

Eleonora Sfrappini IWH - Halle Institute for Economic Research

FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS AND EMISSION INTENSITY



EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

EUROSYSTEM

How do high-emitting firms adjust to tighter financial constraints? And what happens to their emission intensity when they adjust?

Winner-Picking in Dirty Firms:

- Headquarters can reallocate scarce resources within the firm to fund relatively more profitable projects (Stein, 1997) → Winner Picking
- When dirty subsidiaries are more profitable: ↑ Emission intensity
- · Are dirty subsidiaries more profitable?



Data

European firms active in emission-intensive sectors:

Financial and Ownership: Bureau van Dijk Ownership Database

- Historical parent-subsidiary links 2009-2019
- · At subsidiary and parent level

Emissions: EU Emission Trading Scheme Data

• Installation-level data mapped to parents and subsidiaries Banking Relationships: AMADEUS Bankers

1st Natural Experiment: The EBA Capital Exercise

- In 2011, 61 EU banks had to increase their Tier 1 capital ratios to 9%
- This led to a reduction in corporate lending (Gropp et al., 2018) and a credit crunch (Mésonnier and Monks, 2015) for borrowers of participating banks
- Difference-in-Difference approach where *Treated* are borrowers of EBA Banks

Do treated firms engage in winner-picking?

Treated × Post	0.015*** (0.003)	0.290* (0.144)	-0.042** (0.018)	0.075 (0.076)
Observations Firm FE Industry-Year FE Country-Year FE Adjusted <i>R</i> ² Number of firms Clustering	735 Yes Yes 0.514 241 Country	735 Yes Yes 0.930 241 Country	735 Yes Yes 0.973 241 Country	735 Yes Yes 0.956 241 Country

An alternative mechanism: Constraint-Minimization

- High emitting firms can face tighter financial constraints due to their dirty status: a carbon premium in equity markets (Bolton and Kacperczyk, 2021) and higher loan (Delis et al., 2021) and bond prices (Seltzer et al., 2022)

2nd Natural Experiment: Banks' SBTi commitments

- Between 2015 and 2019, 12 banks join the Science Based Carbon Initiative (SBTi) and pledge to a target of portfolio decarbonization
- This led to a reduction in credit supply to high-emitting borrowers of committed banks (Kacperczyk and Peydró, 2022)
- Staggered DiD approach following Sun and Abraham (2021):

$$Y_{ft} = \sum_{l \in \{-3, -2, 0, 1, 2, 3\}} \beta_l L_{ft}^l + \zeta_f + \zeta_{it} + \zeta_{lt} + \varepsilon_f$$

Do treated firms engage in winner-picking? Or rather constraint-minimization?



Further Results: Constraint-Minimization

 No winner-picking and no shrinking at the margin: profitability

First Results: Winner Picking in Dirty Firms

- <u>The marginal project is clean:</u> ↑ emission intensity
- Is this about within-firm capital allocation choices?
- Subsidiary level: Decline in size for clean subsidiaries, not dirty ones

 Firms cater to lenders' sustainable preferences: emissions

Are treated firms engaging in constraint-minimization?

- Emission reductions are concentrated at the parent level: where *visible*
- Parents *distance themselves* from *less visible* emissions by increasing the number of intermediary ownership relationships to dirty subsidiaries

Take-Aways

How firms adjust to financial constraints matters for environmental performance:

- I link the idea of winner-picking to an increase in emission intensity for dirty firms
- I propose the alternative mechanism of constraintminimization when the constraint is correlated with firms' environmental performance and show this incentive at play in an empirical setting
- In the paper, I also provide a simple theoretical framework to highlight the trade-offs between winnerpicking and constraint-minimization

Policy Relevance

- Interventions to manage transition risks in the financial sector could worsen financial constraints for dirty firms
- Policy design should preserve dirty firms' incentives to invest in clean projects