

Other information – Not covered by the audit opinion on the annual report

Periodic disclosure for financial products referred to in Article 8, paragraph 1, 2 and 2a, of Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 and Article 6, first paragraph, of Regulation (EU) 2020/852

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

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

Product name: DWS Qi European Equity

Legal entity identifier: 5493005K7901RY2NGP13

Environmental and/or social characteristics

Did this financial product have a sustainable investment objective?

Yes

No

it made **sustainable investments with an environmental objective: ___%**

It promoted Environmental/Social (E/S) characteristics and while it did not have as its objective a sustainable investment, it had a proportion of 23.43% of sustainable investments.

in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy

with an environmental objective in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy

in economic activities that do not qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy

with an environmental objective in economic activities that do not qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy

with a social objective

It made **sustainable investments with a social objective: ___%**

It promoted E/S characteristics, but did **not make any sustainable investments**



Sustainability indicators measure how the environmental or social characteristics promoted by the financial product are attained.

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

Through this fund, the Company promoted environmental and social characteristics in the areas of climate action, social norms, and governance, as well as in relation to a country's political freedoms and civil liberties, while considering the following exclusion criteria:

- (1) Climate and transition risks;
- (2) Norm issues with respect to compliance with international norms for governance, human rights, labor rights, customer safety, environmental safety, and business ethics;
- (3) Countries rated as "not free" by Freedom House;
- (4) Controversial sectors for companies that exceeded a predefined revenue limit;
- (5) Controversial weapons.

Through this fund, the Company also promoted a minimum proportion of sustainable investments that made a positive contribution to one or more United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs).

For this fund, the Company had not designated a reference benchmark for the attainment of the promoted environmental and/or social characteristics.

No derivatives were used to attain the environmental or social characteristics promoted by the fund.

How did the sustainability indicators perform?

A proprietary ESG methodology was used to measure the attainment of the promoted environmental and social characteristics as well as the proportion of sustainable investments. The following sustainability indicators were used:

- **The Climate and Transition Risk Assessment** served as an indicator for the extent to which an issuer is exposed to climate and transition risks.
Performance: No investments in suboptimal assets
- **The Norm Assessment** served as an indicator for the extent to which norm issues constituting breaches of international standards arise at a company.
Performance: No investments in suboptimal assets
- **Freedom House status** served as an indicator of a country's political freedoms and civil liberties.
Performance: No investments in suboptimal assets
- **The Exclusion Assessment for controversial sectors** served as an indicator for determining the extent of a company's exposure to controversial sectors.
Performance: 0%
- **The Exclusion Assessment for controversial weapons** served as an indicator for determining the extent of a company's exposure to controversial weapons.
Performance: 0%
- **The methodology for determining sustainable investments as defined in article 2 (17) of Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 on sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector (SFDR)** was used as an indicator for measuring the proportion of sustainable investments (Sustainability Investment Assessment)
Performance: 23.43%

Please see the section entitled "What actions have been taken to meet the environmental and/or social characteristics during the reference period?" for a description of the binding elements of the investment strategy used to select the investments to attain each of the environmental or social characteristics promoted, including the exclusion criteria, and the assessment methodology for determining whether and to what extent assets met the defined environmental and/or social characteristics (including the turnover thresholds defined for the exclusions). This section contains further information on the sustainability indicators.

The values from the DWS front office system are used to calculate the sustainability indicators. This means that there may be minor deviations from the other market values that appear in the annual report, which are derived from the fund accounting system.

...and compared to previous periods?

Attainment of the promoted environmental and social characteristics at portfolio level was measured in the previous years on the basis of the following sustainability indicators:

DWS Qi European Equity

| Indicators Performance | 29/12/2023 | 30/12/2022 | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Sustainability indicators | | | |
| Climate and Transition Risk Assessment | No investments in suboptimal assets | - | |
| Climate and Transition Risk Assessment A | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Climate and Transition Risk Assessment B | - | 11.89 | % of assets |
| Climate and Transition Risk Assessment C | - | 59.64 | % of assets |
| Climate and Transition Risk Assessment D | - | 20.96 | % of assets |
| Climate and Transition Risk Assessment E | - | 4.67 | % of assets |
| Climate and Transition Risk Assessment F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| ESG Quality Assessment A | - | 72.06 | % of assets |
| ESG Quality Assessment B | - | 15.41 | % of assets |
| ESG Quality Assessment C | - | 9.53 | % of assets |
| ESG Quality Assessment D | - | 0.16 | % of assets |
| ESG Quality Assessment E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| ESG Quality Assessment F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Norm Assessment | No investments in suboptimal assets | - | |
| Norm Assessment A | - | 20.50 | % of assets |
| Norm Assessment B | - | 17.24 | % of assets |
| Norm Assessment C | - | 28.26 | % of assets |
| Norm Assessment D | - | 26.59 | % of assets |
| Norm Assessment E | - | 4.57 | % of assets |
| Norm Assessment F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Sovereign Freedom Assessment | No investments in suboptimal assets | - | |
| Sovereign Freedom Assessment A | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Sovereign Freedom Assessment B | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Sovereign Freedom Assessment C | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Sovereign Freedom Assessment D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Sovereign Freedom Assessment E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Sovereign Freedom Assessment F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Sustainable investments | 22.29 | 21.48 | % of assets |
| Involvement in controversial sectors | | | |
| Civil firearms C | - | 0.62 | % of assets |
| Civil firearms D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Civil firearms E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Civil firearms F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Coal C | - | 0.93 | % of assets |
| Coal D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Coal E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Coal F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Defense (revenue share) C | - | 5.44 | % of assets |
| Defense (revenue share) D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Defense (revenue share) E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Defense (revenue share) F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Exposure to controversial sectors | 0.00 | - | % of assets |
| Oil sands C | - | 2.52 | % of assets |
| Oil sands D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Oil sands E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Oil sands F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Tobacco C | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Tobacco D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Tobacco E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Tobacco F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |

Involvement in controversial weapons

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|-------------|
| Anti-personnel mines C | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Anti-personnel mines D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Anti-personnel mines F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Cluster munitions D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Cluster munitions E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Cluster munitions F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Depleted uranium weapons C | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Depleted uranium weapons D | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Depleted uranium weapons E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Involvement in controversial weapons | 0.00 | - | % of assets |
| Nuclear weapons C | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Nuclear weapons E | - | 0.00 | % of assets |
| Nuclear weapons F | - | 0.00 | % of assets |

The disclosure of the sustainability indicators has been revised compared with previous reports. The assessment methodology is unchanged. Additional information on the currently valid sustainability indicators is provided in the section entitled "What actions have been taken to meet the environmental and/or social characteristics during the reference period?".

Information about taking into account the principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors is provided in the section entitled "How did this financial product consider principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors?"

DWS ESG-Assessment Scale

In the following assessment categories, the assets received one of six possible scores, with "A" being the best score and "F" being the worst score.

| Criteria | Involvement in controversial sectors *(1) | Involvement in controversial weapons | Norm Assessment *(6) | ESG Quality Assessment | SDG- Assessment | Climat & Transition Risk Assessment |
|----------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| A | Non-involvement | Confirmed non-involvement | Confirmed no issues | True leader in ESG (>= 87.5 DWS ESG score) | True SDG contributor (>= 87.5 SDG score) | True climate leader (>= 87.5 score) |
| B | Remote involvement | Alleged | Violations of lesser degree | ESG leader (75-87.5 DWS ESG score) | SDG contributor (75-87.5 SDG score) | Climate solution provider(75-87.5 score) |
| C | 0% - 5% | Dual-Purpose *(2) | Violations of lesser degree | ESG upper midfield (50-75 DWS ESG score) | SDG upper midfield (50-75 SDG score) | Low transition risk (50-75 score) |
| D | 5% - 10% (coal: 5% - 10%) | Owning *(3)/ Owned *(4) | Violation of lesser degree | ESG lower midfield (25-50 DWS ESG score) | SDG lower midfield (25-50 SDG score) | Mod. transition risk (25-50 score) |
| E | 10% - 25% (coal: 15% - 25%) | Component Producer *(5) | High severity or re-assessed highest violation *(7) | ESG laggard (12.5-25 DWS ESG score) | SDG obstructer (12.5-25 SDG score) | High transition risk (12.5-25 score) |
| F | >= 25% | Weapon producer | Highest severity / global compact violation *(8) | True laggard in ESG (0-12.5 DWS ESG score) | Significant SDG obstructer (0-12.5 SDG score) | Excessive transition risk (0-12.5 score) |

*(1) Revenue share thresholds as per standard scheme. Sub-Granularity available. Thresholds can be individually set.

*(2) Encompasses e.g.. weapon-carrying systems such as combat aircraft that carry non-controversial weapons as well as controversial ones.

*(3) Owning more than 20% equity.

*(4) Being owned by more than 50% of company involved in grade E or F.

*(5) Single purpose key component.

*(6) Includes ILO controversies as well as corporate governance and product issues.

*(7) In its ongoing assessment, DWS takes into account the violation(s) of international standards – observed via data from ESG data vendors – such as the UN Global Compact, but also possible ESG data vendor errors identified, future expected developments of these violations as well as the willingness of the issuer to engage in dialogue regarding corporate decisions in this regard.

*(8) An F-grade can be considered a reconfirmed violation of the United Nations Global Compact rule framework for corporate behavior.

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

For the fund, the Company invested a portion of the assets in sustainable investments as defined in article 2 (17) of the SFDR. These sustainable investments contributed to at least one of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs), which have environmental and/or social objectives such as the following (non-exhaustive) list:

- Goal 1: No poverty
- Goal 2: Zero hunger
- Goal 3: Good health and well-being
- Goal 4: Quality education
- Goal 5: Gender equality
- Goal 6: Clean water and sanitation
- Goal 7: Affordable and clean energy
- Goal 8: Decent work and economic growth
- Goal 10: Reduced inequalities
- Goal 11: Sustainable cities and communities
- Goal 12: Responsible consumption and production
- Goal 13: Climate action
- Goal 14: Life below water
- Goal 15: Life on land

The extent of the contribution to the individual UN SDGs varied depending on the actual investments in the portfolio. The Company determined the contribution to the UN SDGs on the basis of its Sustainability Investment Assessment, in which various criteria were used to assess the potential investments with regard to whether they can be classified as sustainable. As part of this assessment methodology, it was determined whether (1) an investment made a positive contribution to one or more UN SDGs, (2) the issuer significantly harmed these goals (“Do No Significant Harm” – DNSH assessment) and (3) the enterprise applied good governance practices.

The Sustainability Investment Assessment used data from several data providers, public sources and/or internal assessments (based on a defined assessment and classification methodology) to determine whether an investment was sustainable. Activities that made a positive contribution to the UN SDGs were assessed based on turnover, capital expenditure (CapEx) and/or operational expenditure (OpEx), depending on the investment. Where a contribution is determined to be positive, the investment was deemed sustainable if the issuer passed the DNSH assessment and the enterprise applied good governance practices.

The share of sustainable investments was defined by article 2 (17) SFDR in the portfolio was calculated in proportion to the economic activities of the issuers that qualify as sustainable. Notwithstanding the preceding, use-of-proceeds bonds that qualified as sustainable were counted towards the value of the entire bond.

With the fund the Company did not currently pursue a minimum proportion of sustainable investments with an environmental objective aligned with the EU Taxonomy.

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

The Do No Significant Harm (DNSH) assessment was an integral part of the DWS Sustainability Investment Assessment and assessed whether an issuer that contributed to a UN SDG significantly harmed one or more of these goals. Where significant harm was identified, the issuer did not pass the DNSH assessment and the investment could therefore not be deemed sustainable.

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

As part of the Sustainability Investment Assessment, a DNSH assessment systematically integrated the mandatory indicators for the principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors from Table 1 (by relevance) and relevant indicators from Tables 2 and 3 in Annex I of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 supplementing the Disclosure Regulation. Taking these adverse impacts into account, the Company had set quantitative thresholds and/or defined qualitative values to determine whether an issuer significantly harmed the environmental or social objectives. These values were defined based on various external and internal factors, such as data availability, policy objectives, or market trends, and could be adjusted over time.

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

As part of the Sustainability Investment Assessment, the Company also assessed, on the basis of the Norm Assessment, the extent to which an enterprise met international standards. This entailed tests of compliance with international standards such as the OECD Guidelines for multinational enterprises, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the principles of the UN Global Compact, and the standards of the International Labour Organisation. Companies with the lowest Norm Assessment (i.e., a letter score of "F") did not qualify as sustainable and were excluded as an investment.

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

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

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



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

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

The fund, the Company considered the following principal adverse impacts on sustainability factors from Annex I of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 supplementing the Disclosure Regulation:

- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector (no. 4);
- Violation of the UNGC principles and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (no. 10); and
- Exposure to controversial weapons (anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical and biological weapons) (no. 14).

DWS Qi European Equity

| Indicators | Description | Performance |
|--|---|------------------|
| Principal Adverse Impact | | |
| PAII - 04. Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector | Share of investments in companies active in the fossil fuel sector | 25.4 % of assets |
| PAII - 10. Violations of UNGC principles and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises | Share of investments in investee companies that have been involved in violations of the UNGC principles or OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises | 0 % of assets |
| PAII - 14. Exposure to controversial weapons | Share of investments in investee companies involved in the manufacture or selling of controversial weapons (anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons and biological weapons) | 0 % of assets |

As of: December 30, 2024

The Principal Adverse Impact Indicators (PAIIs) are calculated on the basis of the data in the DWS back office and front office systems, which are primarily based on the data of external ESG data providers. If there is no data on individual PAIIs for individual securities or their issuers, either because no data is available or the PAII is not applicable to the particular issuer or security, these securities or issuers are not included in the calculation of the PAII. With target fund investments, a look-through of the target fund holdings is performed if appropriate data is available. The calculation method for the individual PAI indicators may change in subsequent reporting periods due to evolving market standards, a change in the treatment of securities of certain types of instruments (such as derivatives) or as a result of regulatory clarifications.

Moreover, improved data availability may have an effect on the reported PAIIs in subsequent reporting periods.



What were the top investments of this financial product?

DWS Qi European Equity

| Largest investments | Breakdown by sector according to NACE Codes | in % of average portfolio volume | Breakdown by country |
|---|--|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Novo-Nordisk | C - Manufacturing | 3.9 % | Denmark |
| ASML Holding | M - Professional, scientific and technical activities | 3.8 % | Netherlands |
| Novartis AG | C - Manufacturing | 2.8 % | Switzerland |
| Deutsche Managed Euro Fund Z-Class | K - Financial and insurance activities | 2.6 % | Ireland |
| SAP | J - Information and communication | 2.3 % | Germany |
| Nestlé | M - Professional, scientific and technical activities | 2.2 % | Switzerland |
| Shell | M - Professional, scientific and technical activities | 1.9 % | United Kingdom |
| Roche Holding AG | M - Professional, scientific and technical activities | 1.8 % | Switzerland |
| LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton (C.R.) | M - Professional, scientific and technical activities | 1.8 % | France |
| Allianz | K - Financial and insurance activities | 1.7 % | Germany |
| Iberdrola | D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply | 1.6 % | Spain |
| ABB Reg. | C - Manufacturing | 1.5 % | Switzerland |
| Industria de Diseño Textil | G - Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles | 1.5 % | Spain |
| 3i Group | K - Financial and insurance activities | 1.5 % | United Kingdom |
| Siemens Reg. | C - Manufacturing | 1.4 % | Germany |

for the period from January 01, 2024, through December 30, 2024

The list includes the investments constituting **the greatest proportion of investments** of the financial product during the reference period which is:
for the period from January 01, 2024, through December 31, 2024



What was the proportion of sustainability-related investments?

The proportion of sustainability-related investments as of the reporting date was 98.66% of portfolio assets.

Proportion of sustainability-related investments for the previous years:

29/12/2023: 98.63 %

30/12/2022: 97.16 %


Asset allocation

describes the share of investments in specific assets.

What was the asset allocation?

This fund invested 98.66% of its assets in assets that met ESG standards defined by the Company (#1 Aligned with E/S characteristics). 23.43% of the fund's assets were invested in sustainable investments (#1A Sustainable).

1.34% of the fund's assets were invested in assets for which the ESG assessment methodology was not applied or for which ESG data coverage was not complete (#2 Other). Within this quota, investments of up to 49% of the fund's assets in investments for which there was not complete data coverage with respect to the ESG assessment categories and exclusions were tolerated. This tolerance did not apply to the Norm Assessment, so companies were required to apply good governance practices.



#1 Aligned with E/S characteristics includes the investments of the financial product used to attain the environmental or social characteristics promoted by the financial product.

#2 Other includes the remaining investments of the financial product which are neither aligned with the environmental or social characteristics, nor are qualified as sustainable investments.

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

- The sub-category **#1A Sustainable** covers sustainable investments with environmental or social objectives.
- The sub-category **#1B Other E/S characteristics** covers investments aligned with the environmental or social characteristics that do not qualify as sustainable investments.

In which economic sectors were the investments made?

DWS Qi European Equity

| NACE-Code | Breakdown by sector according to NACE Codes | in % of portfolio volume |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| B | Mining and quarrying | 1.7 % |
| C | Manufacturing | 20.0 % |
| D | Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply | 3.6 % |
| F | Construction | 1.1 % |
| G | Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles | 3.8 % |
| H | Transporting and storage | 1.5 % |
| I | Accommodation and food service activities | 0.5 % |
| J | Information and communication | 7.6 % |
| K | Financial and insurance activities | 20.1 % |
| M | Professional, scientific and technical activities | 34.9 % |
| N | Administrative and support service activities | 1.3 % |
| NA | Other | 3.9 % |
| Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector | | 25.4 % |

As of: December 30, 2024



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

The promoted proportion of environmentally sustainable investments in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2020/852 (Taxonomy Regulation) was 0% of the fund's assets. It may, however, have been the case that some sustainable investments were nevertheless aligned with an environmental objective of the Taxonomy Regulation.

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

Enabling activities directly enable other activities to make a substantial contribution to an environmental objective.

Transitional activities are economic activities for yet low-carbon alternatives are not yet available and that have greenhouse gas emission levels corresponding to the best performance.

Did the financial product invest in fossil gas and/or nuclear energy related activities complying with the EU Taxonomy¹?

Yes:

In fossil gas

In nuclear energy

No

The Company did not pursue Taxonomy-aligned investments in the areas of fossil gas and/or nuclear energy. However, it is possible that, as part of the investment strategy, investments have been made in companies that were also active in these sectors.


¹ Fossil gas and/or nuclear related activities will only comply with the EU Taxonomy where they contribute to limiting climate change ("climate change mitigation") and do no significant harm to any EU Taxonomy objective - see explanatory note in the left hand margin. The full criteria for fossil gas and nuclear energy economic activities that comply with the EU Taxonomy are laid down in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1214.

Taxonomy-aligned activities are expressed as a share of:

- **turnover** reflecting the share of revenue from green activities of investee companies.
- **capital expenditure** (CapEx) showing the green investments made by investee companies, e.g. for a transition to a green economy.
- **operational expenditure** (OpEx) reflecting the green operational activities of investee companies.


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

1. Taxonomy-alignment of investments including sovereign bonds*



| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Taxonomy-aligned: Fossil gas | 0.00% |
| Taxonomy-aligned: Nuclear | 0.00% |
| Taxonomy-aligned (no gas and nuclear) | 0.00% |
| Taxonomy-aligned | 0.00% |
| Non Taxonomy-aligned | 100.00% |

2. Taxonomy-alignment of investments excluding sovereign bonds*



| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Taxonomy-aligned: Fossil gas | 0.00% |
| Taxonomy-aligned: Nuclear | 0.00% |
| Taxonomy-aligned (no gas and nuclear) | 0.00% |
| Taxonomy-aligned | 0.00% |
| Non Taxonomy-aligned | 100.00% |

This graph represents 100% of the total investments.

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

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

There was no minimum share of investments in transitional or enabling activities.

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

The promoted proportion of environmentally sustainable investments in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2020/852 (Taxonomy Regulation) was 0% of the fund's assets in the current as well as previous reference periods. It may, however, have been the case that some sustainable investments were nevertheless aligned with an environmental objective of the Taxonomy Regulation.

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

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

There was no separate minimum proportion for sustainable investments with an environmental objective that were not consistent with the EU Taxonomy. It was not possible to make a separation when assessing whether sustainable investments were environmental or social investments. The total share of sustainable investments was 23.43% of the assets of the fund.

Shares of sustainable investments in previous reporting periods:

| reporting period | sustainable investments (total) | with environmental objective | socially sustainable |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 29/12/2023 | 22.29% | -- | -- |
| 30/12/2022 | 21.48% | -- | -- |



What was the share of socially sustainable investments?

The Company had not defined a minimum percentage for environmentally or socially sustainable investments in accordance with article 2 (17) of the Disclosure Regulation. As a separation in the assessment of sustainable investments was not possible, the total share of environmentally and socially sustainable investments was therefore 23.43% of the fund's assets.

Shares of sustainable investments in previous reporting periods:

| reporting period | sustainable investments (total) | with environmental objective | socially sustainable |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 29/12/2023 | 22.29% | -- | -- |
| 30/12/2022 | 21.48% | -- | -- |



What investments were included under "other", what was their purpose and were there any minimum environmental or social safeguards?

Assets amounting to 1.34% of the fund's assets for which the DWS ESG assessment methodology was not applied or for which ESG data coverage is not complete come under #2 Other.

Within this quota, investments of up to 49% of the fund's assets in investments for which there was not complete data coverage with respect to the ESG assessment categories and exclusions were tolerated.

This tolerance did not apply to the Norm Assessment, so companies were required to apply good governance practices.

These other investments could include all assets provided for in the investment policy, including bank balances and derivatives.

"Other investments" could be used to optimize the investment performance, as well as for diversification, liquidity and hedging purposes.

Minimum environmental or social safeguards were not considered or only partially considered with respect to this fund's other investments.



What actions have been taken to meet the environmental and/or social characteristics during the reference period?

This fund followed an equity strategy. The fund's assets were primarily invested in assets that fulfilled the defined standards for the promoted environmental or social characteristics, as set out in the following sections. The strategy of the fund in relation to the promoted environmental or social characteristics was an integral part of the proprietary ESG assessment methodology and was continuously monitored through the investment guidelines of the fund. Further details of the investment policy could be found in the special section of the sales prospectus and the Special Terms and Conditions of Investment.

ESG assessment methodology

The Company sought to attain the promoted environmental and social characteristics by assessing potential investments via a proprietary ESG assessment methodology irrespective of economic prospects of success and by applying exclusion criteria based on this.

The ESG assessment methodology was based on the ESG database, which used data from multiple ESG data providers, public sources and internal assessments. Internal assessments took into account factors such as an issuer's future expected ESG development, plausibility of the data with regard to past or future events, an issuer's willingness to engage in dialogue on ESG matters and an enterprise's ESG-specific decisions.

The ESG database derived "A" to "F" letter coded scores within different categories. Issuers each received one of six possible scores (A to F), with "A" being the highest score and "F" being the lowest score on the scale. On the basis of other categories, the ESG database also provided exclusion criteria (complete exclusions or exclusions based on turnover thresholds).

The respective scores for the assets were considered individually. If an issuer in an assessment category had a score that was considered to be unsuitable in that assessment category, assets from this issuer could not be acquired even if it had a score in another assessment category that would have been suitable.

The ESG database used, for example, the following categories to assess whether issuers/investments comply with ESG standards relating to the promoted environmental and social characteristics and whether companies that were invested in applied good governance practices:

• Climate and Transition Risk Assessment

The Climate and Transition Risk Assessment evaluated the behavior of issuers in relation to climate change and environmental changes, e.g., with respect to greenhouse gas reduction and water conservation.

Issuers that contributed less to climate change and other negative environmental changes or that were less exposed to such risks receive a better score.

Issuers that received a letter score of F in the Climate and Transition Risk Assessment category were excluded.

• The Norm Assessment

The Norm Assessment evaluated the behavior of companies, for example, within the framework of the principles of the UN Global Compact, the standards of the International Labour Organization, and behavior within generally accepted international standards and principles. The Norm Assessment examines, for example, human rights violations, violations of workers' rights, child or forced labor, adverse environmental impacts and business ethics. The assessment takes into account violations of the aforementioned international standards. These violations were assessed using data from ESG data providers and/or other available information, such as the expected future development of these violations as well as the willingness of the company to begin dialogue concerning relevant business decisions.

Companies that received a letter score of F in the Norm Assessment category were excluded.

• Freedom House status

Freedom House is an international non-governmental organization that classifies countries by their degree of political freedoms and civil liberties. On the basis of the Freedom House status, countries rated as "not free" by Freedom House were excluded.

• The Exclusion Assessment for controversial sectors

Companies that were involved in particular business areas and business activities in controversial areas ("controversial sectors") were excluded.

Companies were excluded as an investment based on the share of total revenues they generated in controversial sectors. The fund expressly excluded companies which generated revenues as follows:

- more than 10% from production of products and/or services provided in the armaments industry;
- more than 5% from production and/or sale of civil handguns or munition;
- more than 5% from production of tobacco products;
- more than 25% from coal mining and coal-based power generation;
- more than 5% from mining of oil sands.

Companies with coal expansion plans, such as additional coal mining, production or usage, were excluded based on an internal identification methodology.

The aforementioned coal-related exclusions only applied to thermal coal, i.e., coal that was used in power stations to generate power. In the event of exceptional circumstances, such as measures imposed by a government to overcome challenges in the energy sector, the Company may decide to temporarily suspend applying the coal-related exclusions to individual companies/geographical regions.

• **The Exclusion Assessment for controversial weapons**

Companies that were identified as manufacturers – or manufacturers of key components – of anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons, biological weapons, nuclear weapons, depleted uranium weapons or uranium munitions were excluded. In addition, the relative exposures within a Group structure have been taken into consideration for the exclusions.

• **Assessment of use-of-proceeds bonds**

In a departure from the above assessment categories, investment in bonds of excluded issuers was nevertheless permitted if the particular requirements for use-of-proceeds bonds were met. To begin with, the bonds were checked for compliance with the ICMA Green Bond Principles, Social Bond Principles or Sustainability Bond Guidelines. In addition, a defined minimum of ESG criteria was checked in relation to the issuer of the bond, and issuers and their bonds that did not meet these criteria were excluded.

Issuers were excluded based on the following criteria:

- Sovereign issuers rated as “not free” by Freedom House;
- Companies with the lowest Norm Assessment (i.e., a letter score of “F”);
- Companies with involvement in controversial weapons production; or
- Companies with identified coal expansion plans.

• **Assessment of investment fund units**

Investment fund units were assessed taking into account the investments within the target funds in accordance with the Climate and Transition Risk Assessment, Norm Assessment, and Freedom House status, as well as in accordance with the Exclusion Assessment for the controversial weapons sector (excluding nuclear weapons, depleted uranium weapons or uranium munitions).

The assessment methods for investment fund units were based on examining the entire portfolio of the target fund, taking into account the investments within the target fund portfolio. Depending on the respective assessment category, exclusion criteria (such as tolerance thresholds) that resulted in exclusion of the target fund were defined. Thus, target funds might invest in investments that were not compliant with the defined ESG standards for issuers.

Sustainability Investment Assessment in accordance with article 2 (17) SFDR

Further, for the proportion of sustainable investments DWS measured the contribution to one or several UN SDGs via its Sustainability Investment Assessment which evaluated potential investments in relation to different criteria to conclude that an investment could be considered as sustainable as further detailed in section “What were the objectives of the sustainable investments that the financial product partially made and how did the sustainable investment contribute to such objectives?”.

Non-ESG assessed asset classes

Not every asset of the sub-fund was assessed by the ESG assessment methodology. This applied in particular to the following asset classes:

Bank balances were not assessed.

Derivatives were not used to attain the environmental and social characteristics promoted by the fund, which was why they were not taken into account in the calculation of the minimum proportion of assets that fulfill these characteristics. However, derivatives on individual issuers could be acquired for the fund if, and only if, the issuers of the underlyings met the ESG standards and were not excluded in accordance with the ESG assessment categories described above.

The applied ESG investment strategy did not pursue a committed minimum reduction of the scope of the investments.

The assessment of the good governance practices of the investee companies was based on the DWS Norm Assessment. Accordingly, the assessed investee companies followed good governance practices.



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

An index had not been defined as a benchmark.

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