

Green Beta: Carbon Efficiency Investing

- *Fossil fuel divestment activism has elevated awareness of climate change and its implications for investing.*
- *Investors concerned about climate change should consider their fiduciary responsibility as well as their desire to de-carbonize their investments.*
- *We believe a Green Beta approach fulfills both environmental and fiduciary objectives.*

William Cazalet, CAIA
Managing Director,
Head of Active Equity Strategies



Karen Q. Wong, CFA
Managing Director,
Head of Equity Portfolio Management



From rising sea levels to extreme weather, there is mounting scientific evidence that global warming is real and immediate. Despite many irreconcilable ideological differences, President Obama and China's President Xi reached a mutual agreement last November to reduce carbon emissions within the two largest economies in the world, sending a strong signal to other countries to follow suit and act now. As investors, what solutions do we have in our hands to build a greener economy? In this paper, we discuss an investment approach that we term *Green Beta*, which we believe can help contribute to a lower carbon economy. The ultimate question for such an approach is: how can we create a low carbon investment strategy without undermining the key responsibility of a fiduciary—to generate a reasonable return on capital?

One Perspective: Fossil Fuel Divestment

The fossil fuel divestment campaign on university campuses deserves credit for raising the climate change issue in the investment arena. This campaign is built largely around the “stranded assets” argument, which may be summarized as follows: global warming, if unaddressed, is forecast to increase the earth's average temperature two degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. This would eventually render the earth unsustainable for many forms of life including human beings. In order to stay within this two-degree limit, only a small portion of carbon reserves can be burned. Consequently, many argue that the majority of carbon reserves are unburnable and hence stranded and overvalued. This in turn drives the economic argument for fossil fuel divestment.

A Fresh Perspective—Beyond Fossil Fuel

While the stranded assets argument is powerful and has a number of prominent advocates, in our view it's incomplete. It requires assumptions about energy supply and demand that are driven by many complex factors such as regulations and innovation. In addition, it represents a practical challenge: The global economy is so energy-dependent that it is currently impossible to implement a near-term wholesale shift away from fossil fuels and the technologies that use them without a massive—many would say unacceptable—economic impact. While some countries have taken steps to materially increase energy produced by alternative means, no viable comprehensive alternative energy infrastructure currently exists to meet existing energy needs on a global basis. Therefore, we must accept that significant changes in energy production and usage will likely come about more gradually; we need a way to have a more immediate impact.


While we certainly don't dismiss the climate risk associated with fossil fuel assets or carbon reserves, we believe that they represent a less effective yardstick for addressing the immediacy of global warming. Until a model is developed to estimate such risk more reliably, we prefer to focus on carbon emissions—it is these that are raising temperatures, creating air pollution, and damaging fragile ecosystems today. The earth will not cool down by itself. According to a recent research study by NASA and NOAA¹, global temperatures increased 0.68 degree Celsius above the long term average in 2014, making it the warmest year on record. The greenhouse gases emitted today will stay in the atmosphere for many decades to come, so we must focus on what we put in the air every day to create a sense

¹ National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Institute for Space Studies GISS Surface Temperature Analysis (GISTEMPP and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration January 16, 2015

of urgency for reducing carbon emissions. Almost every company emits greenhouse gases and contributes to global warming to some extent. As we invest, we have a choice to make regarding the companies that we invest in and how much capital we allocate to them. That choice can have an environmental impact as we support those companies that make the world greener.

Another Fresh Perspective—Beyond Divestment

Divestment imposes investment risk in terms of increased volatility. To illustrate this impact, we can consider the Energy sector as a proxy for fossil fuels, and exclude this sector from the Russell 3000® Index to create a custom Russell 3000 ex Energy Index. The ex-post tracking error of this Russell 3000 ex Energy Index against its parent Russell 3000 Index from 1997 to 2014 is 1.59% per annum (the ex-ante tracking error is 1.20%). The chart below depicts the annual returns of the Russell 3000 ex Energy Index, relative to the parent index since 1997. While the divestment approach might look smart in light of the recent plunge in oil prices, the same approach would have struggled to gain adherents during the strong energy run-up from 2004 to 2007, during which the Russell 3000 ex Energy Index would have returned 36.10%, compared to the Russell 3000 return of 44.54%.



Investment performance considerations aside, those divesting their holdings in fossil fuel companies lose their voice of influence over those companies. There is also risk that the holdings, and with them the voice of influence on climate change issues, pass to other investors that are less concerned with such issues. Aside from coal, which has the highest level of carbon per unit of energy and faces a range of sensible substitutes in power generation, we believe that oil and gas assets can benefit from innovations and technological advances in energy production. This motivates us to engage with companies that produce and use fossil fuels to adopt more environmentally friendly corporate policies in order to improve their carbon footprint. In addition, energy companies happen to be a very convenient target, while many companies in the other sectors—predominantly utilities, materials, and industrials—make profits while ignoring or dismissing global warming. Fighting global warming is a long journey, from reducing carbon emissions in the near term to building a more environmentally friendly energy infrastructure globally. We believe that divestment is a missed opportunity to influence changes, and engagement is a better strategy.

Designed to Achieve Two Objectives in One Strategy: Environmental Impact and Fiduciary Responsibility

The journey from awareness to implementation is a long one. From the first time that they hear about the fossil fuel divestment campaign to the moment that they decide to make an impact on global warming, investors are often unsure how to execute a carbon efficient strategy while still fulfilling their fiduciary responsibility. Unlike some earlier adopters who are willing to give up return and/or accept significant deviation from the broader market for a social or environmental objective, most institutional investors need to pursue a reasonable return on capital, as expressed in commonly measured terms.


PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS.

As investors assess the carbon exposures in their portfolios, many will likely conclude that those exposures come predominantly from their index allocation. Given that index-based investing, by definition, tends to be broad based, it includes companies that are heavy emitters of greenhouse gases. This is an important insight because, even with a benchmark-centric strategy—*Green Beta* investing—investors would be able to decarbonize their overall holdings in a defensible manner. Furthermore, these investors are not forced to question or determine whether or not fully active low-carbon investing truly adds or subtracts value from their portfolio. Such an insight into carbon exposures builds the basis for *Green Beta* investing. We believe fulfilling both the environmental and fiduciary objectives in a *Green Beta* strategy can be achieved by striking the appropriate balance between addressing carbon exposure and achieving suitable beta exposure.

To illustrate this point, consider the right-hand chart in Figure 2 below, which shows that the three most carbon-intensive sectors in the Russell 3000® index—utilities, energy, and materials—account for more than 75% of the overall carbon emissions intensity² of the index, and yet represent just over 16% of the overall index composition (below left in Figure 2). One potential pitfall in pursuit of quick carbon emissions exposure reduction is to significantly underweight these three sectors, which can introduce unintended sector tilts. We think it's better to underweight companies within these sectors that have higher carbon intensity, while maintaining exposure to the sectors as a whole by overweighting companies within the same sectors that are taking a more proactive approach to reducing their carbon emissions. A truly robust strategy goes beyond the sector level and neutralizes exposures even at the industry level. This is particularly important when considering a sector as diverse as Consumer Discretionary, where an unintended bias can be created between two different industries that form part of the sector (auto and apparel, for example).

Figure 2: Carbon Emissions Intensity and Russell 3000® Index Weight As of August 31, 2014

Data sources: Mellon Capital and MSCI ESG Research



Beyond sector and industry constraints, risk control is necessary at other levels in order to create a well-balanced *Green Beta* strategy. Most high carbon intensity companies exhibit factor characteristics of lower volatility, larger market capitalization, orientation towards value and away from growth, and higher yield, to name a few. It's important to compensate for these factor exposures arising from underweighting such companies in order to achieve lower carbon exposure. Furthermore, individual security misweights must be limited so as to avoid introducing idiosyncratic risk to the strategy.

Conclusion: Green Beta

Since 2011, the fossil fuel divestment movement has elevated awareness of global warming and its implications for investing. Combating global warming is a long journey, and taking the first step demands deliberation and planning, especially with respect to fiduciary responsibility. In evaluating an approach to addressing the issues raised by fossil fuels and their impact on global warming, investors should consider their fiduciary responsibility in tandem with their desire to decarbonize their investments. Overall we believe a *Green Beta* approach fulfills both environmental and fiduciary objectives, and offers a great opportunity to broadly mobilize the investment community to do its part in reducing emissions in the near term.

² Carbon intensity is defined as carbon emissions per unit of sales.

Publication Disclosure

Mellon Capital Management and its abbreviated form Mellon Capital are service marks of Mellon Capital Management Corporation.

This publication reflects the opinion of the authors as of the date noted and is subject to change without notice. The information in this publication has been developed internally and/or obtained from sources we believe to be reliable; however, Mellon Capital does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of such information. This publication is provided for informational purposes only and is not provided as a sales or advertising communication nor does it constitute investment advice or a recommendation for any particular investment product or strategy for any particular investor. Economic forecasts and estimated data reflect subjective judgments and assumptions and unexplained events may occur. Therefore, there can be no assurance that developments will transpire as forecasted in this publication. Past performance is not an indication of future performance.

Charts and graphs herein are provided as illustrations only and are not meant to be guarantees of any return. The illustrations are based upon certain assumptions that may or may not turn out to be true.

No part of this article may be reproduced in any form, or referred to in any other publication without express written permission of Mellon Capital Management Corporation.

Mellon Capital Management Corporation (“Mellon Capital”) is an investment adviser registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. Mellon Capital is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation (“BNY Mellon”).

The providers of the indices referred to herein are not affiliated with Mellon Capital, do not endorse, sponsor, sell or promote the investment strategies or products mentioned herein and they make no representation regarding the advisability of investing in the products and strategies described herein.

Russell Investments is the owner of the trademarks and copyrights relating to the Russell 1000® Index, the Russell 1000® Growth Index, the Russell 1000® Value Index, the Russell 2000® Index, the Russell 2000® Growth Index, the Russell 2000® Value Index, the Russell 2500TM Index, the Russell 3000® Index, the Russell Midcap® Growth Index, Russell Top 200® Value Index, and the Russell Midcap® Value Index.

Neither MSCI nor any other party involved in or related to compiling, computing or creating the MSCI data makes any express or implied warranties or representations with respect to such data (or the results to be obtained by the use thereof), and all such parties hereby expressly disclaim all warranties of originality, accuracy, completeness, merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose with respect to any of such data. Without limiting any of the foregoing, in no event shall MSCI, any of its affiliates or any third party involved in or related to compiling, computing or creating the data have any liability for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential or any other damages (including lost profits) even if notified of the possibility of such damages. No further distribution or dissemination of the MSCI data is permitted without MSCI’s express written consent. Neither MSCI nor any other party involved in or related to compiling, computing or creating the MSCI data recommends, endorses, approves or otherwise expresses any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies and none of the data is intended to constitute investment advice or a recommendation to make (or refrain from making) any kind of investment decision and may not be relied on as such.

Australian prospects and clients, please note the following: If this document is used or distributed in Australia, it is issued by BNY Mellon Asset Management Australia Limited (“BNY AMI Australia”) (ABN 56 102 482 815, AFS License No. 227865) located at Level 6, Macquarie Place, Sydney, NSW 2000. BNY AMI Australia holds an Australian Financial Services Licence authorising it to provide financial services in Australia. BNY AMI Australia also introduces the capabilities of BNY Mellon affiliated United States asset managers or investment advisers, such as Mellon Capital Management Corporation, in Australia. Mellon Capital is exempt from the requirement to hold an Australian Financial Services Licence under the Corporations Act 2001 in respect of financial services provided in Australia. Mellon Capital, and any financial services that may be provided by Mellon Capital, are regulated by the SEC under United States laws, which differ from Australian laws. This material is for wholesale clients only and is not intended for distribution to, nor should it be relied upon by, retail clients.

Japanese prospects and clients, please note the following: BNY Mellon Asset Management Japan Limited (“BNY AMI Japan”) provides information about the investment advisory skills and products of BNY Mellon’s investment management firms in Japan. Mellon Capital provides subadvisory services to BNY AMI Japan. The presentation is not an invitation of subscription and provides information only. BNY AMI Japan is not responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the information contained in this presentation. Past performance and simulated performance are not a guarantee of future performance or principle and returns. The information may be amended or revoked at any time without notice.

If this document is used or distributed in Hong Kong, it is issued by BNY Mellon Asset Management Hong Kong Limited, whose business address is Level 14, Three Pacific Place, 1 Queen’s Road East, Hong Kong. BNY Mellon Asset Management Hong Kong Limited is regulated by the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission and its registered office is at 6th floor, Alexandra House, 18 Chater Road, Central, Hong Kong.

BNY Mellon Investment Management EMEA Limited (BNYMIM EMEA), formerly named BNY Mellon Asset Management International Limited, 160 Queen Victoria Street, London EC4V 4LA. Registered in England No. 1118580. Authorized and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.



ABOUT US

Mellon Capital – Global. Insightful. Engaged. Mellon Capital has provided global multi-asset solutions for over thirty years. Our precise understanding of world markets, coupled with our fundamentals-based and forward-looking analytical methods are the foundation for tailored client solutions. Our investment capabilities range from indexing to alternatives with the infrastructure and skill to transact in all liquid asset classes and securities.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Global Distribution

Richard K. Watson, Jr.
617.722.6903
richardw@mcm.com

International Investors and Clients

Keiko Kai
415.975.3556
keikok@mcm.com

North America Institutional

David Dirks
617.248.4562
davidd@mcm.com

North America Consumer and Sub-Advisory

Sheryl Linck
412.234.9439
sheryll@mcm.com

GLOBAL PRESENCE

Boston
Hong Kong
London
Pittsburgh
Pune
San Francisco

Headquarters
San Francisco, CA
50 Fremont Street
Suite 3900
San Francisco, CA 94105
415.546.6056

ONLINE

www.mcm.com