



G R E S B[®]
INFRASTRUCTURE

2020

Fund Assessment

Contents

Entity & Reporting Characteristics

Leadership

Policies

Reporting

Risk Management

Stakeholder Engagement

Disclaimer: 2020 GRESB Infrastructure Fund & Asset Assessment Pre-Release

The information in this document has been provided in good faith and on an “as is” basis. While we do not anticipate major changes, we reserve the right to make modifications prior to the official start of the 2020 reporting period on April 1 and the official release of the 2020 Infrastructure Fund and Asset Assessments. We will publicly announce any such modifications.

Introduction

About GRESB

Mission-driven and investor-led, GRESB is the environmental, social and governance (ESG) benchmark for real assets. We work in collaboration with the industry to provide standardized and validated ESG data to the capital markets. The 2019 Real Estate benchmark covers more than 1,000 property companies, real estate investment trusts (REITs), funds, and developers. Our coverage for Infrastructure includes 500 infrastructure funds and assets. Combined, GRESB represents USD 4.5 trillion in real asset value. More than 100 institutional investors, with over USD 22 trillion AUM, use GRESB data to monitor their investments, engage with their managers, and make decisions that lead to a more sustainable real asset industry.

For more information, visit [gresb.com](https://www.gresb.com). Follow [@GRESB](https://twitter.com/GRESB) on Twitter.

2020 Assessments Structure

An important outcome of the 2020 Assessment development process has been a reconfirmation that the Assessments address material ESG topics for the real estate and infrastructure industry. As a result, the 2020 development process was focused on making structural changes to the Assessments and refinements to indicators rather than making extensive content changes with an impact on scoring.

The structural changes mainly arise from splitting the assessments into separate Management and Performance Components. The Fund Assessment will only include a Management Component, whereas the Asset Assessment has both. This new split allows entities to complete either or both components, and enables entities starting off on their sustainability journey to develop their data collection processes first before reporting performance data. The Infrastructure Fund Assessment has now been divided into five Aspects, to align closely with the Infrastructure Asset Assessment Management Component and the Real Estate Assessment.

On the content side, several indicators have been removed and others have been simplified or modified to better suit reporting for various sectors. This is most notable in the Performance Component.

Overall, the 2020 Assessments provide more consistency between real estate and infrastructure and an improved alignment with other reporting standards and frameworks. The Assessments also lay the groundwork for us to provide new data and analytical tools in the portal and support a further evolution in data quality.

The starting point for the Assessment development process was the 2019 Assessments. The 2019 indicators have been allocated to the new Management and Performance Components on the basis that:

- The Management Component measures the entity's strategy and leadership management, policies and processes, risk management and stakeholder engagement approach, comprising of information collected at the organizational level.
- The Performance Component measures the entity's performance, comprising of information collected at the asset level. It is suitable for any infrastructure company with operational assets.

For more information about the 2020 Assessments development process, click [here](#).

Grace Period

GRESB offers participants reporting for the first time the option to not disclose their Assessment results to their investors. This first year "Grace Period" allows companies and funds a year to familiarize themselves with the GRESB reporting and assessment process without externally disclosing their results to GRESB Investor Members.

While Grace Period participant names are disclosed to GRESB Investor Members, Investor Members are not able to request access to Grace Period participant results.

First-time participants wishing to opt for the Grace Period can select the option from the settings section in the Assessment Portal.

Who can see my data?

Data collected through the GRESB Infrastructure Fund and AssetReal Estate Assessments is only disclosed to the participants themselves and:

- In the case of non-listed funds and companies, to those of that company or fund's investors that are GRESB Investor Members;
- In the case of listed infrastructure companies, to all GRESB Investor Members that invest in listed infrastructure securities.

All data provided to GRESB is strictly confidential and will only be disclosed to participants' investors, with their explicit consent.

Timeline & Process

The GRESB Infrastructure Fund and Asset Assessments open in the GRESB Portal on April 1, 2020. The submission deadline is July 1, 2020, providing participants with a three-month window to complete the Assessment. This is a fixed deadline and GRESB will not accept submissions received after this date. GRESB validates and analyzes all participants' Assessment submissions.

In 2020 we will introduce a new Review Period in the Assessment cycle to further strengthen the reliability of our Assessments and benchmark results. The Review Period will start on September 1, when preliminary individual GRESB results will be made available to all participants and run for one month. During the Review Period, participants will be able to submit a review request to GRESB using a dedicated form. The final results will be launched to both participants and Investor Members on October 1. Public Results events and other results outputs will be rescheduled to October and November in order to accommodate the September Review Period.

For more information about the 2020 Assessment timeline, click [here](#).

Response Check service

A Response Check is a high-level check of a participant's GRESB Infrastructure Fund or Asset Assessment by the GRESB team, taking place prior to submission. It minimizes the risk of errors that could adversely impact Assessment results. The Response Check fee is 1750 EUR (exclusive of VAT).

Guidance & Support

The 2020 Infrastructure Fund and Asset Assessments will be accompanied by indicator-specific Guidance that explains:

- The intent of each indicator;
- The requirements for each response;
- Explanation of any terminology used;
- References to any third-party documents;
- Scoring mechanism for each indicator.

The written Reference Guide will be available during the first week of March 2020. Starting April 1, 2020, guidance is also available in the GRESB Portal through pop-up fields next to each indicator. The GRESB [here](#) will open on the same date.

2020 Infrastructure GRESB Fund Assessment Changes

Guided by the GRESB Medium Term Plan (Assessment Roadmap), we are proposing to make some important changes to the GRESB Infrastructure Fund Assessment (Fund Assessment) in 2020.

The table below lists the key changes, as well as their implications for your reporting process.

High-level comments

<p>1 Divide the assessment into 5 aspects:</p> <p>The assessment formerly had no aspects, just a set of indicators. To align with the Infrastructure Asset (Management component) and Real Estate Assessments, it makes sense to structure the assessment into logical aspects as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Leadership2. Policies3. Reporting4. Risk Management5. Stakeholder Engagement
<p>2. New Indicators</p> <p>Four new indicators on reporting of incidents, employee engagement, training and development, and employee satisfaction have been added. These indicators provide further alignment with the Real Estate and Asset Assessments and provide useful information to investors. They will not be scored in 2020 but may be in future years. This increases the total number of indicators from 13 to 17.</p>
<p>3. Removed indicator on ESG monitoring of assets</p> <p>The indicator on monitoring of ESG performance of assets has been removed as this is covered by the underlying asset assessment.</p>
<p>4. Several changes to indicators to increase alignment</p> <p>Several changes have been made to indicators to increase alignment to the Real Estate and Infrastructure Asset Assessments, as well as external frameworks like CDP and DJSI. These changes reduce reporting burden for participants and/or provide more useful information for investors.</p>
<p>5. Revise the names of the key fund level scores</p> <p>The names of the key fund level scores have been changed to provide much greater clarity. The average score for just the Fund Assessment will be called the Management Component Score - Infrastructure Fund, the aggregated score for the underlying assets will be called the Performance Component Score - Infrastructure Fund, and the combined score will be called the GRESB Score - Infrastructure Fund.</p>

Indicator Level Changes/Comments

EC2	<p>Nature of ownership - 'Other identifier' option removed</p> <p>Description: 'Other identifier' checkbox removed.</p>
------------	--

Rationale for change: Funds can only be Public, Private or Government owned so there is no need for an 'Other' option.

Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.

Nature of ownership - New Classifications within 'Private entity'

Description: Made the following classification changes for 'Private entity':

- Added Debt
- Added Core
- Added Value
- Added Opportunistic
- Removed the option 'Other'.

Rationale for change: To cater for Debt funds and to align with Real Estate Assessment. Potential use for peer grouping, rankings and insights.

Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for enhanced insights.

Nature of ownership - Added classification for 'Type of Investment Vehicle'

Description: Added 'Type of Investment Vehicle'.

Rationale for change: Changes brought in to add further granularity and to align with Real Estate Assessment. Potential use for peer grouping, rankings and insights.

Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for enhanced insights.

Nature of ownership - New classification

Description: Added 'Government Entity' as a 'Nature of Ownership' type.

Rationale for change: To match Real Estate Assessment and to provide for government participation. Potential use for peer grouping, rankings and insights.

Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for enhanced insights.

EC3

Year of commencement - New Indicator

Description: New indicator on commencement date of the entity.

Rationale for change: Useful to understand the vintage of the fund as this can have a bearing on maturity of ESG approach.

Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for enhanced insight.

EC4

Reporting Period - Fund's reporting year

Description: Add year of reporting (on top of month) in case it isn't in calendar year.

Rationale for change: To clarify the precise reporting year since this was not always clear in the past, when the reporting year was not the calendar year.

Impact of change: Greater clarity for reporting.

RC2

Economic Size - Committed capital replaced with Aggregate NAV

Description: Economic Size clarified to require reporting of Aggregated GAV. Committed Capital is replaced by Aggregate Net Asset Value (NAV).

Rationale for change: GAV was already required but is clarified. This is the aggregate total asset value (equity and debt) of all of the assets held by the funds. Committed capital was not a useful

	<p>measure of size for investors. Aggregate NAV reflects just the equity invested in assets held by the fund (i.e. invested capital) and is a much more useful measure of fund size. Feedback has clarified that these are the two best measures of economic size of a fund.</p> <p>Impact of change: More useful data for investors.</p>
RC3	<p>Sector and Geography - Merged</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Merged former RC4 with RC3.</p> <p>Rationale for change: Simplify and alignment with Real Estate and Asset Assessments.</p> <p>Impact of change: Simplify reporting.</p>
RC4 (New)	<p>Nature of entity's business - New indicator</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Added indicator on 'Nature of Business'.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To distinguish funds that focus on investments in development of new construction and major renovation projects (greenfield) versus management of standing investments/operating assets (brownfield) or both. This is useful information for insights and potentially peer grouping.</p> <p>Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for enhanced insights.</p>
RC5 (New)	<p>Description of the fund - New indicator</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Description and logo of the fund or fund manager.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To align with Asset and Real Estate Assessments and allow for logos to be added to Scorecards, Benchmark Reports and the GRESB website.</p> <p>Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for increased recognition of participating funds.</p>
LE1 (Former Fund 3)	<p>ESG leadership commitments - PRI report requirement removed</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Sub-section on whether entity is reporting to PRI removed (signatory retained).</p> <p>Rationale for change: PRI signatories must report after a year so the sub-section was redundant.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p> <p>ESG leadership commitments - New commitments</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Added several new commitments.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To recognize new important ESG commitments and align with Real Estate Assessment.</p> <p>Impact of change: Recognition of new commitments.</p> <p>ESG leadership commitments - New indicator structure</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Split up commitments to distinguish those that oblige organizations to take actions and those that do not and also those that have a broad ESG scope and those that are issue specific.</p> <p>Rationale for change: The level of commitment is different in these various cases and this warrants appropriate recognition and scoring.</p> <p>Impact of change: Level of commitment better recognised in scoring.</p>

LE2 (Former Fund 1)	<p>Responsible investment strategy - Strategy publicly available</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Added whether or not the strategy is publicly available.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To recognise that this is good practice and to align with the Real Estate Assessment.</p> <p>Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for increased recognition of good practice.</p>
LE3 (Former Fund 4)	<p>Individual responsible for ESG - Remove email and LinkedIn</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Removed optional entry of email address and LinkedIn profile.</p> <p>Rationale for change: These were optional and not used for any purpose.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p> <p>Individual responsible for ESG - Additional reporting option added</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Added option for Investment partners (co-investors/ JV partners).</p> <p>Rationale for change: To align with the Real Estate Assessment and allow for this option.</p> <p>Impact of change: Slight increase in reporting burden in exchange for useful information for investors.</p>
LE4 (Former Fund 5)	<p>ESG senior-decision maker - New decision-maker options</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Added sub-options for 'the individual's most senior role'.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To align with the Real Estate Assessment.</p> <p>Impact of change: Increased standardization and granularity.</p> <p>ESG senior-decision maker - Remove email and LinkedIn</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Remove optional entry of email address and LinkedIn profile.</p> <p>Rationale for change: These were optional and not used for any purpose.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p>
LE5 (Former Fund 6)	<p>Personnel ESG performance targets - Separate financial and non-financial incentives</p> <hr/> <p>Description: The incentives are split into financial and non-financial sections, with the applicable employees list applying to.</p> <p>Rationale for change: Adds more granularity and aligns with the Real Estate Assessment.</p> <p>Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for useful data for investors.</p> <p>Personnel ESG performance targets - New employee options</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Modified sub-options for 'employees to whom these targets apply'.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To align with Real Estate Assessment and DJSI.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p>

P01, P02, P03 (Former Fund 2)	<p>Policies - Indicator split into separate E, S and G indicators</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Split into three separate E, S and G indicators.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To provide better aggregation of E, S and G scores and to align with Real Estate and Asset Assessments.</p> <p>Impact of change: Slightly increased reporting burden in exchange for more useful E, S and G scores.</p>
RP1.1 (Former FUND 11&12)	<p>ESG Reporting - Merged indicators</p> <hr/> <p>Description: The two indicators (formerly FUND11 and FUND12) have been merged together, forming a combined indicator on ESG disclosure and third-party review. The name of the service provider will no longer be required.</p> <p>Rationale for change: Combining these two indicators simplifies the reporting and validation process.</p> <p>Impact of change: Simplified reporting.</p> <p>ESG Reporting - Removed Service Provider</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Removed requirement to report the name of the Service Provider used for external check / verification / assurance.</p> <p>Rationale for change: GRESB does not use this information.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p>
RP2.1 (Former Fund 13)	<p>ESG incident monitoring - Change in scope of indicator</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Added 'breaches against the code of conduct/ethics' to question.</p> <p>Rationale for change: Alignment with DJSI.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p> <p>ESG incident monitoring - New stakeholder groups</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Added some stakeholder groups as sub-options.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To align with the Infrastructure Asset Assessment.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p>
RP2.2 (New)	<p>ESG Incident occurrences - Separated from former FUND13</p> <hr/> <p>Description: New indicator separate from RP2.1 on reporting of incidents.</p> <p>Rationale for change: Alignment with Asset and Real Estate Assessments.</p> <p>Impact of change: Clearer and more aligned reporting approach.</p>
RM1.1	<p>ESG Due Diligence for new acquisitions - Checkbox removed</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Checkbox 'Material issues are identified' removed.</p> <p>Rationale for change: Checkbox overlapped with the second option in the indicator.</p> <p>Impact of change: Cleaner reporting approach and reduced reporting burden.</p>

Former Fund10 Removed	<p>Former FUND10 - removed</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Removed indicator on monitoring of the ESG management and performance of underlying assets.</p> <p>Rationale for change: This is covered by the Asset Assessments for the underlying assets.</p> <p>Impact of change: Reduced reporting burden.</p>
SE1 (New)	<p>Employee engagement program - New Indicator</p> <hr/> <p>Description: New indicator added on Employee Engagement Programs.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To recognise the importance of employee engagement at the fund level and to align with the Infrastructure Asset and Real Estate Assessments.</p> <p>Impact of change: Increase in reporting burden in exchange for useful information for investors.</p>
SE2 (New)	<p>Training and development - New indicator</p> <hr/> <p>Description: New indicator added on Training and Development for employees.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To recognise the importance of employee training at the fund level and to align with the Infrastructure Asset and Real Estate Assessments.</p> <p>Impact of change: Increase in reporting burden.</p>
SE3 (New)	<p>Employee satisfaction monitoring - New indicator</p> <hr/> <p>Description: New indicator added on Employee Satisfaction Monitoring.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To recognise the importance of employee satisfaction at the fund level and to align with the Infrastructure Asset and Real Estate Assessments.</p> <p>Impact of change: Increase in reporting burden in exchange for useful information for investors.</p>
SE4 (Former Fund 7)	<p>Diversity of organization & employees - Split into governance bodies and employees</p> <hr/> <p>Description: Split the indicator into two parts, one looking at gender and diversity of governance bodies and the other looking at employees.</p> <p>Rationale for change: To recognise the importance of both levels when it comes to gender and diversity and to align with the Real Estate Assessment.</p> <p>Impact of change: Increase in reporting burden in exchange for useful information for investors.</p>

Entity & Reporting Characteristics

Entity Characteristics

2019 Indicator

EC1 Reporting entity

Entity Name: _____

Fund Manager Organization Name (May be same as entity name): _____

EC1

EC2 Nature of ownership

Public entity

Specify ISIN: _____

Private (non-listed) entity

Entity style classification

Debt

Core

Value added

Opportunistic

Open or closed end:

Open end

Closed end

Type of investment vehicle

Direct investment

Joint venture (JV)

Separate account

Special Purpose Vehicle

Other

-

Government entity

EC2

EC3 Entity commencement date

Year of commencement (listed) or Year of establishment (non-listed)

New

EC4 Reporting year

EC3

Calendar year

Fiscal year

Specify the starting month

RC1 Reporting currency

Values are reported in

RC1

Currency

- Australian Dollar (AUD)
- Brazilian Real (BRL)
- Canadian Dollar (CAD)
- Chilean Peso (CLP)
- Chinese Yuan (CNY)
- Columbian Peso (COP)
- Danish Krone (DKK)
- Euro (EUR)
- Hong Kong Dollar (HKD)
- Indian Rupee (INR)
- Japanese Yen (JPY)
- Malaysian Ringgit (MYR)
- Mexican Peso (MXN)
- New Zealand Dollar (NZD)
- Norwegian Krone (NOK)
- Philippine Peso (PHP)
- Pound Sterling (GBP)
- Singapore Dollar (SGD)
- South African Rand (ZAR)
- South Korean Won (KRW)
- Swedish Krona (SEK)
- Swiss Franc (CHF)
- United States Dollar (USD)
- Other: _____

RC2 Economic size

RC2

Aggregate Gross Asset Value (GAV) (in millions): _____

Aggregated Net Asset Value (NAV) (or invested capital) (in millions):

What is the sector focus of the entity?

- Diversified
- Data Infrastructure
- Energy and Water Resources
- Environmental Services
- Network Utilities
- Power Generation X-Renewables
- Renewable Power
- Social Infrastructure
- Transport
- Other: _____

What is the regional focus of the entity?

- Globally diversified
- Africa
- Americas
- Asia
- Europe
- Oceania

RC4 Nature of entity's business

New

What is the entity's core business?

- Management of standing investment/operating assets
- Development of new construction and major renovation projects

RC5 Description of the fund

New

Provide a description of the entity (max 250 words): _____

Can the entity upload (as supporting evidence) a logo(s) that represents the fund (for GRESB marketing purposes)?

By uploading a logo image, you give GRESB permission to credit the logo to the Reporting Entity specified in EC1, and to use the logo, both in print and digitally, for marketing and communication purposes only.

Yes

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found _____

No

RC6 Summary of entity assets

Did the entity own any asset investments?

Yes

Asset Name	Asset Sector	Asset Weight	Reason for exclusion from scoring	Ownership	Contact Name	E-mail
	Select ▾	%	Choose ▾	%		
	Select ▾	%	Choose ▾	%		
	Select ▾	%	Choose ▾	%		

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Classify asset sector

- Data Infrastructure
- Diversified
- Energy and Water Resources
- Environmental Services
- Network Utilities
- Power Generation x-Renewables
- Renewable Power
- Social Infrastructure
- Transport
- Other: _____

Classify nature of investment

- Debt
- Equity investment
- Other: _____

Reason for exclusion from scoring

- Greenfield asset
- Operational - less than 6 months
- Recently purchased - purchased and owned less than 6 months
- Recently sold - sold prior to 1 July 2020



Leadership

Leadership

2019 Indicator

Has the entity made a public commitment to ESG standards or principles? Yes

- General ESG commitments (multiple answers possible)
 - Commitments that are publicly evidenced and oblige the organization to take action (multiple answers possible).
 - Equator Principles
 - PRI
 - UN Global Compact
 - Other: _____
 - Commitments that are publicly evidenced and do not oblige the organization to take action (multiple answers possible).
 - UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative
 - Other: _____
- Formal environmental issue-specific commitments (multiple answers possible)
 - Commitments that are publicly evidenced and oblige the organization to take action (multiple answers possible).
 - Climate Action in Financial Institutions Initiative
 - Climate Action 100+
 - EV100
 - IFC Operating Principles for Impact Management
 - IIGCC Paris Aligned Investment Initiative
 - Montreal Pledge
 - Partnership for Carbon Accounting Financials
 - Powering Past Coal Alliance (PPCA)
 - RE 100
 - Science Based Targets Initiative
 - UNFCCC Climate Neutral Now Pledge
 - UN Global Compact Our Only Future
 - UN-convened Net-Zero Asset Owner Alliance
 - WorldGBC's Net Zero Carbon Buildings Commitment
 - Other: _____
 - Commitments that are publicly evidenced and do not oblige the organization

— to take action (multiple answers possible).

- Coalition for Climate Resilient Investment (CCRI)
- Global Investor Coalition on Climate Change (including AIGCC, Ceres, IGCC, IIGCC)
- Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures
- Other: _____

Formal social issue-specific commitments (multiple answers possible)

Commitments that are publicly evidenced and oblige the organization to take action (multiple answers possible).

List commitment(s): _____

Commitments that are publicly evidenced and do not oblige the organization to take action (multiple answers possible).

- World Business Council for Sustainable Development's Call to Action
- 30% Club
- Other: _____

Formal governance issue-specific commitments (multiple answers possible)

Commitments that are publicly evidenced and oblige the organization to take action (multiple answers possible).

List commitment(s): _____

Commitments that are publicly evidenced and do not oblige the organization to take action (multiple answers possible).

List commitment(s): _____

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found _____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Does the entity have a sustainable investment strategy? Yes

The strategy incorporates the following approaches (multiple answers possible)

- Corporate engagement and shareholder action
- Impact/community investing
- Integration of ESG factors
- Positive/best-in-class screening
- Negative/exclusionary screening
- Norms-based screening
- Sustainability themed investing

Describe the strategy and how it is being implemented (for reporting purposes only)
(maximum 250 words)

The strategy is:

 Publicly available

Provide applicable hyperlink or a separate publicly available evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

 Not publicly available

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

 No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Does the entity have one or more persons responsible for implementing the ESG objectives? Yes Dedicated employee for whom sustainability is the core responsibility

Provide the details for the most senior of these employees

Name: _____

Job title: _____

 Employee for whom sustainability is among their responsibilities

Provide the details for the most senior of these employees

Name: _____

Job title: _____

 External consultant/manager

Name of the main contact: _____

Job title: _____

 Investment partners (co-investors/JV partners)

Name of the main contact: _____

Job title: _____

 No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Does the entity have a senior decision-maker accountable for ESG issues? Yes

Provide the details for most senior decision-maker on ESG issues

Name: _____

Job title: _____

The individual's most senior role is as part of:

- Board of directors
- C-suite level staff
- Fund/portfolio managers
- Investment committee
- Other: _____

 No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Does the entity include ESG factors in the annual performance targets of personnel? Yes

Does performance against these targets have predetermined consequences?

 Yes Financial consequences

Select the personnel to whom these factors apply (multiple answers possible)

- All other employees
- Asset managers
- Board of directors
- C-suite level staff
- Dedicated staff on ESG issues
- ESG managers
- External managers or service providers
- Fund/portfolio managers
- Investment analysts
- Investment committee
- Investor relations
- Other: _____

 Non-financial consequences

Select the personnel to whom these factors apply (multiple answers possible)

- All other employees
- Asset managers
- Board of directors
- C-suite level staff
- Dedicated staff on ESG issues
- ESG managers
- External managers or service providers
- Fund/portfolio managers
- Investment analysts

Investment committee

Investor relations

Other: _____

No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found _____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)



Policies

Policies

2019 Indicator

P01 Policies on environmental issues

Does the entity have a policy or policies on environmental issues?

Yes

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

FUND2

P02 Policies on social issues

Does the entity have a policy or policies on social issues?

Yes

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

FUND2

P03 Policies on governance issues

Does the entity have a policy or policies on governance issues?

Yes

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

FUND2



Reporting

Reporting

2019 Indicator

Does the entity disclose its ESG actions and/or performance?

Yes

Please select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

Integrated Report*

*Integrated Report must be aligned with the IIRC framework

Select the applicable reporting level

- Group
- Investment manager or business unit
- Entity

Is this disclosure third-party reviewed?

- Yes
 - Externally checked
 - Externally verified
 - using
 - Externally assured
 - using
- No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

Stand-alone sustainability report(s)

Select the applicable reporting level

- Group
- Investment manager or business unit
- Entity

Aligned with third-party standard

Is this disclosure third-party reviewed?

- Yes
 - Externally checked
 - Externally verified
 - using
 - Externally assured
 - using

No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

Section in Annual Report

Select the applicable reporting level

Group

Investment manager or business unit

Entity

Aligned with third-party standard

Is this disclosure third-party reviewed?

Yes

Externally checked

Externally verified

using

Externally assured

using

No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

Dedicated section on website

Select the applicable reporting level

Group

Investment manager or business unit

Entity

URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

Entity reporting to investors

Frequency of reporting: _____

Aligned with third-party standard

Is this disclosure third-party reviewed?

Yes

Externally checked

Externally verified

using

Externally assured

using

No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found _____

Other: _____

Select the applicable reporting level

Group

Investment manager or business unit

Entity

Aligned with third-party standard

Is this disclosure third-party reviewed?

Yes

Externally checked

Externally verified

using

Externally assured

using

No

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found _____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Scheme name

- AA1000AS
- Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)
- Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe
- Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation
- ASAE3000
- Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)
- Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)
- California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as California Air Resources Board regulations)
- Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025
- Carbon Trust Standard
- Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard
- Climate Registry General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))
- Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)
- Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT

- DNV Verisustain Protocol/ Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting
- Earthcheck Certified
- Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard
- ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology
- IDW PS 821: IDW Prüfungsstandard: Grundsätze ordnungsmäßiger Prüfung oder prüferischer Durchsicht von Berichten im Bereich der Nachhaltigkeit
- IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues
- ISAE 3000
- ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements
- ISO14064-3
- JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification
- Korean GHG and energy target management system
- NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
- RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)
- RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors professional body
- Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program
- SGS Sustainability Report Assurance
- Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)
- Standard 3810N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants
- State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.
- Swiss Climate CO2 label
- Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol
- Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme
- Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws
- Dutch Standard for Assurance assignments 3000A
- MOHURD Guidelines for Public Building Energy Audit
- ISO 50002 standard
- ISO 19011 standard

Guideline name

- GRI Standards, 2016
- GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines, G4
- IIRC International Integrated Reporting Framework, 2013
- PRI Reporting Framework, 2018
- TCFD Recommendations, 2017
- Other: _____

Does the entity have a process to monitor and communicate ESG-related misconduct, penalties, incidents, accidents or breaches against the codes of conduct/ethics?

Yes

The process includes external communication of misconduct, penalties, incidents or accidents to (multiple answers possible):

- Clients/customers
- Community/public
- Contractors
- Employees
- Investors/shareholders
- Regulators/government
- Special interest groups
- Suppliers
- Other stakeholders: _____

Describe the communication process (for reporting purposes only) (maximum 250 words)

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

** The information in RP2.1 and RP2.2 may be used as criteria for the recognition of 2020 Sector Leaders*

Has the entity been involved in any ESG-related misconduct, penalties, incidents, accidents breaches against the codes of conduct/ethics in the reporting period?

(For reporting purposes only)

Yes

Specify the total number of cases that occurred: _____

Specify the total value of fines and/or penalties incurred during the reporting period (must align with currency selected in RC1)

Specify the total number of currently pending investigations: _____

Provide additional context for the response, focusing on the three most serious incidents

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

** The information in RP2.1 and RP2.2 may be used as criteria for the recognition of 2020 Sector Leaders*



Risk Management

Risk Management

2019 Indicator

RM1.1 ESG due diligence for new acquisitions

FUND8

Does the entity have a process to formally address ESG risks and/or opportunities in its pre-investment processes?

Yes

Select elements of the pre-investment process (multiple answers possible)

- ESG risks and opportunities are identified (relating to the material issues) are identified
- ESG risks are analysed
- ESG risks are evaluated and treated
- ESG risks and opportunities are considered and can impact the investment decision

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL _____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found _____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Does the entity formally address ESG risks and/or opportunities in its investment monitoring processes/asset management?

Yes

Elements of the investment process including ESG factors:

Integrate ESG risks and/or opportunities into business plans

Describe how and which ESG risks and/or opportunities are treated or mitigated, and which tools are used: (maximum 250 words)

Regular review of ESG risks and/or opportunities

Describe how and which ESG risks and/or opportunities are regularly reviewed, and which tools are used: (maximum 250 words)

Externally report or communicate ESG risks and/or opportunities

Describe how and which ESG risks and/or opportunities are reported or communicated externally, and which tools are used: (maximum 250 words)

Who are the risks and/or opportunities communicated to:

Community/public

Investors

Regulators/government

Special interest groups

Provide applicable evidence

UPLOAD or URL_____

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found_____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)



Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder Engagement

2019 Indicator

SE1 Employee engagement program

Does the entity have an employee engagement program?

Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- Development of action plan
- Feedback sessions with Senior Management Team
- Feedback sessions with separate teams/departments
- Focus groups
- Implementation
- Planning and preparation for engagement
- Program review and evaluation
- Training
- Other: _____

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

New

Does the entity provide training and development for employees?

Yes

Percentage of employees who received professional training in the reporting year

Percentage of employees who received ESG-related training in the reporting year

ESG-related training focuses on the following elements (multiple answers possible)

Environmental issues

Social issues

Governance issues

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Has the entity undertaken an employee satisfaction survey during the last three years?

Yes

The survey is undertaken (multiple answers possible)

Internally

Percentage of employees covered: _____%

Survey response rate: _____%

By an independent third party

Percentage of employees covered: _____%

Survey response rate: _____%

The survey includes quantitative metrics

Yes

Metrics include

Net Promoter Score

Overall satisfaction score

Other: _____

No

No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)

Does the entity report on inclusion and diversity? Yes Diversity of the entity's governance bodies

Select all diversity metrics (multiple answers possible)

 Age group distribution Board tenure Gender pay gap Gender ratio

Percentage of employees that identify as:

Women: _____%

Men: _____%

 International background Racial diversity Socioeconomic background Diversity of the organization's employees

Select all diversity metrics (multiple answers possible)

 Age group distribution

Percentage of employees that are:

Under 30 years old: _____%

Between 30 and 50 years old: _____%

Over 50 years old: _____%

 Gender pay gap Gender ratio

Percentage of employees that identify as:

Women: _____%

Men: _____%

 International background Racial diversity Socioeconomic background No

Provide additional context for the answer provided (not validated, for reporting purposes only)
