UNICREDIT BANK GMBH

Benchmark Statement - UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family

Introduction:

This document is the benchmark statement (the "**Benchmark Statement**" or "**BMS**") for the members of the Benchmark Family which are benchmarks for the purpose of the Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2016 on indices used as benchmarks in financial instruments and financial contracts or to measure the performance of investment funds and amending Directives 2008/48/EC and 2014/17/EU and Regulation (EU) No 596/2014 (the "**Benchmarks Regulation**" or "**BMR**").

Nothing contained in this Benchmark Statement should be construed as an offer or solicitation of any transaction.

Original document date: 26 February 2021

Version date: 26 November 2024

The latest version of this Benchmark Statement can be found at www.onemarkets.de. UniCredit Bank GmbH reserves the right to amend, supplement or update this Benchmark Statement and/or the Index Descriptions from time to time and accepts no liability for any such modifications.

Benchmark Family and Categorisation:

UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family comprises the benchmarks specified in Annex I – Members of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family.

The benchmarks described herein have been categorised as (i) non-significant benchmarks (NSBM) and (ii) no contributions of input data by contributors are used for the determination of the benchmarks. Hence, only the provisions for a benchmark that is a non-significant benchmark (NSBM) are applicable.

None of the benchmarks described herein is an interest rate benchmark or a commodity benchmark.

Further Definitions:

"**Index Committee**" means the index committee of the UniCredit Bank GmbH as defined and described in the "Operational Regulation of the Index Committee of the UniCredit Bank GmbH".

"**Index Description**" means in relation to a Benchmark the full and definitive rules of the Benchmark which will be made available to stakeholders upon request and, if applicable, subject to confidentiality or other agreements between UniCredit Bank GmbH and the relevant party.

"**RTS**" means the Reference in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/1643 of 13 July 2018.

Ref.	Clause	Description
BMR Article 27(1)(a)	The BMS shall clearly and unambiguously define the market or economic reality measured by the benchmark and the circumstances in which such measurement may become unreliable;	The UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family is designed to represent the performance of listed companies based on a market, market segment, theme, or investment strategy.
BMR Article 27(1)(b)	The BMS shall lay down technical specifications that clearly and unambiguously identify the elements of the calculation of the benchmark in relation to which discretion may be exercised,(I)the criteria applicable to the exercise of such discretion and (II) the position of the persons that can exercise discretion,(III) and how such discretion may be subsequently evaluated;(IV)	The index descriptions listed in the appendix are written with the intent of removing the need for judgement or discretion to be exercised in so far as is feasible. Where there may be a need to take an action that is not prescribed in the index descriptions, the Index Committee will develop an approach with the goal of remaining consistent with the goals of the index description and ensuring timely calculation and distribution.
BMR Article 27(1)(c)	The BMS shall provide notice of the possibility that factors, including external factors beyond the control of the administrator, may necessitate changes to, or the cessation of, the benchmark; and	UniCredit Bank GmbH hereby provides notice that is might be possible that factors, including external factors beyond the control of the administrator, may necessitate changes to, or the cessation of, the benchmark.
BMR Article 27(1)(d)	The BMS shall advise users that changes to, or the cessation of, the benchmark may have an impact upon the financial contracts and financial instruments that reference the benchmark or the measurement of the performance of investment funds.	Possible changes to, or the cessation of, a UC administered benchmark may have an impact upon the financial contracts and financial instruments that reference the benchmark or the measurement of the performance of investment funds.
BMR Article 27(2)(a)	The BMS shall contain the definitions for all key terms relating to the benchmark	The definitions of all key terms can be found in the *GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS USED IN INDEX DESCRIPTIONS FOR UniCredit BENCHMARKs.*
BMR Article 27(2)(b)	The BMS shall contain the rationale for adopting the (I) benchmark methodology and (II) procedures for the review and approval of the methodology;	<u>Re. (I):</u> The methodology of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family reflects the economic reality as set out above (Ref. BMR Article 27(1)(a)). <u>Re. (II):</u> The review of all benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family follows the governance process set out in the operational regulation of the Index Committee. The approval of all new benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family follows the governance process set out in an internal directive document. The review and

Ref.	Clause	Description
		approval process ensures that the requirements of investors and other index users are met.
BMR Article 27(2)(c)	The BMS shall contain the criteria and procedures used to determine the benchmark, including a description of the input data, the priority given to different types of input data, the minimum data needed to determine a benchmark, the use of any models or methods of extrapolation and any procedure for rebalancing the constituents of a benchmark's index;	The calculation of all benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family is rule-based and specified in the index description, especially that the input data for these benchmarks consists of official closing prices sourced via vendors from predefined relevant exchanges. Regarding input data, [see RTS Article 1(1)(c) and RTS Article 2].
BMR Article 27(2)(d)	The BMS shall contain the controls and rules that govern any exercise of judgement or discretion by the administrator or any contributors, to ensure consistency in the use of such judgement or discretion;	The circumstances in which judgement and/or discretion may be exercised are set above (Ref. BMR Article 27(1)(b)).
BMR Article 27(2)(e)	The BMS shall contain the procedures which govern the determination of the benchmark in periods of stress or periods where transaction data sources may be insufficient, inaccurate or unreliable and the potential limitations of the benchmark in such periods;	The procedures which govern the determination of the benchmark in periods of stress or periods where transaction data sources may be insufficient, inaccurate or unreliable and the potential limitations of the benchmark in such periods can be found in the market disruption paragraphs of the respective index descriptions.
BMR Article 27(2)(f)	The BMS shall contain the procedures for dealing with errors in input data or in the determination of the benchmark, including when a re- determination of the benchmark is required	Procedures for dealing with errors in input data or in the determination of the benchmark, including when a re- determination of the benchmark is required, are outlined in an internal directive document. Errors in the index determination shall be corrected in accordance with the initial intention and is in the interest of the parties.
BMR Article 27(2)(g)	The BMS shall contain the identification of potential limitations of the benchmark, including its operation in illiquid or fragmented markets and the possible concentration of inputs.	The potential limitations of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family include circumstances where a significant proportion of the closing prices of constituents of the benchmarks are unavailable or disrupted. The procedures which govern the determination or possible suspension of the benchmark can be found in the market disruption paragraphs of the respective index descriptions.
BMR Article 28(1)	An administrator shall publish, together with the benchmark statement referred to in Article 27, a procedure concerning the actions to be taken by the administrator in the event of changes to or the cessation of a benchmark which may be used in the Union in accordance with Article 29(1). The procedure may be drafted, where applicable, for families of benchmarks and shall be updated and published whenever a material change occurs.	If the regular or any additional review of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family as set out in the operational regulation of the Index Committee results (see description regarding BMR Article 27(2)(b)) in a consideration of changes to or the cessation of a UC Equity ESG Benchmark, an respective impact study is carried out. The impact of a potential change to or the cessation of the considered UC Equity ESG Benchmark to both the benchmark and known users is considered. The Index Committee aims to provide a consultation period on the proposals and or current benchmark

Ref.	Clause	Description
		methodology for the benchmark users before a change decision is made. The Index Committee aims to make a notice of the change at least one month prior to a change. This period maybe shortened if market events necessitate an immediate change. Where a benchmark is designed for a single end user, changes may be made based on a mutual agreement with the users.
RTS Article 1(1)(a)	The BMS shall state the date of publication of the statement and, where applicable, the date of its last update;	Original document date: 26 February 2021 Version date: 26 November 2024
RTS Article 1(1)(b)	The BMS shall state where available, the international securities identification number (ISIN) of the benchmark or benchmarks; alternatively, for a family of benchmarks, the statement may provide details of where the ISINs are publicly accessible free of charge;	UC doesn't assign ISINs (international securities identification number) to all of the indexes for which it is the administrator. If an ISIN is assigned to an UC index it can be found in the respective index descriptions free of charge.
RTS Article 1(1)(c)	The BMS shall whether the benchmark, or any benchmark in the family of benchmarks, is determined using contributions of input data;	No benchmark in the family of UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family is determined using contributions of input data.
RTS Article 1(1)(d)	The BMS shall state whether the benchmark or any benchmark in the family of benchmarks qualifies as one of the types of benchmarks listed under Title III of Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, including the specific provision by virtue of which the benchmark qualifies as that type.	Each benchmark in the family of UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family is a non-significant benchmark as defined under Title III of Regulation (EU) 2016/1011.
RTS Article 1(2)	In defining the market or economic reality, the benchmark statement shall include at least the following information:	
	(a) a general description of the market or economic reality;	The benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family are designed to represent the performance of companies listed on international stock exchanges.
	(b) the geographical boundaries, if any, of the market or economic reality;	The benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family are not subject to specific geographical boundaries of the market or economic reality.
	(c) any other information that the administrator reasonably considers to be relevant or useful to help users or potential users of the benchmark to understand the relevant features of the market or economic reality, including at least the following elements insofar as reliable data on these elements is available: (i)	Not applicable for non-significant benchmarks.

Ref.	Clause	Description
	information on actual or potential participants in the market; (ii) an indication of the size of the market or economic reality.	
RTS Article 1(3)	In defining the potential limitations of the benchmark and the circumstances in which the measurement of the market or economic reality may become unreliable, the benchmark statement shall include at least:	
	(a) a description of the circumstances in which the administrator would lack sufficient input data to determine the benchmark in accordance with the methodology;	The circumstances in which UC would lack sufficient input data to determine a benchmark of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family in accordance with the methodology can be found in the market disruption paragraphs of the respective index descriptions.
	(b) where relevant, a description of instances when the accuracy and reliability of the methodology used for determining the benchmark can no longer be ensured, such as when the administrator deems the liquidity in the underlying market as insufficient;	Not applicable for non-significant benchmarks.
	(c) any other information that the administrator reasonably considers to be relevant or useful to help users and potential users to understand the circumstances in which the measurement of the market or economic reality may become unreliable, including a description of what might constitute an exceptional market event.	Not applicable for non-significant benchmarks.
RTS Article 1(4)	In specifying the controls and rules that govern any exercise of judgement or discretion by the administrator or any contributors in calculating the benchmark or benchmarks, the benchmark statement shall include an outline of each step of the process for any ex post evaluation of the use of discretion, together with a clear indication of the position of any person(s) responsible for carrying out the evaluations.	Not applicable for non-significant benchmarks.
RTS Article 1(5)	In specifying the procedures for review of the methodology, the benchmark statement shall at least outline the procedures for public consultation on any material changes to the methodology.	Not applicable for non-significant benchmarks.
RTS Article 2	Specific disclosure requirements for regulated-data benchmarks	All benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family are not regulated-data benchmarks.

Ref.	Clause	Description
RTS Article 3	Specific disclosure requirements for interest rate benchmarks	All benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family are not interest rate benchmarks.
RTS Article 4	Specific disclosure requirements for commodity benchmarks	All benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family are not commodity benchmarks.
RTS Article 5	Specific disclosure requirements for critical benchmarks	All benchmarks of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family are not critical benchmarks.

Consideration of ESG Factors

1. Name of the benchmark administrator	UniCredit Bank GmbH
2. Type of family of benchmarks	Equity ESG
3. Name of the family of benchmarks	UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family
4. Are there in the portfolio of the benchmark administrator any EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks, benchmarks that pursue ESG objectives or benchmarks that take into account ESG factors?	Yes
5. Does the family of benchmarks pursue ESG objectives?	Yes
Does the family of benchmarks pursue carbon emission objectives?	No
6. Details (score) in relation to the ESG factors for each family of benchmarks at aggregated level. The ESG factors are disclosed at an aggregated weighted average value at the level of the family of benchmarks.	
a) List of combined ESG factors	
Weighted average ESG rating of the benchmark	2.746
b) List of environmental factors	
Weighted average environmental rating of the benchmark	2.730
Degree of exposure of the portfolio to the sectors listed in Sections A to H and Section L of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1893/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council(1) as a percentage of the total weight in the portfolio.	33.25%
Greenhouse gas (GHG) intensity of the benchmark.	39.321
Percentage of GHG emissions reported versus estimated.	100.0 / 0.0

Exposure of the benchmark portfolio to companies the activities of which fall under Divisions 05 to 09, 19 and 20 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1893/2006.	33.2%
Exposure of the benchmark portfolio to activities included in the environmental goods and services sector, as defined in Article 2, point (5) of Regulation (EU) No 691/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council.	10.6%[a]
c) List of social factors	
Weighted average social rating of the benchmark.	2.684
International treaties and conventions, United Nations principles or, where applicable, national law used in order to determine what constitutes a 'controversial weapon'.	Institutional Shareholder Services Inc.: Anti-personnel mines: Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction Biological weapons: Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction Chemical weapons: Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction Chemical weapons: Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction Cluster munitions: Convention on Cluster Munitions Nuclear weapons: Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the International Court of Justice's Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons as well as the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons
Weighted average percentage of benchmark constituents in the controversial weapons sector.	0 Limited information
Weighted average percentage of benchmark constituents in the tobacco sector.	0
Number of benchmark constituents subject to social violations (absolute number and relative divided by all benchmark constituents), as referred to in international treaties and conventions, United Nations principles and, where applicable, national law.	0 / 0

[a] Percentage of companies exposed to relevant activities.

	Limited information	
Exposure of the benchmark portfolio to companies without due diligence policies on issues addressed by the fundamental International Labor Organisation Conventions 1 to 8.	0.0%	
Weighted average gender pay gap.	0.1% Limited information	
Weighted average ratio of female to male board members.	42.9 / 57.1	
Weighted average ratio of accidents, injuries, fatalities.	7.534[b] Limited information	
Numbers of convictions and amount of fines for violations of anti-corruption and anti-bribery laws.	No information	
d) List of governance factors		
Weighted average governance rating of the benchmark.	2.941	
Weighted average percentage of board members who are independent.	67.9	
Weighted average percentage of female board members.	41.5	
7. Details (score) for each benchmark, in relation to the ESG factors depending on the relevant underlying asset concerned.	UC ESG Goods for Life Index Series	UC SDG Transatlantic Leaders Index Series
a) List of combined ESG factors		
Weighted average ESG rating of the benchmark	2.730	2.762

[b] The factor evaluates the company employee's total recordable incident rate, normalized by 200,000 hours worked.

b) List of environmental factors		
Weighted average environmental rating of the benchmark	2.657	2.804
Degree of exposure of the portfolio to the sectors listed in Sections A to H and Section L of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1893/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council(1) as a percentage of the total weight in the portfolio.	28.3%	38.2%
Greenhouse gas (GHG) intensity of the benchmark.	20.232	58.410
Percentage of GHG emissions reported versus estimated.	100.0 / 0.0	100.0 / 0.0
Exposure of the benchmark portfolio to companies the activities of which fall under Divisions 05 to 09, 19 and 20 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1893/2006.	28.3%	38.2%
Exposure of the benchmark portfolio to activities included in the environmental goods and services sector, as defined in Article 2, point (5) of Regulation (EU) No 691/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council.	3.0%[c]	18.2%[c]
c) List of social factors		
Weighted average social rating of the benchmark	2.750	2.617
International treaties and conventions, United Nations principles or, where applicable, national law used in order to determine what constitutes a 'controversial weapon'.	Institutional Shareholder Services Inc.: Anti-personnel mines: Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction Biological weapons: Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction Chemical weapons: Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction Chemical weapons: Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction Cluster munitions: Convention on Cluster Munitions	

[c] Percentage of companies exposed to relevant activities.

	Nuclear weapons: Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the International Court of Justice's Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons as well as the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons	
Weighted average percentage of benchmark constituents in the controversial weapons sector.	0 Limited information	0 Limited information
Weighted average percentage of benchmark constituents in the tobacco sector.	0	0
Number of benchmark constituents subject to social violations (absolute number and relative divided by all benchmark constituents), as referred to in international treaties and conventions, United Nations principles and, where applicable, national law.	0 / 0 Limited information	0 / 0 Limited information
Exposure of the benchmark portfolio to companies without due diligence policies on issues addressed by the fundamental International Labor Organisation Conventions 1 to 8.	0.0%	0.1%
Weighted average gender pay gap.	0.1%	0.1%
Weighted average ratio of female to male board members.	41.9 / 58.1	43.9 / 56.1
Weighted average ratio of accidents, injuries, fatalities.	13.68[d] Limited information	1.393[d] Limited information
Numbers of convictions and amount of fines for violations of anti-corruption and anti-bribery laws.	No information	No information
d) List of governance factors		
Weighted average governance rating of the benchmark	2.781	3.101
Weighted average percentage of board members who are independent.	59.2	76.6
Weighted average percentage of female board members.	41.0	42.0

[d] The factor evaluates the company employee's total recordable incident rate, normalized by 200,000 hours worked.

8. Data and standards used	
a) Description of data sources used to provide information on the ESG factors in the benchmark statement	Institutional Shareholder Services Inc.
b) Reference standards	Orientation on the ten principles of the United Nations Global Compact, a worldwide initiative for responsible corporate governance.
Date on which information has been last updated	26 November 2024
Reason for the update	Yearly update

Annex I – Members of the UC Equity ESG Benchmark Family

Name of the benchmark	**ISIN of the benchmark**
UC ESG Goods for Life Index	DE000A2P3UB5
UC ESG Goods for Life Strategy Index	DE000A2P3UE9
UC ESG Goods for Life (Performance) Index	DE000A2P3UD1
UC SDG Transatlantic Leaders Index	DE000A2QLVH8
UC SDG Transatlantic Leaders (Performance) Index	DE000A2QMKZ1
UC SDG Transatlantic Leaders Strategy Index	DE000A2QMYE7