

# Power, protests, and the future of investor influence

- While the ESG backlash continues, ESG risks for investors are still paramount
- The number of shareholder resolutions are declining in the US
- Reforms in Japan and South Korea focus on value creation and better governance

**It's an annual ritual which is supposed to allow shareholders to hold the executives of the companies that they own to account and ask for change where necessary. In reality, it can range from mere rubber stamping of routine company work, to forums for loud and often angry protests about some aspects of the company's behavior. And sustainability issues can be lauded on the one hand and shot down on the other. In our annual outlook for the upcoming annual general meeting (AGM) season, Robeco's Voting team outline what to expect this year.**

## The backdrop to 2026

They may be routine, but AGMs are still an important responsibility for investors, and certainly for anyone who cares about active ownership, as Robeco does. Regulators and clients have encouraged institutional investors to actively exercise their voting rights to address emerging risks in line with their own and their clients' long-term interests.

A range of stewardship codes, best-practice guidelines, and voting tools have reinforced expectations that investors should use these rights actively. As a result, ESG-related topics have become more prominent on AGM agendas over the past decade, and AGMs have increasingly served as platforms for shareholder protest. More recently, however, this trend has faced growing resistance.

The combination of an ESG backlash and rapidly shifting geopolitical dynamics has made AGMs more complex for both investors and companies to navigate. Expectations increasingly diverge across regions and investor groups. This raises the question of whether stewardship remains as effective as it was framed several years ago.

*“The combination of an ESG backlash and rapidly shifting geopolitical dynamics has made AGMs more complex for both investors and companies to navigate*

## Reframing climate activism

One of those growing resistance issues can be seen with climate change. Following a certain level of political and investor fatigue with ESG proposals, the form in which climate change investor action is being framed has changed.

### ARTICLE MARCH 2026

Marketing material for professional investors, not for onward distribution



**Michiel van Esch**  
Head of Voting



**Lucas van Beek**  
Engagement Specialist

For the 2026 AGMs at BP and Shell, shareholders have deliberately moved away from asking for Paris-aligned emissions reductions. Instead, the new resolutions focus on a more investor-friendly question: how will these companies create shareholder value if oil and gas demand declines?

*“ Shareholders have deliberately moved away from asking for Paris-aligned emissions reductions*

This reframing is not cosmetic. Support for climate-target resolutions at oil majors has plateaued in recent years. By anchoring its demands in financial resilience, downside scenarios and capital allocation, shareholders are effectively conceding that the ESG label has become a constraint rather than an accelerant.

However, by doing so, they aim to preserve the underlying goals: aligning strategy with long-term value creation and proper risk management. This reinforces the core principle that effective investor stewardship speaks the language of risk and return rather than ideology. The fact is, climate change remains a systemic risk posing threats to long-term sustainable value creation and financial stability.

*“ Climate change remains a systemic risk posing threats to long-term sustainable value creation and financial stability*

#### AI and governance: the next frontier

Another hot topic is artificial intelligence. This is emerging as a governance topic that cuts across strategy, risk and oversight. Unlike earlier ESG waves, AI-related shareholder proposals and engagement efforts are now less ideological and more operational. Instead of purely focusing on societal impact, initiatives focus on board level oversight, ethical guidelines and risk management.

While the social impact of AI remains a crucial element, this aligns with Robeco's long-standing emphasis on board competence and accountability. As a result, investors are likely to escalate expectations through voting where AI poses material risks or opportunities, and engagement fails to yield sufficient results.

*“ AI-related shareholder proposals and engagement efforts are now less ideological and more operational*

#### Moonshot awards

Another trend we expect to continue is the introduction of moonshot awards. Such awards are often very large payouts granted when a CEO or other members of management deliver an extraordinary performance on a certain business KPI.

While these awards often appear to intensify performance, there are a couple of features that should concern shareholders. Remuneration committees often decide to pay out moonshot awards soon after a single performance criterion is met. When results subsequently decline they generally do not have to be repaid. As a result, companies often end up paying moonshot after moonshot.

There are three aspects of moonshot awards that we view unfavorably. First, they typically provide little incentive for consistent performance; there is no downside risk. Then they can lead to excessive risk-taking, since performance attribution is asymmetric. Finally, they undermine regular compensation structures due to the sheer size of the payout and their focus on a single or very limited set of targets.

### Fewer proposals, sharper focus in the US

For the AGM season in the world's largest corporate sphere, the US, we don't expect to see shareholder activism receding, rather refocusing. Proxy fights, M&A-driven campaigns and board-level interventions are expected to remain prominent. At the same time, we expect to see a lower level of shareholder proposals, which previously were a much-used tool. Straightforward filing processes with low share ownership thresholds required to file resolutions, have made it a central point of stewardship during the American AGM season.

Besides that, we have seen company-sponsored retail voting programs (such as the ones introduced by ExxonMobil last year) could materially alter voting dynamics in close contests. Programs encouraging retail shareholders to vote would, in practice, be an automatic support buffer for board recommendations and company management.

*“Programs encouraging retail shareholders to vote would, in practice, be an automatic support buffer for board recommendations and company management*

### A decline in activity on sustainability related shareholder resolutions

Several factors caused a decline in environmental and social shareholder resolutions last year. This trend is expected to further accelerate in the 2026 season, with fewer shareholder proposals being filed, fewer reaching the ballot, and fewer still commanding broad-based support.

Governance-focused proposals, by contrast, continue to attract relatively high support, reinforcing the idea that investors are prioritizing decision-useful governance mechanisms over thematic demands. This is also supported by the increase in scrutiny around voting decisions, which are expected to be defensible, proportionate and clearly linkable to fiduciary responsibilities. This does not imply that sustainability issues have lost relevance. Rather, they are increasingly addressed through engagement, board oversight expectations and strategic dialogue instead of ballot-box escalation.

### The SEC steps back

The procedural environment has also changed materially. The SEC's reduced involvement in issuing no-action guidance has shifted responsibility for deciding which resolutions make it to companies' agendas. Thus far, companies have taken different approaches to this new reality. Some are very cautious and have decided to leave most proposals on the agenda, whereas others have taken the opportunity to dismiss most proposals based on their own assessment of the SEC's no-action criteria.

Moreover, the SEC revised its guidance to limit exempt solicitation filings on the Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis and Retrieval system (EDGAR) to shareholders holding at least USD 5 million in a company's shares. This effectively hinders most shareholders from using the platform to campaign for their views and garner support among other shareholders for their resolutions. While this is likely to discourage borderline or symbolic filings, it does raise the stakes for genuine stewardship efforts as the importance of legal certainty increases.

### Governance as a catalyst in Asia

Going further around the world, while much of the global debate around retrenchment of ESG focuses on Western markets, and the US in particular, Asia has shown itself to be a region where governance reforms and shareholder rights are advancing hand-in-hand with unlocking value and financial performance by public companies. This can be seen in welcomed developments in South Korea, Japan and China.

*“Asia has shown itself to be a region where governance reforms and shareholder rights are advancing*

### South Korea: Reform as a long game

South Korea is becoming a focal point of attention for governance-driven stewardship. Long-standing concerns around controlling shareholder dominance, weak board independence and limited protection for minority investors are gradually being addressed through legislative reform and have been met with various degrees of enthusiasm by international investors.

During the 2025 AGM season, several companies were approached by activist investors asking for accelerated changes to their 'Value Up' programs. South Korean companies, catalyzed by legislative developments around Korea's Commercial Act, often responded by initiating dialogue to get feedback and support for their plans. These observations render us optimistic about the direction of travel on how companies discuss topics like valuation, capital efficiency and governance structures. Moreover, this shows international investors that even when activist proposals do not prevail, they can catalyze clearer disclosure, stronger governance frameworks, and more explicit capital allocation commitments.

*“ Even when activist proposals do not prevail, they can catalyze clearer disclosure, stronger governance frameworks, and more explicit capital allocation commitments*

### Japan: Value creation with governance discipline

Compared to South Korea, Japan's governance journey is further advanced. Initiated as part of Abenomics, reforms aim to improve corporate governance, disclosures, policies on capital allocation, and a wind-down of non-returning cross-shareholdings, which aimed to lure foreign investors and push up equity valuations. Moreover, independent directors, transparent remuneration frameworks, and credible board evaluations are increasingly central. Robeco strongly believes actions demonstrate that value creation and strong governance are complementary not competing objectives.

### China: Signals, not transformation

In China, expectations remain more cautious. Recent regulatory guidance encouraging companies to focus on shareholder returns and capital discipline is directionally positive, but governance reform remains uneven and disclosure quality and board independence continue to vary widely.

### Conclusion: Fewer moves, higher stakes

While the answer will vary across markets, 2026 is shaping up to be a year in which the way shareholders exercise their rights matters more than ever before. Proxy voting is shifting away from a one-size fits all approach, often stemming from standardized recommendations by large proxy advisors, to customized, materiality-based frameworks, supported by personalized objectives, data and the use of AI.

Moreover, engagement efforts are expected to become more targeted and shareholder activism more financially framed. In the midst of all this change, one common denominator across investors remains paramount – that strong governance practices can be beneficial to all investors, regardless of their investment thesis. Boards that demonstrate independence, accountability and credible oversight continue to attract investor support, while those that do not face sharper, more focused challenges.

The power of stewardship is not disappearing. It is being tested, redistributed and, in some cases, challenged. The outcome of the 2026 proxy season will reveal whether investors are prepared to adapt, and for some jurisdictions whether the systems that underpin shareholder democracy are resilient enough to endure. For Robeco, this environment reinforces the importance of making informed use of voting rights and conducting constructive engagement, grounded in shareholder rights and long-term value creation.

**Important information – Capital at risk**

This information refers only to general information about Robeco Holding B.V. and/or its related, affiliated and subsidiary companies ("Robeco"), Robeco's approach, strategies and capabilities. This is a marketing communication solely intended for professional investors, defined as investors qualifying as professional clients, who have requested to be treated as professional clients or who are authorized to receive such information under any applicable laws. Unless otherwise stated, the data and information reported is sourced from Robeco, is, to the best knowledge of Robeco, accurate at the time of publication and comes without any warranties of any kind. Any opinion expressed is solely Robeco's opinion, it is not a factual statement, and is subject to change, and in no way constitutes investment advice. This document is intended only to provide an overview of Robeco's approach and strategies. It is not a substitute for a prospectus or any other legal document concerning any specific financial instrument. The data, information, and opinions contained herein do not constitute and, under no circumstances, may be construed as an offer or an invitation or a recommendation to make investments or divestments or a solicitation to buy, sell, hold or subscribe for financial instruments or as financial, legal, tax, or investment research advice or as an invitation or to make any other use of it. All rights relating to the information in this document are and will remain the property of Robeco. This document may not be copied or used with the public. No part of this document may be reproduced or published in any form or by any means without Robeco's prior written permission. Robeco Institutional Asset Management B.V. has a license as manager of UCITS and AIFs of the Netherlands Authority for the Financial Markets in Amsterdam.

Parts of the marketing material may involve the use of AI-assisted tools to support the evaluation and review of marketing materials. These tools are designed to help ensure greater consistency and efficiency. All outcomes are reviewed by human evaluators.

**United Kingdom**

This information is provided by Robeco Institutional Asset Management UK Limited, 30 Fenchurch Street, Part Level 8, London EC3M 3BD, registered in England no.15362605. Robeco Institutional Asset Management UK Limited is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA – Reference No: 1007814).

**Switzerland**

Robeco Switzerland Ltd is licensed by the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority FINMA as a manager of collective assets.

**Australia**

This document is distributed in Australia by Robeco Hong Kong Limited (ARBN 156 512 659) which is exempt from the requirement to hold an Australian financial services license under the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) pursuant to ASIC Class Order 03/1103. Robeco Hong Kong Limited is regulated by the Securities and Futures Commission under the laws of Hong Kong and those laws may differ from Australian laws.

**New Zealand**

In New Zealand, this document is only available to "wholesale investors" within the meaning of clause 3(2) of Schedule 1 of the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 ('FMCA'). This document is issued by Robeco Hong Kong Limited which does not have a place of business in New Zealand.

**Hong Kong**

This document is issued by Robeco Hong Kong Limited, which is regulated by the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission ("SFC"). The contents of this document have not been reviewed by the SFC. Investment involves risks. This information does not constitute an offer to sell, a solicitation of an offer to buy, or a recommendation for any security.

**Singapore**

This information is for informational purposes only and should not be construed as an offer to sell or an invitation to buy any securities or products, nor as investment advice or recommendation. The contents of this document have not been reviewed by the Monetary Authority of Singapore ("MAS"). Robeco Singapore Private Limited holds a capital markets services licence for fund management issued by the MAS and is subject to certain clientele restrictions under such licence. An investment will involve a high degree of risk, and you should consider carefully whether an investment is suitable for you.

**US**

This document may be distributed in the US by Robeco Institutional Asset Management US, Inc. ("Robeco US"), an investment adviser registered with the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Such registration should not be interpreted as an endorsement or approval of Robeco US by the SEC. Robeco B.V. is considered "participating affiliate" and some of their employees are "associated persons" of Robeco US as per relevant SEC no-action guidance. Employees identified as associated persons of Robeco US perform activities directly or indirectly related to the investment advisory services provided by Robeco US. In those situations, these individuals are deemed to be acting on behalf of Robeco US. SEC regulations are applicable only to clients, prospects and investors of Robeco US. Robeco US is wholly owned subsidiary of ORIX Corporation Europe N.V. ("ORIX"), a Dutch Investment Management Firm located in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Robeco US is located at 230 Park Avenue, 33rd floor, New York, NY 10169.