Robeco Capital Growth Funds - Robeco QI Emerging Markets 3D Active Equities

Annex IV

Periodic disclosure for the financial products referred to in Article 8, paragraphs 1, 2 and 2a, of Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 and Article 6, 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 QI Emerging Markets 3D Active Equities **Legal entity identifier:** 549300CZ8S23ZD8TW786

Environmental and/or social characteristics

Did this financial product have a sustainable investment objective?

☐ Yes	☒ No
☐ It made **sustainable investments with an environmental 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 63.7% of sustainable investments
☐ in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy	☒ with an environmental objective in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy
☐ in economic activities that do not 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 made **sustainable investments with a social objective:** ___%	☐ It promoted E/S characteristics, but **did not make any sustainable investments**

To what extent were the environmental and/or social characteristics promoted by this financial product met?

The sub-fund promotes the following Environmental and Social characteristics:

1. The sub-fund portfolio complied with Robeco's Exclusion Policy Level 2, that is based on exclusion criteria with regards to products and business practices that Robeco believes are detrimental to society. This means that the sub-fund had 0% exposure to excluded securities, taking into account a grace period. This includes any company that is in breach of the ILO standards, UNGPs, UNGC or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. Information with regards to the effects of the exclusions on the Fund's universe can be found at the website.
2. All equity holdings granted the right to vote and Robeco exerted that right by voting according to Robeco's Proxy Voting Policy, unless impediments occured (e.g. share blocking).
3. The sub-fund's weighted water and waste footprints were at least 20% better than that of the General Market Index. The Sub-fund's weighted carbon footprint (scope level 1, 2 and 3 upstream) was 30% better than the General Markets Index.
4. The sub-fund's weighted average ESG score was at least 10% better than that of the General Market Index.
5. Investments with an elevated sustainability risk are defined by Robeco as companies with an ESG Risk Rating of 40 and higher. The sub-fund was limited to a maximum exposure of 5% to investments with an elevated sustainability risk , based on the market weight in the portfolio taking into account regional differences and benchmark. Each investment with an ESG Risk rating of higher than 40 requires separate approval by a dedicated committee of SI specialists, compliance and risk management that oversees the bottom-up sustainability analysis.
6. The sub-fund excluded all high negative SDG scores (-3).

There is no reference benchmark designated for the purpose of attaining the environmental or social characteristics promoted by the sub-fund.

Sustainability indicators measure how the environmental or social characteristics promoted by the 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 Level 2 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. On behalf of the sub-fund votes, were cast on 3225 agenda items at 370 shareholders' meetings.
3. The sub-fund's weighted score for water and waste footprint were respectively 81.97% and 78.68% better than the general market index. The sub-fund's weighted carbon footprint (scope level 1, 2 and 3 upstream) was 42.07% better than that of the General Markets Index.
4. The sub-fund's weighted average ESG score was 19.07 against 21.34 for the general market index. A lower score means a lower risk. against
5. 0.02% of the holdings in portfolio had an elevated sustainability risk profile.
6. 0.00% of the investments (on average) held a high negative SDG score (-3) based on the internally developed SDG framework.

…and compared to previous periods?

Sustainability indicator	2025	2024	2023	2022
Number of votes casted	3225	2761	2631	3,239
Investments with a high or medium negative SDG score (-3 or -2)	2.88%	0.79%	0.00%	0.00%
Holdings with a positive SDG rating	63.71%	53.42%	73.14%	66.59%
Weighted score for:				
- Carbon footprint (% better than the general market index)	42.07%	42.48%	48.46%	53.21%
- Water footprint (% better than the general market index)	81.97%	85.06%	87.62%	90.20%
- Waste footprint (% better than the general market index)	78.68%	-50.64%	28.09%	85.01%
Holdings in violation of the ILO standards, UNGPs, UNGC or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Weighted average ESG Score	19.07	20.34	22.32	22.45
Investments on exclusion list	0.00%	0.00%	0.60%	3.17%

What were the objectives of the sustainable investments that the financial product partially made and how did the sustainable investment contribute to such objectives?

The sustainable investments contributed to the UN Sustainable Development Goals ("SDGs"), that have both social and environmental objectives. These are 17 goals that are globally recognised and include environmental goals such as climate action, clean water, life on land and water and social goals such as zero hunger, gender equality, education, etc. Robeco has developed a proprietary framework based on the UN SDGs through which an issuer's contribution to such SDGs is determined through a 3-step process. This process starts with a sector baseline on which a company's products are analysed to examine contribution to the society and environment. Further, the operational processes involved in creating such products is checked along with any controversies/litigation claims and remediation actions taken which are perused before a final SDG score is determined. The final score ranges between high negative (-3) to high positive (+3) and only those issuers which achieve positive SDG scores (+1, +2 and, +3) are regarded as Sustainable Investments.

How did the sustainable investments that the financial product partially made not cause significant harm to any environmental or social sustainable investment objective?

The sustainable investments did no significant harm to any environmental or social sustainable investment objective by considering a principal adverse impact and aligning with the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. In addition, sustainable investments score positively on Robeco's SDG Framework, and therefore do not cause significant harm.

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?

Mandatory principal adverse impact indicators are considered through Robeco's SDG Framework, either directly or indirectly, when identifying sustainable investments for the Sub-fund. In addition, voluntary environmental and social indicators are taken into account, depending on their relevance for measuring impacts on the SDGs and the availability of data. A detailed description of the incorporation of principal adverse impacts is available via Robeco's Principal Adverse Impact Statement published on the Robeco website. In this statement, Robeco sets out its approach to identifying and prioritizing principal adverse impacts, and how principal adverse impacts are considered as part of Robeco's investment due diligence process and procedures relating to research and analysis, exclusions and restrictions and/or voting and

engagement. This description also explains how principal adverse impact indicators are considered by the SDG Framework.

The following PAIs were considered in the Sub-fund:

PAI 1, table 1 was considered for scope 1, 2 and 3 (upstream) Green House Gas emissions via engagement 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 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 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 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 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 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 Sub-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 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. 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 Sub-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. 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. 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 4, table 2 regarding investments in companies without carbon emission reduction initiatives was considered via engagement. Robeco engages with key high emitters in our investment portfolios via the engagement themes "Acceleration to Paris" and "Net Zero Carbon Emissions".
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 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 both Robeco's Exclusion Policy and Robeco's SDG Framework.

Robeco's Exclusion Policy includes an explanation of how 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 treaties to assess the behavior of companies. Robeco continuously screens its investments for breaches of these principles. In case of a breach, the company will be excluded or engaged with, and is not considered a sustainable investment.

Robeco's SDG Framework screens for breaches on these principles in the final step of the framework. In this step, Robeco checks whether the company concerned has been involved in any controversies. Involvement in any controversy will result in a negative SDG score for the company, meaning it is not a sustainable investment.

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 1.13% of the net assets, compared to 4.21% 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 0.70% 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 1.71% of the net assets, compared to 1.50% 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 0.70% 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 588 tons per EUR million EVIC, compared to 836 tons per EUR million EVIC 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 1.71% of the net assets, compared to 1.50% 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 0.03 tons, compared to 0.05 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 44.04 tons, compared to 261.37 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 122,875 tons, compared to 218,909 tons for the benchmark.
- The carbon footprint of the portfolio (PAI 2, table 1) was 588 tons per EUR million EVIC, compared to 836 tons per EUR million EVIC for the benchmark.
- The green house gas intensity of the portfolio (PAI 3, table 1) was 1,501 tons per EUR million revenue, compared to 2,337 tons per EUR million revenue for the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector (PAI 4, Table 1) was 1.13% of the net assets, compared to 4.21% 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 59.95% of the net assets, compared to 63.05% 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 voor de funds was 66.70% of the net assets, compared to 78.77% of the benchmark.
- The energy consumption per million EUR of revenue of investee companies, per high-impact climate sector (PAI 6, Table 1) was 0.32 GWh, compared to 0.96 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 0.70% 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 2.68%, compared to 1.74% 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 64.18%, compared to 67.88% for the benchmark.
- The average unadjusted gender pay gap of investee companies (PAI 12, Table 1) was 14.53%, compared to 16.59% 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 21.22%, compared to 20.24% 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 206, compared to 561 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 122,875 tons, compared to 218,909 tons for the benchmark.
- The carbon footprint of the portfolio (PAI 2, table 1) was 588 tons per EUR million EVIC, compared to 836 tons per EUR million EVIC for the benchmark.
- The green house gas intensity of the portfolio (PAI 3, table 1) was 1,501 tons per EUR million revenue, compared to 2,337 tons per EUR million revenue for the benchmark.
- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector (PAI 4, Table 1) was 1.13% of the net assets, compared to 4.21% 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 59.95% of the net assets, compared to 63.05% 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 voor de funds was 66.70% of the net assets, compared to 78.77% of the benchmark.
- The energy consumption per million EUR of revenue of investee companies, per high-impact climate sector (PAI 6, Table 1) was 0.32 GWh, compared to 0.96 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 1.71% of the net assets, compared to 1.50% 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 0.03 tons, compared to 0.05 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 44.04 tons, compared to 261.37 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 0.70% 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
Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co Lt	Semiconductors & Semiconductor Equipment	9.31%	Taiwan
Tencent Holdings Ltd	Interactive Media & Services	4.25%	China
Alibaba Group Holding Ltd	Multiline Retail	3.02%	China
Samsung Electronics Co Ltd	Technology Hardware, Storage & Peripherals	2.95%	Korea
SK Hynix Inc	Semiconductors & Semiconductor Equipment	1.66%	Korea
China Construction Bank Corp	Banks	1.21%	China
Xiaomi Corp	Technology Hardware, Storage & Peripherals	1.05%	China
Infosys Ltd ADR	IT Services	1.03%	India
Delta Electronics Inc	Electronic Equipment, Instruments & Components	0.95%	Taiwan
NetEase Inc	Entertainment	0.92%	China
MediaTek Inc	Semiconductors & Semiconductor Equipment	0.84%	Taiwan
Emaar Properties PJSC	Real Estate Management & Development	0.82%	United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.)
KB Financial Group Inc	Banks	0.81%	Korea
Hana Financial Group Inc	Banks	0.79%	Korea
Grupo Financiero Banorte SAB de CV	Banks	0.77%	Mexico

What was the proportion of sustainability-related investments?



Asset allocation describ
share of investments in
assets.

What was the asset allocation?



#1 Aligned with E/S characteristics includes the investments of the financial product used to attain the environmental or social characteristics promoted by the financial product.
#2 Other includes the remaining investments of the financial product which are neither aligned with the environmental or social characteristics, nor are qualified as sustainable investments.

The category **#1 Aligned with E/S characteristics** covers:

- The sub-category **#1A Sustainable** covers environmentally and socially sustainable investments.
- The sub-category **#1B Other E/S characteristics** covers investments aligned with the environmental or social characteristics that 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 -	
Oil, Gas & Consumable Fuels	0.68%
Gas Utilities	0.45%
Other sectors	
Banks	18.10%
Semiconductors & Semiconductor Equipment	13.15%
Technology Hardware, Storage & Peripherals	6.91%
Insurance	5.36%
Multiline Retail	5.34%
Interactive Media & Services	5.21%
Pharmaceuticals	3.52%
IT Services	3.40%
Wireless Telecommunication Services	2.78%
Electronic Equipment, Instruments & Components	2.59%
Automobiles	2.47%
Entertainment	2.06%
Metals & Mining	1.79%
Diversified Telecommunication Services	1.67%
Marine	1.66%
Auto Components	1.60%
Electrical Equipment	1.44%
Machinery	1.35%
Household Durables	1.33%
Real Estate Management & Development	1.27%
Electric Utilities	1.25%
Industrial Conglomerates	1.12%
Hotels, Restaurants & Leisure	1.11%
Transportation Infrastructure	1.00%
Specialty Retail	0.95%
Capital Markets	0.88%
Life Sciences Tools & Services	0.82%
Software	0.79%
Textiles, Apparel & Luxury Goods	0.77%
Air Freight & Logistics	0.66%
Diversified Financial Services	0.59%
Construction Materials	0.58%
Biotechnology	0.56%
Food & Staples Retailing	0.49%
Communications Equipment	0.49%
Construction & Engineering	0.49%
Food Products	0.49%
Chemicals	0.42%
Airlines	0.39%
Health Care Providers & Services	0.34%
Consumer Finance	0.21%
Paper & Forest Products	0.21%
Professional Services	0.17%
Personal Products	0.07%
Beverages	0.06%
Diversified Consumer Services	0.02%
Household Products	0.02%
Water Utilities	0.02%
Not Classified	0.00%
Cash and other instruments	0.91%

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?

0.1%.

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


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.

1. Taxonomy-alignment of investments including sovereign bonds*



2. Taxonomy-alignment of investments excluding sovereign bonds*



This graph represents 100.00% 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 0.14%, measured in percentages of revenues was 0.49%. The percentages taxonomy alignment were 0.00% in previous years.

[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.

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?

3.8%. 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?

59.8%. 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)

What investments were included under "other", 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 meet the environmental and/or social characteristics 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. 22 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 Environmental footprint was more than 40% lower than the reference index.

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

Not applicable.

Reference benchmarks are indexes to measure whether the financial product attains the environmental or social characteristics that they promote.