

Table 1

Statement on principal adverse impacts of investment decisions on sustainability factors

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Financial market participant Sarasin IE Multi Asset - Dynamic (GBP) | | | | | | |
| <p>Summary</p> <p>The Sarasin Sustainability Impact Matrix (SIM) is the Investment Manager's framework that considers the impact of the Trust's investments on planet and people. Fifteen different factors are considered using Sarasin's primary research and supplemented by data from third-party providers. Harms to people and planet are identified and calibrated using a traffic light system, with red lights signifying significant adverse impacts.</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Description of the principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors</p> <p>The Principal Adverse Impacts (PAIs) that are considered relate to the nature of the entity's business and the contribution it makes to climate change through emissions of greenhouse gases, other forms of pollution, as well as any impacts from poor land and resource use. In terms of human capital, Sarasin considers whether the entity's products and services cause harm to suppliers, customers, employees and wider society. Sarasin considers a range of governance measures around board structure, reporting, remuneration and business ethics. Having identified the principal adverse impact issues, Sarasin then moves on to separately consider its engagement and, where appropriate, voting strategy to encourage the entity to mitigate them and their financial materiality for its investment judgements.</p> | | | | | | |
| Indicators applicable to investments in investee companies | | | | | | |
| Adverse sustainability indicator | | Metric | Impact [year n] | Impact [year n-1] | Explanation | Actions taken, and actions planned and targets set for the next reference period |
| CLIMATE AND OTHER ENVIRONMENT-RELATED INDICATORS | | | | | | |
| Greenhouse gas emissions | 1. GHG emissions | Scope 1 GHG emissions | 7202.55 | 6809.95 | Scope 1 emissions cover the direct Green House Gas (GHG) emissions - for example from a company's vehicle fleet. | We examine plans for transition to net zero, including shorter-term targets for reduction and whether these are Science Based Targets. We engage with corporates to encourage adoption of a net zero strategy and where those policies already |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | exist, push for a faster pace of execution. |
| | | Scope 2 GHG emissions | 3958.24 | 3432.05 | Scope 2 emissions are indirect emissions associated with the use of energy (electricity, steam, heat or cooling). | We track company and industry data sources to provide actual or estimates of location generated emissions. We use this data to encourage corporates to shift, where possible, to renewable energy sources. |
| | | Scope 3 GHG emissions | 97170.59 | 72240.08 | Scope 3 emissions are those that the organisation is indirectly responsible for, up and down its value chain. For example, emissions made when customers use the products (e.g. cars). Scope 3 emissions are normally much larger than Scopes 1 & 2 | In our engagement with companies we encourage them to consider the wider adverse impacts of their activities and products |
| | | Total GHG emissions | 107458.09 | 81435.00 | The total of scopes 1,2 & 3 emissions. | |
| | 2. Carbon footprint | Carbon footprint | 211.72 | 6420.86 | The investments' total GHG emissions divided by the fund value | |
| | 3. GHG intensity of investee companies | GHG intensity of investee companies | 609.16 | 627.66 | The sum of the investments' GHG emissions per €m of revenues | We seek to avoid the most carbon intensive investments |
| | 4. Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector | Share of investments in companies active in the fossil fuel sector | 4.52% | 4.94% | | For companies that extract or deploy fossil fuels in their operations we analyse whether their strategies are aligned to a decarbonisation transition to net zero by 2050. This would include an evaluation of benchmarking data and interim milestones. We engage with |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | management teams to monitor and evaluate progress. |
| | 5. Share of non-renewable energy consumption and production | Share of non-renewable energy consumption and non-renewable energy production of investee companies from non-renewable energy sources compared to renewable energy sources, expressed as a percentage of total energy sources | 60.78% | 68.98% | | |
| | 6. Energy consumption intensity per high impact climate sector | Energy consumption in GWh per million EUR of revenue of investee companies, per high impact climate sector | A: 0.79 B: 2.07 C: 0.31 D: 0.68 E: 0.71 F: 0.27 G: 0.08 H: 1.18 L: 0.71 | A: 0.31 B: 2.19 C: 0.37 D: 2.08 E: 0.80 F: 0.15 G: 0.09 H: 0.34 L: 1.07 | B: Mining and Quarrying C: Manufacturing D: Electricity, Gas, Steam and Air Conditioning Supply E: Water Supply, Sewerage, Waste Management and Remediation Activities F: Construction G: Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles H: Transportation and Storage L: Real Estate Activities | The Sarasin Sustainability Impact Matrix (SSIM) is a framework that considers the risks posed by our investments to the environment. As an absolute measure it flags entities with high energy intensity which would trigger engagement for the corporate to establishing and pursuing a Net Zero transition strategy. |
| Biodiversity | 7. Activities negatively affecting biodiversity-sensitive areas | Share of investments in investee companies with sites/operations located in or near to biodiversity-sensitive areas where activities of those investee companies negatively affect those areas | 3.85% | 0.01% | | We engage with the entity on both mitigation and adaptation strategies that would seek to reduce their operational impact on bio-diversity. It should be noted that data to measure biodiversity is sparse and as yet, without a common measurement. |
| Water | 8. Emissions to water | Tonnes of emissions to water generated by investee companies per million EUR invested, expressed as a weighted average | 0.00 | 4.39 | We consider the broader water-related impacts of the entity | We engage with the entity on both mitigation and adaptation strategies that would seek to reduce their operational impact on emissions to |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------|--------|---|--|
| | | | | | | water. It should be noted that there is limited disclosure of emissions to water. |
| Waste | 9. Hazardous waste and radioactive waste ratio | Tonnes of hazardous waste and radioactive waste generated by investee companies per million EUR invested, expressed as a weighted average | 0.12 | 0.11 | | In our engagement we encourage entities to adapt processes to reduce waste intensity. |
| INDICATORS FOR SOCIAL AND EMPLOYEE, RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, ANTI-CORRUPTION AND ANTI-BRIBERY MATTERS | | | | | | |
| Social and employee matters | 10. Violations of UN Global Compact principles and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises | Share of investments in investee companies that have been involved in violations of the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises | 0.03% | 0.01% | We screen for red flags in the supply chain, employee and customer rights as well as screening for legal controversies. | Sarasin & Partners are signatories to the Workforce Disclosure Initiative, and the Find it, Fix it, Prevent it Modern Slavery Initiative that collectively work to improve diversity, equity and inclusion [DEI] as well as fair conditions for employees, customers and communities. We engage and use our vote to encourage monitoring, disclosure and improvement in these issues which are encapsulated in the UN Global Compact Principles. |
| | 11. Lack of processes and compliance mechanisms to monitor compliance with UN Global Compact principles and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises | Share of investments in investee companies without policies to monitor compliance with the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises or grievance / complaints handling mechanisms to address violations of the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises | 11.69% | 36.24% | We screen for red flags in the supply chain, employee and customer rights as well as screening for legal controversies. | |
| | 12. Unadjusted gender pay gap | Average unadjusted gender pay gap of investee companies | 12.73% | 0.12 | In developed markets there tend to be strong | We engage and use our voting policy to ensure |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | contractual and legal protections for employees, but this is not always the case (consider the 'gig' economy), particularly in the developing world. We look for unfair employment practices such as zero hours contracts, union bans, poor working conditions etc. and whether the entity references the fundamental conventions of the ILO (International Labour Organization) or is an accredited Living Wage employer | entities to comply with the spirit of the ILO as a minimum; but encourage them to become a best in class leader in equalising pay across gender and race. |
| | 13. Board gender diversity | Average ratio of female to male board members in investee companies, expressed as a percentage of all board members | 35.43% | 0.34 | Different laws, standards and codes around the world regulate board composition however all the directors should have appropriate skills and experience and there should be good diversity. | As part of our internal processes, we red flag any entity where the Board composition fails to achieve a minimum 30% female participation. Where appropriate, we vote and engage to drive change. |
| | 14. Exposure to controversial weapons (anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons and biological weapons) | Share of investments in investee companies involved in the manufacture or selling of controversial weapons | 0.02% | | Controversial weapons are those which are prohibited under applicable international treaties or conventions (such as cluster bombs, anti-personnel mines, chemical or biological weapons) | We deploy an exclusion policy for entities producing weapons which are prohibited under applicable international treaties or conventions. |
| Indicators applicable to investments in sovereigns and supranationals | | | | | | |
| Adverse sustainability indicator | | Metric | Impact [year n] | Impact [year n-1] | Explanation | Actions taken, and actions planned and targets set for the next reference period |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Environmental | 15. GHG intensity | GHG intensity of investee countries | 149.11 | | | |
| Social | 16. Investee countries subject to social violations | Number of investee countries subject to social violations (absolute number and relative number divided by all investee countries), as referred to in international treaties and conventions, United Nations principles and, where applicable, national law | Absolute: 1 Relative: 0% | | | |
| Indicators applicable to investments in real estate assets | | | | | | |
| Adverse sustainability indicator | | Metric | Impact [year n] | Impact [year n-1] | Explanation | Actions taken, and actions planned and targets set for the next reference period |
| Fossil fuels | 17. Exposure to fossil fuels through real estate assets | Share of investments in real estate assets involved in the extraction, storage, transport or manufacture of fossil fuels | | | | |
| Energy efficiency | 18. Exposure to energy-inefficient real estate assets | Share of investments in energy-inefficient real estate assets | | | | |