

ESG Risk Rating Portfolio Report

Portfolio Information		ESG Risk Rating Coverage	
Name	Number of Constituents	By Portfolio Weight	By Number of Constituents
Portfolio MBI Global Equity 30 09 2023	32	100%	32
Benchmark MSCI World 30 09 2023	1,510	99%	1,495

Overview

Sustainalytics' ESG Risk Ratings are designed to help investors identify and understand financially material ESG risks at the security and portfolio level and how they might affect the long-term performance for equity and fixed income investments. The ESG Risk Ratings combined with qualitative analyses, provide a differentiated risk signal and deeper insights into the materiality of certain ESG issues for a company and how effectively the company is managing these issues.

Portfolio

Benchmark



ESG Risk Rating (Unmanaged Risk)

Page 3-4

The ESG Risk Rating measures the degree to which a company's economic value is at risk driven by ESG factors, as assessed through Sustainalytics' calculation of the company's unmanaged ESG risks.

The portfolio's ESG risk is considered **Low**, and is 7% lower than the benchmark.

Overall Risk Rating

Score	Category
19.9	Low
21.5	Medium



Exposure

Page 5

Overall, the portfolio's exposure to ESG issues is 8% lower than the benchmark.

Exposure

Score	Category
38.8	Medium
42.4	Medium



Management

Page 6

Overall, the portfolio's management of ESG issues is 0% weaker than the benchmark.

Management

Score	Category
52.9	Strong
53.0	Strong



Other Analysis

Page 7-11

Sector and Region

Page 7

Attribution Analysis

Page 8

Active Risk Analysis

Page 9

Issue Performance

Page 10

Events

Page 11

ESG Risk Rating

Overall Risk Rating (Unmanaged Risk)


The ESG Risk Rating measures the degree to which a company’s economic value is at risk driven by ESG factors, as assessed through Sustainalytics’ calculation of the company’s unmanaged ESG risks. Companies are placed into one of five risk categories (negligible, low, medium, high, severe). These risk categories are absolute, meaning that a “high risk” assessment reflects a comparable degree of unmanaged ESG risk across the research universe, whether it refers to an agriculture company, a utility or any other type of company. One point of risk is the same, no matter which company or which issue it applies to, and points of risk add up across issues to create overall scores. Companies with lower Risk Ratings scores have lower ESG risk.

<p>Portfolio</p> <p>Benchmark</p> <p>Divergence</p>	<p>The portfolio’s ESG risk is considered Low, and is 7% lower than the benchmark.</p>	<p>Overall Risk Rating</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Score</td> <td>Category</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19.9</td> <td>Low</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21.5</td> <td>Medium</td> </tr> </table>	Score	Category	19.9	Low	21.5	Medium
Score	Category							
19.9	Low							
21.5	Medium							

ESG Risk Categories

- Negligible: 0 - 10**
Negligible risk of material financial impacts driven by ESG factors
- Low: 10 - 20**
Low risk of material financial impacts driven by ESG factors
- Medium: 20 - 30**
Medium risk of material financial impacts driven by ESG factors
- High: 30 - 40**
High risk of material financial impacts driven by ESG factors
- Severe: > 40 - 100**
Severe risk of material financial impacts driven by ESG factors

ESG Risk Category by aggregate portfolio weight %



Average Score		ESG Risk Rating			
Arithmetic	Weighted	Median	Min.	Max.	Std. Dev.
19.9	19.9	18.7	9.6	34.1	6.6
21.4	21.5	20.8	5.4	67.4	7.0
-1.5	-1.5	-2.1	4.2	-33.3	-0.4

Average Percentile		ESG Risk Rating Percentile*			
Arithmetic	Weighted	Median	Min.	Max.	Std. Dev.
30.0	30.2	23.3	2.4	81.4	23.7
35.3	35.4	31.1	1.1	100.0	24.0
-5.3	-5.2	-7.9	1.4	-18.6	-0.3

* Percentiles are based on positioning within the full research universe. A low percentile means low risk.

Highest Risk Portfolio Constituents

Identifies the 10 constituents with the highest ESG Risk score in the portfolio

Company Name	Sector	ESG Risk				Weight		
		Score	Category	Exposure	Mgmt	Port	Bench	Active
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Information Technology	34.1	High	47.8	31.2	3.2%	1.2%	1.9%
Valero Energy Corp.	Energy	32.6	High	59.1	53.5	5.0%	0.1%	4.9%
Shin-Etsu Chemical Co., Ltd.	Materials	31.2	High	49.5	41.0	1.2%	0.1%	1.1%
Envista Holdings Corp.	Healthcare	30.7	High	46.7	37.1	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Amazon.com, Inc.	Consumer Discretionary	30.6	High	41.5	28.3	4.0%	2.2%	1.8%
Walmart, Inc.	Consumer Staples	25.3	Medium	43.8	45.6	5.0%	0.4%	4.5%
CSL Ltd.	Healthcare	24.7	Medium	38.7	37.5	2.6%	0.1%	2.4%
Alphabet, Inc.	Information Technology	24.0	Medium	40.5	43.9	4.3%	2.7%	1.6%
DAIKIN INDUSTRIES Ltd.	Industrials	22.3	Medium	40.0	47.4	1.6%	0.1%	1.5%
Amgen, Inc.	Healthcare	22.0	Medium	38.6	44.9	5.3%	0.3%	5.0%

Lowest Risk Portfolio Constituents

Identifies the 10 constituents with the lowest ESG Risk score in the portfolio

Company Name	Sector	ESG Risk				Weight		
		Score	Category	Exposure	Mgmt	Port	Bench	Active
ASML Holding NV	Information Technology	9.6	Negligible	34.5	76.6	2.9%	0.4%	2.5%
Compagnie Financière Richemont SA	Consumer Discretionary	11.3	Low	26.6	62.1	3.2%	0.1%	3.1%
Danaher Corp.	Healthcare	11.9	Low	29.9	63.5	2.9%	0.3%	2.6%
Teleperformance SA	Industrials	13.0	Low	36.0	67.5	2.2%	0.0%	2.2%
Public Storage	Real Estate	13.0	Low	26.1	50.8	2.5%	0.1%	2.4%
Adobe, Inc.	Information Technology	13.1	Low	32.4	64.3	3.6%	0.4%	3.2%
NVIDIA Corp.	Information Technology	13.6	Low	32.6	62.4	1.8%	2.0%	-0.2%
Canadian National Railway Co.	Industrials	14.0	Low	39.0	71.6	2.9%	0.1%	2.8%
adidas AG	Consumer Discretionary	14.8	Low	31.9	59.6	1.1%	0.1%	1.0%
Microsoft Corp.	Information Technology	15.1	Low	34.1	60.0	8.0%	4.1%	3.9%



ESG Risk Exposure

Exposure considers a company's sensitivity or vulnerability to ESG risks. Lower exposure scores indicate that the constituent companies face less ESG risk.

Portfolio

Benchmark

Divergence

Exposure

Score	Category
38.8	Medium
42.4	Medium

ESG Risk Categories

Low: 0 - 35

Low exposure to material ESG issues


Medium: 35 - 55

Medium exposure to material ESG issues

High: 55 - 100

High exposure to material ESG issues

Distribution of aggregated portfolio weight by Exposure categories



The prevalence of companies with high exposure to ESG issues in the portfolio is 61% lower than the benchmark.

Average Exposure		Exposure Score			
Arith.	Weighted	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Dev.
38.7	38.8	38.6	26.1	59.1	7.7
41.8	42.4	40.5	15.3	90.0	12.3
-3.2	-3.5	-1.9	10.8	-30.9	-4.6

Companies with the Highest Exposure in the Portfolio

Company Name	Sector	Exposure Score	Exposure Category	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
Valero Energy Corp.	Energy	59.1	High	5.0%	0.1%	4.9%
Sika AG	Materials	50.0	Medium	3.0%	0.1%	2.9%
Shin-Etsu Chemical Co., Ltd.	Materials	49.5	Medium	1.2%	0.1%	1.1%

Companies with the Lowest Exposure in the Portfolio

Company Name	Sector	Exposure Score	Exposure Category	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
Public Storage	Real Estate	26.1	Low	2.5%	0.1%	2.4%
Five Below, Inc.	Consumer Discretionary	26.3	Low	3.1%	0.0%	3.1%
Compagnie Financière Richemont SA	Consumer Discretionary	26.6	Low	3.2%	0.1%	3.1%



ESG Risk Management

Management evaluates a company's performance on managing its exposure to ESG issues. Higher management scores indicate the constituent companies have stronger management of their exposure.

Portfolio

Management

Score

Category



Strong

Benchmark



Strong

Divergence

Distribution of aggregated portfolio weight by Management categories

ESG Risk Categories

Strong: 100 - 50


Strong management of material issues

Average: 50 - 25

Average management of material issues

Weak: 25 - 0

Weak management of material issues



Average Management		Management Score			
Arith.	Weighted	Median	Min	Max	Std. Dev.
52.8	52.9	54.3	28.3	76.6	12.7
51.8	53.0	52.2	15.4	84.2	11.9
1.0	-0.1	2.1	12.8	-7.7	0.8

Companies with the Weakest Management in the Portfolio

Company Name	Sector	Management Score	Management Category	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
Amazon.com, Inc.	Consumer Discretionary	28.3	Average	4.0%	2.2%	1.8%
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Information Technology	31.2	Average	3.2%	1.2%	1.9%
Five Below, Inc.	Consumer Discretionary	31.6	Average	3.1%	0.0%	3.1%

Companies with the Strongest Management in the Portfolio

Company Name	Sector	Management Score	Management Category	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
ASML Holding NV	Information Technology	76.6	Strong	2.9%	0.4%	2.5%
Canadian National Railway Co.	Industrials	71.6	Strong	2.9%	0.1%	2.8%
L'Oréal SA	Consumer Staples	68.3	Strong	2.6%	0.2%	2.4%

Sector ESG Risk

Looks at the active weight and ESG Risk Rating score across sectors in the Portfolio. Lower scores equal lower risk.

Sector	ESG Risk			Weight		Exposure		Management	
	Portfolio Contribution*	Port	Bench	Port	Bench	Port	Bench	Port	Bench
Consumer Discretionary	11.6%	2.3	2.5	11.4%	11.5%	3.7	4.1	4.7	5.0
Consumer Staples	8.6%	1.7	1.7	7.6%	6.9%	3.4	3.3	4.1	3.7
Energy	8.2%	1.6	1.8	5.0%	5.3%	3.0	3.6	2.7	3.2
Financials	11.4%	2.3	2.8	12.1%	13.1%	4.8	5.7	6.6	6.9
Healthcare	13.6%	2.7	2.6	13.3%	12.4%	4.8	5.2	6.2	6.5
Industrials	9.9%	2.0	2.4	10.9%	10.1%	4.1	4.6	6.1	5.2
Information Technology	29.9%	6.0	5.3	32.9%	29.7%	12.4	10.7	18.8	16.2
Materials	5.1%	1.0	1.0	4.2%	4.2%	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.4
Real Estate	1.7%	0.3	0.3	2.5%	2.3%	0.7	0.6	1.3	1.2
Telecommunication Services	0.0%	0.0	0.4	0.0%	1.8%	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.0
Utilities	0.0%	0.0	0.7	0.0%	2.6%	0.0	1.6	0.0	1.6

*Sector contribution to overall ESG Risk calculated as the weighted sum of sector risk scores divided by the total portfolio weighted risk score.

Regional ESG Risk

Looks at the active weight and ESG Risk Rating score across regions in the Portfolio. Lower scores equal lower risk.

Region	ESG Risk			Exposure		Management	
	Portfolio Contribution	Portfolio	Benchmark	Port	Bench	Port	Bench
Africa / Middle East	0.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Asia / Pacific	10.4%	2.1	2.1	3.8	4.0	4.3	4.7
Europe	13.7%	2.7	3.8	7.0	8.8	11.9	11.7
Latin America and Caribbean	0.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
United States and Canada	75.9%	15.1	15.4	28.0	29.4	36.7	36.4

Attribution Analysis - ESG Risk Rating

Looks at the attribution of ESG Risk across sectors. Lower scores equal lower risk.

Sector	Weight		ESG Risk*		Active Score	Effect			
	Port	Bench	Port	Bench		Sector Allocation	Stock Selection	Interaction	Total
Consumer Discretionary	11.4%	11.5%	20.4	21.3	-0.9	0.00	-0.10	0.00	-0.10
Consumer Staples	7.6%	6.9%	22.7	24.9	-2.3	0.02	-0.16	-0.02	-0.15
Energy	5.0%	5.3%	32.6	33.2	-0.6	-0.03	-0.03	0.00	-0.07
Financials	12.1%	13.1%	18.9	21.5	-2.6	0.00	-0.34	0.03	-0.32
Healthcare	13.3%	12.4%	20.3	21.1	-0.8	0.00	-0.10	-0.01	-0.11
Industrials	10.9%	10.1%	18.0	23.9	-5.9	0.02	-0.60	-0.05	-0.63
Information Technology	32.9%	29.7%	18.1	17.8	0.3	-0.12	0.09	0.01	-0.02
Materials	4.2%	4.2%	24.2	24.7	-0.5	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.02
Real Estate	2.5%	2.3%	13.0	12.9	0.1	-0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.02
Telecommunication Services	0.0%	1.8%	0.0	21.4	-21.4	0.00	-0.39	0.39	0.00
Utilities	0.0%	2.6%	0.0	25.6	-25.6	-0.11	-0.68	0.68	-0.11
Totals	100%	100%	19.9	21.5	-1.5	-0.2	-2.3	1.0	-1.5

* By aggregated weighted score (normalized)

Effect**:

. **Sector Allocation Effect:** Captures the effect on the portfolio's total ESG risk from the portfolio's sector weighting decisions relative to the benchmark's sector weights. A negative allocation effect indicates that the portfolio either overweights a sector that has a lower risk than the total ESG risk of the benchmark or underweights a sector with higher risk than the total ESG risk of the benchmark.

. **Selection Effect:** Captures the effect on the portfolio's total ESG risk from the portfolio's stock selection decisions relative to the benchmark's stock selections. A negative selection effect indicates that the portfolio, relative to the benchmark, overweights companies with lower ESG risks.

. **Total Effect:** Is the sum of the sector allocation effect, the stock selection effect, and the residual effect that results from the interaction between the sector allocation effect and the stock selection effect. A negative total effect indicates that the portfolio has lower ESG risk than the benchmark.

Companies that Increase Active ESG Risk

Identifies up to 10 companies in the portfolio that contribute the most to increasing overall risk for the portfolio relative to the benchmark, for example by under-weighting low risk companies or over-weighting high risk companies.

Company Name	Sector	ESG Risk Score	ESG Risk Category	Contribution to Active Risk	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
Valero Energy Corp.	Energy	32.6	High	0.55	5.0%	0.1%	4.9%
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Information Technology	34.1	High	0.24	3.2%	1.2%	1.9%
Walmart, Inc.	Consumer Staples	25.3	Medium	0.17	5.0%	0.4%	4.5%
Amazon.com, Inc.	Consumer Discretionary	30.6	High	0.17	4.0%	2.2%	1.8%
Shin-Etsu Chemical Co., Ltd.	Materials	31.2	High	0.11	1.2%	0.1%	1.1%
CSL Ltd.	Healthcare	24.7	Medium	0.08	2.6%	0.1%	2.4%
Envista Holdings Corp.	Healthcare	30.7	High	0.07	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Alphabet, Inc.	Information Technology	24.0	Medium	0.04	4.3%	2.7%	1.6%
Amgen, Inc.	Healthcare	22.0	Medium	0.02	5.3%	0.3%	5.0%
DAIKIN INDUSTRIES Ltd.	Industrials	22.3	Medium	0.01	1.6%	0.1%	1.5%

Companies that Decrease Active ESG Risk

Identifies up to 10 companies in the portfolio that contribute the most to reducing overall risk for the portfolio relative to the benchmark, for example by under-weighting high risk companies or over-weighting low risk companies.

Company Name	Sector	ESG Risk Score	ESG Risk Category	Contribution to Active Risk	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
Compagnie Financière Richemont SA	Consumer Discretionary	11.3	Low	-0.31	3.2%	0.1%	3.1%
ASML Holding NV	Information Technology	9.6	Negligible	-0.30	2.9%	0.4%	2.5%
Adobe, Inc.	Information Technology	13.1	Low	-0.27	3.6%	0.4%	3.2%
Danaher Corp.	Healthcare	11.9	Low	-0.25	2.9%	0.3%	2.6%
Microsoft Corp.	Information Technology	15.1	Low	-0.25	8.0%	4.1%	3.9%
Canadian National Railway Co.	Industrials	14.0	Low	-0.21	2.9%	0.1%	2.8%
Public Storage	Real Estate	13.0	Low	-0.21	2.5%	0.1%	2.4%
Teleperformance SA	Industrials	13.0	Low	-0.18	2.2%	0.0%	2.2%
Workday, Inc.	Information Technology	17.3	Low	-0.14	3.4%	0.1%	3.3%
CME Group, Inc.	Financials	17.4	Low	-0.13	3.3%	0.1%	3.2%

Relative Issue Performance

Evaluates ESG Risk, Exposure and Management at the individual material ESG Issue (MEI) level

Issue	Prevalence of Issue		Risk Score			Exposure			Management		
	Port	Bench	Port	Bench	Div	Port	Bench	Div	Port	Bench	Div
Corporate Governance	100.0%	100.0%	3.9	3.9	0.1	9.0	9.0	0.0	56.4	57.1	-0.7
Human Capital	95.8%	98.1%	2.7	2.7	0.0	5.6	5.5	0.1	51.1	51.6	-0.5
Carbon - Own Operations	72.4%	71.3%	1.1	1.1	0.0	2.4	2.7	-0.3	44.1	47.8	-3.7
Emissions, Effluents and Waste	33.8%	31.7%	0.8	0.8	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	18.3	16.9	1.5
Bribery and Corruption	0.7%	15.7%	0.0	0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.9	-0.8	0.4	11.0	-10.7
Data Privacy and Security	59.2%	54.4%	1.9	1.8	0.1	3.9	3.5	0.4	37.4	32.0	5.4
Land Use and Biodiversity	4.2%	9.9%	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	-0.2	1.7	6.3	-4.6
Community Relations	9.3%	10.9%	0.3	0.4	-0.1	0.5	0.8	-0.3	4.1	6.2	-2.1
Resilience	2.9%	4.5%	0.0	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.1	2.9	3.9	-0.9
Business Ethics	92.9%	95.9%	2.8	3.2	-0.4	4.7	5.2	-0.5	41.2	40.7	0.6
Human Rights	0.0%	0.4%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	-0.3
E&S Impact of Products and Services	29.8%	24.0%	0.7	0.7	0.1	1.2	1.1	0.2	13.2	10.9	2.2
Occupational Health and Safety	27.8%	29.7%	0.6	0.6	-0.1	1.3	1.4	-0.1	17.2	17.3	-0.1
Resource Use	44.6%	40.1%	0.6	0.8	-0.1	1.3	1.5	-0.2	26.6	23.3	3.3
Resource Use - Supply Chain	10.0%	13.6%	0.1	0.2	-0.1	0.2	0.4	-0.2	8.2	9.9	-1.7
Product Governance	83.4%	87.7%	2.5	3.0	-0.5	4.2	4.9	-0.7	35.3	35.4	-0.1
Access to Basic Services	8.6%	10.8%	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.6	-0.1	1.6	4.8	-3.2
Human Rights - Supply Chain	23.0%	34.0%	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.9	-0.1	9.9	18.7	-8.7
Land Use and Biodiversity - Supply Chain	7.6%	7.7%	0.1	0.1	-0.1	0.2	0.3	-0.1	5.0	4.5	0.4
ESG Integration - Financials	12.2%	14.5%	0.3	0.4	-0.1	0.7	0.9	-0.2	6.6	7.7	-1.1
Carbon - Products and Services	5.0%	14.7%	0.3	0.6	-0.2	0.5	0.9	-0.4	2.2	7.9	-5.7
Idiosyncratic	0.0%	0.4%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Issues marked in gray are idiosyncratic issues. An idiosyncratic issue is an issue that was not initially deemed material at the subindustry level but becomes a material ESG issue for a company based on the occurrence of a Category 4 or 5 event.

Overall Risk Score		Total Issue Risk		Unallocated risk	
Portfolio	Bench	Portfolio	Bench	Portfolio	Bench
19.9	21.5	19.9	21.5	0.0	0.0

Events

Event indicators signal a failure of management to adequately address its exposure to ESG issues. Events provide a signal that a company has not yet managed risks on an issue. Sustainalytics categorizes events that have resulted in negative ESG impacts into five event categories: Category 1 (low impact); Category 2 (moderate impact); Category 3 (significant impact); Category 4 (high impact); and Category 5 (severe impact).

Most Significant Events in the Portfolio

Identifies the 10 most significant Events with the highest constituent weight in the portfolio

Company Name	Sector	Event Name	Event Category	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
Alphabet, Inc.	Information Technology	Anti-Competitive Practices	Category 4	4.3%	2.7%	1.6%
Mastercard, Inc.	Information Technology	Anti-Competitive Practices	Category 4	3.4%	0.6%	2.8%
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Information Technology	Data Privacy and Security	Category 4	3.2%	1.2%	1.9%
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Information Technology	Quality and Safety	Category 4	3.2%	1.2%	1.9%
Microsoft Corp.	Information Technology	Data Privacy and Security	Category 3	8.0%	4.1%	3.9%
Amgen, Inc.	Healthcare	Accounting and Taxation	Category 3	5.3%	0.3%	5.0%
Walmart, Inc.	Consumer Staples	Anti-Competitive Practices	Category 3	5.0%	0.4%	4.5%
Walmart, Inc.	Consumer Staples	Employees - Human Rights - SC	Category 3	5.0%	0.4%	4.5%
Walmart, Inc.	Consumer Staples	Labour Relations	Category 3	5.0%	0.4%	4.5%
Walmart, Inc.	Consumer Staples	Labour Relations - SC	Category 3	5.0%	0.4%	4.5%

Most Significant Events in the Benchmark

Identifies the 10 most significant Events with the highest constituent weight in the benchmark

Company Name	Sector	Event Name	Event Category	Port Weight	Bench Weight	Active Weight
Wells Fargo & Co.	Financials	Business Ethics	Category 5	0.0%	0.3%	-0.3%
Glencore Plc	Materials	Bribery and Corruption	Category 5	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%
3M Co.	Industrials	Emissions, Effluents and Waste	Category 5	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%
Bayer AG	Healthcare	Social Impact of Products	Category 5	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%
Tokyo Electric Power Co. Holdings, Inc.	Utilities	Community Relations	Category 5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Tokyo Electric Power Co. Holdings, Inc.	Utilities	Emissions, Effluents and Waste	Category 5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Tokyo Electric Power Co. Holdings, Inc.	Utilities	Quality and Safety	Category 5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Alphabet, Inc.	Information Technology	Anti-Competitive Practices	Category 4	4.3%	2.7%	1.6%
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Information Technology	Data Privacy and Security	Category 4	3.2%	1.2%	1.9%
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Information Technology	Quality and Safety	Category 4	3.2%	1.2%	1.9%

Glossary of Terms

ESG Risk Category

Companies' ESG Risk Rating scores are assigned to five ESG risk categories in the ESG Risk Rating. Note that because ESG risks materialize at an unknown time in the future and depend on a variety of unpredictable conditions, no predictions on financial or share price impacts, or on the time horizon of such impacts, are intended or implied by these risk categories.

ESG Risk Rating Score (Unmanaged Risk Score)

The company's final score in the ESG Risk Rating; it applies the concept of risk decomposition to derive the level of unmanaged risk for a company.

Event Category

Sustainalytics categorizes events that have resulted in negative ESG impacts into five event categories: Category 1 (low impact); Category 2 (moderate impact); Category 3 (significant impact); Category 4 (high impact); and Category 5 (severe impact).

Event Indicator

An indicator that provides a signal about a potential failure of management through involvement in controversies.

Exposure

A company's sensitivity or vulnerability to ESG risks.

Management

A company's handling of ESG risks.

Management Gap

Refers to the difference between what a company has managed and what a company could possibly manage. It indicates how far the company's performance is from best practice.

Material ESG Issue

A core building block of the ESG Risk Rating. An ESG issue is considered to be material within the rating if it is likely to have a significant effect on the enterprise value of a typical company within a given subindustry.

Unmanaged Risk

Material ESG risk that has not been managed by a company, and includes two types of risk: unmanageable risk, as well as risks that could be managed by a company through suitable initiatives but which may not yet be managed.

Weighted Scores

Sustainalytics normalizes the security weights of the matched security results within the selected portfolio and benchmark to equal 100% of the total portfolio weight, by evenly redistributing unmatched security weights. If there are no security weights available, Sustainalytics will assign equal weights to all securities. Weighted Scores are calculated by aggregating normalized security weighted scores.

Notice and Disclaimer

Sustainalytics is not responsible for information supplied by you, regardless if derived from you or from a third party, provided for the purpose of this report and/or included herein and you bear all risks associated with the use and (re)distribution of such information. Moreover, Sustainalytics will not assume any responsibility for the reliability, completeness or accuracy of such information and makes no representation or warranty as to any of the information, including, without limitation, any representation or warranty that the information or any portion of it is accurate or complete. Sustainalytics shall have no liability hereunder for any use of the information provided by you. You agree and acknowledge that it is your responsibility to obtain all relevant licenses for use, reproduction, extraction and redistribution of any information made available to Sustainalytics.

Copyright © 2023 Sustainalytics. All rights reserved.

The information, methodologies, data and opinions contained or reflected herein are proprietary of Sustainalytics and/or content providers, intended for internal, non-commercial use and may not be copied, distributed or used in any other way, including via citation, unless otherwise explicitly agreed in writing. They are provided for informational purposes only and (1) do not constitute an endorsement of any product, project, investment strategy or consideration of any particular environmental, social or governance related issues as part of any investment strategy; (2) do not constitute investment advice, nor represent an expert opinion or negative assurance letter; (3) are not part of any offering and do not constitute an offer or indication to buy or sell securities, to select a project or make any kind of business transactions; (4) are not an assessment of the issuer's economic performance, financial obligations nor of its creditworthiness; (5) are not a substitute for professional advice; (6) past performance is no guarantee of future results; (7) have not been submitted to, nor received approval from, any relevant regulatory bodies.

These are based on information made available by third parties, subject to continuous change and therefore are not warranted as to their merchantability, completeness, accuracy, up-to-datedness or fitness for a particular purpose. The information and data are provided "as is" and reflects Sustainalytics' opinion at the date of its elaboration and publication.

Neither Sustainalytics nor any of its content providers accept any liability for damage arising from the use of the information, data or opinions contained herein, or from the use of information resulting from the application of the methodology, in any manner whatsoever, except where explicitly required by law. Any reference to content providers' names is for appropriate acknowledgement of their ownership and does not constitute a sponsorship or endorsement by such owner. A list of our content providers and their respective terms of use is available on our website. For more information visit <http://www.sustainalytics.com/legal-disclaimers>

Sustainalytics may receive compensation for its ratings, opinions and other deliverables, from, among others, issuers, insurers, guarantors and/or underwriters of debt securities, or investors, via different business units. Sustainalytics believes it has put in place appropriate measures designed to safeguard the objectivity and independence of its opinions. For more information visit Governance Documents or contact compliance@sustainalytics.com.

About Sustainalytics

Sustainalytics, a Morningstar Company, is a leading independent ESG and corporate governance research, ratings and analytics firm that supports investors around the world with the development and implementation of responsible investment strategies. For more than 25 years, the firm has been at the forefront of developing high-quality, innovative solutions to meet the evolving needs of global investors. Today, Sustainalytics works with hundreds of the world's leading asset managers and pension funds who incorporate ESG and corporate governance information and assessments into their investment processes. Sustainalytics also works with hundreds of companies and their financial intermediaries to help them consider sustainability in policies, practices and capital projects. As of January 2022, Sustainalytics has 17 offices globally, with more than 1200 staff members, including more than 500 analysts with varied multidisciplinary expertise across more than 40 industry groups, with any such numbers changing on a regular basis. For more information, visit www.sustainalytics.com.