-related claims while allowing for the diversity of reasonably held beliefs and approaches to sustainable investment.

To achieve this end, we have developed and started to apply principles for our own SDG claims. We believe these principles have broader application, both by asset owners wishing to test the claims made by asset managers, and asset managers wanting to ensure the credibility of their own products. The principles are as follows:

SDG claims should:

1. Demonstrate a clear link to SDG targets, especially where developing countries are differentiated from developed.
2. Be meaningful and relevant for the company (not corporate philanthropy) either as:
 - a. a revenue/growth driver
 - b. strategic initiative backed by research and development (R&D) and capital expenditure

c. a function of deep culture and ‘how they do things’ e.g. for gender equality targets

3. Make a real and preferably recurring difference to target outcomes by being demonstrable (not necessarily measurable) and deliberate.
4. Recognise and be transparent about negative impacts from the company, including contradictions and risks of perverse outcomes – with claims only being made where disclosure is balanced and comfort can be drawn that negatives are being addressed.

Additionally, investors should be clear about what type of contribution an investee company is making, recognising that not all ‘sustainable’ companies necessarily contribute directly to the SDG targets with companies noted as either providing:

1. Direct contributions to targets
2. Enabling/supporting activities
3. Sustainable and socially useful products and services, but not directly relevant to a target

By extension, applying these principles would require full portfolio holdings disclosure.

Principles in practice - examples of how companies are contributing to sustainable development

Examples of companies we have so far categorised this way include, Ain Holdings, a Japanese drug store dispensary that has been the clear leader in distributing generic medications through a large retail network, making these medicines more accessible for rural and low-income populations. This is particularly important with Japan’s ageing population. We believe Ain make a direct contribution to:

SDG target 3.8: Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health-care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all.

A company providing supporting activities is Ansys, which has created the world’s leading engineering and product design software. Ansys is supporting a move towards a circular economy⁶ (SDG 12.2 and 12.5) as its software virtually tests performance of products and processes, with the ability to evaluate energy efficiency, greenhouse gas emissions and water usage. The technology reduces development time 9x and overall product cost 4x. While we are

concerned that Ansys software is used by the defence and oil and gas industry, these represent relatively small proportions of revenue at around 1% each.

Lastly, an example of a company whose products are sustainable and socially useful, but not directly linked to an SDG target, is Pigeon, which manufactures and distributes best-in-class infant feeding products, including bottles and breast pumps, but also health and hygiene products for the elderly.

In our attempts to apply these principles, we have started with our Worldwide strategies, where we have also developed a new [microsite](#) and interactive map that provides full portfolio disclosure. While it is a work in progress, we will gradually improve our approach and roll it out in our other strategies.

Standards for claims made about the SDGs across the industry must improve, lest trust be further eroded and the all-important real world impacts fail to materialise. Transparency is a critical feature of building trust, as is the ability to demonstrate that companies are making a meaningful and enduring impact on sustainable development through their core business activities and conduct. As we look to improve our own disclosure, we invite other investors to join us on this journey.

¹ Source: 2019 Edelman Trust Barometer.

² https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/EXEC.SUM_SG-Roadmap-Financing-SDGs-July-2019.pdf

³ <https://www.morningstar.co.uk/uk/news/199190/record-shattering-year-for-sustainable-investments.aspx>

⁴ <http://globalsustain.org/files/The%20Responsible%20Business%20Trends%20Report%202019.pdf>

⁵ <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620550/dp-walking-the-talk-business-sdgs-240918-en.pdf>

Source for company information: Stewart Investors investment team. The Stewart Investors Sustainable Funds Group supports the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The full list of SDGs can be found on the [United Nations website](#). This stock information does not constitute any offer or inducement to enter into any investment activity nor is it a recommendation to purchase or sell any security.

Glossary

Access to Medicine Index: analyses how the world's largest pharmaceutical companies are addressing access to medicine in low- to middle-income countries for various diseases, conditions and pathogens.

Circular economy: an economic system aimed at eliminating waste and the continual use of resources rather than a traditional linear economy (make, use, dispose).

Edelman Trust Barometer: an annual trust and credibility survey, measuring trust across a number of institutions, sectors and geographies. The 2019 Barometer surveyed more than 33,000 respondents across 27 countries.

Greenwashing: making products appear more environmentally friendly than they are.

Kickback: is an illegal payment intended as compensation for preferential treatment or other improper services. The kickback may be money, a gift, credit, or anything of value.

Rainbow washing: making products appear more aligned and targeted to the colourful icons of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

Important information

This document has been prepared and issued by First Sentier Investors (Australia) IM Limited (ABN 89 114 194 311 AFSL 289017) (FSI AIM).

Stewart Investors is a trading name of FSI AIM. FSI AIM forms part of First Sentier Investors, which is ultimately owned by Mitsubishi UFJ Financial Group, Inc (MUFG), a global financial group.

It is directed at persons who are professional, sophisticated or wholesale clients and has not been prepared for and is not intended for persons who are retail clients. A copy of the Financial Services Guide for FSI AIM is available from First Sentier Investors on its website. This material contains general information only. It is not intended to provide you with financial product advice and does not take into account your objectives, financial situation or needs. Before making an investment decision, you should consider, with a financial adviser, whether this information is appropriate in light of your investment needs, objectives and financial situation.

MUFG and its subsidiaries do not guarantee the performance of any financial products mentioned or the repayment of capital in relation to any financial products mentioned. Investments in any investment-type financial products mentioned are not deposits or other liabilities of MUFG or its subsidiaries, and investment-type products are subject to investment risk including loss of income and capital invested.

To the extent permitted by law, no liability is accepted by FSI AIM, MUFG or any affiliates thereof for any loss or damage as a result of any reliance on this information. This information is, or is based upon, information that we believe to be accurate and reliable, however neither FSI AIM, MUFG nor any affiliates thereof offer any warranty that it contains no factual errors. No part of this material may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written consent of FSI AIM.

In Australia 'Colonial', 'CFS' and 'Colonial First State' are trade marks of Colonial Holding Company Limited and 'Colonial First State Investments' is a trade mark of the Bank and all of these trade marks are used by First Sentier Investors under licence.

Contact details

Edinburgh

23 St Andrew Square
Edinburgh EH2 1BB
United Kingdom
t. +44 (0) 131 473 2900

London

Finsbury Circus House
15 Finsbury Circus
London EC2M 7EB
United Kingdom
t. +44 (0) 207 332 6500

Singapore

58 Duxton Road
2nd & 3rd Floor
Singapore 089522
t. +65 680 59670

Sydney

Suite 10, Level 3
13 Hickson Road
Dawes Point
Sydney NSW
Australia 2000
t. +61 2 8274 8000

info@stewartinvestors.com
stewartinvestors.com