

Mercedes-Benz

Detailed assessment of Mercedes-Benz’s corporate industry association review

April 2022

This document outlines a detailed breakdown of InfluenceMap’s assessment of the company’s corporate disclosure on industry association lobbying, using the traffic-light assessment framework summarized below. Further details on the assessment methodology is available in the Appendix, and on our website [here](#).

Key	Explanation
	Has broadly met investor expectations in this area.
	Has made some progress on investor expectations in this area, but with significant deficiencies.
	Has fallen short of investor expectations in this area.

A summary of Mercedes-Benz’s disclosures on industry associations is shown below. Mercedes-Benz has undertaken one review of its industry associations to date. The Review Score represents InfluenceMap’s overall assessment of the quality of the company’s industry association review process, where 100 would indicate that a company has met investor expectations for all criteria related to the review process.

Date of Review	Review Score
March 2022	29 / 100

This assessment focuses solely on Mercedes-Benz’s disclosure on industry associations and climate lobbying, which can be [found here](#). This assessment does not include an analysis of the company’s direct lobbying, which can be found on InfluenceMap’s online profile of Mercedes-Benz [here](#).

Applying the traffic-light framework outlined above, the table below summarizes the company’s performance under the seven indicators which form InfluenceMap’s assessment. A more detailed breakdown, along with examples of best practice evidenced by other companies to date, can be found on the following page.

Disclosure & Transparency	Policy Alignment Process
Corporate climate positions	Identify & Assess
Industry group climate positions	Monitor & Review
Alignment assessment method	Act
Framework for misalignment	

Mercedes-Benz’s Company Scorecard

The tables below highlight, for each indicator, the criteria for companies to meet investor expectations, Mercedes-Benz’s assessment, and examples of better practice by companies to date.

While InfluenceMap did not find an example of best practice across the entire industry association review process, some companies have demonstrated better practice under specific metrics under the 'Disclosure & Transparency' and 'Policy Alignment Process' assessments.

Disclosure & Transparency

Corporate climate policy positions and influencing activities	
<p>To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to disclose a detailed and clearly referenced breakdown of its own climate policy positions and influencing activities beyond ‘top-line’ climate statements. This includes descriptions of the company’s positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation which are material to the company’s operations, business sector, and/or the region(s) in which it operates.</p>	
<p>Mercedes-Benz</p>	<p>Mercedes-Benz has disclosed some of its own climate policy positions and influencing activities on specific items of regulation and legislation, including support for the EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) and Renewable Energy Directive (RED). However, the company's disclosure is largely limited to top-line positions on issues such as carbon neutrality and electric vehicles, operational initiatives, and high-level commitments such as the Climate Pledge and the Transform to Net Zero initiative. Mercedes-Benz has disclosed its engagement activities on electric mobility and other issues, including examples of meetings and topics of discussion, but with no specific details on the company's detailed positions or outcomes sought from these discussions.</p> <p>Mercedes-Benz does not appear to disclose a full and accurate account of its engagement on items of regulation and legislation which are material to the company's operations. For instance, the company does not disclose a position on <i>EU's proposed 2030 and 2035 zero-emission CO2 targets for cars and vans</i>. Further, Mercedes-Benz has not disclosed a position on US GHG and CAFE standards. However, in a September 2021 <i>consultation response</i> to US GHG emissions standards for vehicles, the company appeared unsupportive of higher GHG emissions stringency options, supporting only a mid-range option that included numerous flexibilities that would potentially weaken the proposal.</p> <p>The disclosure contains a clear link to Mercedes-Benz's 2021 Sustainability Report for further detail, but there is limited further information in this report beyond the German emissions trading system.</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p><i>Shell</i> has disclosed six detailed climate policy positions in its 2021 review including net-zero emissions and carbon pricing. Shell’s 2020 update also outlined the company’s position on specific climate policies including the EU Green Deal and methane regulation in the EU and US. The 2021 review also includes a clear reference to a list of climate policy positions and live advocacy updates on Shell’s corporate website.</p>

Industry association climate policy positions and influencing activities

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to disclose a detailed and accurate account of the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, including descriptions of positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation beyond 'top-line' statements.

<p>Mercedes-Benz</p>	<p>Mercedes-Benz has disclosed some of its industry associations' positions on, and engagement with, specific items of regulation and legislation. For example, the company outlines engagement by European Automobile Manufacturers' Association (ACEA) and German Association of the Automotive Industry (VDA) on key EU policy including the Renewable Energy Directive, Emissions Trading System, and CO2 targets for cars and vans. Mercedes-Benz also disclosed the positions of the Alliance for Automotive Innovation (Auto Innovators) on the Federal Clean Fuels Policy and EPA rule on 2023 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards.</p> <p>However, the company appears to overlook instances of detailed negative lobbying by Auto Innovators. For example, in an October 2021 <i>consultation response</i>, Auto Innovators only appeared to support a mid-range proposal for increasing the stringency of US GHG emissions standards for light duty vehicles in 2023-2026, while supporting numerous flexibilities to weaken the stringency of the proposal, and appearing unsupportive of higher proposed standards.</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p>No companies have met investor expectations in this area, although <i>BASF</i> and <i>Shell</i> exhibit current leading practice. Both companies have disclosed a detailed account of all key industry associations' climate policy positions, and a summary of their influencing activities. However, they appear to overlook detailed negative lobbying by a number of industry associations identified by InfluenceMap's database.</p>

Alignment assessment method

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to: (1) disclose a clear and detailed framework for assessing alignment with its industry associations across all relevant areas of policy engagement; (2) consistently apply this framework across *all* industry associations; and (3) provide a clear and detailed explanation behind each evaluation.

<p>Mercedes-Benz</p>	<p>Mercedes-Benz does not disclose a clear and detailed framework for assessing alignment with its industry associations, stating only that it is based on the company's seven top-line climate positions, but without reference to what constitutes a finding of alignment or misalignment. However, Mercedes-Benz has provided an explanation behind each evaluation, describing the industry associations' positioning related to each of the seven top-line climate positions.</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p><i>BASF</i> has also disclosed a clear explanation of its alignment assessment method along with a clear and detailed explanation of how it has been applied to each industry association. The company also provided specific alignment indicators for EU climate policy such as the EU ETS to assess the alignment of key European industry associations.</p>

Framework for addressing misalignment

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company must disclose a clear and detailed framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations including escalation steps and clear deadlines for industry associations which do not amend misaligned practices.

<p>Mercedes-Benz</p>	<p>Mercedes-Benz has not disclosed a framework to address potential cases of misalignment. As such, there are no clear escalation steps or deadlines for industry associations which do not amend misaligned practices.</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p><i>BHP</i> has disclosed clear and detailed steps for addressing potential misalignment, including an escalation strategy and clear timelines attached. The company states it will communicate material differences, request that the industry association develop a position or refrain from advocacy in certain areas, and review the membership if there has been no action within 12 months.</p>

Policy Alignment Process

Identify & Assess

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to identify all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap’s *database* on corporate lobbying.

<p>Mercedes-Benz</p>	<p>Mercedes-Benz does not identify any cases of misalignment with the three industry associations included within the scope of the review: European Automobile Manufacturers’ Association (ACEA), German Association of the Automotive Industry (VDA), Alliance for Automotive Innovation (Auto Innovators). However, InfluenceMap analysis indicates that all three industry associations have climate policy engagement misaligned, or potentially misaligned, with the Paris Agreement.</p> <p>Overall, InfluenceMap analysis indicates that the company likely has three memberships to industry associations with climate policy engagement misaligned with the Paris Agreement (<i>German Association of the Automotive Industry (VDA), BusinessEurope, Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers</i>) and a further four memberships to industry associations with climate policy engagement potentially misaligned with the Paris Agreement (<i>European Automobile Manufacturers’ Association (ACEA), Alliance for Automotive Innovation, Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders, European Roundtable for Industry</i>).</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p>No companies have met investor expectations in this area. InfluenceMap analysis indicates that all companies have missed key cases of misalignment with industry associations lobbying counter to the goals of the Paris Agreement.</p>

Monitor & Review

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to publish a review of industry associations on an annual basis, commit to do so at least once a year, or commit to disclose regular updates on its review and alignment process. Updates should accurately report on relevant material and on-going lobbying activities of potentially misaligned industry associations, as well as the company's alignment and engagement with the industry association concerning these activities.

Mercedes-Benz	Mercedes-Benz has not committed to publish another review of its industry associations, or to disclose regular updates on its review and alignment process. The company has only published one review to date.
Best Practice	<i>Shell</i> has published full industry association reviews in 2019 and 2021. In April 2020, Shell also published an update on the nine associations with some misalignment found in 2019 including actions taken within each association, key changes to the associations' climate positions and detailed next steps. Shell has committed to publish its next update in 2022.




Act

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to show evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, in line with InfluenceMap's *database* on corporate lobbying. The investor expectations outlined by *PRI*, *IIGCC* and *Ceres* include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Steps should include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.

Mercedes-Benz	<p>Mercedes-Benz has shown some evidence of action to address misalignments. For example, the company states that it has engaged with ACEA and VDA on the Fit for 55 package and pushed for clear commitments on climate protection and ambition, achieving more progressive positions by the associations. It also states that it will continue to advocate for more progressive positioning. However, there is limited details on the specific outcomes sought in these engagements.</p> <p>Further, the company does not appear to have addressed key cases of material and potential misalignment with the Paris Agreement identified by InfluenceMap's database (see Identify & Assess).</p>
Best Practice	<p>No companies have met investor expectations in this area by showing evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment identified by InfluenceMap's database, although some companies have made more progress. <i>Total</i> announced in January 2021 that it had decided not to renew its membership to the American Petroleum Institute due to divergences on climate positions. <i>BHP</i> suspended its membership to Queensland Resources Council in 2020 following its 'Vote Greens Last' advertising campaign and outlined detailed actions to be taken at four "partly aligned" industry associations. <i>Chevron</i> has not left any industry associations but has disclosed its engagement on specific climate change policy issues with seven industry associations, including details of the results of this engagement. Similarly, <i>General Motors</i> has disclosed that it has not financially contributed to advocacy campaigns against the Build Back Better Act by the Business Roundtable and US Chamber, and has publicly advocated a supportive position to ensure its stance is differentiated from them.</p>

Appendix A: Methodologies for Assessment



Scoring Disclosures and Policy-Alignment

Key	Explanation
	Has broadly met investor expectations in this area.
	Has made some progress on investor expectations in this area, but with significant deficiencies.
	Has fallen short of investor expectations in this area.

Assessing Disclosures

Since BHP’s 2017 industry association review, around 40 major global corporates have delivered similar, specific disclosures on their industry association links in response to investor pressure. This positive momentum is undermined, however, if the resulting disclosures are of poor quality.

In its *‘Investor Expectations on Corporate Climate Lobbying’* report, the PRI highlights the need for disclosure on the company’s positions and activities on climate change policy engagement, as well as the positions and activities of the industry groups it supports. The PRI further requests information on the governance processes and actions taken to ensure alignment between these activities and the company’s stated climate goals. *IIGCC* and *Ceres* articulate similar expectations, also requiring companies to disclose a material impact assessment of lobbying by an organization that opposes their public position. InfluenceMap uses the following assessment criteria to test the clarity, accuracy and scope of information provided by companies against four key issues.

Disclosure Item	Score	InfluenceMap’s Assessment Criteria
Corporate climate policy positions and influencing activities		The company has disclosed a detailed and clearly referenced breakdown of its own climate policy positions and influencing activities beyond ‘top-line’ climate statements. This includes descriptions of the company’s positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation which are material to the company’s operations, business sector, and/or the region(s) in which it operates.
		The company has disclosed a breakdown of its own climate policy positions and influencing activities. However, the company’s description of its positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation lacks detail, and/or the company has not disclosed its position and engagement activities on key items of regulation and legislation which are material to its operations, business sector, and/or the region(s) in which it operates.

		The company has made no attempt to disclose its climate policy positions and influencing activities, or the company’s disclosure is limited to a brief overview of its ‘top-line’ climate statements and operational commitments without reference to specific items of regulation and legislation.
Industry association climate policy positions and influencing activities		The company has disclosed a detailed and accurate account of the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, including descriptions of positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation beyond ‘top-line’ statements.
		The company has disclosed an account of the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, beyond ‘top-line’ statements. However, the disclosure lacks detail on positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation, and/or does not disclose evidence of negative climate lobbying by one or more of its industry associations.
		The company has not disclosed the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, and/or the company’s disclosure is limited to a brief overview of ‘top-line’ climate statements without reference to specific items of regulation and legislation.
Alignment assessment method		The company has: (1) disclosed a clear and detailed framework for assessing alignment with its industry associations across all relevant areas of policy engagement; (2) consistently applied this framework across <i>all</i> industry associations; and (3) provided a clear and detailed explanation behind each evaluation.
		The company has disclosed a framework for assessing alignment with its industry associations but the disclosure lacks detail regarding <i>one</i> of the above steps (1-3).
		The company has not disclosed a framework for assessing alignment with industry associations, or it has disclosed a framework but the disclosure lacks detail regarding <i>more than one</i> of the above steps (1-3).
Framework for addressing misalignment		The company has disclosed a clear and detailed framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations including escalation steps and clear deadlines for industry associations which do not amend misaligned practices.
		The company has disclosed a clear and detailed framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations including escalation steps, but there is no clear deadlines for industry associations which do not amend misaligned practices
		The company has not disclosed a framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations, or the company has disclosed a framework but the steps are ambiguous and lack sufficient detail.

Assessing Policy Alignment Process

As well as transparent disclosures on industry group links and lobbying activities, the investor expectations communicated by IIGCC, CERES and the UN PRI also set out the need for robust processes to ensure alignment between the company’s stated policy positions and the positions and lobbying activities of their industry groups. These processes consist of the following three elements:

Alignment Process	Score	InfluenceMap's Assessment Criteria
Identify & Assess	Green	The company has identified all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying.
	Yellow	The company has not identified key cases of misalignment with the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying. Companies are scored in this category if they miss up to three cases of "potential" misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 51-75 in InfluenceMap's database).
	Red	The company has not identified key cases of misalignment with the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying. Companies are scored in this category if they miss one case of misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 0-50) or more than three cases of "potential" misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 51-75 in InfluenceMap's database).
Monitor & Review	Green	The company has published a review of industry associations on an annual basis, has committed to do so at least once a year, or is/has committed to disclose regular updates on its review and alignment process. Updates should accurately report on relevant material and on-going lobbying activities of potentially misaligned industry associations, as well as the company's alignment and engagement with the industry association concerning these activities.
	Yellow	The company has committed to publish an update to its review of industry associations but not an annual basis or not specified a timeframe.
	Red	The company has not committed to any follow-up processes as part of its review of industry associations.
Act	Green	The company has shown evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying. The investor expectations outlined by <i>PRI</i> , <i>IIGCC</i> and <i>Ceres</i> include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Steps should include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.
	Yellow	The company has shown some evidence of action to address cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, but has not addressed key cases of misalignment or "potential" misalignment identified by InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying, i.e. industry associations with Organization Scores 0-75 in InfluenceMap's database. The investor expectations outlined by <i>PRI</i> , <i>IIGCC</i> and <i>Ceres</i> include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Steps should include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.
	Red	The company has shown no or limited evidence of action to address cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, missing key cases of misalignment or potential misalignment identified in InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying, i.e. industry associations with Organization Scores 0-75. The investor expectations outlined by <i>PRI</i> , <i>IIGCC</i> and <i>Ceres</i> include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Action will be scored under this category if it does not include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.

To assist this assessment, InfluenceMap will be applying its database on corporate and industry group climate change lobbying. This tracks in real-time the detailed climate policy lobbying of around 300 companies and 100 industry associations globally, allowing like-for-like comparisons of organizations' positions on climate policy that are compared to a benchmark of Paris-aligned climate policy. This system can track the evolution of corporate and industry group climate lobbying positions over time.