Overview

DATE OF HOLDINGS 30 SEP 2025 AMOUNT INVESTED 99,555,167 USD PORTFOLIO TYPE EQUITY NO. OF HOLDINGS 65 TOTAL COVERAGE 99.56%

BENCHMARK USED MSCI World Small BENCHMARK COVERAGE 95.13% ATTRIBUTION FACTOR Market Cap

Carbon Metrics 1 of 3

Portfolio Overview

	Disclosure Number/Weight	Emission Exposure tCO_2e		Relative Emission Exposure tCO_2e/Invested	tCO_2e/Revenue		Climate Performance Weighted Avg
	Share of Disclosing Holdings	Scope 1 & 2	Incl. Scope 3	Relative Carbon Footprint	Carbon Intensity	Weighted Avg Carbon Intensity	Carbon Risk Rating[1]
Portfolio	69.2% / 67.6%	8,535	87,635	85.73	120.56	132.31	46
Benchmark	66% / 70.1%	12,869	125,731	129.27	153.39	134.68	46
Net Performance	3.3 p.p. /-2.5 p.p.	33.7%	30.3%	33.7%	21.4%	1.8%	–

Emission Exposure Analysis





[1] Note: Carbon Risk Rating data is current as of the date of report generation.
[2] Emissions contributions for all other portfolio sectors is less than 1% for each sector.

Emission Exposure Analysis (continued)

Top 10 Contributors to Portfolio Emissions

Issuer Name	Contribution to Portfolio Emission Exposure (%)	Portfolio Weight (%)	Emissions Reporting Quality	Carbon Risk Rating
Alcoa Corporation	43.55%	1.56%	Strong	Medium Performer
Eagle Materials Inc.	9.85%	1.19%	Non-Reporting	Medium Performer
Melia Hotels International SA	7.65%	3.51%	Strong	Outperformer
Billerud AB	4.95%	1.09%	Moderate	Outperformer
Diodes Incorporated	3.15%	1.58%	Moderate	Medium Performer
Daiei Kankyo Co. Ltd.	2.88%	2.05%	Moderate	-
Aurubis AG	2.43%	0.96%	Strong	Outperformer
Casella Waste Systems, Inc.	2.09%	1.80%	Strong	Outperformer
ATN International, Inc.	1.90%	0.78%	Non-Reporting	Medium Performer
Advantage Energy Ltd.	1.82%	0.64%	Strong	Laggard
Total for Top 10	**80.26%**	**15.18%**		

Carbon Metrics 2 of 3

Emission Attribution Analysis

Emission Attribution Analysis examines the extent to which higher or lower GHG exposure between the portfolio and the benchmark can be attributed to sector allocation versus issuer selection. A portfolio with a larger amount of assets allocated to an emissions-intense sector will ultimately have higher GHG emissions exposure. However, this can be offset by the selection of less emissions-intense issuers from that sector. This analysis relates to the carbon footprint of the portfolio, specifically the Emissions Scope 1 & 2 (tCO_2e) and Relative Carbon Footprint (tCO_2e/Mio Invested) metrics.

The subsequent table identifies the most emissions-intense issuers in the analysis, the comparative weight for each issuer between the portfolio and benchmark, as well as the sector allocation and issuer selection effects. A positive (green) number represents less greenhouse gas exposure for the issuer in the portfolio relative to the benchmark.

Top Sectors to Emission Attribution Exposure vs.Benchmark

Sector	Portfolio Weight	Benchmark Weight	Difference	Sector Allocation Effect	Issuer Selection Effect
Communication Services	2.37%	4.19%	-1.82%	0.21%	-1.04%
Consumer Discretionary	11.93%	12.78%	-0.85%	0.27%	-2.05%
Consumer Staples	7.23%	4.9%	2.34%	-2.24%	5.16%
Energy	2.31%	4.07%	-1.76%	4.61%	3.61%
Financials	14.27%	15.26%	-0.99%	0.02%	0.19%
Health Care	13.18%	8.64%	4.54%	-0.42%	-0.54%
Industrials	22.73%	20.66%	2.07%	-1.71%	10.89%
Information Technology	9.83%	11.52%	-1.69%	0.16%	-1.92%
Materials	5.95%	7.4%	-1.45%	6.31%	-14.72%
Real Estate	7%	7.79%	-0.79%	0.07%	-0.2%
Utilities	3.18%	2.77%	0.41%	-4.14%	31.15%
Other	0%	0.02%	-0.02%	0%	0%
Cumulative Higher (-) and Lower (+) Emission Exposure vs. Benchmark				**3.14%**	**30.54%**
Higher (-) / Lower (+) Net Emission Exposure vs. Benchmark				**34%**	

Emission Attribution Analysis (continued)

Highest Emission-Intense Issuers in Combined Portfolio & Benchmark Universe

Issuer Name	Sector	Emissions Intensity Scope 1 & 2 (tCO_2e/Mio Mcap or AEV)	Carbon Risk Rating	Portfolio Under (-) / Overexposure (+)
1. Electric Power Development Co., Ltd.	Utilities	12,975.48	Laggard	-0.03%
2. Algoma Steel Group Inc.	Materials	11,376.18	Medium Performer	0%
3. Hokuriku Electric Power Co.	Utilities	10,944.17	Medium Performer	-0.01%
4. Tohoku Electric Power Co., Inc.	Utilities	9,233.45	Medium Performer	-0.03%
5. Sumitomo Osaka Cement Co., Ltd.	Materials	8,828.76	Medium Performer	-0.01%
6. AGL Energy Limited	Utilities	8,418.06	Laggard	-0.04%
7. Tokyo Electric Power Co. Holdings, Inc.	Utilities	8,360.82	Medium Performer	-0.07%
8. The Chugoku Electric Power Co., Inc.	Utilities	8,181.2	Laggard	-0.02%
9. Hokkaido Electric Power Co., Inc.	Utilities	7,319	Laggard	-0.01%
10. Air France-KLM SA	Industrials	7,100.22	Medium Performer	-0.03%

Carbon Metrics 3 of 3

Greenhouse Gas Emission Intensity

Weighted Avg Greenhouse Gas Intensity Sector Contribution

tCO_2e/ Mio USD Revenue

Top 10 Emission Intense Companies (tCO_2e Scope 1 & 2/Revenue Millions)

Issuer Name	Emission Intensity	Peer Group Avg Intensity
1. Eagle Materials Inc.	2,375.27	5,862.16
2. Alcoa Corporation	1,899.84	1,286.96
3. Advantage Energy Ltd.	885.62	833.85
4. Daiei Kankyo Co. Ltd.	538.98	585.36
5. Casella Waste Systems, Inc.	473.27	585.36
6. Boardwalk Real Estate Investment Trust	325.41	56.14
7. Gulfport Energy Corporation	262.78	833.85
8. Diodes Incorporated	253.87	169.90
9. Ormat Technologies, Inc.	238.37	240.16
10. Billerud AB	221.19	793.76

Climate Scenario Alignment 1 of 2

Alignment Analysis

The scenario alignment analysis compares current and future portfolio greenhouse gas emissions with the carbon budgets for the IEA Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS), Announced Pledges Scenario (APS), and Stated Policies Scenario (STEPS). Performance is shown as the percentage of assigned budget used by the portfolio and benchmark.

The CCL Global Alpha Fund strategy in its current state is MISALIGNED with a SDS scenario by 2050. The CCL Global Alpha Fund has a potential temperature increase of 2.8°C, whereas the MSCI World Small has a potential temperature increase of 2.5°C.

Portfolio and Benchmark Comparison to SDS Budget (Red = Overshoot)

	2025	2030	2040	2050
Portfolio	+26.41%	+34.76%	+118.64%	+296.32%
Benchmark	-15.29%	-7.88%	+53.78%	+196.07%

2025 The portfolio exceeds its SDS budget in 2025.

2.8°C The portfolio is associated with a potential temperature increase of 2.8°C by 2050.

Portfolio Emission Pathway vs. Climate Scenarios Budgets



Climate Targets Assessment (% Portfolio Weight)

In order to transition, holdings need to commit to alignment with international climate goals and demonstrate future progress. Currently 38% of the portfolio's value is committed to such a goal. This includes ambitious targets set by the companies as well as committed and approved Science Based Targets (SBT). While commitments are not a guarantee to reach a goal, the 48% of the portfolio without a goal is unlikely to transition and should receive special attention from a climate risk conscious investor.



Climate Scenario Alignment 2 of 2

The table below shows the percent of the SDS budget used in 2025, 2030, and 2050 for key sub-sectors of the portfolio.

Sub-sector SDS Budget Overshoot



Percent of Allocated Budget vs. Percent of Total Budget Used

The budget allocated to the portfolio is dependent on the portfolio holdings. The graphs below compare the percent of the portfolio's SDS budget allocated to a defined sub-sector compared to the percent of the portfolio's budget used within the same sub-sector for the years 2025 and 2050.

Pct. of Allocated Budget vs Pct. of Total Budget Used 2025



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



Percent of Holdings SDS Aligned in 2025, 2030, and 2050



Net Zero Analysis 1 of 2

This report evaluates the portfolio’s readiness to transition to a Net Zero by 2050 pathway through the analysis of data disclosure and target-setting; emissions trajectory and Net Zero alignment; and exposure to fossil fuels.

Material GHG Disclosure (%)



Net Zero Alignment (%)



Fossil Fuel Expansion (%)



Reserves Potential Emissions ($GtCO_2e$)



Emissions Overview

The International Energy Agency’s Net Zero Emission by 2050 (NZE2050) scenario provides a framework for analyzing current and future alignment with NZ emissions objectives. Using current-year and forecasted emissions metrics for relative carbon footprint, weighted average carbon intensity, and absolute emissions, the tables below estimate the needed minimum change in emissions performance to achieve NZ trajectory alignment.

	Relative Carbon Footprint Scope 1				Relative Carbon Footprint Scope 2				Relative Carbon Footprint Scope 3			
	2025	2025	2030	2050	2025	2025	2030	2050	2025	2025	2030	2050
Portfolio	**60.61**	63.11	73.19	142.35	**25.12**	26.35	30.18	60.29	**794.54**	652.82	723.44	1.34 k
NZE Trajectory	-	50.47	37.79	0	-	20.92	15.66	0	-	661.61	495.44	0
Benchmark	**109.28**	116.01	136.34	276.16	**19.99**	20.79	23.49	47.01	**1.13 k**	1.18 k	1.32 k	2.39 k

	Weighted Average Carbon Intensity (Scope 1, 2 & 3)				Absolute Emissions (Scope 1, 2 & 3)			
	2025	2025	2030	2050	2025	2025	2030	2050
Portfolio	**2.13 k**	1.58 k	1.75 k	3.27 k	**87.64 k**	73.9 k	82.31 k	153.33 k
NZE Trajectory	-	1.77 k	1.33 k	0	-	72.97 k	54.65 k	0
Benchmark	**1.97 k**	2.05 k	2.33 k	4.53 k	**125.73 k**	130.78 k	146.89 k	270.24 k

Climate Net Zero Targets

Net Zero targets provide an important indicator of climate awareness and action. Given the current state of disclosure, government policy, and technology, it is impossible to define any entity as “Aligned”. An issuer is “Committed to Aligning” if it has set a NZ target for 2050 and “Aligning” if it has a decarbonization strategy and, additionally, set an interim target. An issuer with no targets is considered “Not Aligned”.

Target Alignment Status



Alignment per High Impact Sector



Net Zero Analysis 2 of 2

When assessing overall alignment with Net Zero it is vital to determine if the product portfolio of held companies is compatible with the objective of transitioning to a net zero system by 2050. The IEA's NZE2050 scenario states that all expansion of fossil fuel assets after 2021 is incompatible with a net zero future. The graphs below show the revenue linked to fossil fuels and those linked to climate change mitigating activities.

Revenue From Fossil Fuels

The portfolio has 547.1 k USD revenue linked to fossil fuels, which account for less than 1% of total portfolio revenue. Of the revenue from fossil fuels, 32% is attributed to oil, 66% to gas, and 1% to coal. The portfolio's revenue exposure exceeds the benchmark by a net difference of -84%.





Revenue Eligible for Climate Change Mitigating Activities



The EU Taxonomy defines climate change mitigating activities as those which are directly linked to the avoidance, reduction, or removal of GHGs from the atmosphere. EU Taxonomy "Aligned" revenues are derived from directly reported data, and have passed the substantial contribution, do no significant harm and minimum social safeguards assessments. "Likely Aligned" revenues has the same criteria, however the data is derived from the ISS ESG proxy / modelled assessment. Potentially aligned revenues are again derived from the ISS ESG proxy / modelled assessment, and have only passed the substantial contribution assessment.

Revenues from economic activities outside of climate change mitigation are considered "Not Eligible". Where there is a lack of data to make an assessment, revenues are categorized as "Not Covered".

Bottom Five Issuers by Net Zero Target Alignment and Weight

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	GICS Sector	Mitigation Revenue	Net Zero Alignment	Fossil Fuel Expansion
Concordia Financial Group, Ltd.	3.55%	Financials	0%	Not aligned	No
Melia Hotels International SA	3.51%	Consumer Discretionary	0%	Not aligned	No
Extendicare Inc.	3.38%	Health Care	0%	Not aligned	No
Ormat Technologies, Inc.	3.18%	Utilities	22.83%	Not aligned	No
UMB Financial Corporation	2.53%	Financials	0%	Not aligned	No

Transition Climate Risk Analysis 1 of 4

Transition opportunities and risks, including carbon pricing, impact investees and portfolio valuations. This analysis estimates a Transition Value at Risk (TVaR) based on the IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 (NZE2050) scenario.

Transition Value at Risk (%)



Issuers at Risk (%)



Portfolio Green Revenues (%)



Portfolio Brown Revenues (%)



Portfolio Transition Value at Risk by Sector Based on NZE2050

Portfolio Value at Risk by Sector



The total estimated Transition Value at Risk for the portfolio is 5.5 M USD based on the NZE2050 scenario. The chart on the left shows the sector-level contribution to the total potential financial impact of transition risks and opportunities on the portfolio. The Value at Risk presented is a net number between the positive and negative potential share price performance in the portfolio. A negative TVaR means positive share price movement.

The Transition (and Physical) VaR is an equity-based analysis, and its output should not be interpreted as the potential change in price of a bond. Nevertheless, the VaR remains a useful metric for fixed income as it is a holistic indicator of the issuer's exposure to Physical or Transition Risks, even if not directly material to the bond price itself.

Worst Five Performers by Transition Value at Risk Based on NZE2050

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	GICS Sector	Transition VaR (%)	Sector WAvg TVaR (%)
Alcoa Corporation	1.56%	Materials	100%	23.85%
Eagle Materials Inc.	1.19%	Materials	85.22%	23.85%
Rush Enterprises, Inc.	1.56%	Industrials	30.11%	8.74%
Federal Signal Corporation	1.95%	Industrials	20.21%	8.74%
Billerud AB	1.09%	Materials	17.89%	23.85%

Top Five Issuers with the Highest Proportion of Green Revenues

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	GICS Sector	Green Revenues (%)	Sector WAvg Green Revenue (%)
Ormat Technologies, Inc.	3.18%	Utilities	88.8%	15.42%
Clean Energy Fuels Corp.	0.64%	Energy	50%	0.4%
Sprott Inc.	1.27%	Financials	20%	0.99%
Curtiss-Wright Corporation	1.64%	Industrials	10%	8.83%
Gentherm Incorporated	1.33%	Consumer Discretionary	5%	4.09%

Transition Climate Risk Analysis 2 of 4

A decarbonized world needs to address both the demand side (for example Utilities burning fossil fuels) and the supply side (i.e. fossil reserves) of future emissions. For Utilities, it matters whether the power generated and power generation planned for the future stem from renewable (green) or fossil (brown) sources. For fossil reserve owning companies, potential future greenhouse gas emissions might indicate stranded asset risk. The Carbon Risk Rating (1-100) provides a view on how well the respective portfolio and benchmark holdings are managing such risks.

Transition Analysis Overview

	Power Generation		Reserves		Climate Performance
	% Generation Output Green Share	% Generation Output Brown Share	% Investment Exposed to Fossil Fuels	Total Potential Future Emissions ($ktCO_2$)	Weighted Avg Carbon Risk Rating
Portfolio	90.79%	9.21%	1.67%	126.05	46
Benchmark	25.25%	66.73%	2.72%	368.06	46

Power Generation

Power Generation Exposure
(Portfolio vs. Benchmark vs. Climate Target)



For a decarbonized future economy, it is key to transition the energy generation mix from fossil to renewable sources. Utilities relying on fossil power production without a substitute plan might run a higher risk of getting hit by climate change regulatory measures as well as reputational damages. The graph on the left compares the energy generation mix of the portfolio with the benchmark and a Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS) compatible mix in 2030 and 2050, according to the International Energy Agency. Below, the 5 largest Utility holdings can be compared on fossil versus renewable energy production capacity, their contribution to the overall portfolio greenhouse gas emission exposure and their production efficiency for 1 GWH of electricity.

Fossil Fuels Nuclear Renewables

Top 5 Utilities' Fossil vs. Renewable Energy Mix

Issuer Name	% Fossil Fuel Capacity	% Renewable Energy Capacity	% Contribution to Portfolio Emissions	Emissions tCO_2e Scope 1 & 2 /GWh
Ormat Technologies, Inc.	0%	95.8%	1.25%	-

Transition Climate Risk Analysis 3 of 4

For fossil reserve owning companies, potential future greenhouse gas emissions might indicate stranded asset risk, as about 80% of those reserves need to stay in the ground to not exceed 2 degrees Celsius of warming. The portfolio contains 126,049 tCO_2 of potential future emissions, of which 0% stem from Coal reserves, 100% from Oil and Gas reserves. Investor focus is often on the 100 largest Oil & Gas and 100 largest Coal reserve owning companies, to understand the exposure to these top 100 lists.

Portfolio
126,049 tCO_2 Potential Future Emissions



Benchmark
368,062 tCO_2 Potential Future Emissions

Exposure to the 100 Largest Oil & Gas and Coal Reserve Owning Assets

Issuer Name	Contribution to Portfolio Potential Future Emissions	Oil & Gas Top 100 Rank	Coal Top 100 Rank
Gulfport Energy Corporation	56.28%	93	-
Advantage Energy Ltd.	43.72%	-	-

Unconventional and controversial energy extraction such as “Fracking” and Arctic Drilling is a key focus for investors, both from a transition and a reputation risk perspective.

Exposure to Controversial Business Practices

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	Arctic Drilling	Hydraulic Fracturing	Oil Sands	Shale Oil and/or Gas
DNOW Inc.	1.09%	-	Services	Services	Services
Gulfport Energy Corporation	1.03%	-	Production	Production	Production
Advantage Energy Ltd.	0.64%	-	Production	-	Production

Transition Climate Risk Analysis 4 of 4

Portfolio Carbon Risk Rating

The Carbon Risk Rating (CRR) assesses how an issuer is exposed to climate risks and opportunities, and whether these are managed in a way to seize opportunities, and to avoid or mitigate risks. It provides investors with critical insights into how issuers are prepared for a transition to a low carbon economy and is a central instrument for the forward-looking analysis of carbon-related risks at portfolio and issuer level.

CRR Distribution Portfolio vs. Benchmark



Avg Portfolio CRR and Spread for Selected ISS ESG Rating Industries

ISS ESG Rating Industry [1]	Average Carbon Risk Rating
Renewable Energy (Operation) & Energy Efficiency Equipment	100
Financials/Commercial Banks & Capital Markets	44
Transport & Logistics	43
Electronic Components	41
Machinery	39
Food & Beverages	37
Oil, Gas & Consumable Fuels	20
Utilities/Electric Utilities	-
Transportation Infrastructure	-
Oil & Gas Equipment/Services	-



Top 5 [2]	Country	ISS ESG Rating Industry	CRR	Portfolio Weight (consol.)
Ormat Technologies, Inc.	USA	Renewable Electricity	100	3.18%
Sega Sammy Holdings, Inc.	Japan	Leisure Products	76	2.44%
Melia Hotels International SA	Spain	Leisure	67	3.51%
Ipsos SA	France	Research & Consulting Services	64	0.61%
Aurubis AG	Germany	Metals Processing & Production	63	0.96%

Bottom 5 [2]	Country	ISS ESG Rating Industry	CRR	Portfolio Weight (consol.)
Wintrust Financial Corporation	USA	Public & Regional Banks	24	1.18%
Limoneira Company	USA	Food Products	23	1.63%
Advantage Energy Ltd.	Canada	Oil & Gas Exploration & Production	23	0.64%
UMB Financial Corporation	USA	Public & Regional Banks	20	2.53%
Gulfport Energy Corporation	USA	Oil & Gas Exploration & Production	17	1.03%

Climate Laggard (0 - 24) Climate Medium Performer (25 - 49) Climate Outperformer (50 - 74) Climate Leader (75 - 100)

[1] The proprietary ISS ESG Rating industry Classification is intended to group companies from an ESG perspective and might differ from other classification systems.
[2] Multiple issuers may have the same CRR value. In the event the Top 5 and Bottom 5 tables have more than one issuer in the last position due to a tie in CRR values, the weight of the issuers in the portfolio will determine the issuer assigned to the table.

Physical Climate Risk Analysis 1 of 4

Even if limited to 2° Celsius, rising temperatures will change the climate system, including physical risks such as floods, droughts, or storms. This analysis evaluates the most financially impactful climate hazards and how they might affect the portfolio value.

Portfolio Value at Risk (% change)



Issuers at Risk (%)



Issuers at Risk with Tenable Management Strategies (%)



Physical Risk Score



Physical Risk Exposure per Geography



This map shows the portfolio's physical risk exposure by 2050 in a likely warming scenario.

Portfolio Value at Risk and Physical Risk Management

Physical climate risk may affect the value of a company and a portfolio. The chart on the left quantifies the potential financial implications on a sector level. Such financial implications from physical effects of climate change can be addressed by adopting appropriate strategies. The chart on the right provides an overview of the robustness of risk management strategies for the portfolio holdings.

Portfolio Value at Risk by Sector



Physical Risk Management



Physical Climate Risk Analysis 2 of 4

Change in Portfolio and Benchmark Value due to Physical Risk by 2050

Physical risk can impact future portfolio value. The chart below highlights potential impact on the portfolio value in 2050 based on current risk levels (Risk 2025), and hazards due to climate change (Climate Change), along with total anticipated net change in value. The analysis compares the portfolio to the benchmark using both the likely and worst case scenarios.



Physical Risk Assessment per Sector

For key sectors, this chart provides the portfolio's overall physical risk score distribution as well as the average score. This is contrasted with the benchmark's average physical risk score and complemented by the sector impact on the portfolio's potential value change in a likely scenario.

Sector	Range and Averages	Portfolio Avg Score	Benchmark Avg Score	Portfolio Value Change
Utilities		42	65	<0.1%
Communication Services		53	56	<0.1%
Information Technology		54	64	0.2%
Financials		58	61	<0.1%
Consumer Staples		61	68	<0.1%
Consumer Discretionary		62	66	0.2%
Health Care		65	62	0.1%
Industrials		70	65	0.2%
Energy		71	59	<0.1%
Real Estate		71	75	<0.1%
Materials		82	68	<0.1%



Physical Climate Risk Analysis 3 of 4

Physical Risk Score per Hazard

The portfolio is exposed to different natural hazards in different geographies which can affect the value of the portfolio and the benchmark. The chart on the right evaluates the change in financial risk due to six of the most costly hazards for a likely scenario. A low score indicated a large increase in physical risks, while a high score reflects a minimal increase in physical risks.



Top 5 Portfolio Holdings — Physical Risk and Management Scores

With physical risks of climate change unfolding, it is key to understand if and how portfolio holdings are addressing such risks. The Physical Risk Management Score gives an indication for the robustness of the measures in place. The table shows the largest portfolio holdings with their Physical Risk and Risk Management scores. A higher Physical Risk Score reflects a lower risk and a higher Management Score indicates a better management strategy.

Issuer Name	Portfolio Weight	Sector	Overall Physical Risk Score	Risk Mgmt Score
Concordia Financial Group, Ltd.	3.55%	Financials	49	Robust
Melia Hotels International SA	3.51%	Consumer Discretionary	53	Moderate
Extendicare Inc.	3.38%	Health Care	86	Not Covered
Sanmina Corporation	3.32%	Information Technology	40	Moderate
Ormat Technologies, Inc.	3.18%	Utilities	42	Moderate

Physical Climate Risk Analysis 4 of 4

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

The Physical Risk Score of each holding is impacted by the projected change in exposure to individual hazards. The table below shows the portfolio holdings that will see the most increase in risk and the potential hazards contributing to this risk in a likely scenario. A low score reflects a large projected increase in Physical Risks, while a high score reflects a minimal increase in Physical Risks.

Issuer Name	Overall Physical Risk	Tropical Cyclones	Coastal Floods	River Floods	Wildfires	Heat Stress	Droughts	Risk Mgmt Score
Raffles Medical Group Ltd.	7	31	41	39	100	39	100	Not Covered
Diodes Incorporated	35	36	48	36	100	50	44	Moderate
KLN Logistics Group Limited	36	61	56	41	100	42	50	Moderate
Sanmina Corporation	40	77	50	100	100	70	44	Moderate
Vitasoy International Holdings Limited	41	34	29	33	100	63	50	Not Covered
Ormat Technologies, Inc.	42	43	39	50	36	100	100	Moderate
Kurita Water Industries Ltd.	43	41	55	48	100	50	100	Robust
ALS Limited	43	59	52	41	50	54	39	Not Covered
Samsonite Group S.A.	46	100	100	58	100	100	50	Moderate
Euronet Worldwide, Inc.	47	66	69	49	100	46	50	Not Covered

Disclaimer

This report and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs and charts, is the property of ISS STOXX and/or its licensors and is provided for informational purposes only. The information may not be modified, reverse-engineered, reproduced or disseminated, in whole or in part, without prior written permission from ISS STOXX.

This report and the recommendations, ratings and/or other analytical content in the report has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body.

The user of this report assumes all risks of any use that it may make or permit to be made of the information. While ISS STOXX exercised due care in compiling this report, ISS STOXX makes no express or implied warranties or representations with respect to the information in, or any results to be obtained by the use of, the report. In particular, the recommendations, ratings and/or other analytical content in the report are not intended to constitute an offer, solicitation or advice to buy or sell securities nor are they intended to solicit votes or proxies. ISS STOXX shall not be liable for any losses or damages arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of, reliance on, or inability to use any such information.

Please note the issuer(s) mentioned within this report and/or material may have a commercial relationship with ISS Corporate Solutions, Inc. ("ISS-Corporate"), a wholly owned subsidiary of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc., or ISS-Corporate may have provided advisory or analytical services to the issuer(s) in connection with the information described in this report. No employee of ISS-Corporate played a role in the preparation of this report. If you are an institutional client of ISS STOXX, you may inquire about any issuer's use of products and services from ISS-Corporate via ProxyExchange or by emailing disclosure@issgovernance.com.

Additionally, the issuer(s) mentioned within this report and/or material may be a client of ISS STOXX, or the parent of, or affiliated with, a client of ISS STOXX. One or more of the proponents of a shareholder proposal at an upcoming meeting may be a client of ISS STOXX, or the parent of, or affiliated with, a client of ISS STOXX. None of the sponsors of any shareholder proposal(s) played a role in preparing this report.

ISS STOXX is majority owned by Deutsche Börse AG ("DB"), an international exchange organization. Both ISS STOXX and DB have established standards and procedures to protect the integrity and independence of the research, recommendations, ratings and other analytical offerings ("Research Offerings") produced by ISS STOXX.

Further information about conflict mitigation can be found here.