

Bankers to the Rescue

Canonical: <https://northmoregordon.com/news/bankers-to-the-rescue/>

Details:

[Summary](#) | [Article](#) | [Current use](#) | [Related guidance](#)

About this update

This dated news record has been reorganised for clear reading and connected to current guidance.

Publication date: October 30, 2014.

Status note: Present-tense statements, market figures, deadlines and program details in the archived record belong to its publication date. Check current official sources before making a decision.

What this article reported

> Not even the investment bankers buy into our prime minister's goal of every increasing coal exports. Poor coal price, long term price risks from climate change and environmental risks to the great barrier reef are too much for many of the global banking community. Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan and Morgan Stanley and numerous others won't back the expansion of Abbot Point export terminal

<http://reneweconomy.com.au/2014/even-coal-loving-banks-wont-touch-abbot-point-24562>

Time for ANZ, NAB, Westpac and CBA to step up as well.

Climate Change, Coal, Financial Services

How to use this information now

For current use, confirm the applicable scheme rules, regulator notices, market date and reporting period. Keep historical prices or forecasts separate from present quotes and verified outcomes.

Separate source-reported facts from forecasts, targets and commentary. For a current project, retain the official source, version, effective date, assumptions and decision record in the evidence file.

Related guidance

[Carbon advisory](#)

[Current articles and guidance](#)

[Contact Northmore Gordon](#)

What is the main argument presented in the Northmore Gordon article 'Bankers to the Rescue'?

The article argues that major international investment banks—including Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan, and Morgan Stanley—are declining to finance coal export expansion projects like the Abbot Point terminal expansion. The banks' withdrawal reflects economic and environmental concerns: poor coal prices, long-term price risks from climate change, and environmental risks to the Great Barrier Reef. By demonstrating that even institutions with traditional fossil-fuel interests are reassessing coal investments, the article illustrates how financial markets are responding to climate and market risks, with implications for how Australian businesses and banks should approach energy transition strategy.

Which Australian financial institutions does the article identify as needing to take similar action?

The article calls on ANZ, NAB, Westpac, and CBA (Commonwealth Bank of Australia) to align their lending practices with the international banking trend of withdrawing support from coal export expansion. This appeal reflects the broader argument that Australian banks should acknowledge the same economic and environmental risks that have prompted major global financial institutions to decline coal-export financing. The implicit message is that responsible financial stewardship requires Australian banks to reassess their own coal-sector exposure and transition strategy, particularly as market and climate risks accumulate.

What role does climate risk play in the banks' decision to withdraw from coal export financing?

Climate risk is presented as one of three material factors influencing banks' investment decisions. Alongside poor current coal prices and immediate environmental concerns like Great Barrier Reef protection, long-term climate risk shapes the financial outlook for coal assets. Banks recognize that climate change creates regulatory, market, and physical risks that affect asset viability and investment returns over multi-decade time horizons. This reflects how our carbon management and climate advisory services address transition planning and financial implications of decarbonisation—banks and corporate clients must assess climate risk as a core investment and operational factor, not merely an environmental concern.

How does the Abbot Point export terminal controversy illustrate broader energy-transition risks?

The Abbot Point case demonstrates that even major expansion projects face capital constraints when financial institutions reassess risk profiles. Banks' refusal signals that commodity price volatility, climate policy uncertainty, and environmental liabilities can make projects unfinanceable despite technical feasibility. For Australian energy-intensive businesses and water utilities, this illustrates why our investment case methodology and transition planning services are relevant: organizations must build financial cases that account for climate risk, regulatory change, and evolving capital-market expectations. The article shows that energy transition is not purely a technical challenge—it is a financial and strategic imperative shaped by shifting investor behavior.

What practical implications does this article have for Australian businesses planning energy and decarbonisation strategy?

The article signals that access to capital for fossil-fuel-intensive or carbon-intensive projects is tightening, independent of Australian regulatory requirements. Businesses cannot assume financing will remain available for coal-dependent operations or expansion. This reinforces why our carbon advisory services—including diagnostic workshops, emissions inventories, transition planning, and climate-risk assessment—are operationally critical. Organizations need to understand their own climate exposure, identify decarbonisation pathways, evaluate electrification and renewable-heat feasibility, and build investment cases that reflect evolving market and regulatory conditions. Banks are effectively signalling that transition planning is now a financial prerequisite, not an optional sustainability initiative.

How does this article relate to Northmore Gordon's services in carbon management and transition planning?

The article provides a case study in how external financial and market pressures drive organizations toward decarbonisation and transition strategy—precisely the domain where we offer comprehensive support. Our carbon advisory capabilities include emissions inventories, diagnostic workshops, opportunity assessment, transition pathway development, electrification feasibility analysis, and climate-risk scenario analysis. The Abbot Point example demonstrates that businesses cannot rely on historical financing patterns; they must proactively develop credible transition plans, quantify emissions and financial implications of decarbonisation, and communicate that strategy to investors and lenders. Our integrated approach to technical assessment, commercial decision-making, and ongoing performance monitoring directly addresses these strategic imperatives.

What does the banks' withdrawal from coal export financing suggest about the future of fossil-fuel-dependent industries in Australia?

The coordinated withdrawal by major global banks suggests that coal-dependent industries face structural headwinds: declining price competitiveness, increasing climate and regulatory risk, and shifting capital-market expectations. For Australian industrial businesses, water utilities, and commercial operators, this signals a transitional operating environment where carbon intensity increasingly affects financial viability and access to capital. The article implicitly endorses the view that energy transition is not discretionary. Our knowledge library and services support organizations preparing for this transition by identifying energy and carbon opportunities, building investment cases that reflect long-term price and climate risks, and developing multi-stage implementation plans that preserve optionality while demonstrating tangible progress toward lower-emissions operations.

Why is the Great Barrier Reef mentioned as a factor in banks' coal-export decisions?

The Great Barrier Reef is cited as a specific environmental liability associated with coal export infrastructure like Abbot Point. Banks recognize that large-scale expansion could trigger regulatory backlash, reputational damage, or environmental remediation costs that affect project economics. The reef reference illustrates how climate and environmental risks are interconnected: climate change threatens the reef independently, while coal expansion threatens it locally through shipping and infrastructure impacts. For Australian businesses, this highlights why our climate-risk and scenario-analysis services matter operationally. Organizations must understand not only their direct carbon footprint but also how their operations interact with environmental systems and regulatory frameworks—factors that increasingly influence financing, insurance, and long-term operational viability.