Robeco Capital Growth Funds - Robeco Climate Global Credits

Annex V

Periodic disclosure for the financial products referred to in Article 9, paragraphs 1 to 4a, of Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 and Article 5, first paragraph, of Regulation (EU) 2020/852

Sustainable investment means an investment in an economic activity that contributes to an environmental or social objective, provided that the investment does not significantly harm any environmental or social objective and that the investee companies follow good governance practices.

The **EU Taxonomy** is a classification system laid down in Regulation (EU) 2020/852, establishing a list of **environmentally sustainable economic activities**. That Regulation does not include a list of socially sustainable economic activities. Sustainable investments with an environmental objective might be aligned with the Taxonomy or not.

Product name: Robeco Climate Global Credits **Legal entity identifier:** 213800LB657HDJBI4637

Sustainable investment objective

Did this financial product have a sustainable investment objective?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

- [x] It made **sustainable investments with an environmental objective:**80.1%
  - [ ] in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy
  - [x] in economic activities that do not qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy
  - [ ] with an environmental objective in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy
  - [ ] with an environmental objective in economic activities that do not qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy
  - [ ] with a social objective
- [ ] It promoted Environmental/Social (E/S) characteristics and while it did not have as its objective a sustainable investment, it had a proportion of ___% of sustainable investments
- [x] It made **sustainable investments with a social objective:** 9.0%
- [ ] It promoted E/S characteristics, but **did not make any sustainable investments**

To what extent was the sustainable investment objective of this financial product met?

The sustainable investments of the Sub-fund aim to reduce the carbon footprint of the portfolio and thereby contribute towards the goals of the Paris Agreement to keep the maximum global temperature rise well-below 2°C. The sub-fund's weighted carbon footprint (scope level 1, 2 and 3) was 7.38% better than that of the Solactive Paris Aligned Global Corporate Index.

The Sub-fund also promotes investment in green, social and/or sustainability bonds used to finance environmental and social projects. The sub-fund invested 19.89% of its assets In green, social, sustainable and/or sustainability-linked bonds.

Sustainability indicators measure how the sustainable objectives of this financial product are attained

How did the sustainability indicators perform?

The sustainability indicators used to measure the attainment of each of the environmental or social characteristics promoted by this financial product performed as follows. All values are based on average positions and latest available data as at 31/12/2025.

1. The portfolio contained on average 0.00% investments that are on the Exclusion list as result of the application of the applicable exclusion policy. Unless sanctions stipulate specific timelines, exclusions apply within three months after the announcement. If selling is not possible for liquidity reasons, then buying is not allowed. Once selling is possible at a reasonable price, holdings will be sold.
2. The sub-fund's weighted carbon footprint (scope level 1, 2 and 3) was 7.38% better than that of the Solactive Paris Aligned Global Corporate Index.
3. The portfolio contained on average 0.00% investments that are excluded as result of the application of the exclusion criteria as referred to in Article 12(1)(a) to (g) of the Regulation on EU Climate Benchmarks.
4. The sub-fund invested 19.89% of its assets In green, social, sustainable and/or sustainability-linked bonds.

…and compared to previous periods?

Sustainability indicator	2025	2024	2023	2022
Investments in green, social, sustainable and/or sustainability-linked bonds	19.89%	21.74%	15.91%	12.71%
Investments on exclusion list	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.42%
Investments excluded as a result ot the appication of the Regulation on EU Climate Benchmarks.	0.00%			
Weighted score for: - Carbon footprint as % better than the Solactive Paris Aligned Global Corporate Index	7.38%	13.66%	39.74%	23.85%

How did the sustainable investments not cause significant harm to any sustainable investment objective?

The sustainable investments did no significant harm to any environmental or social sustainable investment objective by applying Robeco's ESG bond eligibility frameworks in the selection process. Robeco's ESG bond eligibility frameworks require that international norms related to social and governance issues are met. Under the frameworks, ESG bond investments are assessed on (i) social safeguards – the issuer respects international Human and Labor Rights, (ii) controversial behavior – the issuer is not in violation of the UN Global Compact, and (iii) sanctions – the issuer is not subject to international sanctions.

To identify whether an issuer is involved in a controversy, ratings and data from external providers are used to aid our in-house monitoring. If a controversy is found, the analyst determines whether this has material impacts on the ESG bond analysis and/or the SDG score. If the controversy is deemed material, the issuer receives a negative SDG Score and the investment is not sustainable.

Principal adverse impacts are the most significant negative impacts of investment decisions on sustainability factors relating to environmental, social and employee matters, respect for human rights, anti-corruption and anti-bribery matters.

How were the indicators for adverse impacts on sustainability factors taken into account?

Sustainable investments can be constituents of Paris-Aligned Benchmark.

PAI 1, table 1 was considered for scope 1, 2 and 3 (upstream) Green House Gas emissions via engagement, proxy voting and exclusions. Robeco's Exclusion policy covers the exclusion of activities with highly negative climate impacts (e.g. thermal coal (≥ 20% of the revenues), oil sands (≥ 10% of the revenues) and artic drilling (≥ 5% of the revenues)).
PAI 2, table 1 was considered for the carbon footprint via engagement, proxy voting and exclusions. Robeco's Exclusion policy covers the exclusion of activities with highly negative climate impacts (e.g. thermal coal (≥ 20% of the revenues), oil sands (≥ 10% of the revenues) and artic drilling (≥ 5% of the revenues)).
PAI 3, table 1 was considered for the Green House Gas intensity of investee companies via engagement, proxy voting and exclusions. Robeco's Exclusion policy covers the exclusion of activities with highly negative climate impacts (e.g. thermal coal (≥ 20% of the revenues), oil sands (≥ 10% of the revenues) and artic drilling (≥ 5% of the revenues)).
PAI 4, table 1 regarding the exposure to companies in the fossil fuel sector was considered via engagement, proxy voting and exclusions. Robeco's Exclusion policy covers the exclusion of activities with highly negative climate impacts (e.g. thermal coal (≥ 20% of the revenues), oil sands (≥ 10% of the revenues) and artic drilling (≥ 5% of the revenues)).
PAI 5, table 1 regarding the share of energy consomption from non-renewable sources was considered via engagement, proxy voting and exclusions. Robeco is committed to contribute to the goals of the Paris Agreement and to achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2050. The portfolio decarbonization targets are derived from the P2 pathway from the IPCC 1.5-degree scenario of 2018. The P2 pathway is composed of the following emission milestones: 49% reduction of GHG emissions in 2030 and -89% reduction of GHG emissions in 2050, both relative to 2010 baseline.
PAI 6, table 1 regarding Energy comsumption per High Impact Climate sector was considered via engagement, proxy voting and exclusions. Robeco's Exclusion policy covers the exclusion of activities with highly negative climate impacts (e.g. thermal coal (Coal power expansion plans ≥ 300 MW)).
PAI 7, table 1 regarding activities negatively affecting biodiversity sensitive areas was considered via engagement. Robeco is developing methods to evaluate the materiality of biodiversity for our portfolios, and the impact of our portfolios on biodiversity. Based on such methods Robeco will set quantified targets in order to combat biodiversity loss, latest by 2024.
For relevant sectors, biodiversity impact is considered in fundamental SI research analysis. Robeco is developing a framework to consider this across all investments.
Robeco's Exclusion policy covers the exclusion of palm oil producers in which a minimum percentage of RSPO certified hectates of land at plantations as detailed in Robeco's exclusion policy.
PAI 8, table 1 regarding Water emissions was considered via engagement. Within Robeco's Controversial Behavior program, companies are screened on a potential violation in relation to water. When Robeco deems a company to cause significant negative impact on local water supply or waste issues which is a breach of UN Global Compact principle 7, it will either apply enhanced engagement or directly exclude the company from the universe.
PAI 9, table 1 regarding hazardous waste and radioactive waste ratio was considered via engagement. In

addition, within Robeco's Controversial Behavior program, companies are screened on a potential violation in relation to waste. When Robeco deems a company to cause significant negative impact on local water supply or waste issues which is a breach of UN Global Compact principle 7, it will either apply enhanced engagement or directly exclude the company from the universe.
PAI 10, table 1 regarding violations of UN Global Compact principles and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises was considered via engagement, proxy voting and exclusions. Robeco acts in accordance with the International Labor Organization (ILO) standards, United Nations Guiding Principles (UNGPs), United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) Principles and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and is guided by these international standards to assess the behavior of companies. In order to mitigate severe breaches, an enhanced engagement process is applied where Robeco deems a severe breach of these principles and guidelines has occured. If this enhanced engagement, which may last up to a period of three years, does not lead to the desired change, Robeco will exclude a company from its investment universe.
PAI 11, table 1 regarding lack of processes and compliance mechanisms to monitor compliance with UN Global Compact principles and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises was considered via engagement and proxy voting. Robeco supports the human rights principles described in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and detailed in the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGP), the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the eight fundamental International Labour Organization (ILO) conventions. Our commitment to these principles means Robeco will expect companies to formally commit to respect human rights, have in place human rights due diligence processes, and, where appropriate, ensure that victims of human rights abuses have access to remedy.
PAI 12, table 1 regarding unadjusted gender pay-gap was considered via engagement and proxy voting. In 2022, Robeco launched an engagement program on diversity and inclusion, which will include elements in relation to the gender pay gap. Overall, gender pay gap disclosures are only mandatory in few jurisdictions (e.g. UK, California). Companies are encouraged to improve such disclosures.
PAI 13, table 1 regarding board gender diversity was considered via engagement and proxy vorting. In 2022, Robeco launched an engagement program on diversity and inclusion, which will include elements in relation to equal pay.
PAI 14, table 1 regarding exposure to contraversial weapons was considered via exclusions. For all strategies Robeco deems anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical, biological weapons, white phosphorus, depleted uranium weapons and nuclear weapons that are tailor made and essential, to be controversial weapons. Exclusion is applied to companies that are manufacturers of certain products that do not comply with the following treaties or legal bans on controversial weapons:1. The Ottawa Treaty (1997) which prohibits the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines.2. The Convention on Cluster Munitions (2008) which prohibits the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of cluster munitions.3. The Chemical Weapons Convention (1997) which prohibits the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of chemical weapons. 4. Biological Weapons Convention (1975) which prohibits the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of biological weapons.5. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1968) which limits the spread of nuclear weapons to the group of so-called Nuclear Weapons States (USA, Russia, UK, France and China). 6. The Dutch act on Financial Supervision 'Besluit marktmisbruik' art. 21 a. 7. The Belgian Loi Mahoux, the ban on uranium weapons. 8. Council Regulation (EU) 2018/1542 of 15 October 2018 concerning restrictive measures against the proliferation and use of chemical weapons.
PAI 5, table 3 regarding the share of investments in investee companies without any grievance or complaints handling mechanism was considered.
PAI 8, table 3 regarding exessive CEO pay ratio was considered via proxy voting and engagement under the engagement program "Responsible Executive Remuneration".

Were sustainable investments aligned with the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights? Details:

The sustainable investments were aligned with the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights via Robeco's Exclusion Policy, Robeco's SDG Framework, and the methodology of the benchmark provider.

The EU Taxonomy sets out a "do not significant harm" principle by which Taxonomy-aligned investments should not significantly harm EU Taxonomy objectives and is accompanied by specific Union criteria.

The "do no significant harm" principle applies only to those investments underlying the financial product that take into account the EU criteria for environmentally sustainable economic activities. The investments underlying the remaining portion of this financial product do not take into account the EU criteria for environmentally sustainable economic activities.

Any other sustainable investments must also not significantly harm any environmental or social objectives.



How did this financial product consider principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors?

The sub-fund considered principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors as referred to in Annex I of the SFDR Delegated Act.

Pre-investment, the following principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors were considered:

o Via the applied normative and activity-based exclusions, the following PAIs were considered:
- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector (PAI 4, Table 1) was 0.54% of the net assets, compared to 0.07% of the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies in violations of the UN Global Compact Principles and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 10, Table 1) was 0.00% of the net assets, compared to 0.00% of the benchmark.
- The share of investments in investee companies with sites/operations located in or near biodiversity sensitive areas where activities of those investee companies negatively affect those areas (PAI 7, Table 1) was 0.95% of the net assets, compared to 1.54% of the benchmark.
- Exposure to controversial weapons (anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons (PAI 14, Table 1) was 0.00% of the net assets, compared to 0.00% of the benchmark.

o Via the environmental footprint performance targets of the sub-fund, the following PAIs were considered:
- The carbon footprint of the portfolio (PAI 2, table 1) was 129 tons per EUR million EVIC, compared to 160 tons per EUR million EVIC for the Paris-Aligned Benchmark.
- The emissions to water generated by investee companies per million EUR invested, expressed as a weighted average (PAI 8, Table 1) were 0.01 tons, compared to 0.13 tons of the benchmark.
- The generation of hazardous waste and radioactive waste generated by investee companies per million EUR invested, expressed as a weighted average were 18.53 tons, compared to 31.73 tons of the benchmark.

Post-investment, the following principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors are taken into account:

o Via the application of the voting policy, the following PAIs were considered:
- The greenhouse gas emissions (PAI 1, table 1) of the portfolio were 61,991 tons, compared to 77,758 tons for the benchmark.
- The carbon footprint of the portfolio (PAI 2, table 1) was 129 tons per EUR million EVIC, compared to 160 tons per EUR million EVIC for the benchmark.
- The green house gas intensity of the portfolio (PAI 3, table 1) was 672 tons per EUR million revenue, compared to 732 tons per EUR million revenue for the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector (PAI 4, Table 1) was 0.54% of the net assets, compared to 0.07% of the benchmark.
- The share of non-renewable energy consumption of investee companies from non-renewable energy sources compared to renewable energy sources (PAI 5, Table 1), expressed as a percentage of total energy sources was 51.47% of the net assets, compared to 56.19% of the benchmark.
- The share of non-renewable energy production of investee companies from non-renewable energy sources compared to renewable energy sources (PAI 5, Table 1), expressed as a percentage of total energy sources for the sub-fund was 37.69% of the net assets, compared to 38.24% of the benchmark.
- The energy consumption per million EUR of revenue of investee companies, per high-impact climate sector (PAI 6, Table 1) was 0.34 GWh, compared to 0.27 GWh for the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies in violations of the UN Global Compact Principles and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 10, Table 1) was 0.00% of the net assets, compared to 0.00% of the benchmark.
- The share of investments in investee companies without policies to monitor compliance with the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 11, Table 1) was 0.68%, compared to 0.67% for the benchmark.
- The share of investments in investee companies without grievance / complaints handling mechanisms to address violations of the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 11, Table 1) was 41.00%, compared to 54.03% for the benchmark.
- The average unadjusted gender pay gap of investee companies (PAI 12, Table 1) was 15.22%, compared to 13.79% for the benchmark.
- The average ratio of female to male board members in investee companies expressed as a percentage of all board members (PAI 13, Table 1) was 38.71%, compared to 37.91% for the benchmark.
- Indicators in relation to social and employee matters (PAI 5-7, Table 3).
- The average ratio within investee companies of the annual total compensation for the highest compensated individual to the median annual total compensation for all employees (excluding the highest compensated individual) (PAI 8, Table 3) was 303, compared to 256 for the benchmark.

o Via Robeco's entity engagement program, the following PAIs were considered:
- The greenhouse gas emissions (PAI 1, table 1) of the portfolio were 61,991 tons, compared to 77,758 tons for the benchmark.
- The carbon footprint of the portfolio (PAI 2, table 1) was 129 tons per EUR million EVIC, compared to 160 tons per EUR million EVIC for the benchmark.
- The green house gas intensity of the portfolio (PAI 3, table 1) was 672 tons per EUR million revenue, compared to 732 tons per EUR million revenue for the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector (PAI 4, Table 1) was 0.54% of the net assets, compared to 0.07% of the benchmark.
- The share of non-renewable energy consumption of investee companies from non-renewable energy sources compared to renewable energy sources (PAI 5, Table 1), expressed as a percentage of total energy sources was 51.47% of the net assets, compared to 56.19% of the benchmark.
- The share of non-renewable energy production of investee companies from non-renewable energy sources compared to renewable energy sources (PAI 5, Table 1), expressed as a percentage of total energy sources for the sub-fund was 37.69% of the net assets, compared to 38.24% of the benchmark.

- The energy consumption per million EUR of revenue of investee companies, per high-impact climate sector (PAI 6, Table 1) was 0.34 GWh, compared to 0.27 GWh for the benchmark.
- The share of investments in investee companies with sites/operations located in or near biodiversity sensitive areas where activities of those investee companies negatively affect those areas (PAI 7, Table 1) was 0.95% of the net assets, compared to 1.54% of the benchmark.
- The emissions to water generated by investee companies per million EUR invested, expressed as a weighted average (PAI 8, Table 1) were 0.01 tons, compared to 0.13 tons of the benchmark.
- The generation of hazardous waste and radioactive waste generated by investee companies per million EUR invested, expressed as a weighted average were 18.53 tons, compared to 31.73 tons of the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies in violations of the UN Global Compact Principles and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 10, Table 1) was 0.00% of the net assets, compared to 0.00% of the benchmark.
- The share of investments in investee companies without policies to monitor compliance with the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 11, Table 1) was 0.68%, compared to 0.67% for the benchmark.
- The share of investments in investee companies without grievance / complaints handling mechanisms to address violations of the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 11, Table 1) was 41.00%, compared to 54.03% for the benchmark.
- The average unadjusted gender pay gap of investee companies (PAI 12, Table 1) was 15.22%, compared to 13.79% for the benchmark.
- The average ratio of female to male board members in investee companies expressed as a percentage of all board members (PAI 13, Table 1) was 38.71%, compared to 37.91% for the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies in violations of the UN Global Compact Principles and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (PAI 10, Table 1) was 0.00% of the net assets, compared to 0.00% of the benchmark.
- The share of investments in investee companies with sites/operations located in or near biodiversity sensitive areas where activities of those investee companies negatively affect those areas (PAI 7, Table 1) was 0.95% of the net assets, compared to 1.54% of the benchmark.
- In addition, based on a yearly review of Robeco's performance on all mandatory and selected voluntary indicators, holdings of the Sub-fund that cause adverse impact might be selected for engagement.

More information is available via Robeco's Principal Adverse Impact Statement, published on Robeco's website.

What were the top investments of this financial product?


The list includes the investments constituting **the greatest proportion of investments** of the financial product during the reference period which is: 1 January 2025 through 31 December 2025

Largest Investments	Sector	% Assets	Country
United States Treasury Note/Bond	TREASURIES	2.45%	United States
Goldman Sachs Group Inc/The	BANKING	1.93%	United States
Morgan Stanley	BANKING	1.87%	United States
NatWest Group PLC	BANKING	1.81%	United Kingdom
Bank of America Corp	BANKING	1.72%	United States
Pfizer Investment Enterprises Pte Ltd	CONSUMER_NON_CYCLICAL	1.68%	United States
Deutsche Bank AG	BANKING	1.67%	Germany
Apple Inc	TECHNOLOGY	1.65%	United States
Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc	CONSUMER_NON_CYCLICAL	1.63%	United States
ING Groep NV	BANKING	1.59%	Netherlands
HSBC Holdings PLC	BANKING	1.52%	United Kingdom
Visa Inc	TECHNOLOGY	1.33%	United States
Volkswagen International Finance NV	CONSUMER_CYCLICAL	1.31%	Germany
Southern California Edison Co	ELECTRIC	1.27%	United States
Citibank NA	BANKING	1.21%	United States

What was the proportion of sustainability-related investments?

What was the asset allocation?

Asset allocation describes the share of investments in specific assets.



#1 Sustainable covers sustainable investments with environmental or social objectives.

#2 Not sustainable includes investments which do not qualify as sustainable investments

In which economic sectors were the investments made?

Sector	Average exposure in % over the reporting period
Sectors deriving revenues from exploration, mining, extraction, production, processing, storage, refining or distribution, including transportation, storage and trade, of fossil fuels -	
NATURAL_GAS	0.24%
Other sectors	
BANKING	31.32%
CONSUMER_NON_CYCLICAL	13.82%
COMMUNICATIONS	8.83%
TECHNOLOGY	8.55%
ELECTRIC	6.89%
INSURANCE	4.70%
CONSUMER_CYCLICAL	3.85%
MORTGAGE_ASSETS	3.80%
OWNED_NO_GUARANTEE	3.32%
TREASURIES	3.05%
FINANCIAL_OTHER	2.56%
REITS	1.55%
LOCAL_AUTHORITIES	1.20%
GOVERNMENT_GUARANTEE	0.89%
BASIC_INDUSTRY	0.42%
TRANSPORTATION	0.31%
UTILITY_OTHER	0.12%
BROKERAGE_ASSETMANAGERS_EXCHANGES	0.09%
CAPITAL_GOODS	0.08%
FINANCE_COMPANIES	0.04%
Not Classified	1.31%
Cash and other instruments	3.06%

To comply with the EU Taxonomy, the criteria for **fossil gas** include limitations on emissions and switching to fully renewable power or low-carbon fuels by the end of 2035. For **nuclear energy**, the criteria include comprehensive safety and waste management rules.

Enabling activities directly enable other activities to make a substantial contribution to an environmental objective. **Transitional activities are** economic activities for which low-carbon alternatives are not yet available and that have greenhouse gas emission levels corresponding to the best performance.

To what extent were the sustainable investments with an environmental objective aligned with the EU Taxonomy?

4.9%.

Did the financial product invest in fossil gas and/or nuclear energy related activities complying with the EU Taxonomy?[1]

☐ Yes


☐ In fossil gas ☐ In nuclear energy


☒ No

[1] Fossil gas and/or nuclear related activities will only comply with the EU Taxonomy where they contribute to limiting climate change ("climate change mitigation") and do not significantly harm any EU Taxonomy objective – see explanatory note in the left hand margin. The full criteria for fossil gas and nuclear energy economic activities that comply with the EU Taxonomy are laid down in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1214.

Taxonomy-aligned activities are expressed as a share of:
- **turnover** reflecting the share of revenue from green activities of investee companies.
- **capital expenditure** (Capex) showing the green investments made by investee companies, e.g. for a transition to a green economy.
- **operational expenditure** (Opex) reflecting green operational activities of investee companies.

The graphs below show in green the percentage of investments that were aligned with the EU Taxonomy. As there is no appropriate methodology to determine the taxonomy-alignment of sovereign bonds*, the first graph shows the Taxonomy alignment in relation to all the investments of the financial product including sovereign bonds, while the second graph shows the Taxonomy alignment only in relation to the investments of the financial product other than sovereign bonds.





This graph represents 96.95% of the total investment.

*For the purpose of these graphs, 'sovereign bonds' consist of all sovereign exposures

What was the share of investments made in transitional and enabling activities?

0.0%.

How did the percentage of investments that were aligned with the EU Taxonomy compare with previous reference periods?

The percentage Taxonomy Alignment measured in percentage of CAPEX was 4.91%, measured in percentages of revenues was 3.24%.

are sustainable investments with an environmental objective that **do not take into account the criteria** for environmentally sustainable economic activities under Regulation (EU) 2020/852.

What was the share of sustainable investments with an environmental objective not aligned with the EU Taxonomy?

75.2%. This concerns investments with a positive score on one of more of the following SDG's, without harming other SDG's: SDG 12 (responsible consumption and prodcution), 13 (climate action), 14 (life below water) or 15 (life on land).

What was the share of socially sustainable investments?

9.0%. This concerns investments with a positive score on one of more of the following SDGs, without harming other SDGs: SDG 1 (No poverty), 2 (zero hunger), 3 (good health and well-being), 4 (quality education), 5 (gender equality), 6 (clean water and sanitation), 7 (affordable and clean energy), 8 (decent work and economic growth), 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure), 10 (reduced inequalities), 11 (sustainable cities and communities), 16 (peace justice and strong insttutions) or 17 (partnerships for the goals).

What investments were included under "not sustainable", what was their purpose and were there any minimum environmental or social safeguards?

The use of cash, cash equivalents and derivatives is included under "not sustainable". The mandate may make use of derivatives for hedging, liquidity and efficient portfolio management as well as investment purposes (in line with the investment policy). Any derivatives in the mandate were not used to attain environmental or social characteristics promoted by the financial product.

What actions have been taken to attain the sustainable investment objective during the reference period?

During the reporting period, the overall sustainability profile of the mandate was improved further by focusing on material information with regards to Environmental, Social and Governance factors. 20 holdings were under active engagement either within Robeco's thematic engagement programs or under more company-specific engagement topics related to Environmental, Social and/or Governance issues. The Carbon profile was lower than that of the reference index. In addition, 19.89% of the assets was invested in green, social. sustainable and/or sustainability linked bonds.

How did this financial product perform compared to the reference benchmark?

How does the reference benchmark differ from a broad market index?

The benchmark differs from a broad general market index in that the latter does not take into account in its methodology any criteria for alignment with the Paris Agreement on greenhouse gas emission reduction and related exclusions.

Reference benchmarks are indexes to measure whether the financial product attains the sustainable objective.

How did this financial product perform with regard to the sustainability indicators to determine the alignment of the reference benchmark with the sustainable investment objective?

The sub-fund's weighted carbon footprint (scope level 1, 2 and 3) was 7.38% better than that of the Solactive Paris Aligned Global Corporate Index.

How did this financial product perform compared with the reference benchmark?

	Greenhouse gas emissions (t CO2-eq/mUSD)	Green Bonds
Robeco Climate Global Credits	258.13	19.9%
Solactive Paris Aligned Global Corporate Index.	277.18	7.8%

How did this financial product perform compared with the broad market index?

	Greenhouse gas emissions (t CO2-eq/mUSD)	Green Bonds
Robeco Climate Global Credits	258.13	19.9%
General Market Index.	885.47	6.6%