



Julie A. Ellsworth

IDAHO STATE TREASURER

Press Release

August 9, 2023

Contact:

Noelle Veldhouse
Deputy Treasurer-Outreach
208-332-2996
noelle.veldhouse@sto.idaho.gov

S&P Global Ratings Update ESG

State Treasurer Ellsworth's Update on ESG

August 9, 2023

BOISE - Idaho's voice was heard!

On May 18, 2022, Idaho leaders sent a letter to S&P objecting to the use of ESG credit indicators as part of its credit ratings for states and state subdivisions. On August 4, 2023, S&P Global Ratings announced that effective immediately, they are no longer publishing new ESG credit indicators.

I hope you have time to review the original letter and the S&P Ratings Update that are included below.

This is a great success for Idaho and I appreciate all of those who work so hard to ensure Idaho's fiscal well-being.

[Idaho Leader's Letter](#)
[S&P Global Ratings](#)

Sincerely,

Julie A. Ellsworth
Idaho State Treasurer

-end-

S&P Global Ratings Update On ESG Credit Indicators

August 4, 2023

NEW YORK (S&P Global Ratings) Aug. 4, 2023--S&P Global Ratings remains committed to providing the market with transparency on how and when environmental, social and governance (ESG) factors influence our assessment of creditworthiness. However, effective immediately, we are no longer publishing new ESG credit indicators in our reports or updating outstanding ESG credit indicators.

In 2021, S&P Global Ratings began publishing alphanumeric ESG credit indicators for publicly rated entities in some sectors and asset classes. These indicators were intended to illustrate and summarize the relevance of ESG credit factors on our rating analysis through the use of an alphanumeric scale. They supplemented the narrative paragraphs in our credit rating reports where we describe the impact of ESG credit factors on creditworthiness. After further review, we have determined that the dedicated analytical narrative paragraphs in our credit rating reports are most effective at providing detail and transparency on ESG credit factors material to our rating analysis, and these will remain integral to our reports.

This update does not affect our ESG principles criteria (<https://disclosure.spglobal.com/ratings/en/regulatory/article/-/view/sourceId/12085396>) or our research and commentary on ESG-related topics, including the influence that ESG factors can have on creditworthiness. We will be updating our external websites and platforms to reflect this change.

This report does not constitute a rating action.

S&P Global Ratings, part of S&P Global Inc. (NYSE: SPGI), is the world's leading provider of independent credit risk research. We publish more than a million credit ratings on debt issued by sovereign, municipal, corporate and financial sector entities. With over 1,400 credit analysts in 26 countries, and more than 150 years' experience of assessing credit risk, we offer a unique combination of global coverage and local insight. Our research and opinions about relative credit risk provide market participants with information that helps to support the growth of transparent, liquid debt markets worldwide.

PRIMARY CREDIT ANALYST

Gregg Lemos-Stein, CFA
New York
+ 212438 1809
gregg.lemos-stein
@spglobal.com

MEDIA CONTACTS

Orla OBrien
Boston
+1 (857) 407-8559
orla.obrien
@spglobal.com

Arnaud Humblot
London
+ 44 20 7176 6685
Arnaud.Humblot
@spglobal.com

S&P Global Ratings Update On ESG Credit Indicators

Copyright © 2023 by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC. All rights reserved.

No content (including ratings, credit-related analyses and data, valuations, model, software or other application or output therefrom) or any part thereof (Content) may be modified, reverse engineered, reproduced or distributed in any form by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC or its affiliates (collectively, S&P). The Content shall not be used for any unlawful or unauthorized purposes. S&P and any third-party providers, as well as their directors, officers, shareholders, employees or agents (collectively S&P Parties) do not guarantee the accuracy, completeness, timeliness or availability of the Content. S&P Parties are not responsible for any errors or omissions (negligent or otherwise), regardless of the cause, for the results obtained from the use of the Content, or for the security or maintenance of any data input by the user. The Content is provided on an "as is" basis. S&P PARTIES DISCLAIM ANY AND ALL EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR USE, FREEDOM FROM BUGS, SOFTWARE ERRORS OR DEFECTS, THAT THE CONTENT'S FUNCTIONING WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED OR THAT THE CONTENT WILL OPERATE WITH ANY SOFTWARE OR HARDWARE CONFIGURATION. In no event shall S&P Parties be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental, exemplary, compensatory, punitive, special or consequential damages, costs, expenses, legal fees, or losses (including, without limitation, lost income or lost profits and opportunity costs or losses caused by negligence) in connection with any use of the Content even if advised of the possibility of such damages.

Credit-related and other analyses, including ratings, and statements in the Content are statements of opinion as of the date they are expressed and not statements of fact. S&P's opinions, analyses and rating acknowledgment decisions (described below) are not recommendations to purchase, hold, or sell any securities or to make any investment decisions, and do not address the suitability of any security. S&P assumes no obligation to update the Content following publication in any form or format. The Content should not be relied on and is not a substitute for the skill, judgment and experience of the user, its management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions. S&P does not act as a fiduciary or an investment advisor except where registered as such. While S&P has obtained information from sources it believes to be reliable, S&P does not perform an audit and undertakes no duty of due diligence or independent verification of any information it receives. Rating-related publications may be published for a variety of reasons that are not necessarily dependent on action by rating committees, including, but not limited to, the publication of a periodic update on a credit rating and related analyses.

To the extent that regulatory authorities allow a rating agency to acknowledge in one jurisdiction a rating issued in another jurisdiction for certain regulatory purposes, S&P reserves the right to assign, withdraw or suspend such acknowledgment at any time and in its sole discretion. S&P Parties disclaim any duty whatsoever arising out of the assignment, withdrawal or suspension of an acknowledgment as well as any liability for any damage alleged to have been suffered on account thereof.

S&P keeps certain activities of its business units separate from each other in order to preserve the independence and objectivity of their respective activities. As a result, certain business units of S&P may have information that is not available to other S&P business units. S&P has established policies and procedures to maintain the confidentiality of certain non-public information received in connection with each analytical process.

S&P may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P's public ratings and analyses are made available on its Web sites, www.standardandpoors.com (free of charge), and www.ratingsdirect.com (subscription), and may be distributed through other means, including via S&P publications and third-party redistributors. Additional information about our ratings fees is available at www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees.

STANDARD & POOR'S, S&P and RATINGSDIRECT are registered trademarks of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC.



May 18, 2022

TRANSMITTED VIA U.S. MAIL AND EMAIL

Douglas L. Peterson
President and CEO
S&P Global Ratings
55 Water Street
New York, NY 10041
douglas.peterson@spglobal.com

Martina L. Cheung
President
S&P Global Ratings
55 Water Street
New York, NY 10041
martina.cheung@spglobal.com

Re: ESG Credit Indicators – State of Idaho

Dear Mr. Peterson and Ms. Cheung:

On behalf of the State of Idaho, we object to S&P Global Ratings' ("S&P") publishing ESG credit indicators as part of its credit ratings for states and state subdivisions. To this end, we join with our sister states, especially Utah's thorough letter in objection, in opposing S&P's use of ESG credit indicators and object to any attempts at subjective quantification beyond the conservative and careful management of a state's finances, repayment of debt, and a State's ongoing creditworthiness.

Idaho has consistently maintained a solid credit rating, weathered recessions, corrections, and market volatility without deviation. The state balances its budget each and every year, and carefully manages its debt load, which currently includes being on track to pay thirteen (13) bonds off early. Idaho has full and robust reserve and rainy days funds which are currently at their statutory maximum. In short, Idaho is solvent and should not be penalized by you or any other entity for its sovereign

decisions. We, the undersigned officers of the State of Idaho object to S&P's attempts to overlook Idaho's sound financial management in favor of evaluating its political priorities. This is inconsistent with the fundamentals of sound financial planning and evaluation.

Most concerning is S&P's adoption of these tools with a blind eye towards its own past. In 2015, S&P admitted to falsely representing that its ratings were objective, independent and uninfluenced by S&P's business relationship with the investment banks that issued securities covered by S&P. S&P also paid \$1.375 billion to settle these claims, including millions of dollars to Idaho. Paramount among these allegations was that S&P refused to use sound objective financial information and instead chose to rely upon business relationships. We are very concerned that S&P does not appear to be learning the lessons of its own past, and instead is again embarking on a political course designed to curry favor with specific customers through the creation of a subjective ratings system. This is not how the State of Idaho manages its finances, nor is it how S&P should evaluate Idaho's careful stewardship of its monies.

Equally baffling is the means by which S&P creates these "scores." For example, in reviewing the scores no state has a score of positive for Governance (G-1). But every state in the nation is governed by an elected governor and legislature. Virtually all political subdivisions are governed by elected officials. Within your explanation, S&P suggests that:

Through the lens of this governance factor, we consider a state or territory's forward-looking plan governance decisions, risk mitigation planning, its legal flexibility and practical ability to implement of assumption changes and plan reforms, and prioritization of plan contributions in our credit rating analysis.

But there is no means to measure any of that. For example, Idaho balances its budget every year, it pays all of its debt on time (or ahead of time), it has a robust and filled collection of "rainy-day" accounts, and has looked forward to accurately balance growth and tax policy. The ratings criteria make passing reference to some influence of the State's pension fund, but that does not appear to have been taken into account either because Idaho's Public Employees Retirement System (PERSI) is fully funded. By any objective means, there is no basis for Idaho to receive a Governance rating of anything other than positive. This can only mean that either the ratings are political, or S&P is not actually making any inquiry and simply publishing generic ratings. Neither scenario is acceptable to Idaho. We respectfully request that S&P immediately take down these ratings and cease from engaging in any non-objective ratings criteria.

It is impossible for the State of Idaho not to conclude that S&P has adopted a politicized ratings system. As Utah tellingly pointed out within their objection, S&P bequeathed higher ESG ratings on Russian and Chinese energy companies than on American ones. Objectively this would appear impossible because Russian energy is state-controlled. This is even more perplexing knowing the corrupt and sanctions filled past of these Russian controlled companies, while law abiding American companies who are answerable within the American and international system are scored lower. Similarly, China's state-owned energy company has a higher score as well, even though China has an ongoing and well documented pattern of human rights abuses. As Utah noted S&P has removed these scores from its website, which simply fuels the concerns that Idaho has over the political and opaque nature of S&P's ESG ratings system.

Review of the ESG credit indicators and their methodology reveals an opaque process that is impossible for any government or political subdivision to objectively evaluate. If the goal of the system is to allow for enhanced risk management and transparency, an opaque evaluation system is completely counter-productive. Although S&P identifies factors and creates an evaluation system, there are no objective criteria upon which a state or political subdivision can evaluate itself. The absence of any transparent and objective criteria only serves to further our conclusion that these ratings are a means to politically evaluate the decisions of states and their subdivisions. In the future if S&P contemplates any changes to its ratings structure, the State of Idaho and its political subdivisions must be included within the process by which S&P makes any adjustments or additions to its ratings structure.

Finally, S&P is a nationally recognized statistical rating organization under Federal Law. With this designation, S&P is "prohibited from having a conflict of interest related to the issuance or maintenance of a credit rating." 17 C.F.R. § 240.17g-5(a). Idaho is concerned that through S&P's memberships, such as the Net Zero Financial Service Providers Alliance, it may be in violation of the law prohibiting specific conflicts of interest by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization.

Based upon the above as well as the concerns and questions outlined within the letter from Utah, Idaho objects entirely to S&P's creation, use, and publication of Idaho and Idaho political subdivision public finance ESG credit indicators. Idaho will not participate in the S&P's abandonment of its statutorily assigned responsibility for evaluating material factors in favor of S&P's expansion into politically biased ESG credit indicators. In the future if S&P contemplates any changes to its ratings structure, the State of Idaho and its political subdivisions must be included within the process by which S&P makes any adjustments or additions to its ratings structure. Based upon Idaho's strong objection to S&P's creation and publication of


Douglas L. Peterson
Martina L. Cheung
May 18, 2022
Page 4

the ESG credit indicator system, Idaho reserves all of its rights, and maintains the right under federal and state law to make further inquiry into S&P.

Sincerely,




BRAD LITTLE
Governor



LAWRENCE G. WASDEN
Attorney General




JULIE A. ELLSWORTH
Treasurer




BRANDON D. WOOLF
Controller



MIKE CRAPO
United States Senator



JAMES E. RISCH
United States Senator



MIKE SIMPSON, Congressman
Idaho Second District



RUSS FULCHER, Congressman
Idaho First District



CHUCK WINDER
President Pro Tempore
Idaho State Senate



SCOTT BEDKE
Speaker of the House
Idaho House of Representatives