ESG in EMD: A Journey, Not a Destination

Assessing the creditworthiness of sovereign issuers increasingly depends on having a robust framework to investigate their environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices. While the availability of ESG data has exploded in the past few years, not all data is reliable or frequent enough to translate directly into a forward-looking, relevant scorecard. In this paper, we detail how we have refined our approach to incorporating ESG factors into our rigorous, bottom-up fundamental analysis of sovereign issuers to reflect both new possibilities and the benefit of experience over time.
Assessing the creditworthiness of emerging markets borrowers increasingly depends on assessing the sustainability of their operations—the fairness of the societies they govern in the case of sovereign issuers, the way they treat the natural environment, as well as the transparency, consistency, and good faith of their governance. Our research shows that strong environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors tend to indicate a more resilient borrower, while weak ESG characteristics can pose significant risks if overlooked. Thus, we believe the thorough analysis of ESG considerations is a critical component of rigorous, bottom-up fundamental analysis, and we combine forward-looking ESG analysis with traditional economic and balance sheet analysis to gain a comprehensive view of creditworthiness and a stronger basis for investment decisions.

Four years ago, we published a paper, “Giving Credit Where It’s Due,” where we laid out our research into the relationship between ESG and debt performance. We also detailed our method for scoring ESG factors and integrating scores into our bottom-up fundamental analysis—specifically, whether we are being paid adequately for risk. Developing a rigorous ESG model is an ongoing journey, rather than a final destination, and accordingly we have continued to enhance our approach. These changes are an evolution that reflect lessons learned from our experience, as well as an increase in the availability and quality of ESG data in emerging markets.

Regarding the last point, it’s important to understand that just because there is more ESG data available, it does not mean that it is all usable or helpful. It takes careful consideration and calibration to incorporate the flood of new information into a workable scorecard that allows for meaningful comparisons and trend-tracking over time. In this paper, we discuss our views on ESG data and the key changes to our scoring approach over the years.

You Are What You Measure

Despite vast improvements in the quality and availability of data in recent years, ESG data on emerging markets countries still has its limitations. For one thing, some emerging markets countries either don’t report certain data or we do not consider the data they do report to be wholly reliable. The frequency of reporting can also be an issue. Certain data sets are updated infrequently, with a significant time lag of anywhere from one to five years, and therefore cannot be anything but backward-looking. Although ESG practices within a country tend to evolve at a slow pace, lags in data collection may render some data less effective in reflecting recent developments. For example, the political unrest in Belarus and the suppression of political opposition in Russia that unfolded in late 2020 indicate heightened ESG risks that are not yet reflected in the available data.

In order to make ESG scores more forward-looking, we often adjust data from third-party providers so that they reflect trends, rather than relying solely on absolute levels. (Some third-party data providers use a similar approach.) We have over a decade’s worth of data for many of the variables that we include in our overall scorecard, which allows us to track ESG trajectories over a meaningful time period, observe changes—both on an absolute basis and relative to peers—and better identify the factors driving these changes. Thus, we are able to better identify those issuers that are on an improving (or deteriorating) trajectory that may not yet be fully reflected in the most recent data. For example, we believe that an issuer such as Cote d’Ivoire, which has a low ESG score but seems to be working to improve its outcomes, should not be penalized because it is in an early stage of development.

Developing countries tend to have any number of factors—higher levels of pollution, less access to clean energy and technology, and more prevalent corruption, to name a few possibilities—that cap their maximum possible ESG scores. However, it makes more sense to evaluate these countries not just on where they are, but where they come from and where they seem to be going.

Another shortcoming of ESG data is that certain factors are more subjective and not easily quantifiable. For example, it would be somewhat arbitrary to assign numbers to the strength of a country’s institutions. Therefore, we complement our quantitative scoring with a qualitative assessment to provide a more holistic view. As part of our qualitative overlay, we may adjust some scores based on forward-looking considerations, although we are mindful not to stray too far from the underlying data.

Building a Foundation for Rigorous ESG Analysis

We built our framework for ESG assessment on the foundation of the World Bank’s ESG Data Framework, which is coordinated with other international organizations and encompasses a total of 17 broad themes—five to six under each pillar (Exhibit 1). Together, these themes encompass a multitude of factors likely to impact a country’s long-term prospects. In addition to the World Bank themes, we also include the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a framework that is designed to measure the level of social, economic, and environmental sustainability of countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emissions &amp; pollution</td>
<td>Education &amp; skills</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural capital endowment &amp; management</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Government effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy use &amp; security</td>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>Stability &amp; rule of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/climate risk resilience</td>
<td>Poverty &amp; inequality</td>
<td>Economic enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security</td>
<td>Health &amp; nutrition</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to services</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank
Development Goals (UNSDG) Index for a total of 18 indicators. The index ranks countries based on progress toward achieving the SDGs, which cover poverty, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation, peace and justice.

It’s worth noting that these indicators are an expansion of our previous 14-indicator sovereign scoring system. The expansion was intended to correct a specific weakness in our prior set of indicators: an over-representation of governance factors. Previously, we used 10 governance indicators and only two indicators each under the environmental and social pillars. In some ways, this weighting reflects a bias that we believe is common among many bottom-up, fundamental approaches. Governance has long been recognized as a material factor for fundamental analysts to consider, both in equities and fixed income. However, the increasing focus in recent years among regulators, policymakers, and ordinary citizens on issues such as climate change and economic inequality have reinforced to us that the environmental and social pillars of ESG are just as critical for a long-term investor to consider. Our current system of 18 indicators is more equally weighted, acknowledging the growing importance of the environmental and social pillars in investment decisions.

Each of the 17 themes under the World Bank’s framework includes two-to-six sets of data one could use to track that theme. However, we have selected one set of data to track for all but two themes—Rule of Law and Innovation (Exhibit 2). (We include the UNSDG Index as our 18th theme because we believe achieving these sustainability targets is the ultimate goal of most countries’ ESG efforts.)

Our choice of indicators is governed by several considerations, most importantly, our assessment of the “materiality,” or relevance, of the data to long-term economic performance. We also consider the availability of the data. Several of the World Bank’s data sets lack information on a significant number of countries. For example, under the governance pillar, there is a dearth of information for emerging markets countries in all three of the innovation-themed datasets. Moreover, we do not believe innovation data are particularly material to the ESG performance of most emerging market countries. Thus, we do not include any data from the Innovation theme and instead include two data sets under the Stability & Rule of Law theme, which we deem to be highly material to the long-term performance of emerging markets countries. The stability of a country’s system and the strength of rule of law are major determinants of whether a country will be able to implement the policies needed to achieve important structural reforms—policies that are often very challenging on a political level. Finally, since the aim of our ESG analysis is to focus exclusively on ESG-related issues, we avoid purely economic indicators, such as real GDP growth, which are already included in our macro-analytic framework.

Although we favor the World Bank’s framework, we believe it is best practice to continually enhance and refine an ESG approach. We are always receptive to the inclusion of other indicators in the future if they are deemed more material to the assessment of ESG considerations across emerging markets.
Quantifying ESG: Moving from Data to Scores

For each of the 80 countries in our investment universe, we calculate sub-scores across each of the 18 indicators we track, as well as subtotals for each of the three pillars (E, S, and G), and an overall score that is equally weighted across the 18 indicators. We consider the sub-scores on their own as well as in aggregate. Our initial overall scores are based on trend-adjusted data and ranked by percentile. We then rescale our scores to facilitate comparison to third-party sources. ²

We also normalize the data by calculating z-scores for each country to see how far it is from the median of our 80 country universe on each indicator. This allows us to understand each country’s ESG strengths and potential ESG risks both on a standalone basis and relative to peers. In Exhibit 3, the blue circle represents the median score within our investment universe. The indicators that stretch beyond that blue circle—the green shaded area—are outperforming the universe. Thus, Uruguay’s overall ESG score is more than one standard deviation above the median of our universe. The country’s E, S, and G scores are all better than the median, with a particularly strong governance score that is nearly two standard deviations above the median. Uruguay underperforms only on the Food Production and Ease of Doing Business rankings—the blue shaded areas inside the circle. ³

In terms of sourcing data, we do not rely on the scoring systems of third-party providers, but over the past few years we have begun to make greater use of data from select sources that provide data that we deem to be clean, timely, and accurate. We believe Sustainalytics, the largest independent provider of ESG research and ratings, to be a market leader in this respect. Comparing our scores to those of Sustainalytics provides a way of benchmarking our scores for each country and a screening tool to identify significant outliers. In Exhibit 4, we show a matrix comparing our scores to those of Sustainalytics and found that our scores are generally aligned, with a few notable outliers. These outliers warrant further analysis to understand the root cause of the difference. Scoring differences could arise from different methodologies, data discrepancies, or emerging risks that have not yet appeared in one data set. For example, we see that a number of countries in the Middle East

---

Exhibit 3
Depicting Country Indicators versus the Investment Universe
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For illustrative purposes only
Source: Lazard, United Nations, World Bank

Exhibit 4
Comparing ESG Scores to Identify Outliers

Lazard vs Sustainalytics Country ESG Risk Scores
Higher Value = Higher Risk
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have higher scores (i.e., riskier) in our framework versus that of Sustainalytics. These countries score poorly on two components of our model: school enrollment (a social indicator) and voice and accountability (a governance indicator that tracks the degree to which citizens can freely express themselves and select and participate in their government).

Bringing ESG Analysis to Life: Qatar

Based on our framework, Qatar underperforms other emerging markets countries on many indicators (Exhibit 5). The country compares especially poorly on carbon emissions and voice and accountability, although Qatar outperforms on the government effectiveness, rule of law, and life expectancy indicators. Qatar also lags other emerging markets countries in achieving the UNSDGs. In aggregate, we assign a score of 23.4 to Qatar, placing it solidly in the medium ESG risk category.

In contrast, Sustainalytics assigns Qatar a country risk rating of 15.5, placing it in the low risk category. According to Sustainalytics, Qatar’s national wealth is high and its environmental score is in line with other high-income countries, but the country’s human and institutional capital lags peers, with a specific weakness in civil liberties. We also see risks of a material event arising in certain arenas, including labor rights, discrimination, and state repression.

In short, we see ESG risks in Qatar as both more significant than Sustainalytics does and a medium-level risk to the country’s long-term performance and creditworthiness.

Putting It All Together

As the quality and availability of ESG data have evolved at a rapid clip, so too has our approach to integrating ESG considerations into our fundamental analysis of sovereign issuers. While ESG data in emerging markets present challenges, we have enhanced our framework to better address these issues as much as possible. Moreover, we continually strive to further enhance and refine our process.

Over the last several years, we have expanded the set of indicators we analyze from one that is governance-heavy to one that we believe more equally weights indicators across all three ESG pillars. We acknowledge that ESG analysis involves a high degree of subjectivity and thus we adjust our quantitative scoring system to reflect a qualitative assessment of risks. We have also increased our emphasis on measuring and monitoring data trends, rather than absolute measurements, in order to take a more forward-looking approach. Furthermore, we now make greater use of third-party ESG scores for comparison purposes to understand where our perception of ESG risks may differ from those of the market.

What hasn’t changed about our approach is that ESG considerations continue to be fully integrated with the analysis of more traditional economic factors in our fundamental research process and asset valuation targets. Our systematic framework allows for consistent comparison of ESG risks across countries. As always, we seek to directly engage with issuers whenever possible as we believe this engagement can positively influence behavior and is preferable to outright exclusion. Ultimately, by embedding a forward-looking ESG framework in our rigorous bottom-up analysis, we seek to gain a comprehensive understanding of an issuer’s creditworthiness and make better informed investment decisions as a result.
Appendix

World Bank Sovereign ESG Framework and Lazard’s Indicators

The list below shows the indicators included in the Sovereign ESG dataset. The 17 indicators in blue are inputs for Lazard’s ESG scoring system.

Environment Pillar

This category encompasses key themes that provide a picture of the sustainability of a country’s economic performance given its natural resource endowment, management, and supplementation, as well as its risk or resilience to climate change and other natural hazards. This category pays particular attention to the internalization of environmental externalities created by economic activity. This category also accounts for sustainable energy access and food security, which are crucial factors for stable long-term economic growth.

Emissions and pollution
- CO2 emissions (metric tons per capita)
- GHG net emissions/removals by LUCF (Mt of CO2 equivalent)
- Methane emissions (metric tons of CO2 equivalent per capita)
- Nitrous oxide emissions (metric tons of CO2 equivalent per capita)
- PM2.5 air pollution, mean annual exposure (micrograms per cubic meter)

Natural capital endowment and management
- Adjusted savings: natural resources depletion (% of GNI)
- Adjusted savings: net forest depletion (% of GNI)
- Annual freshwater withdrawals, total (% of internal resources)
- Forest area (% of land area)
- Mammal species, threatened
- Terrestrial and marine protected areas (% of total territorial area)

Social Pillar

This category encompasses key themes that provide a picture of the sustainability of a country’s economic performance given its efficacy in meeting the basic needs of its population and reducing poverty, managing social and equity issues, and investing in human capital and productivity. This category also includes demographic criteria that are pertinent to stable long-term economic growth.

Education and skills
- Government expenditure on education, total (% of government expenditure)
- Literacy rate, adult total (% of people ages 15 and above)
- School enrollment, primary (% gross)

Employment
- Children in employment, total (% of children ages 7–14)
- Labor force participation rate, total (% of total population ages 15–64) (modeled ILO estimate)
- Unemployment, total (% of total labor force) (modeled ILO estimate)

Demography
- Fertility rate, total (births per woman)
- Life expectancy at birth, total (years)
- Population ages 65 and above (% of total population)

Poverty and Inequality
- Annualized average growth rate in per capita real survey mean consumption or income, total population (%)
- GINI index (World Bank estimate)
- Income share held by lowest 20%
- Poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of population)

Governance Pillar

This category encompasses key themes that provide a picture of the sustainability of a country’s economic performance given its institutional capacity to support long-term stability, growth, and poverty reduction. This category also accounts for the strength of a country’s political, financial, and legal systems and the capacity to address environmental and social risks.

Human Rights
- Strength of legal rights index (0=weak to 12=strong)
- Voice and Accountability: Estimate

Government Effectiveness
- Government Effectiveness: Estimate
- Regulatory Quality: Estimate

Stability and Rule of Law
- Control of Corruption: Estimate
- Net migration
- Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism: Estimate
- Rule of Law: Estimate

Economic Environment
- Ease of doing business index (1=most business-friendly regulations)
- GDP growth (annual %)
- Individuals using the internet (% of population)
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Environment Pillar (Continued)
- Energy use and security
  - Electricity production from coal sources (% of total)
  - Energy imports, net (% of energy use)
  - Energy intensity level of primary energy (MJ/$2011 PPP GDP)
  - Energy use (kg of oil equivalent per capita)
  - Fossil fuel energy consumption (% of total)
  - Renewable electricity output (% of total electricity output)
  - Renewable energy consumption (% of total final energy consumption)

Environment/climate risk and resilience
- Cooling Degree Days (projected change in number of degrees Celsius)
- Droughts, floods, extreme temperatures (% of population, average 1990–2009)
- Heat Index 35 (projected change in days)
- Maximum 5-day Rainfall, 25-year Return Level (projected change in mm)
- Mean Drought Index (projected change, unitless)
- Population density (people per sq. km of land area)

Food Security
- Agricultural land (% of land area)
- Agriculture, forestry, and fishing, value added (% of GDP)
- Food production index (2004–2006 = 100)

Social Pillar (Continued)
- Health and Nutrition
  - Cause of death, by communicable diseases and maternal, prenatal, and nutrition conditions (% of total)
  - Hospital beds (per 1,000 people)
  - Mortality rate, under 5 (per 1,000 live births)
  - Prevalence of overweight (% of adults)
  - Prevalence of undernourishment (% of population)

Access to Services
- Access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking (% of population)
- Access to electricity (% of population)
- People using safely managed drinking water services (% of population)
- People using safely managed sanitation services (% of population)

Governance Pillar (Continued)
- Gender
  - Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments (%)
  - Ratio of female to male labor force participation rate (%) (modeled ILO estimate)
  - School enrollment, primary and secondary (gross), gender parity index (GPI)
  - Unmet need for contraception (% of married women ages 15-49)

Innovation
- Patent applications, residents
- Research and development expenditure (% of GDP)
- Scientific and technical journal articles
## Lazard ESG Scores by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lazard ESG Score</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lazard ESG Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 31 March 2021
Scale: 0 = Lowest Risk, 40 = Highest Risk
Source: Lazard, United Nations, World Bank
This content represents the views of the author(s), and its conclusions may vary from those held elsewhere within Lazard Asset Management. Lazard is committed to giving our investment professionals the autonomy to develop their own investment views, which are informed by a robust exchange of ideas throughout the firm.

Notes
1. The complete World Bank database is detailed in the Appendix along with the data sets we track under each theme.
2. ESG scores for each country in our investment universe can be found in the Appendix.
3. In the radar chart, a z-score higher than the median (i.e., wide to the blue line) represents relative strength, while a score lower than the median (tight to the blue line) represents relative weakness.
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