

Position Paper

Targeted consultation on the implementation of the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)



December 2023

Context

As a pioneering sustainable investment firm, Mirova has been a strong advocate for the European Union's initiative to establish a transparency framework within the financial sector. We firmly believe that transparency is critical to ensure that investors have access to accurate and reliable information about the sustainability contribution and risks of their investments. The emergence of the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) framework has encouraged more investment companies to disclose their sustainable investment approach and improve their ESG capabilities.

The SFDR regulation requests that each product be categorized according to its characteristics. The definition of each of these categories is as follows:

- Article 6: the product has no sustainability objective;
- Article 8: The product promotes environmental or social characteristics, or a combination of those characteristics, provided that the companies in which the investments are made follow good governance practices;
- Article 9: the product has a sustainability objective.

Two years after its implementation, it is important to recognize that the SFDR regulation has been effective in achieving its primary objective by providing transparency to the market by classifying products based on their sustainability credentials. This has resulted in more investments being directed towards sustainable products: flows into Article 8 & 9 funds have significantly outpaced Article 6, with cumulative flows into ESG equity funds in the past three years standing at 3.4x compared to non-ESG counterparts¹.

Nevertheless, considering the numerous clarifications made by the regulatory authorities, the current framework appears to have reached its limits. **It may no longer be sufficient to meet the clarity needed**

¹ Source: Morningstar, Goldman Sachs Global Investment Research

by investors to navigate the market and make informed decisions. Thus, new measures may be necessary to address emerging challenges and opportunities in the realm of sustainable investments.

Main challenges

Increasing Disclosure Requirements Across the Board

While there has been an effort to increase transparency on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors in the investment product industry, it is important to note that such transparency has not been equally applied to all types of products. The reporting requirements for article 8 and 9 funds has been disproportionately higher than those for non-ESG funds (Article 6). This has significantly limited the ability of end investors to fully understand the profile of their investments.

We believe that mandating transparency on ESG factors solely for sustainable funds is similar to having nutritional scores exclusively on healthy foods, while withholding such information on other products. This lack of transparency can lead to confusion and dissatisfaction among investors as it prevents them to access full, adequate information regarding their investment opportunities. Therefore, in order to meet investors' need for clear and transparent information across the market, **we feel that all products classified under SFDR should be required to report on ESG criteria and performance as well as harmful activities.**

Product classification

Over time, the practical implementation of Article 6, 8, and 9 has resulted in categorization being used as "labelling" for investment products, leading to a situation where **the definition of Article 8 products is too broad** and covers various realities. For example, under Article 8 are found both funds with limited exclusions and funds that have over 90% sustainable investments.

In contrast, the definition for Article 9 products seems very narrow, covering only funds with 100% sustainable investments (excluding cash). As a result, the current classification system barely differentiates products of the Article 9 category on their degree of sustainability.

We firmly believe that requiring that Article 9 funds have "100% sustainable investments at all times" is not always appropriate for many investment products and investor needs:

- **In the case of listed assets**, the strict "100% threshold" can prevent funds from investing in other assets for liquidity and risk management purposes, which may be detrimental to the fiduciary obligation of asset managers to their clients, by undermining the ability of fund managers to effectively manage performance and risks of their products.
- **In the case of illiquid assets or for insurance investors**, the requirement for "100% sustainable investments at all times" can be impractical as investors do not have the possibility to sell assets as easily as listed assets investors, for instance when a controversy emerges.

Therefore, we argue that it is important to consider specific investment objectives and constraints according to the different specificities of each asset class when establishing sustainability requirements to **ensure that these requirements are practical, attainable, and effective**. This should enable asset managers to fulfil their fiduciary duty towards investors, but also to enable the financial sector to strive for greater sustainability.

Moreover, we believe that institutional and retail investors would greatly benefit from better clarity between SFDR and other regulations such as the European taxonomy² and the sustainability preferences under Mifid II³.

Mirova's position

Mirova is convinced that the objective of the SFDR regulation should remain twofold: facilitating the development of sustainable investing while at the same time providing tools to the market to ensure the best transparency possible for investors and to avoid greenwashing.

To that purpose, the revised regulation should clearly differentiate between its disclosure requirements and requirements linked to products categorization.

Disclosure requirements: product categories in addition to transparency requirements

We strongly endorse the Commission's proposal to broaden the scope of sustainability disclosures for all products regardless of categorization. It is particularly important to promote fairness and transparency in the financial sector by ensuring that all investment products are subject to the same standards and requirements. This includes establishing shared minimum transparency standards related to environmental and social impacts. **Only by doing so can we trust that institutional or retail investors will make fully informed investment decisions.**

Rather than developing new reporting standards, which could lead to confusion and potentially conflicting regulation, we believe minimum disclosure requirements could be linked to existing tools and regulations, including exposure to sensitive activities or practices. These requirements could build on the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)⁴ disclosure requirements for companies and/or some relevant Principal Adverse Impacts (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, involvement in fossil fuels, tobacco industries, anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions, etc.). These minimum disclosure requirements should be applied across all financial products, with additional requirements for funds with sustainability objectives. This approach will ensure that all financial products meet the minimum disclosure standards, while also addressing the unique sustainability objectives associated with each product category.

Although SFDR's mandate should not be to produce labels, the way the market has been using Articles 6, 8 and 9 as labels since its implementation show how much more than a need for transparency is at stake ("nature abhors a vacuum"). As such, **the Commission's proposal to introduce product categories, alongside setting minimum requirements, seems to be a fair "in between" that would allow labels (national or supranational) to build on this framework.**

Product categories: building on the existing framework rather than "starting fresh"

While we support the Commission's proposal to introduce formal product categories, we see a risk with a "starting fresh" strategy such as the four proposed categories which would also need to be clarified

² The European taxonomy lists environmentally sustainable activities. [REGULATION \(EU\) 2020/852 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 18 June 2020 on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment, and amending Regulation \(EU\) 2019/2088](#)

³ [Commission Delegated Regulation \(EU\) 2017/565 of 25 April 2016 supplementing Directive 2014/65/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards organisational requirements and operating conditions for investment firms and defined terms for the purposes of that Directive](#)

⁴ [Directive \(EU\) 2022/2464 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 December 2022 amending Regulation \(EU\) No 537/2014, Directive 2004/109/EC, Directive 2006/43/EC and Directive 2013/34/EU, as regards corporate sustainability reporting](#)



to be properly implemented (e.g., what could be considered as a “credible sustainability standard” in category B? What would be the definition of transition focus in category D?). Besides, as the categories cannot be mutually exclusive (products can use a mix of exclusions, transition and sustainable investments), this could result in a complex categorization and hamper the clarity objective for end investors.

Instead of exploring new alternatives and potentially creating uncertainty in the market, **formalizing Articles 8 and 9 as product categories and establishing clear and specific criteria to support these existing concepts (including adopting the four proposed categories) appears to be a more effective approach, particularly when addressing the retail market.**

With this perspective in mind, we strongly advocate for a framework that incorporates the following key elements:

- **Keeping the current “Sustainable investment” definition unchanged** as it already includes the fundamental concepts of positive contribution, Do No Significant Harm (DNSH), good governance. Establishing a unified qualitative definition of what constitutes a sustainable investment was a significant step forward in the ESG sector. Omitting this concept from the SFDR regulation would run the risk of creating multiple definitions, which would ineluctably undermine the coherence of the transparency framework. In the foreseeable future, the definition could be enhanced by considering:
 - **An all-encompassing environmental taxonomy (including ultimately a taxonomy of “negative activities”).** As the current taxonomy only covers a limited number of activities and sectors, it would be premature to use this criterion as it would automatically constrain investments to these specific areas. Therefore, including a minimum threshold of “taxonomy-aligned activities” in the definition of sustainable investment should only be considered once a comprehensive environmental taxonomy has been implemented.
 - **Establishing a specific taxonomy for social issues** which have often been given less attention compared to environmental issues. It is crucial not to restrict Article 9 to “green” investments and disregard the social dimensions of sustainability such as diversity and inclusion, creation of quality jobs, fair pay, etc., which reflect the broader sustainability challenges of our society.
- **Keeping three levels of products categories**, not based on their objective (all ESG products must have a sustainable objective) but on their level of ambition. While Article 9 funds should remain largely composed of sustainable investments, Article 8 funds could allow a significant proportion of transition investments. The regulation should further clarify that minimum shares of sustainable investments and/or transition investments should be calculated excluding cash, cash equivalents and derivatives.
- **Differentiating “Solutions” and “Credible sustainability standards”** as part of the “sustainable investment” definition. Reflecting on the Commission’s proposal, we consider that category A (“solutions”) and category B (“credible standards”) both reflect the current “sustainable investment” definition. We feel that asking market participants to disclose the proportion of these two categories as part of their reporting on the proportion of “sustainable investment” would bring more clarity to end investors.
- **Introducing the concept of “transition investment” in the regulation** (as reflected in category D). As it is the case for taxonomy-aligned activities, “sustainable investments” still remain a minor part of the economy, and therefore cannot be the sole concept used in SFDR. The concept of “transition investment” could be defined when related to climate-related transition based on existing tools

such as [Science Based Targets \(SBTi\)](#), [Assessing low-Carbon Transition \(ACT\)](#), [Transition Pathway Initiative \(TPI\)](#), etc. However, it should also cover other aspects of the transition (in particular with regards to improved social impact) and be attached to mandatory requirements on credible targets, engagement activities and reporting on progress (Key Performance Indicators).

- **Aligning definitions of article 8 and 9 with CSRD by further embedding double materiality in SFDR.** Although double materiality is already present in SFDR notably with the concepts “sustainability risks” and “adverse sustainability impacts”, ESG product classification should only be applied to funds implementing double materiality, i.e., that have a sustainability objective. In this regard, the notion “promotion of environmental or social characteristics” in Article 8 should be deleted. Instead, differentiation between Articles 8 and 9 should be done according to the level of ambition with regards to the sustainability objective of the fund.
- **Setting minimum standards.** For Articles 8 and 9 categories, the regulation should define minimum standards applicable to all investments in the fund to ensure the respect of the DNSH principle and of good governance practices. These minimum standards could be built on information required by CSRD for companies (i.e., tobacco, fossil fuels, anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions, chemical products), or draw from the list of exclusions established for Paris Aligned Benchmark (PAB) and Climate Transition Benchmark (CTB)⁵ and/or use of some Principal Adverse Impacts (including those on biodiversity and human rights). (see *Appendix*)

⁵ [Regulation \(EU\) 2019/2089 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 November 2019 amending Regulation \(EU\) 2016/1011 as regards EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks and sustainability-related disclosures for benchmarks](#)

Appendix

	Article 6	Article 8	Article 9
	No or low level of ambition	Transition	Sustainable investment
Level of sustainability ambition of the strategy	Products that do not have sustainability as an objective (including products that intend to consider sustainability risks in their investment decisions, with the objective to improve financial returns only)	Products that intend to invest in the transition towards sustainability	Products that intend to invest in sustainability
MAIN APPROACH Corresponding categories proposed in the consultation	C Products that exclude activities and/or investees involved in activities with negative effects on people and/or the planet (optional)	D Products with a transition focus	A Products investing in assets that specifically strive to offer targeted, measurable solutions to sustainability related problems that affect people and/or the planet B Products aiming to meet credible sustainability standards or adhering to a specific sustainability-related theme
COMPLEMENTARY APPROACH Corresponding categories proposed in the consultation	None	C Products that exclude activities and/or investees involved in activities with negative effects A Products investing in assets that specifically strive to offer targeted, measurable solutions to sustainability B Products aiming to meet credible sustainability standards or adhering to a specific sustainability-related theme (optional)	C Products that exclude activities and/or investees involved in activities with negative effects D Products with a transition focus (optional)
Criteria at portfolio level	No ESG characteristics in investment decisions	At least 70% minimum share of transition investments (TI) and/or sustainable investments (SI)* Minimum standards applicable to all investments	At least 70% minimum of sustainable investments (SI)* Remaining investments in transition (TI) Minimum standards applicable to all investments
Disclosure requirements	Exposure to sensitive activities/practices GHG emissions (Scope 1/2/3)	Exposure to sensitive activities/practices GHG emissions (Scope 1/2/3) Taxonomy alignment Proportion of SI (with split between solutions and sustainability standards) / TI	Exposure to sensitive activities/practices GHG emissions (Scope 1/2/3) Taxonomy alignment Proportion of SI (with split between solutions and sustainability standards) / TI
Naming Rule	Not possible to have any ESG related terms in the fund name or marketing communication	Possible to have ESG/sustainability related terms in the fund name and marketing communication	Possible to have ESG and Impact/Sustainability related terms in the fund name and marketing communication
Correlation with former SFDR classification	Article 6 + part of Article 8	Article 8	Article 9 + part of Article 8

*70% minimum share is an indicative threshold aiming to represent a significant proportion of investments pursuing the sustainability objective. Defining the most appropriate threshold would require technical works conducted by the Commission. These thresholds would need to be calculated excluding cash, cash equivalents and derivatives.



LEGAL MENTION

This document is intended for non-professional and professional clients as defined by MiFID for information purposes only.

This document does not constitute or form part of any offer, or solicitation, or recommendation to subscribe for, or buy, or concede any shares issued or to be issued by the funds managed by Mirova investment management company. The presented services do not take into account any investment objective, financial situation or specific need of a particular recipient. Mirova shall not be held liable for any financial loss or for any decision taken on the basis of the information contained in this document, and shall not provide any consulting service, notably in the area of investment services.

The information contained in this document is based on present circumstances, intentions and guidelines, and may require subsequent modifications. Although Mirova has taken all reasonable precautions to verify that the information contained in this document comes from reliable sources, a significant amount of this information comes from publicly available sources and/or has been provided or prepared by third parties. Mirova bears no responsibility for the descriptions and summaries contained in this document. No reliance may be placed for any purpose whatsoever on the validity, accuracy, durability or completeness of the information or opinion contained in this document, or any other information provided in relation to the fund.

This presentation contains forward-looking information which may be identified by the use of the following terms: “anticipate”, “believe”, “may”, “expect”, “intend to”, “can”, “plan”, “potential”, “project”, “search”, “should”, “will”, “could”, including in their negative form, as well as any variations or similar terms.

This forward-looking information reflects current opinions regarding current and future events and circumstances and is no guarantee by Mirova of the fund's future performance. It is subject to risks, uncertainties and hypotheses, including those related to the evolution of business, markets, exchange and interest rates; economic, financial, political and legal circumstances as well as any other risk linked to the fund's activity. On account of these several risks and uncertainties, the actual results may substantially differ from the information contained in the forward-looking statements. Any financial information regarding prices, margins or profitability is informative and subject to changes at any time and without notice, especially depending on market circumstances. Mirova makes no commitment to update or revise any forward-looking information, whether due to new information, future events or any other reason.

The information contained in this document is the property of Mirova. It may not be communicated to third parties without the prior written consent of Mirova. It may not be copied, in part or in whole, without the prior written consent of Mirova. The distribution, possession or delivery of this document in some jurisdictions may be limited or prohibited by law. Persons receiving this document are asked to learn about the existence of such limitations or prohibitions and to comply with them. Mirova voting and engagement policy as well as transparency code are available on its website: www.mirova.com.

Non-contractual document, written in December 2023

Mirova aims, for all its investments, to propose portfolios consistent with a climate trajectory of less than 2°C defined in the Paris Agreements of 2015, and systematically displays the carbon impact of its investments (excluding Social impact and Natural Capital funds), calculated from a proprietary methodology that may involve biases.

ESG INVESTING RISK & METHODOLOGICAL LIMITS

By using ESG criteria in the investment policy, the relevant Mirova strategies' objective would in particular be to better manage sustainability risk and generate sustainable, long-term returns. ESG criteria may be generated using Mirova's proprietary models, third party models and data or a combination of both. The assessment criteria may change over time or vary depending on the sector or industry in which the relevant issuer operates. Applying ESG criteria to the investment process may lead Mirova to invest in or exclude securities for non-financial reasons, irrespective of market opportunities available. ESG data received from third parties may be incomplete, inaccurate or unavailable from time to time. As a result, there is a risk that Mirova may incorrectly assess a security or issuer, resulting in the incorrect direct or indirect inclusion or exclusion of a security in the portfolio of a Fund. For more information on our methodologies, please refer to our Mirova website: www.mirova.com/en/sustainability



ABOUT MIROVA

Mirova is a management company dedicated to sustainable investment and an affiliate of Natixis Investment Managers. Through conviction management, Mirova's goal is to combine long-term value creation and sustainable development. Pioneers in many areas of sustainable finance, Mirova's talents aim to continue innovating in order to offer their clients solutions with high environmental and social impact. Mirova and its affiliates manage €28.4 billion as of September 30, 2023. Mirova is a mission-driven company, labeled B Corp*.

**The reference to a ranking or a label does not prejudice the future performance of the funds or its managers*

MIROVA

Portfolio Management Company - Anonymous Company
RCS Paris No.394 648 216
AMF Accreditation No. GP 02-014
59, Avenue Pierre Mendès France 75013 Paris
Mirova is an affiliate of Natixis Investment Managers. [Website](#) – [LinkedIn](#)

NATIXIS INVESTMENT MANAGERS

French Public Limited liability company
RCS Paris n°453 952 681
Registered Office: 59, avenue Pierre Mendès-France 75013 Paris
Natixis Investment Managers is a subsidiary of Natixis.

MIROVA US

888 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02199; Tel: 857-305-6333 Mirova U.S, LLC (Mirova US) is a U.S.-based investment advisor that is wholly owned by Mirova. Mirova is operating in the U.S. through Mirova US. Mirova US and Mirova entered into an agreement whereby Mirova provides Mirova US investment and research expertise, which Mirova US then combines with its own expertise, and services when providing advice to clients.

MIROVA UK

UK Private limited company
Company registration number: 7740692
Authorised and Regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority ("FCA") under number 800963
Registered office: Quality House by Agora, 5-9 Quality Court, London, WC2A 1HP
The services of Mirova UK Limited are only available to professional clients and eligible counterparties. They are not available to retail clients. Mirova UK Limited is wholly owned by Mirova.

MIROVA SUNFUNDER

Mirova SunFunder, Inc. is a company registered in Delaware
State File Number: 5125699
Registered Office: 2810 N Church Street, Wilmington - Delaware - 19802 USA
Mirova SunFunder Inc. is a subsidiary of Mirova US Holdings LLC, which is wholly owned by Mirova.