Criterion	Question	Options	Advantage	Disadvantage
Governance	Should a private Label or Public Label be launched?	Private Label	Higher reactivity and expertise	Lower legitimity
		Public Label	Public Label: higher legitimity and appreciation	slow processes
	Should consumer associations be involved in the labelling process?		Higher credibility	Conflict of interest
Business Model	How shall the labelling costs be covered?	Option 1: fixed fee for audit (FNG, Label ISR)	stable business planning, very transparent	
		Option 2: fees when label is obtained (Luxflag)		unstable business planning, risk of conflict of interest
	Shall audit and promotion lay in the hands of one institution or be separated?	Integrated	auditor has the capacity to explain the label concept	possibly a conflict of interest
		Separated	no conflict of interest	gap between knowledge of auditor and promoter
Role of the auditor	Shall there be one or several auditors?	One auditor	One auditor: one institution ensures quality, possible to develop high-quality auditing schemes (for instance grading system), especially necessary in heterogenuous markets with very different SRI fund strategies.	
		several auditors	lower fees (?)	Several auditors: risk to lower audit quality (depending on business model)
Type of label	What should be the focus of the label?	Transparency	High acceptance in the market (because rather easier to obtain - not an evaluation of the quality of the investment process ist)	impact of SRI process not visible, does not lead to major improvements of candidates > lack of credibility + risk of controversy
		Process	helps candidates to strengthen their processes	requires a high workload from candidates and auditor
		Impact	Would match with latest developments on the market Could lead to high credibility among asset owners and public	few precise methodology and impact indicators developed so far
	Shall there be established a Standard level (like Luxflag - label yes or no) or grading system (like FNG Label with stars)?	Standard Level	Higher acceptance, no rivalry between candidates	No incentives to improve quality of SRI process
		Grading system	Incentives to improve quality of SRI process , "race to quality"	high rivalry between candidates, anger if high levels are not reached which might lead to lower number of applying funds
Criteria	Investment process: Focus on funds with ESG selection (Best-in-Class/Universe, etc.) or also thematic funds?	Only ESG selection	easier to develop criteria	
		Thematic funds	more exhaustive and integrative approach, more "impact"	more difficult to design, would barely work with more than 1 auditor (one audit body must make internal calculations)
	Fund provider: shall overall engagement activities and SRI activities (for instance SRI governance) be taken into account?	Yes	the overall SRI activities of the fund will be valorized	very high workload
	Research process: shall high-quality internal reseach be positively rewarded?	No	product focused	does not favor the transition / influence effect