

**Response Form**  
**for the**  
***Consultation Paper on the development of the***  
***CFA Institute ESG Disclosure Standards for Investment Products***

CFA Institute is developing a voluntary, global industry standard, the CFA Institute ESG Disclosure Standards for Investment Products (the “Standard”), to establish disclosure requirements for investment products with ESG-related features. The purpose of the Standard is to provide greater transparency and comparability for investors by enabling asset managers to clearly communicate the ESG-related features of their investment products. The goal for this Consultation Paper is to elicit feedback on the proposed scope, structure, and design principles of the Standard. **All comments must be received by 19 October 2020 in order to be considered.**

**Providing Feedback**

Public commentary on this Consultation Paper will help shape an Exposure Draft, the initial version of the Standard, which is expected to be issued in May 2021. Comments should be provided in this response form. You may address as few or as many of the Consultation Paper’s questions as you wish. Unless otherwise requested, all comments will be posted on the CFA Institute website.

Guidelines for submission

Comments are most useful when they:

- directly address a specific issue or question,
- provide a rationale and support for the opinions expressed, and
- suggest alternative solutions in the event of disagreement.

There is a section for general comments at the end of this response form.

Positive comments in support of a proposal are equally as helpful as those that provide constructive suggestions for improvement.

Requirements for submission

For comments to be considered, please adhere to the following requirements:

- Insert responses to numbered questions in the designated areas of the response form. Please do not remove tags of the type <QUESTION\_XX>. Your response to each question must be framed by the two tags corresponding to the question. If you do not wish to respond to a given question, please do not delete it but simply leave the text “ENTER RESPONSE HERE” between the tags.
- Provide all comments in English.
- Assign a unique file name to your response form.
- Submit the response form as a Microsoft Word document.
- Submit the response form to [standards@cfainstitute.org](mailto:standards@cfainstitute.org) by 5:00 PM E.T. on 19 October 2020.

## General Information (required)

<b>Respondent:</b> <i>(Please enter your full name if you are submitting as an individual or the name of the organization if you are submitting on behalf of an organization.)</i>	Alejandro Pérez-Cotapos Santis
<b>Stakeholder Group:</b> <i>(Please select the stakeholder group with which you most closely identify.)</i>	Consultant or Advisor
<b>Region:</b> <i>(If you are submitting as an individual, please select the region in which you live. If you are submitting on behalf of an organization and the organization has a significant presence in multiple regions, please select "Global". Otherwise, please select the region in which the organization has its main office.)</i>	Latin America
<b>Country:</b> <i>(If you are submitting as an individual, please enter the country in which you live. If you are submitting on behalf of an organization, please enter the country in which the organization has its main office.)</i>	Chile
<b>Confidentiality Preference:</b> <i>(Please select your preference for whether your response is published on the CFA Institute website.)</i>	yes, my response may be published

## Consultation Paper Questions

### **Market Needs**

**Question 1: Do you agree that a standard is needed to help investors better understand and compare investment products with ESG-related features?**

<QUESTION\_01>

Yes, even is every material risk must be disclosed, there is not an standard associated and every company describes their features in a way that is not as comparable as investors would like

<QUESTION\_01>

### **Terminology**

**Question 2: Are any of the defined terms ambiguous? If so, how could they be clarified?**

<QUESTION\_02>

No

<QUESTION\_02>

### **Purpose and Scope**

**Question 3: In addition to the examples listed in Table 1, which regulations and standards, either in existence or in development, should be considered during the development of the Standard to avoid duplication or conflict and to ensure alignment and referencing if and when applicable?**

<QUESTION\_03>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_03>

**Question 4: Do you agree that a disclosure-based approach would be more helpful to achieve the Standard's goals of transparency and comparability than a prescriptive-based approach?**

<QUESTION\_04>

Yes. The heterogeneity of products makes hard to have a prescriptive based approach. We hope that, as disclosure practice becomes extended, some of them will be more homogeneous and standardized

<QUESTION\_04>

**Question 5: Do you agree that the Standard should focus only on product-level disclosures and not firm-level disclosures?**

<QUESTION\_05>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE]

<QUESTION\_05>

**Question 6: Do you agree that an asset manager should be permitted to choose the investment products to which they apply the Standard rather than be required to apply the Standard to all their investment products with ESG-related features?**

<QUESTION\_06>

The asset manager should be required to apply the Standard to all their investment products with ESG-related features, otherwise there is possibility of manipulation, due to the asymmetry of information between investors and asset managers in ESG issues related to the asset

<QUESTION\_06>

### **Design Principles**

**Question 7: Do you agree with the design principles for definitions of ESG-related terms?**

<QUESTION\_07>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_07>

**Question 8: Do you agree with the design principles for disclosure requirements?**

<QUESTION\_08>

Not totally. Every product should report relevant, useful information, even if there is some cost, and information needs to be clearest possible manner given the nature of the products. Questions must be open ended, but others closed to facilitate comparability, with as many categories as possible, not just Yes/No

We would add in feature specific disclosures the need to disclose about security issues related with investments. Experience in Chile shows importance of evaluate assets over security concerns of workers and habitants of places affected by the investment

<QUESTION\_08>

**Question 9: Should the Standard require that all disclosures be made in a single document? If disclosures were spread across multiple documents, would that pose a challenge for investors to understand and compare investment products?**

<QUESTION\_09>

A single document is preferred, but additional data may be disclosed in annexes

<QUESTION\_09>

**Question 10: Do you agree with the design principle for independent examination?**

<QUESTION\_10>

Not with "*Investment product basis*". Independent examination should be applied to the set of investment products affected (in a positive or negative way) for the same ESG-related factor or ESG matter, because asset management does not take place in vacuum and ESG impacts can affect several assets at the same time and at least all those that share must be jointly evaluated. Examine independent assets and allow managers to choose which of them examine may lead to contradictory policies in similar investment products. There should not exist a A+ and B- options over similar investments when risks affect both products.

<QUESTION\_10>

**Question 11: Should independent examination be required, or should it be recommended as best practice but ultimately left to the discretion of the asset manager?**

<QUESTION\_11>

It should be required because there is asymmetry of information between the asset manager and the investor, the latter in practice will look only at indicators and there is room for data manipulation, especially when there is a high appetite for "ESG" characteristics in assets (ESG - related needs).

<QUESTION\_11>

**Question 12: Should the independent examiner (i) examine the disclosures relative to only the design of the investment product, or (ii) examine the disclosures relative to both the design and implementation of the investment product?**

<QUESTION\_12>

Independent examination should be extended to the implementation of the product (seen as a project), Is usual in investment projects that design does not align with implementation and there are changes in the focus of project, since the assumptions made at the beginning proven not to be real, therefore it is important to evaluate the ex post results. Ex ante and ex post evaluation gives confidence that the ESG related features are manifested.

<QUESTION\_12>

**Proposal for General Disclosure Requirements**

**Question 13: Do you agree with the scope of the general disclosure requirements? Are there topics that should be added, deleted, or modified?**

<QUESTION\_13>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_13>

**Question 14: Should the disclosure requirements address an investment product's intention to align with policy goals, such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and if so, should these requirements be part of general disclosure requirements or feature-specific disclosure requirements?**

<QUESTION\_14>

Yes, it should be a category option in order to facilitate comparison

<QUESTION\_14>

**Question 15: Should the disclosure requirements include an explanation of whether, and if so how, an investment product considers principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors and where to find additional information, as required by Article 7 of Regulation EU 2019/2088 Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation?**

<QUESTION\_15>

Yes, it is better to comply with a standard that is likely to be mandatory in the future. Also, not all impacts are positive. In addition, the independent auditor plays a critical role examining if disclosure of all impacts was made.

<QUESTION\_15>

### **Proposal for ESG-Related Features and Feature-Specific Disclosure Requirements**

**Question 16: Do you believe that "ESG Integration" is a clear and appropriate name for this feature? If not, please suggest an alternative and explain why it would be a better choice.**

<QUESTION\_16>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_16>

**Question 17: If an investment product had Feature (A), and only Feature (A), as defined above, would it be consistent with the CFA institute policy paper "Positions on Environmental, Social, and Governance Integration"? In other words, would it be clear that material ESG-related factors are**

**considered alongside traditional financial factors solely for the purpose of seeking to improve risk-adjusted returns? If not, please suggest how that could be made clearer.**

<QUESTION\_17>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_17>

**Question 18: Is Feature (A) clearly defined? If not, please explain how the definition could be made clearer or more precise.**

<QUESTION\_18>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_18>

**Question 19: Do you agree with the issues to be addressed by the disclosure requirements specific to Feature (A)? Are there issues that should be added, deleted, or modified?**

<QUESTION\_19>

Other issue should be added: safety of the workforce. Even if is not part of “environmental, government, social” in some industries safety is important due to operational continuity reasons

<QUESTION\_19>

**Question 20: Do you believe that “ESG-related Exclusions” is a clear and appropriate name for this feature? If not, please suggest an alternative and explain why it would be a better choice.**

<QUESTION\_20>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_20>

**Question 21: Are “negative screening” and “norms-based screening” similar enough, particularly in the types of issues to be addressed by disclosure requirements, that they can both be covered by Feature (B) ESG-Related Exclusions? If you prefer that they be two separate features, please explain the key differences in function, benefits, and disclosure requirements.**

<QUESTION\_21>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_21>

**Question 22: Is Feature (B) clearly defined? If not, please suggest how the definition could be made clearer or more precise.**

<QUESTION\_22>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_22>

**Question 23: Do you agree with the issues to be addressed by the disclosure requirements specific to Feature (B)? Are there issues that should be added, deleted, or modified?**

<QUESTION\_23>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_23>

**Question 24: Do you believe that “Best-in-Class” is a clear and appropriate name for this feature? If not, is “Positive ESG Performance Profile” a better name? If you dislike both of these names, please suggest an alternative and explain why it would be a better choice.**

<QUESTION\_24>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_24>

**Question 25: Do you agree that Feature (C) is distinct enough, particularly in the types of issues to be addressed by disclosure requirements, that it should be separate from other features? If not, please suggest the feature with which it should be combined.**

<QUESTION\_25>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_25>

**Question 26: Is Feature (C) clearly defined? If not, please explain how the definition could be made clearer or more precise.**

<QUESTION\_26>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_26>



**Question 27: Do you agree with the issues to be addressed by the disclosure requirements specific to Feature (C)? Are there issues that should be added, deleted, or modified?**

<QUESTION\_27>

A issue to add is the existence of national or industry standars for ESG factors, associate the reporting system with a national or industry standard is useful for comparability purposes, for example mining may have an emphasis on safety while other industries do not

<QUESTION\_27>

**Question 28: Do you believe that “ESG-related Thematic Focus” is a clear and appropriate name for this feature? If not, please suggest an alternative and explain why it would be a better choice.**

<QUESTION\_28>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_28>

**Question 29: Do you agree Feature (D) is distinct enough, particularly in the types of issues to be addressed by disclosure requirements, that it should be separate from other features? If not, please suggest the feature with which it should be combined.**

<QUESTION\_29>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_29>

**Question 30: Is Feature (D) clearly defined? If not, please explain how the definition could be made clearer or more precise.**

<QUESTION\_30>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_30>

**Question 31: Do you agree with the issues to be addressed by the disclosure requirements specific to Feature (D)? Are there issues that should be added, deleted, or modified?**

<QUESTION\_31>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_31>

**Question 32: Do you believe that “Impact Objective” is a clear and appropriate name for this feature? If not, please suggest an alternative and explain why it would be a better choice.**

<QUESTION\_32>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_32>

**Question 33: Is Feature (E) clearly defined? If not, please explain how the definition could be made clearer or more precise.**

<QUESTION\_33>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_33>

**Question 34: Do you agree with the issues to be addressed by the disclosure requirements specific to Feature (E)? Are there issues that should be added, deleted, or modified?**

<QUESTION\_34>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_34>

**Question 35: Do you believe that “Proxy Voting, Engagement, and Stewardship” is a clear and appropriate name for this feature? If not, please suggest an alternative and explain why it would be a better choice.**

<QUESTION\_35>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_35>

**Question 36: Do you agree that “Proxy Voting, Engagement, and Stewardship” should be a distinct feature? If not, would you prefer that the types of issues to be addressed by disclosure requirements be redistributed to other features or to general disclosures?**

<QUESTION\_36>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_36>

**Question 37: Is Feature (F) clearly defined? If not, please explain how the definition could be made clearer or more precise.**

<QUESTION\_37>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_37>

**Question 38: Do you agree with the issues to be addressed by the disclosure requirements specific to Feature (F)? Are there issues that should be added, deleted, or modified?**

<QUESTION\_38>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_38>

**Question 39: Do the six features described fully cover the spectrum of ESG-related features currently offered in the marketplace?**

<QUESTION\_39>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_39>

### **Proposal for Classification of ESG-Related Features According to ESG-Related Needs**

**Question 40: Does this list of ESG-related needs represent the spectrum of investors' ESG-related needs?**

<QUESTION\_40>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_40>

**Question 41: Are these five ESG-related needs clearly differentiated and mutually exclusive?**

<QUESTION\_41>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_41>

**Question 42: Do you agree with the classification of ESG-related features according to ESG-related needs, as shown in Table 3? If not, how might it be improved?**

<QUESTION\_42>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_42>

### **Users and Benefits**

**Question 43: Do you agree with the description of user benefits? Are there any benefits that should be added or deleted?**

<QUESTION\_43>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_43>

**Question 44: Do you agree with the terms used to define the users of the Standard? Are there any terms we should include, or avoid using?**

<QUESTION\_44>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<QUESTION\_44>

**General Comments: Please enter general comments below.**

<GENERAL\_COMMENTS>

ENTER RESPONSE HERE

<GENERAL\_COMMENTS>