

[MUSIC PLAYING]

*Sustainability Unwrapped*-- a conversation podcast about responsibility, ethics, inequalities, climate change, and other challenges of our times, where science meets practise to think the world and how to make our society more sustainable, one podcast at a time.

Dear listeners, welcome to the podcast, *Sustainability Unwrapped* podcast. My name is Niclas Meyer, and I work as a postdoctoral researcher at Hanken. And today, we're going to talk about ESG investing and responsible investing.

And with us here today is Anna Hyske. Anna works as a principal responsible business specialist at the asset management department, Bank of Finland. She also has a background working in consumer [INAUDIBLE]. And it is very nice to meet you, Anna, and great that you could join us today.

Well, thank you for having me. Great to be here.

Great. We have four topics we're going to cover. So first, we will let Anna introduce herself and talk a little bit about responsible investing at the Bank of Finland. And second, we'll discuss ESG investing and institutional investors. And thirdly, we'll discuss ESG-related risks. And fourth and finally, we will shortly discuss Anna's view on the future of ESG investing.

But let us start with the first topic. So Anna, could you please introduce yourself to our audience, and maybe tell us a little bit about your work at Bank of Finland.

Oh, I'd be happy to. My background is somewhat unimaginative, as in I was born and bred in Finland, did my undergraduate degrees abroad, and I was supposed to study abroad. But then, I found myself working for one of the largest investors in Finland, and got into Hanken, actually, to do my master's degree, and life took over.

And since then, I have actually made ESG and responsible investing as my passion and work. I've written two books on the topic. I've given lectures and speeches, both at home and abroad. I've lived in Asia for several years. Now I'm back in Finland with a new job. So after 20 years at Ilmarinen, I just recently changed to the Bank of Finland.

The job I have at BoF is a newly-created position, so once again, I find myself developing my role and my expertise. And when I started 20 years ago, I half-jokingly said that I want to make myself

redundant. The idea was to pass on the knowledge and the capabilities so that portfolio managers and analysts could do it all themselves.

Now, it seems like I want to make these kind of roles very visible and very important so that ESG gets invited to all the big important tables. And that is the motivation to my move from a huge portfolio and an ESG trailblazer, to a much more smaller portfolio, to a organisation in the first stages of their ESG journey, but with a massive, massive potential for impact.

I mean, central banks are not known for their ESG capabilities, but when you actually start to scratch the surface, you'll be surprised what you can find. My job at Bank of Finland is all about developing and leading the Bank further on the ESG path and to support portfolio managers in their daily activities. It is also to work as a Bank of Finland representative in international working groups to take ESG further. So very, very interesting.

Thank you, and I'm very interested to hear. So I think most people [INAUDIBLE] heard about Norwegian pension fund. So it's one of the largest funds in the world, and they have a specific focus on sustainable and responsible investing. But for some, it might be a new thing to hear that also central banks, including the Bank of Finland, invest responsibly. So is it common for central banks to invest responsibly, and this is a new thing for Bank of Finland, is it? Or has it been around for a long time?

Well, I mean, central banks are increasingly interested in responsible investment. Although there are only a few central banks that have signed the UN-backed principles for responsible investment, there are almost 80 full NGFS members. And NGFS is probably not a very known entity to the listeners, but it is a network for central banks and supervisors on making the system greener, bringing ESG, especially the E part, into the central bank and supervisors' table. And I'm proud to say that the Bank of Finland belongs to both of these organisations to these groups.

This when did BoF adopt the responsible investment strategy is fairly new. So it happened a few years back. And I hope many, many more to come.

Great, interesting to hear. So can I ask you about the Bank of Finland, specifically, responsible investment strategy? How do you actually implement it? Is it's more like looking at ESG ratings than investing, or is it focused more on excluding companies in certain sectors, maybe? Or do you have some entirely different strategy?

Well, what is really important is to understand that your responsible investment strategy depends on

your overall investment strategy. So Bank of Finland does not invest directly into equities, for example. So therefore, active ownership is not as meaningful to perform in-house as to some other investors who do a lot of direct equity investing.

So for BoF, it's important to look at the responsible investment activities that are related to externally managed portfolios when it comes to equities, for example. So does the fund manager look, or how does the fund manager look at ESG? How responsible is the fund manager in his own activities? How does the manager exercise its ownership rights? What kind of responsible investment principles do they have, and how are they implemented in the product we are interested in investing in?

So this is just to give a flavour on why your investment style, why your investment strategy actually leads you to choose, what do you do from responsible investment perspective? So what we do, then, is we have exclusions, and we have ESG classification in place. We do thematic investments, for example. So it is very common for investors to use multiple approaches and different tools in order to show or get the benefits of ESG in the various asset classes they are invested in.

Very interesting. Yeah, let's move on to question two. So it's more about the institutional investors and active ownership. You mentioned that the Bank of Finland is maybe not a typical example of an active owner in the sense that they don't invest in equities. But you have also worked for [INAUDIBLE].

We don't invest equities directly. [LAUGHS]

Directly, OK.

Yes, we use external fund managers, therefore, then. Rather than us doing a lot on proxy voting and engagement, it's important to follow what the fund manager is doing on these topics.

I understand. But let's then discuss more the institutional investor setup-- so pension funds and stuff like that. So the Norwegian pension fund, which was mentioned here earlier, is often considered a typical example, maybe, of an active owner. They engage with their companies they invest in to be active citizens. So from your experience from working in the field a long time, would you say it's a common approach for institutional investors to be active owners on ESG issues?

Well--

Yeah, just go ahead.

Yes, so I am a strong believer that with ownership powers comes responsibilities, and those

responsibilities should be implemented actively. This does not mean an activist owner, but an active owner. And there are many ways to be an active owner. And institutional investors are becoming increasingly active.

And engagement, like you mentioned, is one form of active ownership. And it can take different forms. It can be reactive. It can be proactive.

So reactive engagement means that you are reacting to a negative risk event, for example, whereas then, a proactive engagement is more to build understanding, to learn and help to identify risks. And these engagements can be done either in-house, so you contact the companies yourself, and talk to them, and build the agenda yourself. You can use a service provider-- so the beauty of working within financial markets is that you will have service providers on anything and everything you might wish to have or do.

But you can also do collaborative efforts, where you team up with other similarly-thinking investors or investors who are interested in the same topic or same company as you, so you pool in your resources together and work on the same case. And that's also a growing interest to many investors, because engagement does take resources, and you can't engage with every single company. Or then, if you try to do that, I would say that your engagements may not be very effective and very successful.

So what would you consider the typical firm that an active owner usually engages with? And how are engagements typically executed? That is, is it more like talking to the company, or is divesting the last resort of an institutional investor?

Well, in my experience, it seems to me that if you actually have that ownership status-- whether it is through equity or fixed income investment, but some sort of financial stake in the company-- then the companies are more willing to listen to you compared to if you were a complete outsider and you'd say that, oh, potentially, I'm interested in investing in your company, but there are these issues. So it is usually that there is that ownership structure in place.

The engagement themselves, I think that there should always be an agenda where you have already thought about a desired outcome, you have thought about the plan, next steps, and thought about who you contact, and how you take these issues forward, and what are the point where you can escalate the engagement.

You wouldn't typically think that, maybe, putting forward a shareholder proposal is your first step.

Maybe first step is to actually ask what has happened. It also, obviously, then depends on the topic. If it's a reactive engagement where a risk event has already happened, it's fairly easy to ask what happened and how did it happen. And also, then, as part of the engagement, you start asking, what are the steps that the company is taking in order to prevent from that risk event happening again?

So engagement is much more than just letter-writing or attending big group meetings. It is building relationships and talking to the company management. And it is to listen, and learn, and also bring forward the worrying issues you have as an investor to the company, and hoping that the company understands and makes corrective actions to mitigate any issue that has already happened, and take corrective actions, and also try to prevent these negative events from happening again.

And you need a lot of patience. So sometimes, these engagements take a very, very, very long time. Sometimes, they can be over very quickly. It all depends, also, how the company is willing to respond and engage with you. Because it is not a monologue. It's not one communication to one direction. It should be a dialogue, and it should be that both sides are understanding that they are not against each other, but they are working, they should be working together towards a good outcome. OK. I was just going to ask, what would be the typical response of a company that has [INAUDIBLE] ESG issue, and then you engaged? And so how do they typically respond? Do they get defensive, aggressive, or anything? Or do they try to take actions against this ESG to fix it? And when are these kind of engagement typically successful?

Well, I mean, personally, I've had very mixed responses, but luckily, the days are gone when I have been belittled, ignored, or even ridiculed from the company side, to today, most companies are very good, and very professional, and also used to investors having interest to this level and willingness to discuss. And so every investor can classify engagements differently. So the success also then depends on the desired outcome.

But to me, I think the important is to understand that engagement is not micromanaging the company. It is you, as the investor, bringing forward some issues that you feel or see that they are value-destructive and issues that the company could and should address in order to stop the value destruction from happening. And if you can communicate that effectively, the company should then, obviously, take on board on what you are saying and take corrective action and corrective measures.

But like I said, sometimes, engagement can take years, and you need to escalate the issue sometimes if the company is not that responsive. But like I said, luckily, the things have changed massively over the years. I have been, like I said, belittled, and ridiculed, and told to my face by even

large companies-- which took me aback for a while.

And I once attended a company meeting, and it was a one-on-one meeting. And I thought that the meeting would be over in a few minutes' time, because I was told all the topics that we're not going to discuss, and they were the topics that we were supposed to discuss. In the end, we went over time with the company senior manager, and we discussed every single point that he told me before the meeting that we're definitely not going to discuss about. So you never know. Like I said, it is also about relationship-building.

Thank you. Let's discuss the recently-published paper in the top journal in finance. So it's by [INAUDIBLE]. It's a *Journal of Financial Economics* paper from 2019. And they look at institutional investors and firm-level ESG. So they basically find that the institutional investors can push these kind of environmental and social norms onto the firms they invest in, so basically driving the ESG level, a certain level ESG.

So however, they document that this is only the case given an institutional investor comes from a country with the high ESG standards, as in a European country and not, for example, if the institutional investor comes from a country with low ESG standards, such as, maybe, US, I think, [INAUDIBLE]. What's your take on this? Can institutional investors drive firm-level ESG? And so would you agree with the notion that it appears to be mostly the European institutional investors that do this?

When you introduced this question, you said push the environmental and social norms onto the firms they invest in. I could say that, instead of saying "push," you steer, and you communicate. And that does not mean micromanagement. You bring issues forward, and then it's up to the company how the company wants to take these issues on board. But yes, I do agree that at times, there is a lot of pushing happening as well.

Interestingly about this study, I think, is that it showed that it's PRI signatories that have the greater impact on firms' EMS performance. And if you look at the PRI signatory base, we tend to have more European PRI signatories than the US. And I think that's also, maybe, one of the reasons why the study found the evidence to point out that institutional investors from European countries have that kind of impact.

Now, good news about this notion of PRI signatories is that the numbers are growing, and they're growing massively. And maybe that will, then, lead evidence showing a little different in a few years' time. I just recently looked at some of the growth numbers, and within the last year in the US alone,

the growth has been 27% in PRI signatories. The base has been lower than overall Europe, and you will have certain areas in Europe that is showing superior growth numbers than 27%.

There is one region that I really, really want to pinpoint, is China. And yes, China has had very low numbers of PRI signatories. And therefore, the growth numbers should look impressive. But 77% in one year, I think it's showing that this notion of responsible investment is important, and it is growing.

But to really answer your main question, as in, can institutional investors drive this topic, I think it's absolutely. But it needs other actors, too. It can't be just the investors. And they can't do it by themselves.

I mean, if there is some pushback, that, obviously, slows things down. And in some cases, it halts the progress. But it tends to halt it for some time. We investors can be quite tenacious. We don't give up. We keep on doing-- also, having these discussions and bringing these issues forward.

Unfortunately, in the US, the recent legislative changes has made it more difficult for shareholders to bring forward issues into the annual general meeting. And normally, what happens is that if you have a shareholder proposal, it takes a few years before it gets enough attraction, it gains enough interest from the other shareholders. And in the US now, the threshold on how and when you can resubmit the same proposal has gone up.

We don't know whether or not that is going to change with the new powers that are taking place, but we work with what we have. And the good thing is, more and more investors are looking into these topics. So maybe going forward, it will not take several years to bring issues forward, but that happens quicker.

Thank you-- and a very interesting take on the paper and on this topic. I think we're ready to move on to question three. So it's about ESG risks. And so the world's largest asset manager, BlackRock, there is a statement in their annual letter of 2020 that sustainability should be the new standard for investing. And I think they mentioned that they do especially like climate risk transition and investment risk for investors [INAUDIBLE] portfolios, and that this is the main risk for investors.

So in your opinion, which ESG risks do you consider most important for investors to take into account, then? And would you agree that they are climate change-related risks?

Well, I mean, every investor has to choose their own strategies and approaches. And therefore, then, the risks are considered will vary by topic, too, and by investor. So a lot of emphasis is put on climate

change-related risks, which can, actually, be a risky strategy on its own if we miss out on significant other ESG risks.

Also, one should remember that the climate change topic is not just an environmental risk, but it's a human rights risk, too. In order to understand your risks and where you'd need to concentrate, or where you should, maybe, concentrate, where your impacts are the greatest, you need data, and you need lots of the data. Carbon footprinting scenario analysis have gained ground recently, so it definitely looks like climate change, related-risks are one of the high-level topics or main risk issues that investors are looking at.

What I find interesting is we have seen a lot of mergers in the field of ESG. And just recently, it was announced that two big reporting initiatives or organisations are actually merging and going together, bringing their separate reporting standards together with the idea to bring better reporting to investors, then, to understand the risks and opportunities that they may be facing in their portfolios.

OK, thanks. And so, if we continue with this BlackRock annual letter, so they also, in this letter, argue, basically, [AUDIO OUT] higher risk-adjusted returns. So according to finance theory, basically, it should not be possible on efficient market to earn this kind of higher risk-adjusted return. So I'm just wondering, in your opinion. So is the issue investing about trying to achieve higher risk-adjusted returns, or is it more about that trying to maybe achieve similar risk-adjusted returns, but at the same time, investing in a way that contributes to a more sustainable world?

Well, I mean, I've seen, in many cases-- and especially with pension funds and pension insurance companies, is where ESG started from-- is a risk management. Not quite a risk management function, but an add-on to your overall risk management approach, that we quite often focus on what we hold in our portfolios and the returns that these holdings generate. And we don't look at what we don't hold, and we don't think so often of the risks that we've avoided through the use of ESG data.

So if we think of the current market situation where we have very, very low interest rates, one bad apple in your fixed income portfolio can really destroy your returns. And therefore, in my opinion, it is very important that you understand the overall concept of ESG, that it can allow you to better identify the risks and opportunities within your portfolio-- also, the risks that you are avoiding.

So I have seen studies where researchers have stated that you generate better returns, and I've seen studies that state that you generate inferior returns, and anything in between. And the difficult part is that ESG is not one data point, is not one single issue. It's a bit the same as if you would try to ask a



portfolio manager, what individual data point in the balance sheet led you to invest in this particular company?

It is equally impossible to say what part of ESG data led you to invest in a company. You might be able to say what part prevented you from investing in a company, but because it's such a complex issue, really, to try to take out the ESG component in the return profile is very, very difficult. You can look at the data, and you can look at the returns, and you can try to find patterns there, but the data series tend to be a bit short. A lot of the studies have to be done so that they are back-tested, which means that you've already overcome a hurdle of avoiding companies that went bankrupt in between that time, which makes it not a completely realistic approach.

I don't know. Maybe in the future, we will see studies that will show-- because I would love to be able to fully show that ESG generates better returns. But I am a more cautious person. I wouldn't go that far, to say that definitely, through the use of ESG, you generate better returns. But I'm also definitely not willing to say that you generate inferior returns through the use of ESG.

You just help yourself by understanding and knowing your companies you are interested in investing in. You know them better. That my philosophy and my feeling over the years.

Thanks; very interesting take on this. And like you mentioned, there's a lot of studies that find inferior results, and a lot of studies that find superior results, and even more studies that are somewhere in between there. But maybe one channel that is going to be [INAUDIBLE] investing can generate, in some sense, higher risk-adjusted return. But you mentioned the risk management aspect of ESG investing.

And there's a paper in the *Journal of Finance* in 2007 by [? Lynn, ?] [? Servas, ?] and [? Tomayo. ?] And they basically document that during normal times, high ESG firms and low ESG firms perform roughly the same. But during the financial crisis in 2008, when there was this total lack of trust in the markets, high ESG firms performed much better-- significantly better-- than low ESG firms. And they argued that's basically because high-ESG firms have better trust between stakeholders and firm and between investors and firm. So they work like this kind of insurance for investors during poor economic times. So what is your take on this? Would you agree with this notion?

Well, I mean, we have seen similar reactions this year-- meaning that ESG investment products have had significant inflows and relatively good performance compared to some more traditional products, if you say. The trust that the researchers in this particular paper talk about, I think it's a really interesting notion.

People often think of investments being nothing but number-crunching and computing data. It is that, too-- don't get me wrong-- but it's also about interpreting the numbers, interpreting the data, understanding the story behind the numbers and the data. Taking the issue factors into play can allow you to better understand the companies you're interested in, and you may feel like you have a better understanding on the risks and opportunities. You may think that you trust your method better because you take a more broader approach or broader view to your potential investments, so you may feel like you have better downside protection. What I think should be pointed out, though, that it is not just for poor economic times, but it is equally relevant for better economic times and in bull markets that you can use this ESG as a downside risk factor.

Thanks. I think there's some time left, so I will also discuss another interesting paper published in the *Journal of Finance* in 2019. And it was [INAUDIBLE]. And [? Sussman, ?] then, basically, what they do is that they look at-- it was 2016 that Morningstar made their sustainability ratings available, publicly available. So there's sustainability ratings for a fund-- so it's one globe, two globes, three globes, four globes, five globes.

And then, [INAUDIBLE] this kind of natural experiment, and they found that, OK, when they made this information publicly available, there was a lot of inflow into the high ESG funds and outflows from the low ESG funds. So this basically suggests that investors on average-- so not only a small part of the investors, but investors on average-- actually consider and value sustainability when investing. And I'm interested in hearing your thoughts on this finding. And so, do investors value sustainability?

I do think that investors value sustainability, but I'm a bit sceptical on whether or not the evidence is coming from the Morningstar globes themselves. The Morningstar globes are about the level of disclosure and not, necessarily, actual sustainability. And what I mean by this is that funds that invest in small and mid-caps may get penalised as a sustainability info on their portfolios is scarce compared to funds with mainly large caps.

Large cap names regularly publish sustainability reports, whereas the smaller companies do that more seldom and/or more infrequent, or they don't publish as much data as the larger companies do. The lack of reporting does not automatically equal to poor ESG performance, just as the fact that there is a sustainability report does not automatically equal to superior ESG performance. I think it is important to consider sustainability when investing, but you need to understand what are the metrics, what are the tools, what are the standards, the ratings that you use, and what they do, and what they don't do.

And whatever the desired outcome you have, or whatever is the approach that you have chosen, you'd need to make sure that the tools you apply will actually help you to get to your desired outcome, or that they help you answer the questions you're interested in. As an example, I could say that I've used MSCI ratings in my career, and there's been times when I have disagreed with some of the ratings that MSCI has provided.

And I can say MSCI by name, because they know my opinion, and they've actually invited [AUDIO OUT] some of their events to talk about why I've been unhappy with their ratings-- or some of their ratings. And I was not able to pinpoint why I was disagreeing with some of their findings. And it wasn't until we started to deconstruct the rating-- as in looking at the raw data and the info behind the rating-- that led me to understand why or where I had different views from the rating provider.

And this is not to say that the ratings were completely wrong. I mean, the ratings, and the globes, and whatever standard or method of ranking funds or companies you use, they all have their positives, and they also have their drawbacks. So I may have a different opinion on weights and classifications that are making up a certain rating. And therefore, that's why you need to understand what the tool you choose is doing and what it is not doing in order for you not to have unwanted or unknown biases in your portfolio. Because otherwise, you never want to have biases that you don't understand or you don't know that you have. You want to take the risks that you know and understand in your portfolio.

So my point here is the key is always to read the research behind whatever rating or ranking you're using, not just to take the ranking or the rating itself with face value. You need to understand where it's coming from and what it is that it's telling you. And it can sound complex, and it can sound time-consuming. And I do understand that, for example, for retail investors, it may be a daunting task to do. But we do not have a single standard that would be overarching on all topics related to ESG.

All methods have their positives, and unfortunately, they also have the negatives. And you need to understand what they are in order to navigate in the jungle of standards, and rankings, and ratings out there.

Thanks. Interesting take, again, on the paper, yeah. I think Morningstar also provides more detailed data on sustainability than just the globes. I think that the authors find, basically, that there's a discontinuous jump just around the fifth globe and the one globe. So people look at the globes, but they don't look at the specific numbers behind the globes, because otherwise you would see this linear--

Yeah, exactly.

You will not see a discontinuous jump. So yeah, so if you had five globes compared to four globes, then there was a discontinuous jump in the [INAUDIBLE], yeah.

Yeah, and that's exactly my point, that do the investors who are using-- some of them who are then just looking at the globes, do they understand what the globes represent, and why certain funds are awarded five globes, and someone else is awarded one globe? And if you think that it is to-- like I said, the lack of reporting does not automatically mean poor performance, but with the Morningstar globes, a lack of reporting leads to fewer globes.

Yeah, but still, an interesting finding that, basically, you have this inflow into the high-ESG globes and into the [INAUDIBLE]. That sense seems to be that investors actually look at these globes and take into account the sustainability, but don't look into details, [INAUDIBLE]. Great.

But OK, let's move on to the fourth question, our last topic. Let's discuss a little bit the future of ESG investing. So COVID has, obviously, had a large impact on the world, but moving on to the world beyond COVID, in your opinion, will ESG investing become more or less important, and has COVID in any way changed ESG investing?

I think the evidence mentioned earlier in our discussion here-- the interest on ESG globally, the inflows, the performance-- it seems to indicate that ESG is becoming more and more important. And COVID seems to have highlighted the need for this more holistic approach, more broader approach on looking at the risks and opportunities in your investment portfolio, to really improve your understanding, also, on shocks and market reaction.

So I do think that it has changed positively, if one can say of a horrible, horrible sort of thing like COVID having a positive effect. But it definitely has highlighted the need and the desire of investors to have a better understanding and looking at ESG in a broader way.

So you would say that ESG investing is here to stay?

Well, I mean, I was debating that question with myself almost 20 years ago, when I was faced with a choice. So I mean, I started my ESG journey when I was a credit analyst at Ilmarinen. And so I was analysing industrial companies, manufacturers, and so on, and I realised that looking at ESG topics was taking more and more of my time, and I had less and less time to look at how the fixed income markets were performing. And when you don't have that time, you're not being a very good analyst.

So I had to choose, do I go to be a full-time ESG specialist, or should I remain as a credit analyst? And I trusted my gut feeling then, and I will trust my gut feeling even more confidently today. And I will say, absolutely, ESG is here to stay. We are heading towards an era where I think we will have nothing but ESG investing. Everything will be more or less ESG.

It does not mean that we all invest in a similar fashion, in a similar style. We will still have a multitude of approaches, and styles, and tools to choose from. Thank goodness for that, because otherwise, it would be very, very boring if we all just do exactly the same. I do think that in a few years' time, we will not be so much talking about responsible investments. We will talk about investments. And that means it is done in a way where ESG issues are taken into consideration when making investment decisions.

Yeah, I agree. It also seems to be that finance academia is catching up on this. And you I see a lot more work being done on this, and also a lot more good papers being published all the time in good journals. So there seems to be a trend there, also.

OK, I think we're ready to conclude. So many thanks, Anna, for taking the time to discuss these interesting topics with us and for sharing your thoughts on ESG investing. And maybe, to conclude, could you provide your key takeaways on ESG and responsible investing, and maybe also give some advice, if there is any students, for example, listening to this interested in learning about or working with ESG investing, could you maybe give some advice to these students, what should they focus on?

[LAUGHS] What should they focus on? Well, one key takeaway I would like people to understand is when we talk about ESG, when we talk about responsible investment, in its simplest form, we're talking about good portfolio management. So there is really no reason for you not to use ESG responsible investment approaches in your overall investment strategy.

You do want to make better investment decisions, and I firmly believe that in order for you to be better at making these kind of decisions, you need to look at ESG. It doesn't mean that you look at everything from A to Z. You need to concentrate on the significant topics, on the relevant topics, on the financially important topics.

And that's where the interesting part comes from. We don't always agree what those are. We will have different financial data providers, and service providers, and consultants who are saying that we should be looking at this, and someone else is saying that we should be looking at that.

And that's also the beauty of working in the financial markets, is that you have to make your own

decisions on what you consider as being important, what do you consider as being financially relevant, and concentrate on those topics, even though they may be different from someone else's views. So that's my key takeaway, is that this is good portfolio management, and that's the reason why everyone should be looking at ESG issues.

On the advice side, I'm happy to say that ESG actually seems to be one of the most resilient jobs in financial markets at the moment. So not a bad career choice to pursue, although I have to say that I may be a bit biased on this one. But *Financial Times* did do an article some time ago where they had studied the different jobs within the financial markets. And according to their study, they found that yes, ESG and responsible investment-related jobs actually were ones that were growing in the market, and we're not as risky in job security than some other jobs within the financial markets.

If you're interested in this topic, the way to go forward is to read, to learn, to listen, to attend seminars-- well, webinars now, because no one can do seminars. But, hopefully, someday we'll get to the seminar part as well, the events, et cetera. To learn more and know more, be active in finding trainees, summer trainee positions, and so on.

And I mean, sometimes I feel like I got onto this journey by accident. But in reality, I'd say that if it hadn't happened the way it did happen, it would have happened some other way. If you have the passion or you have the drive for it, you tend to create the possibilities for you in order to achieve what you want to achieve. So just be resilient, and like I said, attend events, and seminars, and webinars, and read, and get to know the network. And that's one way to go forward and find the perfect job.

Thank you very much. And this was a very inspiring and interesting discussion.

[MUSIC PLAYING]

And once again, many thanks for taking your time to discuss. Interesting topic.

Well, thank you for having me. It was it was a great, great pleasure to have this discussion with you today.