ESG Momentum Stocks: Sustainable Investing’s Diamonds in the Rough

Executive Summary

• A company’s efforts to improve its sustainability are often a better gauge of future success than its current ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) score.

• Numeric ESG scoring doesn’t factor in momentum, judgment, and perspective, giving active managers a clear edge in the search for long-term outperformance.

• Independent judgment in assessing relative ESG values in companies across regions, industries, and market capitalization is crucial for portfolio diversification and risk-adjusted returns.
The old investment maxim “buy low and sell high” has an additional corollary in the fast-growing world of sustainable investing. Companies that strive to improve their environmental, social, and corporate governance (ESG) standards, it turns out, may generate market-beating returns for their shareholders. The reasons are simple: first, firms that integrate ESG factors tend to have better risk and return characteristics. Second, for investors who seek to benefit from the improvement in firms’ ESG standards, we believe the best time to invest is before the improvement is widely recognized—and rewarded—by the market.

Contrary to lingering investor concerns that including ESG attributes in the investment research process would undercut risk-adjusted returns, index provider MSCI is providing growing evidence that ESG investing can produce superior performance. At the end of December 2018, the seven-year annualized total net return of the MSCI EAFE ESG Leaders Index stood at 3.83%, outperforming the MSCI EAFE Index’s 3.33% annualized return. Far more striking was the MSCI EM ESG Leaders Index’s 3.61% annualized seven-year return, more than doubling the conventional MSCI EM Index’s 0.24% yearly return in the same period.

“An improvement in ESG scores signals that a company is better equipped to avoid ESG-related risks; this reduction in potential future liabilities is quickly discounted by market participants and built into the share price.”

–MSCI, June 2015

Momentum vs. Tilt

In a study examining stock returns in strategies that focus on ESG “momentum” and “tilt” criteria, MSCI found that both led to outperformance against global benchmarks over seven-year and eight-year periods, respectively. The tilt strategy favored stocks with higher ESG ratings; the momentum strategy focused on stocks that had recently improved their ESG scores. With respect to the latter, “an improvement in ESG scores signals that a company is better equipped to avoid ESG-related risks; this reduction in potential future liabilities is quickly discounted by market participants and built into the share price,” MSCI reported. Importantly, the momentum strategy wasn’t focused on lifting “the ESG profile of the resulting portfolio because stocks with the largest increase in ESG scores are not necessarily the best-rated stocks at the time.”

During the seven-year sample period, the momentum strategy produced yearly benchmark-beating returns of 223 basis points, of which stock-specific return amounted to 132 basis points (Figure 2). As MSCI pointed out, “overall, most of the portfolio’s risk and return came from picking the right stocks, but factor tilts also played a role.” Moreover, both the momentum and tilt strategies “experienced very low tracking error with respect to a global benchmark,” MSCI noted.

Figure 2 | Active Return, Risk in ESG Momentum Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Return</th>
<th>Active Return (%)</th>
<th>Active Risk Contribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Specific</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Active</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decomposition of the active return and risk of the ESG Momentum portfolio, annualized figures, February 2007–March 2015. This is the most recent data available. Inclusion of subsequent periods could change the results. Source: MSCI.

Limitations in ESG Scoring

The MSCI ESG study largely parallels our own research and decade-long experience managing socially responsible separate accounts, and, since September 2015, running our own Thornburg Better World International Fund and, for institutional investors, International Equity ESG Strategy. However, we would highlight important caveats. While investment and market research firms provide some helpful data on a company’s ESG integration, we believe judgment and perspective are crucial for assessing any company’s day-to-day application of expanding ESG standards, particularly in the case of ESG momentum investing. ESG momentum prospects are, almost by definition, initially tagged with low ESG scores by research firms, which don’t have much choice. As MSCI indicated, companies are scored on their current ESG levels, not the potential outcome of their nascent efforts to improve their ESG characteristics. As a result, ESG mutual funds that employ a momentum strategy typically receive lower “sustainability scores” by the research firms, even as portfolio stocks progress toward higher ESG marks and, potentially, returns.

Due to a lack of resources, the research firms can also generate an unintentional bias against mid- and small-capitalization stocks simply by not rating them, even if they have solid ESG attributes. That unrated status counts against them and, by extension, drags down the ESG profile score of multi-capitalization ESG mutual funds. Likewise, companies may be rated against industry peers without a social overlay, meaning those in socially dubious sectors (say, firearms or tobacco) might receive a higher relative scoring. Research firms generally try to adjust for this by assigning a “controversy” score. But even then, an ESG rating may not reflect a company’s true ESG profile.

On the flip side, ESG funds angling for high sustainability ratings by research firms may end up with insufficiently diversified portfolios, leading to higher correlations between portfolio holdings, with greater risk and return volatility.

ESG Investing: More Than a Score

It’s difficult to over-emphasize the necessity of sound judgment and perspective in constructing an ESG portfolio. At Thornburg, we employ fundamental financial analysis coupled with ESG research, which we derive partly from third-party research firms but mostly from direct engagement with companies. As active managers, we find that we have to make judgment calls that are often at odds with the ESG scoring of investment research firms, given the limitations of their methodology or resources for scoring a wide array of companies globally, especially international small- and mid-capitalization stocks. We also believe that rating companies versus industry peers and assigning a “controversy” score often doesn’t accurately capture the social benefits of some companies or the social detriment of others, say tobacco and gaming companies.

Moreover, quite apart from the obvious shortcomings of scoring on ESG momentum strategies, portfolio diversification and reduced correlation between portfolio holdings can only be achieved by accounting for relative differences in context. Should culturally distinct Northeast Asian firms be held to the same disclosure standards as North American companies? Should Latin American firms be held to the same gender diversity standards as Scandinavian peers? Relative differences in context matter when assessing the strength of the trend toward ESG integration in momentum names, or the extent of ESG values integration in companies that already exhibit strong ESG factors.

Correlations within a portfolio can be reduced without sacrificing adherence to ESG principles. For example, Thornburg’s ESG strategy shuns hydrocarbon and certain types of metals producers, but we can compensate for those exposures by investing in firms with strong ESG standards and high return on capital in countries whose economies and currencies benefit from cyclical uptrends in the commodity complex. That partly explains our investments in firms based in Canada, Norway, and Brazil. None of them produces oil or metals. But they all have improving or strong ESG attributes, robust financial characteristics and offer indirect exposure to commodities and energy via the peso, the krone, and the Canadian dollar, helping offset the lack of direct exposure to oil and materials.

Alongside an attractive share price with a good margin of safety, synergistic finan-
cial and ESG characteristics offer real downside protection. Such stocks can deliver higher portfolio returns over time by establishing a higher base off which to rebound following bouts of market volatility. And financially strong companies that don’t yet enjoy high ESG scores, but that demonstrate a concerted effort to achieve them, can also in time produce increasingly attractive, sustainable returns.