Total ESG Risk

Sustainability (E+S)

Covers all material sector-specific environmental and social issues under IFRS S1 (SASB), assessing both policy quality and real-world performance.

Governance (G)

Assesses board structure, oversight, incentives, accountability and shareholder protections using the Minerva governance framework.

Climate Risk

Uses IFRS S2 (TCFD) to evaluate how companies manage climate risks & opportunities across governance, strategy, risk management, and targets.

Impact Risk

Measures a company's contribution to the UN SDG's using the Cambridge Impact Framework, focusing on real-world outcomes.

Consensus

Aggregates external ESG ratings and assessments into a normalised score and an A-E grade that complements Integrum's core analysis.

How our scores & grades are calculated

E	D	C	B	A
< 2 - 1.5 SD	2 - 0.5 SD to 2 - 1.5 SD	2 ± 0.5 SD	2 + 0.5 SD to 2 + 1.5 SD	> 2 + 1.5 SD

Integrum ESG applies a 0-4 scoring system to every material metric using globally recognised standards.

We assess both policy quality and real-world outcomes, and convert 0-4 scores into A-E grades using the above standard deviation bands - so results are transparent, statistically robust and comparable across sectors.

Integrum ESG Grades & Scores

A	B	C	D	E
> 2 + 1.5 SD	2 + 0.5 SD to 2 + 1.5 SD	2 ± 0.5 SD	2 - 0.5 SD to 2 - 1.5 SD	< 2 - 1.5 SD

Integrum ESG evaluates companies using a bottom-up scoring system that measures how well they manage the sustainability, governance and impact issues that are genuinely material to their business.

Our approach combines globally recognised standards into a single, transparent methodology that clients can intuitively understand and audit.

At the heart of our system is a 0–4 scoring scale applied to every single material metric for the company. Each metric is assessed first through an Awareness Score, which evaluates the quality of a company's governance, disclosure and target-setting on a topic. A company that does not acknowledge an issue scores 0; a company with audited policies, detailed disclosures and explicit targets scores 4. For quantitative metrics, we add a second layer: the Performance Score, which measures how the company compares with peers on the underlying data. This is also scored 0–4, using quartiles to ensure fairness and comparability. For quantitative metrics, the Awareness and Performance scores are averaged into a single value. This bottom-up structure means every overall result is traceable back to individual datapoints.

To convert numeric scores into the A–E grades used across our platform, we apply a statistically robust method based on standard deviations rather than simple cut-offs. The midpoint of the 0–4 scale is 2, which corresponds to a C grade.

Companies that fall within ±0.5 standard deviations of this centre point receive a C; those that sit between ±0.5 and ±1.5 standard deviations receive a B or D; and those more than ±1.5 standard deviations from the mean receive an A or E.

This ensures that grades reflect genuine differences in performance and avoids distortions caused by uneven industry distributions or disclosure practices.

Link to full methodology document → just click here