

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?

	ROA	Emission Intensity	Ln Total Assets	Ln Emissions
Treated \times 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 R ² Number of firms	735 Yes Yes 0.514 241	735 Yes Yes 0.930 241	735 Yes Yes 0.973 241	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