2019 Responsible Investment Survey Key Findings
To what extent are ESG principles used as part of your investment approach and decision making?

(all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are your reason(s) for incorporating ESG in your investment approach?

|-------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|
What are your reason(s) for not incorporating ESG factors in your investment approach?

- **Inconsistent with fiduciary duty**
  - Total: 2018 - 27%, 2019 - 33%
  - U.S.: 2018 - 34%, 2019 - 34%
  - Canada: 2018 - 30%, 2019 - 33%
  - Europe/UK: 2018 - 0%, 2019 - 50%

- **Won't materially impact returns**
  - Total: 2018 - 18%, 2019 - 22%
  - U.S.: 2018 - 23%, 2019 - 22%
  - Canada: 2018 - 20%, 2019 - 19%
  - Europe/UK: 2018 - 13%, 2019 - 0%

- **Insufficient resources**
  - Total: 2018 - 29%, 2019 - 19%
  - U.S.: 2018 - 29%, 2019 - 16%
  - Canada: 2018 - 28%, 2019 - 19%
  - Europe/UK: 2018 - 20%, 2019 - 25%

- **Not important to plan members**
  - Total: 2018 - 11%, 2019 - 16%
  - U.S.: 2018 - 16%, 2019 - 19%
  - Canada: 2018 - 11%, 2019 - 11%
  - Europe/UK: 2018 - 7%, 2019 - 25%
For which of the following asset classes do you incorporate ESG factors into portfolio management?

**Equities**
- Total: 84% (2018), 87% (2019)
- U.S.: 81% (2018), 87% (2019)
- Canada: 84% (2018), 89% (2019)
- Europe/UK: 89% (2018), 73% (2019)

**Real Estate**
- Total: 43% (2018), 38% (2019)
- U.S.: 33% (2018), 30% (2019)
- Canada: 48% (2018), 53% (2019)
- Europe/UK: 53% (2018), 35% (2019)

**Fixed Income**
- Total: 60% (2018), 62% (2019)
- U.S.: 52% (2018), 60% (2019)
- Canada: 64% (2018), 65% (2019)
- Europe/UK: 69% (2018), 73% (2019)

**Alternatives**
- Total: 34% (2018), 34% (2019)
- U.S.: 40% (2018), 34% (2019)
- Canada: 32% (2018), 33% (2019)
- Europe/UK: 31% (2018), 43% (2019)
For which of the following asset classes do you incorporate ESG factors into portfolio management?

(continued from previous slide)
How do you believe ESG integrated portfolios are likely to perform relative to non-ESG integrated investments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe/UK</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data for 2017 not available.
Do you believe that integrating ESG factors can help mitigate risk?

(all respondents)

2017
- Yes: 48%
- No: 32%
- Not sure: 20%

2018
- Yes: 67%
- No: 19%
- Not sure: 14%

2019
- Yes: 58%
- No: 18%
- Not sure: 24%
Do you believe that integrating ESG factors can help mitigate risk?

**U.S.**
- **2017**: 28% Yes, 54% No, 22% Not sure
- **2018**: 24% Yes, 21% No, 29% Not sure
- **2019**: 23% Yes, 21% No, 29% Not sure

**Canada**
- **2017**: 68% Yes, 14% No, 18% Not sure
- **2018**: 71% Yes, 11% No, 18% Not sure
- **2019**: 72% Yes, 11% No, 17% Not sure

**Europe/UK**
- **2018**: 83% Yes, 4% No, 13% Not sure
- **2019**: 89% Yes, 9% No, 3% Not sure

**Asia**
- **2018**: 58% Yes, 12% No, 30% Not sure
- **2019**: 48% Yes, 16% No, 36% Not sure

*Data for 2017 not available.*

*Sample size not statistically significant. Data for 2017 not available.*
Do you believe that integrating ESG factors can help generate alpha?

(all respondents)

2017
- Yes: 30%
- No: 24%
- Not sure: 46%

2018
- Yes: 42%
- No: 20%
- Not sure: 38%

2019
- Yes: 41%
- No: 23%
- Not sure: 36%
Do you believe that integrating ESG factors can help generate alpha?

**U.S.**

- **2017:** Yes: 17%, No: 39%, Not sure: 33%
- **2018:** Yes: 28%, No: 26%, Not sure: 33%
- **2019:** Yes: 59%, No: 24%, Not sure: 40%

**Canada**

- **2017:** Yes: 21%, No: 30%, Not sure: 40%
- **2018:** Yes: 37%, No: 16%, Not sure: 22%
- **2019:** Yes: 41%, No: 49%, Not sure: 43%

**Europe/UK**

- **2018:** Yes: 52%, No: 10%, Not sure: 38%
- **2019:** Yes: 61%, No: 11%, Not sure: 28%

**Asia**

- **2018:** Yes: 21%, No: 12%, Not sure: 15%
- **2019:** Yes: 64%, No: 20%, Not sure: 68%

*Sample size not statistically significant. Data for 2017 not available.*
In the Fossil Fuel Free context, do you consider divestment to be more effective than engagement?

(all respondents)

792.0x612.0
In the Fossil Fuel Free context, do you consider divestment to be more effective than engagement?

**U.S.**  
- Divestment is more effective: 6%, 14%, 24%  
- Engagement is more effective: 7%, 15%, 19%  
- They are equally effective: 10%, 11%, 26%  
- Neither approach is effective: 0%, 0%, 0%  
- Not sure: 0%, 0%, 0%

**Canada**  
- Divestment is more effective: 6%, 8%, 6%  
- Engagement is more effective: 51%, 47%, 47%  
- They are equally effective: 11%, 13%, 20%  
- Neither approach is effective: 6%, 7%, 6%  
- Not sure: 27%, 25%, 17%

**Europe/UK**  
- Divestment is more effective: 6%, 38%, 34%  
- Engagement is more effective: 9%, 15%, 15%  
- They are equally effective: 67%, 14%, 8%  
- Neither approach is effective: 6%, 6%, 6%  
- Not sure: 0%, 0%, 0%

**Asia**  
- Divestment is more effective: 9%, 31%, 9%  
- Engagement is more effective: 42%, 19%, 19%  
- They are equally effective: 12%, 15%, 9%  
- Neither approach is effective: 15%, 4%, 4%  
- Not sure: 27%, 31%, 27%

*Sample size not statistically significant. Data for 2017 not available.*
How satisfied are you with the current amount of ESG-related disclosure provided by issuers?

Ranked on a scale of 0-5, 0 being not satisfied, 5 being very satisfied

Top 2 Satisfied (Ranking 4 and 5)
- 13%
- 14%
- 10%
- 18%
- 12%

Bottom 2 Not Satisfied (Ranking 0 and 1)
- 19%
- 20%
- 17%
- 12%
- 32%

Percent of respondents

*Sample size not statistically significant.
How satisfied are you with the current **amount** of ESG-related disclosure provided by issuers?

Ranked on a scale of 0-5, 0 being not satisfied, 5 being very satisfied

*Sample size not statistically significant.*
How satisfied are you with the current quality of ESG-related disclosure provided by issuers?

Ranked on a scale of 0-5, 0 being not satisfied, 5 being very satisfied

Top 2 Satisfied (Ranking 4 and 5)
- TOTAL: 9%
- U.S.: 10%
- Canada: 8%
- Europe/UK: 8%
- Asia*: 12%

Bottom 2 Not Satisfied (Ranking 0 and 1)
- TOTAL: 24%
- U.S.: 23%
- Canada: 29%
- Europe/UK: 17%
- Asia*: 27%

Percent of respondents

*Sample size not statistically significant.
How satisfied are you with the current quality of ESG-related disclosure provided by issuers?

Ranked on a scale of 0-5, 0 being not satisfied, 5 being very satisfied

*Sample size not statistically significant.*
In your opinion, who should take the lead in influencing companies to provide better ESG-related information?

(all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shareholders</th>
<th>Government regulators</th>
<th>Industry organizations</th>
<th>Stock exchanges</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In your opinion, who should take the lead in influencing companies to provide better ESG-related information?

**U.S.**

- Shareholders: 43% (2017), 52% (2018), 55% (2019)
- Stock exchanges: 8% (2017), 5% (2018), 7% (2019)
- Other: 1% (2017), 2% (2018), 2% (2019)

**Canada**

- Shareholders: 38% (2017), 34% (2018), 43% (2019)
- Industry organizations: 6% (2017), 4% (2018), 5% (2019)
- Stock exchanges: 33% (2017), 4% (2018), 3% (2019)
- Other: 2% (2017), 2% (2018), 2% (2019)

**Europe/UK**

- Shareholders: 34% (2017), 54% (2018), 31% (2019)
- Industry organizations: 11% (2017), 4% (2018), 0% (2019)
- Stock exchanges: 4% (2017), 1% (2018), 0% (2019)
- Other: 3% (2017), 3% (2018), 0% (2019)

**Asia**

- Shareholders: 28% (2017), 34% (2018), 37% (2019)
- Industry organizations: 3% (2017), 3% (2018), 0% (2019)
- Stock exchanges: 0% (2017), 0% (2018), 0% (2019)
- Other: 0% (2017), 0% (2018), 0% (2019)

*Sample size not statistically significant. Data for 2017 not available.*
In your opinion, should gender diversity targets be adopted?

All respondents

- Yes: 48%
- No: 52%

By region

- U.S.: Yes 45%, No 55%
- Canada: Yes 50%, No 50%
- Europe/UK: Yes 56%, No 44%
- Asia*: Yes 63%, No 37%

*Sample size not statistically significant.
What is your preferred approach to encourage gender diversity on corporate boards?

(all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shareholder proposals</th>
<th>Government regulations</th>
<th>Market forces</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your preferred approach to encourage gender diversity on corporate boards?

**U.S.**

- **Shareholder proposals**: 42%, 48%, 42%, 43%, 49%
- **Government regulations**: 6%, 5%, 7%, 7%, 13%
- **Market forces**: 12%, 12%, 12%, 12%, 12%
- **Other**: 5%, 5%, 5%, 5%, 5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shareholder proposals</th>
<th>Government regulations</th>
<th>Market forces</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada**

- **Shareholder proposals**: 43%, 40%, 42%, 34%, 41%
- **Government regulations**: 12%, 5%, 11%, 11%, 21%
- **Market forces**: 12%, 11%, 14%, 11%, 27%
- **Other**: 11%, 11%, 12%, 11%, 11%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shareholder proposals</th>
<th>Government regulations</th>
<th>Market forces</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe/UK**

- **Shareholder proposals**: 28%, 34%, 41%, 31%, 53%
- **Government regulations**: 20%, 31%, 11%, 0%, 11%
- **Market forces**: 8%, 8%, 11%, 11%, 0%
- **Other**: 6%, 6%, 6%, 6%, 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shareholder proposals</th>
<th>Government regulations</th>
<th>Market forces</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asia**

- **Shareholder proposals**: 29%, 35%, 29%, 12%, 47%
- **Government regulations**: 29%, 35%, 29%, 12%, 35%
- **Market forces**: 6%, 6%, 6%, 6%, 6%
- **Other**: 6%, 6%, 6%, 6%, 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shareholder proposals</th>
<th>Government regulations</th>
<th>Market forces</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant. Data for 2017 not available.*
What would be a reasonable non-binding target for the board of an issuer to adopt regarding gender diversity?

(all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20% or less</th>
<th>21% – 30%</th>
<th>31% – 40%</th>
<th>More than 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would be a reasonable non-binding target for the board of an issuer to adopt regarding gender diversity?

**U.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20% or less</th>
<th>21% – 30%</th>
<th>31% – 40%</th>
<th>More than 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe/UK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20% or less</th>
<th>21% – 30%</th>
<th>31% – 40%</th>
<th>More than 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20% or less</th>
<th>21% – 30%</th>
<th>31% – 40%</th>
<th>More than 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20% or less</th>
<th>21% – 30%</th>
<th>31% – 40%</th>
<th>More than 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant.*
Do you think corporations are too focused on short-term financial results?

TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europe/UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant.
What do you think is causing that short-term focus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>UK*</th>
<th>Europe*</th>
<th>Asia*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term earning pressures from investors</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly reporting</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly forecasts</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term earning pressures from executives and the board</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly forecasts</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short strategic planning horizons</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant.*
Do you require your external asset manager(s) to apply any negative Socially Responsible Investment (SRI) screens to your portfolio?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe/UK</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia*</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant.*
Which screens are applied?

*n= require that asset managers apply negative SRI screens to your portfolio (all respondents)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Power</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Fuel related</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster munitions and landmines</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of respondents
Is it important to incorporate ESG factors into both equity and fixed income strategies?

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
<th>Both equally important</th>
<th>Both, but more material for equities</th>
<th>Both, but more material for fixed income</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
<th>Both equally important</th>
<th>Both, but more material for equities</th>
<th>Both, but more material for fixed income</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
<th>Both equally important</th>
<th>Both, but more material for equities</th>
<th>Both, but more material for fixed income</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe/UK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
<th>Both equally important</th>
<th>Both, but more material for equities</th>
<th>Both, but more material for fixed income</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asia***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
<th>Both equally important</th>
<th>Both, but more material for equities</th>
<th>Both, but more material for fixed income</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant.*
Do you believe that there are sufficient fixed income product offerings that incorporate ESG factors?

**TOTAL**
- Yes: 43% (2018), 46% (2019)
- No: 38% (2018), 43% (2019)
- Not sure: 14% (2018), 16% (2019)

**U.S.**
- Yes: 42% (2018), 41% (2019)
- No: 36% (2018), 45% (2019)
- Not sure: 17% (2018), 20% (2019)

**Canada**
- Yes: 11% (2018), 12% (2019)
- No: 33% (2018), 37% (2019)
- Not sure: 56% (2018), 51% (2019)

**Europe/UK**
- Yes: 56% (2018), 54% (2019)
- No: 29% (2018), 37% (2019)
- Not sure: 15% (2018), 9% (2019)

**Asia**
- Yes: 50% (2018), 39% (2019)
- No: 39% (2018), 37% (2019)
- Not sure: 52% (2018), 37% (2019)

*Sample size not statistically significant.*
For what type of fixed income issuer do you believe ESG issues are the most material?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSA/Sovereign mandates</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate mandates</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both sovereigns and corporates equally</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All respondents)
For what type of fixed income issuer do you believe ESG issues are the most material?

U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both sovereigns and corporates equally</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate mandates</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA/Sovereign mandates</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europe/UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both sovereigns and corporates equally</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate mandates</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA/Sovereign mandates</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both sovereigns and corporates equally</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate mandates</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA/Sovereign mandates</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asia*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both sovereigns and corporates equally</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate mandates</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA/Sovereign mandates</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant.
Do you/your company have a climate action policy?

(all respondents)

- Yes: 59%
- No: 24%
- Not sure: 17%
Do you currently hold any impact products in your portfolio?

(all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you currently hold any impact products in your portfolio?

**U.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe/UK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asia***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample size not statistically significant.
Do you expect to allocate funds to Impact Investing as opposed to ESG/SRI in the next 1-5 years?

(all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you expect to allocate funds to Impact Investing as opposed to ESG/SRI in the next 1-5 years?

**U.S.**

- 2017: 19% Yes, 41% No, 40% Not sure
- 2018: 34% Yes, 38% No, 29% Not sure
- 2019: 31% Yes, 32% No, 37% Not sure

**Canada**

- 2017: 13% Yes, 18% No, 18% Not sure
- 2018: 35% Yes, 38% No, 44% Not sure
- 2019: 31% Yes, 18% No, 18% Not sure

**Europe/UK**

- 2017: 40% Yes, 32% No, 28% Not sure
- 2018: 42% Yes, 40% No, 17% Not sure
- 2019: 40% Yes, 38% No, 21% Not sure

**Asia***

- 2018: 21% Yes, 28% No, 24% Not sure
- 2019: 24% Yes, 24% No, 52% Not sure

*Sample size not statistically significant. Data for 2017 not available.
Of your portfolio that falls under the umbrella of responsible investing, what percent is actively managed (versus passively managed or index-based)?

(all respondents)

- 0% – it is all passive
- 1 – 25%
- 26 – 50%
- 51 – 75%
- 76 – 99%
- 100% – the entire portfolio is actively managed
Of your portfolio that falls under the umbrella of responsible investing, what percent is actively managed (versus passively managed or index-based)?

- **U.S.**
  - 0% – it is all passive: 8%
  - 1 – 25%: 17%
  - 26 – 50%: 16%
  - 51 – 75%: 20%
  - 76 – 99%: 21%
  - 100% – the entire portfolio is actively managed: 18%

- **Canada**
  - 0% – it is all passive: 13%
  - 1 – 25%: 9%
  - 26 – 50%: 8%
  - 51 – 75%: 10%
  - 76 – 99%: 18%

- **Europe/UK**
  - 0% – it is all passive: 6%
  - 1 – 25%: 15%
  - 26 – 50%: 12%
  - 51 – 75%: 9%
  - 76 – 99%: 12%
  - 100% – the entire portfolio is actively managed: 42%
  - 45%
Among the issues you would consider while investing, how concerned are you about the following…

Ranked on a scale of 0-5, 0 being not concerned, 5 being very concerned (Top 2 Concerned) (all respondents)

- Cyber Security: 67%
- Climate change: 66%
- Income inequality: 57%
- Renewal energy: 57%
- Shareholder rights / voting: 56%
- Health & safety: 58%
- Water: 65%
- Anti-corruption: 66%
- Community impact: 50%
- Employee engagement: 43%
- Biodiversity: 44%
- Resource use & management: 43%
- Board diversity: 42%
- Land use: 40%
- Executive compensation: 37%
- Income inequality: 37%
- Corporate structure: 38%
- Other Governance: 38%
- Workplace diversity: 35%
- Other Environmental: 37%
- Other Social: 25%
Among the issues you would consider while investing, how concerned are you about the following…

**Ranked on a scale of 0-5, 0 being not concerned, 5 being very concerned (Top 2 Concerned)**

- **Cyber Security**
- **Climate change**
- **Anti-corruption**
- **Water**
- **Renewable energy**
- **Health & safety**
- **Shareholder rights / voting**
- **Executive compensation**
- **Income inequality**
- **Resource use & management**
- **Community impact**
- **Employee engagement**
- **Biodiversity**
- **Land use**
- **Board diversity**
- **Workplace diversity**
- **Corporate structure**
- **Corporate governance**
- **Other Environmental**
- **Other Social**
- **Other Governance**
- **Other Other**

**Europe/UK**

- **Cyber Security**
- **Climate change**
- **Anti-corruption**
- **Water**
- **Renewable energy**
- **Health & safety**
- **Shareholder rights / voting**
- **Executive compensation**
- **Income inequality**
- **Resource use & management**
- **Community impact**
- **Employee engagement**
- **Biodiversity**
- **Land use**
- **Board diversity**
- **Workplace diversity**
- **Corporate structure**
- **Corporate governance**
- **Other Environmental**
- **Other Social**
- **Other Governance**
- **Other Other**

**Canada**

- **Cyber Security**
- **Climate change**
- **Anti-corruption**
- **Water**
- **Renewable energy**
- **Health & safety**
- **Shareholder rights / voting**
- **Executive compensation**
- **Income inequality**
- **Resource use & management**
- **Community impact**
- **Employee engagement**
- **Biodiversity**
- **Land use**
- **Board diversity**
- **Workplace diversity**
- **Corporate structure**
- **Corporate governance**
- **Other Environmental**
- **Other Social**
- **Other Governance**
- **Other Other**

**U.S.**

- **Cyber Security**
- **Climate change**
- **Anti-corruption**
- **Water**
- **Renewable energy**
- **Health & safety**
- **Shareholder rights / voting**
- **Executive compensation**
- **Income inequality**
- **Resource use & management**
- **Community impact**
- **Employee engagement**
- **Biodiversity**
- **Land use**
- **Board diversity**
- **Workplace diversity**
- **Corporate structure**
- **Corporate governance**
- **Other Environmental**
- **Other Social**
- **Other Governance**
- **Other Other**
Investment Consultants

Do you employ external managers who incorporate ESG factors into their portfolio management process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (NET)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – for some mandates</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – for all mandates</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you require your external manager to provide regular reporting on any of the following?

- ESG practices and integration: 73%
- Proxy voting: 48%
- Engagement activities: 36%
- Impact measurement: 24%
- Diversity and inclusion: 21%
- Other: 9%

*n=employ managers who incorporate ESG factors into their portfolio management process*
RBC Global Asset Management (RBC GAM) and BlueBay Asset Management LLP developed a survey of 27 questions around the topic of responsible investing.

The survey was distributed to institutional asset owners, consultants, clients, P&I Research Advisory Panel members, and members of the Pensions & Investments database throughout Canada, Europe, Asia and the United States.

Signet Research, Inc. collected and analyzed the results of 799 respondents and determined that the findings from the survey could be accepted as accurate at a 95% confidence level within a sampling tolerance of approximately +/-3.5%.
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