

OVERVIEW

DATE OF HOLDINGS	COVERAGE
31 DEC 2023	100%
AMOUNT INVESTED	BENCHMARK USED
126,050,521 EUR	MSCI World
PORTFOLIO TYPE	
EQUITY	



CI GLOBAL ISR
Climate Impact Assessment

Carbon Metrics 1 of 3

Portfolio Overview

Disclosure Number/Weight	Emission Exposure tCO ₂ e		Relative Emission Exposure tCO ₂ e/Invested tCO ₂ e/Revenue			Climate Performance Weighted Avg
	Share of Disclosing Holdings	Scope 1 & 2	Incl. Scope 3	Relative Carbon Footprint	Carbon Intensity	Weighted Avg Carbon Intensity Carbon Risk Rating ¹
Portfolio	100% / 100%	6,608	34,339	52.42	220.05	149.00 64
Benchmark	90.7% / 96.3%	8,935	82,205	70.88	169.48	133.95 60
Net Performance	9.3 p.p. /3.7 p.p.	26%	58.2%	26%	-29.8%	-11.2% —

Emission Exposure Analysis



¹ Note: Carbon Risk Rating data is current as of the date of report generation.
² Emissions contributions for all other portfolio sectors is less than 1% for each sector.

CI GLOBAL ISR

Emission Exposure Analysis (continued)

Top 10 Contributors to Portfolio Emissions

Issuer Name	Contribution to Portfolio Emission Exposure (%)	Portfolio Weight (%)	Emissions Reporting Quality	Carbon Risk Rating
A.P. Moller-Maersk A/S	41.68%	1.52%	Moderate	● Medium Performer
Air Liquide SA	36.23%	4.80%	Strong	● Outperformer
Linde Plc	10.70%	2.53%	Strong	● Outperformer
Shin-Etsu Chemical Co., Ltd.	3.63%	2.37%	Moderate	● Medium Performer
PepsiCo, Inc.	1.77%	4.64%	Strong	● Outperformer
Renesas Electronics Corp.	1.33%	2.06%	Inconsistent	● Outperformer
Verbund AG	0.82%	1.77%	Strong	● Leader
Lowes Companies, Inc.	0.57%	2.24%	Moderate	● Outperformer
United Rentals, Inc.	0.42%	1.93%	Moderate	● Outperformer
AUTOZONE, INC.	0.42%	1.98%	Inconsistent	● Outperformer
Total for Top 10	97.57%	25.84%		

■ Carbon Metrics 2 of 3

Emission Attribution Analysis

Emission Attribution Analysis examines the extent to which higher or lower GHG exposure between the portfolio and the benchmark can be attributed to sector allocation versus issuer selection. A portfolio with a larger amount of assets allocated to an emissions-intensive sector will ultimately have higher GHG emissions exposure. However, this can be offset by the selection of less emissions-intensive issuers from that sector. This analysis relates to the carbon footprint of the portfolio, specifically the Emissions Scope 1 & 2 (tCO₂e) and Relative Carbon Footprint (tCO₂e/Mio Invested) metrics.

The subsequent table identifies the most emissions-intensive issuers in the analysis, the comparative weight for each issuer between the portfolio and benchmark, as well as the sector allocation and issuer selection effects. A positive (green) number represents less greenhouse gas exposure for the issuer in the portfolio relative to the benchmark.

Top Sectors to Emission Attribution Exposure vs. Benchmark

Sector	Portfolio Weight	Benchmark Weight	Difference	Sector Allocation Effect	Issuer Selection Effect
Communication Services	6.56%	7.16%	-0.6%	0.05%	0.5%
Consumer Discretionary	9.77%	10.88%	-1.11%	0.26%	1.24%
Consumer Staples	6.89%	6.78%	0.1%	-0.05%	1.56%
Financials	15.67%	15.25%	0.43%	-0.04%	1.48%
Health Care	13.87%	12.08%	1.79%	-0.12%	0.66%
Industrials	13.72%	11.1%	2.62%	-1.87%	-22.16%
Information Technology	22.04%	23.11%	-1.07%	0.05%	0%
Materials	9.71%	4.12%	5.58%	-35.54%	24.42%
Utilities	1.77%	2.6%	-0.83%	10.83%	22.36%
Energy	0%	4.49%	-4.49%	22.11%	0%
Real Estate	0%	2.42%	-2.42%	0.31%	0%
Cumulative Higher (-) and Lower (+) Emission Exposure vs. Benchmark				-4%	30.05%
Higher (-) / Lower (+) Net Emission Exposure vs. Benchmark				26%	

CI GLOBAL ISR

Emission Attribution Analysis (continued)


Highest Emission-Intense Issuers in Combined Portfolio & Benchmark Universe

Issuer Name	Sector	Emissions Intensity Scope 1 & 2 (tCO ₂ e/Mio Mcap or AEV)	Carbon Risk Rating	Portfolio Under (-) / Overexposure (+)	
1. Tokyo Electric Power Co. Holdings, Inc.	Utilities	8,801.61	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.01%
2. Vistra Corp.	Utilities	7,944.65	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.02%
3. Chubu Electric Power Co., Inc.	Utilities	7,189.22	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.01%
4. JFE Holdings, Inc.	Materials	6,607.57	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.02%
5. ArcelorMittal SA	Materials	6,441.82	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.02%
6. Fortum Oyj	Utilities	5,967.11	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.01%
7. HeidelbergCement AG	Materials	4,922.42	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.02%
8. Nippon Steel Corp.	Materials	4,388.28	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.03%
9. Cleveland-Cliffs Inc.	Materials	3,696.48	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.01%
10. The AES Corporation	Utilities	3,511.98	● Medium Performer	<div></div>	-0.02%

Carbon Metrics 3 of 3

Greenhouse Gas Emission Intensity

Weighted Avg Greenhouse Gas Intensity Sector Contribution

Top 10 Emission Intense Companies (tCO₂e Scope 1 & 2/Revenue Millions)

Issuer Name	Emission Intensity	Peer Group Avg Intensity
1. Air Liquide SA	1,558.40	1,698.68
2. Linde Plc	1,532.36	1,698.68
3. A.P. Moller-Maersk A/S	711.33	1,818.96
4. Shin-Etsu Chemical Co., Ltd.	382.52	840.95
5. Verbund AG	148.43	614.58
6. Renesas Electronics Corp.	127.91	178.86
7. PepsiCo, Inc.	63.70	83.58
8. United Rentals, Inc.	48.41	41.38
9. AUTOZONE, INC.	36.41	20.39
10. The Procter & Gamble Company	32.55	57.95

CI GLOBAL ISR

■ Climate Scenario Alignment 1 of 2

Alignment Analysis

The scenario alignment analysis compares current and future portfolio greenhouse gas emissions with the carbon budgets for the IEA Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS), Announced Pledges Scenario (APS), and Stated Policies Scenario (STEPS). Performance is shown as the percentage of assigned budget used by the portfolio and benchmark.

The CI GLOBAL ISR strategy in its current state is MISALIGNED with a SDS scenario by 2050. The CI GLOBAL ISR has a potential temperature increase of 1.6°C, whereas the MSCI World has a potential temperature increase of 2.7°C.

Portfolio and Benchmark Comparison to SDS Budget (Red = Overshoot)


	2023	2030	2040	2050
Portfolio	-55.64%	-55.77%	-35.48%	+17.77%
Benchmark	-2.48%	+20.25%	+102.05%	+282.9%

2048
1.6°C

The portfolio exceeds its SDS budget in 2048.


The portfolio is associated with a potential temperature increase of 1.6°C by 2050.

Portfolio Emission Pathway vs. Climate Scenarios Budgets




Climate Targets Assessment (% Portfolio Weight)

In order to transition, holdings need to commit to alignment with international climate goals and demonstrate future progress. Currently 91% of the portfolio's value is committed to such a goal. This includes ambitious targets set by the companies as well as committed and approved Science Based Targets (SBT). While commitments are not a guarantee to reach a goal, the 4% of the portfolio without a goal is unlikely to transition and should receive special attention from a climate risk conscious investor.




■ Climate Scenario Alignment 2 of 2

The table below shows the percent of the SDS budget used in 2023, 2030, and 2050 for key sub-sectors of the portfolio.



Percent of Allocated Budget vs. Percent of Total Budget Used

The budget allocated to the portfolio is dependent on the portfolio holdings. The graphs below compare the percent of the portfolio's SDS budget allocated to a defined sub-sector compared to the percent of the portfolio's budget used within the same sub-sector for the years 2023 and 2050.




Percent of Holdings SDS Aligned in 2023, 2030, and 2050



CI GLOBAL ISR

■ Net Zero Analysis 1 of 2

This report evaluates the portfolio's readiness to transition to a Net Zero by 2050 pathway through the of data disclosure and target-setting; emissions trajectory and Net Zero alignment; and exposure to fossil fossil fuels.



Emissions Overview


The International Energy Agency's Net Zero Emission by 2050 (NZE2050) scenario provides a framework for analyzing current and future alignment with NZ emissions objectives. Using current-year and forecasted emissions metrics for relative carbon footprint, weighted average carbon intensity, and absolute emissions, the tables below estimate the needed minimum change in emissions performance to achieve NZ trajectory alignment.

	Relative Carbon Footprint Scope 1				Relative Carbon Footprint Scope 2				Relative Carbon Footprint Scope 3			
	2023	2025	2030	2050	2023	2025	2030	2050	2023	2025	2030	2050
Portfolio	34.97	35.39	35.99	39.52	17.45	18.86	21.52	44.56	220	215.47	216.48	286.87
NZE Trajectory	-	29.12	21.81	0	-	14.53	10.88	0	-	183.2	137.19	0
Benchmark	59.83	64.66	73.39	135.18	11.05	11.78	13.16	25.25	581.27	615.3	677.54	1.17 k

	Weighted Average Carbon Intensity (Scope 1, 2 & 3)				Absolute Emissions (Scope 1, 2 & 3)			
	2023	2025	2030	2050	2023	2025	2030	2050
Portfolio	828.77	825.76	847.44	1.2 k	34.34 k	34 k	34.54 k	46.76 k
NZE Trajectory	-	690.12	516.79	0	-	28.59 k	21.41 k	0
Benchmark	1.23 k	1.28 k	1.4 k	2.39 k	82.2 k	87.19 k	96.31 k	168.04 k

Climate Net Zero Targets

Net Zero targets provide an important indicator of climate awareness and action. Given the current state of disclosure, government policy, and technology, it is impossible to define any entity as “Aligned”. An issuer is “Committed to Aligning” if it has set a NZ target for 2050 and “Aligning” if it has a decarbonization strategy and, additionally, set an interim target. An issuer with no targets is considered “Not Aligned”.




■ Net Zero Analysis 2 of 2


When assessing overall alignment with Net Zero it is vital to determine if the product portfolio of held companies is compatible with the objective of transitioning to a net zero system by 2050. The IEA's NZE2050 scenario states that all expansion of fossil fuel assets after 2021 is incompatible with a net zero future. The graphs below show the revenue linked to fossil fuels and those linked to climate change mitigating activities.

Revenue From Fossil Fuels

The portfolio has 84.1 k EUR revenue linked to fossil fuels, which account for less than 1% of total portfolio revenue. Of the revenue from fossil fuels, - is attributed to oil, 100% to gas, and - to coal. The portfolio's revenue exposure exceeds the benchmark by a net difference of -98%.



Revenue Eligible for Climate Change Mitigating Activities



The EU Taxonomy defines climate change mitigating activities as those which are directly linked to the avoidance, reduction, or removal of GHGs from the atmosphere. EU Taxonomy "Aligned" revenues are derived from directly reported data, and have passed the substantial contribution, do no significant harm and minimum social safeguards assessments. "Likely Aligned" revenues has the same criteria, however the data is derived from the ISS ESG proxy / modelled assessment. Potentially aligned revenues are again derived from the ISS ESG proxy / modelled assessment, and have only passed the substantial contribution assessment.


Revenues from economic activities outside of climate change mitigation are considered "Not Eligible". Where there is a lack of data to make an assessment, revenues are categorized as "Not Covered".

Bottom Five Issuers by Net Zero Target Alignment and Weight


Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	GICS Sector	Mitigation Revenue	Net Zero Alignment	Fossil Fuel Expansion
Air Liquide SA	4.8%	Materials	12.6%	Not aligned	No
Alphabet Inc.	4.48%	Communication Services	1.86%	Not aligned	No
The Home Depot, Inc.	3.51%	Consumer Discretionary	8.4%	Not aligned	No
Visa Inc.	3.29%	Financials	0%	Not aligned	No
Novo Nordisk A/S	3.15%	Health Care	0%	Not aligned	No

■ Transition Climate Risk Analysis 1 of 4

Transition opportunities and risks, including carbon pricing, impact investees and portfolio valuations. This analysis estimates a Transition Value at Risk (TVaR) based on the IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 (NZE2050) scenario.



Portfolio Transition Value at Risk by Sector Based on NZE2050



The total estimated Transition Value at Risk for the portfolio is 4 M EUR based on the NZE2050 scenario. The chart on the left shows the sector-level contribution to the total potential financial impact of transition risks and opportunities on the portfolio. The Value at Risk presented is a net number between the positive and negative potential share price performance in the portfolio. A negative TVaR means positive share price movement.

The Transition (and Physical) VaR is an equity-based analysis, and its output should not be interpreted as the potential change in price of a bond. Nevertheless, the VaR remains a useful metric for fixed income as it is a holistic indicator of the issuer's exposure to Physical or Transition Risks, even if not directly material to the bond price itself.

Worst Five Performers by Transition Value at Risk Based on NZE2050

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	GICS Sector	Transition VaR (%)	Sector WAvg TVaR (%)
Air Liquide SA	4.8%	Materials	43.52%	45.81%
Linde Plc	2.53%	Materials	22.43%	45.81%
Shin-Etsu Chemical Co., Ltd.	2.37%	Materials	9.32%	45.81%
PepsiCo, Inc.	4.64%	Consumer Staples	4.75%	8.27%
AUTOZONE, INC.	1.98%	Consumer Discretionary	3.26%	3.85%

Top Five Issuers with the Highest Proportion of Green Revenues

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	GICS Sector	Green Revenues (%)	Sector WAvg Green Revenue (%)
Verbund AG	1.77%	Utilities	37%	13.64%
Apple Inc.	4.74%	Information Technology	18%	8.27%
Linde Plc	2.53%	Materials	14%	0.79%
United Rentals, Inc.	1.93%	Industrials	11%	6.17%
Lowes Companies, Inc.	2.24%	Consumer Discretionary	10%	6.09%

■ Transition Climate Risk Analysis 2 of 4


A decarbonized world needs to address both the demand side (for example Utilities burning fossil fuels) and the supply side (i.e. fossil reserves) of future emissions. For Utilities, it matters whether the power generated and power generation planned for the future stem from renewable (green) or fossil (brown) sources. For fossil reserve owning companies, potential future greenhouse gas emissions might indicate stranded asset risk. The Carbon Risk Rating (1-100) provides a view on how well the respective portfolio and benchmark holdings are managing such risks.

Transition Analysis Overview

	Power Generation		Reserves		Climate Performance
	% Generation Output Green Share	% Generation Output Brown Share	% Investment Exposed to Fossil Fuels	Total Potential Future Emissions (ktCO ₂)	Weighted Avg Carbon Risk Rating
Portfolio	95.65%	4.35%	-	-	64
Benchmark	21.07%	57.44%	5.94%	176.03	60

Power Generation

Power Generation Exposure
(Portfolio vs. Benchmark vs. Climate Target)



For a decarbonized future economy, it is key to transition the energy generation mix from fossil to renewable sources. Utilities relying on fossil power production without a substitute plan might run a higher risk of getting hit by climate change regulatory measures as well as reputational damages. The graph on the left compares the energy generation mix of the portfolio with the benchmark and a Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS) compatible mix in 2030 and 2050, according to the International Energy Agency. Below, the 5 largest Utility holdings can be compared on fossil versus renewable energy production capacity, their contribution to the overall portfolio greenhouse gas emission exposure and their production efficiency for 1 GWh of electricity.

■ Fossil Fuels ■ Nuclear ■ Renewables

Top 5 Utilities' Fossil vs. Renewable Energy Mix

Issuer Name	% Fossil Fuel Capacity	% Renewable Energy Capacity	% Contribution to Portfolio Emissions	Emissions tCO ₂ e Scope 1 & 2 /GWh
Verbund AG	10%	90%	0.82%	22.65

CI GLOBAL ISR

■ Transition Climate Risk Analysis 3 of 4

For fossil reserve owning companies, potential future greenhouse gas emissions might indicate stranded asset risk, as about 80% of those reserves need to stay in the ground to not exceed 2 degrees Celsius of warming. The portfolio contains 0 tCO₂ of potential future emissions, of which - stem from Coal reserves, - from Oil and Gas reserves. Investor focus is often on the 100 largest Oil & Gas and 100 largest Coal reserve owning companies, to understand the exposure to these top 100 lists.



Exposure to the 100 Largest Oil & Gas and Coal Reserve Owning Assets

Issuer Name	Contribution to Portfolio Potential Future Emissions	Oil & Gas Top 100 Rank	Coal Top 100 Rank
No Applicable Data			

Unconventional and controversial energy extraction such as "Fracking" and Arctic Drilling is a key focus for investors, both from a transition and a reputation risk perspective.

Exposure to Controversial Business Practices


Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	Arctic Drilling	Hydraulic Fracturing	Oil Sands	Shale Oil and/or Gas
Air Liquide SA	4.8%	-	Services	-	Services
ABB Ltd.	3.18%	-	-	Services	-
Linde Plc	2.53%	-	Services	-	Services
United Rentals, Inc.	1.93%	-	Services	Services	-

■ Transition Climate Risk Analysis 4 of 4

Portfolio Carbon Risk Rating

The Carbon Risk Rating (CRR) assesses how an issuer is exposed to climate risks and opportunities, and whether these are managed in a way to seize opportunities, and to avoid or mitigate risks. It provides investors with critical insights into how issuers are prepared for a transition to a low carbon economy and is a central instrument for the forward-looking analysis of carbon-related risks at portfolio and issuer level.

CRR Distribution Portfolio vs. Benchmark



Avg Portfolio CRR and Spread for Selected ISS ESG Rating Industries

ISS ESG Rating Industry ¹	Average Carbon Risk Rating	
Utilities/Electric Utilities	<div><div></div></div>	76
Financials/Commercial Banks & Capital Markets	<div><div></div></div>	63
Machinery	<div><div></div></div>	60
Food & Beverages	<div><div></div></div>	57
Transport & Logistics	<div><div></div></div>	45
Renewable Energy (Operation) & Energy Efficiency Equipment		-
Electronic Components		-
Transportation Infrastructure		-
Oil & Gas Equipment/Services		-
Oil, Gas & Consumable Fuels		-
	050100	

Top 5 ²	Country	ISS ESG Rating Industry	CRR	Portfolio Weight (consol.)
■ Moodys Corporation	USA	Auxiliary Financial Services & Data	92	2.4%
■ S&P Global, Inc.	USA	Auxiliary Financial Services & Data	90	2.8%
■ Alphabet Inc.	USA	Interactive Media & Online Consumer Services	88	4.48%
■ Novo Nordisk A/S	Denmark	Pharmaceuticals & Biotechnology	85	3.15%
■ Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	USA	Pharmaceuticals & Biotechnology	78	1.81%

Bottom 5 ²	Country	ISS ESG Rating Industry	CRR	Portfolio Weight (consol.)
■ DSV A/S	Denmark	Air Freight & Logistics	47	1.45%
■ Kuehne + Nagel International AG	Switzerland	Air Freight & Logistics	45	1.78%
■ A.P. Moller-Maersk A/S	Denmark	Marine Transportation	43	1.52%
■ W.W. Grainger, Inc.	USA	Trading Companies & Distributors	42	2.23%
■ Gartner, Inc.	USA	Research & Consulting Services	41	1.7%

■ Climate Laggard (0 - 24) ■ Climate Medium Performer (25 - 49) ■ Climate Outperformer (50 - 74) ■ Climate Leader (75 - 100)


¹ The proprietary ISS ESG Rating industry Classification is intended to group companies from an ESG perspective and might differ from other classification systems.

² Multiple issuers may have the same CRR value. In the event the Top 5 and Bottom 5 tables have more than one issuer in the last position due to a tie in CRR values, the weight of the issuers in the portfolio will determine the issuer assigned to the table.


CI GLOBAL ISR

Physical Climate Risk Analysis 1 of 4

Even if limited to 2° Celsius, rising temperatures will change the climate system, including physical risks such as floods, droughts, or storms. This analysis evaluates the most financially impactful climate hazards and how they might affect the portfolio value.




Physical Risk Exposure per Geography



Portfolio Value at Risk and Physical Risk Management


Physical climate risk may affect the value of a company and a portfolio. The chart on the left quantifies the potential financial implications on a sector level. Such financial implications from physical effects of climate change can be addressed by adopting appropriate strategies. The chart on the right provides an overview of the robustness of risk management strategies for the portfolio holdings.



■ Physical Climate Risk Analysis 2 of 4


Change in Portfolio and Benchmark Value due to Physical Risk by 2050

Physical risk can impact future portfolio value. The chart below highlights potential impact on the portfolio value in 2050 based on current risk levels (Risk 2023), and hazards due to climate change (Climate Change), along with total anticipated net change in value. The analysis compares the portfolio to the benchmark using both the likely and worst case scenarios.



Physical Risk Assessment per Sector


For key sectors, this chart provides the portfolio's overall physical risk score distribution as well as the average score. This is contrasted with the benchmark's average physical risk score and complemented by the sector impact on the portfolio's potential value change in a likely scenario.



■ Physical Climate Risk Analysis 3 of 4

Physical Risk Score per Hazard

The portfolio is exposed to different natural hazards in different geographies which can affect the value of the portfolio and the benchmark. The chart on the right evaluates the change in financial risk due to six of the most costly hazards for a likely scenario. A low score indicated a large increase in physical risks, while a high score reflects a minimal increase in physical risks.



Top 5 Portfolio Holdings — Physical Risk and Management Scores

With physical risks of climate change unfolding, it is key to understand if and how portfolio holdings are addressing such risks. The Physical Risk Management Score gives an indication for the robustness of the measures in place. The table shows the largest portfolio holdings with their Physical Risk and Risk Management scores. A higher Physical Risk Score reflects a lower risk and a higher Management Score indicates a better management strategy.

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	Sector	Overall Physical Risk Score	Risk Mgmt Score
Air Liquide SA	4.8%	Materials	65	Robust
Apple Inc.	4.74%	Information Technology	-	Not Covered
PepsiCo, Inc.	4.64%	Consumer Staples	54	Robust
Microsoft Corporation	4.51%	Information Technology	57	Weak
Alphabet Inc.	4.48%	Communication Services	48	Moderate

■ Physical Climate Risk Analysis 4 of 4

Top 10 Portfolio Holdings by Highest Overall Risk Exposure with Hazard Scores (Likely Scenario)

The Physical Risk Score of each holding is impacted by the projected change in exposure to individual hazards. The table below shows the portfolio holdings that will see the most increase in risk and the potential hazards contributing to this risk in a likely scenario. A low score reflects a large projected increase in Physical Risks, while a high score reflects a minimal increase in Physical Risks.

Issuer Name	Overall Physical Risk	Tropical Cyclones	Coastal Floods	River Floods	Wildfires	Heat Stress	Droughts	Risk Mgmt Score
ASML Holding NV	33	73	63	84	100	100	100	Moderate
Applied Materials, Inc.	36	65	41	100	45	69	50	Moderate
Agilent Technologies, Inc.	40	56	42	51	43	53	50	Robust
Renesas Electronics Corp.	40	41	53	44	100	56	42	Robust
LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SE	40	48	36	42	50	90	50	Robust
Visa Inc.	46	48	43	46	100	66	50	Weak
Novo Nordisk A/S	47	63	64	43	50	100	100	Robust
Alphabet Inc.	48	49	39	60	100	100	50	Moderate
ABB Ltd.	48	58	47	50	100	61	50	Robust
A.P. Møller-Maersk A/S	48	47	41	48	100	100	50	Moderate

■ Disclaimer

The issuers that are subject to this report may have purchased self-assessment tools and publications from ISS Corporate Solutions, Inc. ("ICS"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of ISS, or ICS may have provided advisory or analytical services to an issuer. No employee of ICS played a role in the preparation of this report. If you are an ISS institutional client, you may inquire about any issuer's use of products and services from ICS by emailing disclosure@issgovernance.com.

This report has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. While ISS exercised due care in compiling this report, it makes no warranty, express or implied, regarding the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of this information and assumes no liability with respect to the consequences of relying on this information for investment or other purposes. In particular, the research and data provided are not intended to constitute an offer, solicitation or advice to buy or sell securities nor are they intended to solicit votes or proxies.

In February 2021, Deutsche Börse AG ("DB") completed a transaction pursuant to which it acquired an approximate 80% stake in ISS HoldCo Inc., the holding company which owns ISS. The remainder of ISS HoldCo Inc. is held by a combination of Genstar Capital ("Genstar") and ISS management. Policies on non-interference and potential conflicts of interest related to DB and Genstar are available at <https://www.issgovernance.com/compliance/due-diligence-materials>. The issuer(s) that is the subject of this report may be a client(s) of ISS or ICS, or the parent of, or affiliated with, a client(s) of ISS or ICS.