

CI Environment ISR

Climate Impact Assessment

OVERVIEW

DATE OF HOLDINGS 31 MAR 2021
COVERAGE 97.57%AMOUNT INVESTED 121,028,055 EUR
BENCHMARK USED BENCHMARK ENVIRONMENT ISR



PORTFOLIO TYPE MIXED

Carbon Metrics 1 of 3

Portfolio Overview

Disclosure Number/Weight	Emission Exposure tCO ₂ e		Relative Emission Exposure tCO ₂ e/Mio EUR 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	86.8% / 86.4%	768	3,561	6.35	25.56	17.32 59
Benchmark	74.7% / 85.6%	7,393	31,749	61.08	170.61	153.83 53
Net Performance	12.1 p.p. / 0.7 p.p.	89.6%	88.8%	89.6%	85%	88.7% —

Emission Exposure Analysis

Emissions Exposure (tCO₂e)Sector Contributions to Emissions²¹ 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 Environment 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
Yum China Holdings, Inc.	15.25%	1.16%	Non-Reporting	● Medium Performer
Prysmian SpA	13.61%	1.04%	Strong	● Outperformer
Valeo SA	13.09%	1.03%	Strong	● Medium Performer
Umicore	12.83%	1.38%	Strong	● Medium Performer
Tractor Supply Company	4.71%	2.31%	Strong	● Outperformer
Wendel SE	4.08%	1.06%	Moderate	● Outperformer
Barry Callebaut AG	3.77%	1.08%	Strong	● Outperformer
Rentokil Initial plc	3.16%	1.29%	Strong	● Outperformer
The Walt Disney Company	2.34%	2.78%	Moderate	● Outperformer
Fomento Economico Mexicano SAB de CV	2.31%	0.51%	Strong	● Medium Performer
Total for Top 10	75.14%	13.64%		

■ 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	9.17%	8.36%	0.81%	-0.08%	0.46%
Consumer Discretionary	15.99%	11.61%	4.39%	-1.14%	0.25%
Consumer Staples	2.6%	6.77%	-4.16%	1.99%	0.27%
Financials	19.6%	19.03%	0.57%	-0.05%	1.05%
Health Care	12.05%	10.83%	1.22%	-0.12%	0.85%
Industrials	12.36%	10.13%	2.23%	-1.68%	7.14%
Information Technology	22.56%	17.18%	5.38%	-0.38%	1.15%
Materials	1.72%	4.31%	-2.59%	17.99%	10.54%
Other	1.33%	1.83%	-0.5%	0.26%	0.68%
Real Estate	2.6%	2.9%	-0.3%	0.05%	0.35%
Energy	0%	3.39%	-3.39%	20.59%	0%
Utilities	0%	3.67%	-3.67%	29.45%	0%
Cumulative Higher (-) and Lower (+) Emission Exposure vs. Benchmark				66.87%	22.74%
Higher (-) / Lower (+) Net Emission Exposure vs. Benchmark				90%	

CI Environment ISR


Emission Attribution Analysis (continued)

Highest Emission-Intense Issuers in Combined Portfolio & Benchmark Universe

Issuer Name	Sector	Emission Exposure Scope 1 & 2 (tCO ₂ e)	Carbon Risk Rating	Portfolio Under (-) / Overexposure (+)
1. AGL Energy Limited	Utilities	7,321.24	● Laggard	-0.01%
2. Vistra Energy Corp.	Utilities	6,745.68	● Laggard	-0.01%
3. Taiheiyo Cement Corp.	Materials	5,215.92	● Medium Performer	0%
4. ArcelorMittal SA	Materials	5,001.42	● Medium Performer	-0.03%
5. Buzzi Unicem Spa	Materials	3,880.35	● Laggard	-0.01%
6. Uniper SE	Utilities	3,789.18	● Medium Performer	-0.01%
7. RWE AG	Utilities	3,441.52	● Medium Performer	-0.04%
8. HeidelbergCement AG	Materials	3,081.33	● Medium Performer	-0.1%
9. EVRAZ plc	Materials	3,078.43	● Medium Performer	0%
10. LafargeHolcim Ltd.	Materials	2,919.76	● Medium Performer	-0.08%
11. Chubu Electric Power Co., Inc.	Utilities	2,910.2	● Medium Performer	-0.01%
12. JFE Holdings, Inc.	Materials	2,789.61	● Medium Performer	0%
13. NRG Energy, Inc.	Utilities	2,710.07	● Laggard	-0.01%
14. Nippon Steel Corp.	Materials	2,601.33	● Medium Performer	-0.02%
15. South32 Ltd.	Materials	2,465.09	● Medium Performer	-0.01%

Carbon Metrics 3 of 3

Greenhouse Gas Emission Intensity

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

Issuer Name	Emission Intensity	Peer Group Avg Intensity
1. Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	283.48	238.88
2. Yum China Holdings, Inc.	247.04	56.31
3. MERLIN Properties SOCIMI SA	115.34	191.17
4. Victrex Plc	103.93	220.98
5. Prysmian SpA	75.55	47.23
6. Rentokil Initial plc	64.22	29.81
7. Mowi ASA	61.16	358.35
8. Valeo SA	55.38	81.10
9. Danone SA	51.89	120.39
10. Umicore	45.27	220.98

CI Environment 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), Stated Policies Scenario (STEPS) and the Current Policies Scenario (CPS). Performance is shown as the percentage of assigned budget used by the portfolio and benchmark.

The CI Environment ISR strategy in its current state is **ALIGNED** with a SDS scenario by 2050. The CI Environment ISR has a potential temperature increase of 1.5°C, whereas the BENCHMARK ENVIRONMENT ISR has a potential temperature increase of 2.7°C.


Portfolio and Benchmark Comparison to SDS Budget (Red = Overshoot)				
	2021	2030	2040	2050
Portfolio	-89.06%	-84.07%	-68.49%	-49.11%
Benchmark	-5.84%	+23.12%	+106.02%	+174.86%

2050
1.5°C

The strategy in its current state is aligned with a SDS scenario for the full analyzed period (until 2050).


The portfolio is associated with a potential temperature increase of 1.5°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 59% 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 22% of the portfolio without a goal is unlikely to transition and should receive special attention from a climate risk conscious investor.




CI Environment ISR

■ Climate Scenario Alignment 2 of 2

The table below shows the percent of the SDS budget used in 2021, 2030, and 2050 for key sub-sectors of the portfolio.


Percent of SDS Budget Used per Sub-sector




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 2020 and 2050.

Pct. of Allocated Budget vs Pct. of Total Budget Used 2021




Pct. of Allocated Budget vs Pct. of Total Budget Used 2050



■ % Budget Allocated ■ % Budget Used

Percent of Holdings SDS Aligned in 2021, 2030, and 2050



CI Environment ISR

■ Transition Climate Risk Analysis 1 of 3


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	-	-	-	-	59
Benchmark	23%	56.95%	5.3%	155.04	53

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
La Corporacion Andina de Fomento SA	0%	0%	0%	-

CI Environment ISR

■ Transition Climate Risk Analysis 2 of 3

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
Xylem Inc.	1.86%	-	Services	Services	Services
Siemens AG	0.44%	-	Services	-	Services


CI Environment ISR

■ Transition Climate Risk Analysis 3 of 3

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		
Financials/Commercial Banks & Capital Markets			64
Machinery			56
Electronic Components			52
Food & Beverages			45
Renewable Energy (Operation) & Energy Efficiency Equipment			-
Utilities/Electric Utilities			-
Transportation Infrastructure			-
Oil & Gas Equipment/Services			-
Oil, Gas & Consumable Fuels			-
Transport & Logistics			-

Top 5 ²	Country	ISS ESG Rating Industry	CRR	Portfolio Weight (consol.)
Vestas Wind Systems A/S	Denmark	Electrical Equipment	100	1.69%
SAP SE	Germany	Software & Diversified IT Services	83	0.6%
Adobe, Inc.	USA	Software & Diversified IT Services	80	3.15%
RELX Plc	United Kingdom	Media	80	2.47%
Amgen Inc.	USA	Pharmaceuticals & Biotechnology	75	2.84%

Bottom 5 ²	Country	ISS ESG Rating Industry	CRR	Portfolio Weight (consol.)
MERLIN Properties SOCIMI SA	Spain	Real Estate	37	0.53%
PayPal Holdings, Inc.	USA	Digital Finance & Payment Processing	38	3.95%
Games Workshop Group Plc	United Kingdom	Retail	38	1.18%
Yum China Holdings, Inc.	USA	Restaurants	39	1.16%
Duerr AG	Germany	Industrial Machinery & Equipment	39	0.25%

■ 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 Environment ISR


■ Physical Climate Risk Analysis 1 of 4

Rising temperature, even if limited to 2° Celsius, will change the climate system resulting in physical risks such as floods, droughts or storms. This analysis evaluates the most financially impactful climate hazards and how they might affect the portfolio's value.




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 Risk Exposure per Geography




This map shows the estimated increase in physical risk exposure from a baseline year to 2050 in the most likely warming scenario.

CI Environment ISR

■ 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 2021), 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 most 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 "most likely" scenario.




CI Environment ISR

■ Physical Climate Risk Analysis 3 of 4

Physical Risk Score per Hazard

The portfolio is exposed to different natural hazards in different geographies. This can affect the value of the portfolio and the performance between the portfolio and the benchmark. The chart on the right evaluates the scored effect on the portfolio's value from the most impactful hazards under the "most likely" scenario.



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
Accell Group NV	3.03%	Consumer Discretionary	77	Not Covered
Games Workshop Group Plc	1.18%	Consumer Discretionary	75	Not Covered
WPP plc	0.72%	Communication Services	75	Moderate
Booking Holdings Inc.	1.72%	Consumer Discretionary	74	Not Covered
Mowi ASA	0.68%	Consumer Staples	74	Moderate

CI Environment ISR

■ Physical Climate Risk Analysis 4 of 4

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

The Physical Risk Score of each holding is impacted by the exposure to individual hazards. The table below shows the portfolio holdings that are most at risk and the potential hazards contributing to this in a “most likely” scenario. A higher Physical Risk Score reflects a lower risk.

Issuer Name	Overall Physical Risk	Flood	Drought	Wildfire	Heat Stress	Tropical Cyclones	Risk Mgmt Score
ASML Holding NV	0	30	16	100	76	38	Robust
Yum China Holdings, Inc.	0	0	0	100	46	0	Not Covered
LVMH Moet Hennessy Louis Vuitton SE	0	17	0	100	44	33	Moderate
AIA Group Limited	0	0	0	92	28	47	Not Covered
Kering SA	0	21	0	100	12	42	Moderate
Waters Corporation	10	30	0	100	57	46	Weak
Danone SA	13	46	4	100	52	52	Not Covered
Fomento Economico Mexicano SAB de CV	23	59	0	100	42	68	Not Covered
Victrex Plc	27	39	48	100	43	38	Not Covered
Telefonica SA	29	0	25	0	50	68	Moderate

CI Environment ISR

■ **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.

ISS is an independent company owned by entities affiliated with Genstar Capital ("Genstar"). ISS and Genstar have established policies and procedures to restrict the involvement of Genstar and any of Genstar's employees in the content of ISS' reports. Neither Genstar nor their employees are informed of the contents of any of ISS' analyses or reports prior to their publication or dissemination. 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.