

ANNEX IV

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

Product name: EdR Fund – Healthcare

Legal entity identifier: 549300S489MUGD5R2H22

Environmental and/or social characteristics

Did this financial product have a sustainable investment objective?

<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> It made sustainable investments with an environmental objective: ____% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy <input type="checkbox"/> in economic activities that do not qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It promoted Environmental/Social (E/S) characteristics and while it did not have as its objective a sustainable investment, it had a proportion of 85.36% of sustainable investments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> with an environmental objective in economic activities that qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy <input type="checkbox"/> with an environmental objective in economic activities that do not qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> with a social objective
<input type="checkbox"/> It made sustainable investments with a social objective: ____%	<input type="checkbox"/> It promoted E/S characteristics, but did not make any sustainable investments



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

The UCITS promotes environmental and social characteristics identified by our ESG analysis model, and which are included in our analyzes upstream of the selection of securities and has a follow-up on indicators including internal and external ESG

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

ratings, a monitoring the level of controversies, alignment with the trajectory of the Paris agreements or the intensity of carbon emissions.

● **How did the sustainability indicators perform?**

During the period under review, the Sub-Fund invested in securities of a universe reduced of 20% of the worst ESG ratings.

The source used by the portfolio manager is MSCI (versus Sustainalytics) since 30.06.23.

As of 31.03.24:

- portfolio MSCI ESG score 58.83 versus 58.46 for the universe (*ESG score: source EdRAM/MSCI; ESG score on a scale from 0 (worst score) to 100 (best score)*);
- portfolio coverage of 99.37%;
- portfolio climate alignment 2.88°C vs 2.93°C for the universe (*Climate alignment (°C): the global warming trajectory (°C) of each company in the portfolio based on its carbon footprint (scopes 1, 2 and 3*), the efforts undertaken to reduce it and the strategy announced to contribute to the fight against global warming. The trajectory is derived from the individual company's performance compared to a warming trajectory of the global economy of 1.5°C. The trajectories of the companies in the portfolio are then aggregated. Ratios as of 29/02/2024*);
- GHG emissions intensity (scopes 1,2 and 3): portfolio 23.75, universe 45.81 (*Source : Carbon4 Finance ; GHG emissions intensity scopes 1,2 and 3 (retreated) tons CO2 per million Euros invested*).

Moreover, 0% of the portfolio was invested in companies that contribute to the production of controversial weapons, in accordance with relevant international conventions, as well as companies exposed to thermal coal, tobacco or non-conventional fossil energies activities and companies with violation of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC), in accordance with the Edmond de Rothschild Group's exclusion policy.

● **...and compared to previous periods?**

Data as of 31.03.23:

Portfolio Sustainalytics ESG rating 21.81 versus 21.94 for the universe (ESG score: source Sustainalytics; ESG risk score on a scale from 0 (lowest risk) to 100 (highest risk));

- portfolio coverage of 98.55%;
- portfolio climate alignment 2.73°C vs 2.89°C for the universe;

- GHG emissions intensity (scopes 1,2 and 3): portfolio 29.11, universe 51.38 (Source : Carbon4 Finance ; GHG emissions intensity scopes 1,2 and 3 (retreated) tons CO2 per million Euros invested).

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

The sustainable investments of the fund aim at contributing positively to one or more sustainable development goals of the United Nations (SDGs), in the environmental, social or societal space, while not causing significant harm and respecting minimum governance standards.

The description of the sustainable investment methodology defined by Edmond de Rothschild Asset Management (France) is available on the asset management company's website :
<https://www.edmond-de-rothschild.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/Responsible-investment/OUR%20ENGAGEMENT/FR/EdRAM-Definition-et-methodologie-Investissement-durable.pdf>

Based on this approach, the sub-fund has reached its objectives with 85.36% of sustainable investments as of 31.03.24.

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

The sustainable investments made by the Sub-fund ensure that they do not cause significant harm to a sustainable investment objective, in particular:

- by applying the Edmond de Rothschild Group's exclusion policy which includes controversial weapons, tobacco, thermal coal and unconventional fossil fuels,
- by ensuring that it does not invest in companies that violate the UN Global Compact.

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

Adverse impact indicators are integrated in the fund's investment process, and are also part of our ESG rating model and in our definition of sustainable investment (see the description of the sustainable investment methodology available on the website). They are integrated into portfolio monitoring tools and monitored by the Investment team and the Risk Department.

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.

Moreover, and in accordance with the SRI label, the bottom 20% of our universe is excluded, as well as the most severe controversies, limiting any adverse impacts.

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

The investment manager selected sustainable investments in accordance with the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights by excluding any company that violates the UN Global Compact principles.

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.



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

Yes, the sub-fund takes into account the main negative impacts on sustainability factors by first applying Edmond de Rothschild Asset Management's (France) exclusion policy, notably concerning thermal coal and controversial weapons. The main negative impacts are also taken into consideration in the framework of the proprietary or external ESG analysis of issuers and impact the Environmental and Social scores as well as the overall ESG rating.

The sub-fund's periodic reports presenting, in accordance with Article 11 of Regulation (EU) 2019/2088, the so-called SFDR Regulation, in particular the extent to which environmental or social characteristics are respected, are available on the website www.edmond-de-rothschild.com under the "Fund Center" tab.



What were the top investments of this financial product?

Largest investments	Sector	Country	% Net Assets
CVS HEALTH	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	4.84
PFIZER INC	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	4.82
ELI LILLY & CO	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	3.93
ASTRAZENECA PLC	HEALTH CARE	UNITED KINGDOM	3.89
UCB	HEALTH CARE	BELGIUM	3.09
MEDTRONIC HLD	HEALTH CARE	IRELAND	3.04
UNITEDHEALTH GROUP INC	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	3.00
CENTENE CORP	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	2.96
ELEVANCE HEALTH	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	2.91
NOVARTIS AG PREFERRED SHARE	HEALTH CARE	SWITZERLAND	2.81
BIOMARIN PHARMACEUTICAL INC	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	2.76
GILEAD SCIENCES INC	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	2.76
IQVIA HOLDINGS INC	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	2.75
BEIGENE LTD ADR	HEALTH CARE	LUXEMBOURG	2.42
BOSTON SCIENTIF CORP	HEALTH CARE	UNITED STATES	2.33

The list includes the investments constituting the **greatest proportion of investments** of the financial product during the reference period which is:
01/04/2023 – 31/03/2024



What was the proportion of sustainability-related investments?

What was the asset allocation?

As of 31.03.24:

- 94.94% of the net assets in securities aligned with E/S characteristics;
- 85.36% of the net assets in sustainable investments;
- 5.06% of the net assets in # Other;

Asset allocation describes the share of investments in specific assets.


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

activities for which low-carbon alternatives are not yet available and among others have greenhouse gas emission levels corresponding to the best performance.



● In which economic sectors were the investments made?

As of 31.03.24

Sector	% Net Assets
HEALTH CARE	95.54
MISCELLANEOUS (FUND)	3.01



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

Not applicable

● 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

¹ Fossil gas and/or nuclear related activities will only comply with the EU Taxonomy where they contribute to limiting climate change ("climate change mitigation") and do not significantly harm any EU Taxonomy objective - see explanatory note in the left hand margin. The full criteria for fossil gas and nuclear energy economic activities that comply with the EU Taxonomy are laid down in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1214.

 No



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

Taxonomy-aligned activities are expressed as a share of:

- **turnover** reflects the “greenness” of investee companies today.
- **capital expenditure** (CapEx) shows the green investments made by investee companies, relevant for a transition to a green economy.
- **operational expenditure** (OpEx) reflects 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.*



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

Turnover – 0%

CapEx – 0%

OpEx – 0%

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

The share of sustainable investments with an environmental objective that are not aligned with the EU taxonomy was 85.36% of the net assets as of 31.03.24.



What was the share of socially sustainable investments?

The share of socially sustainable investments was 85.36% of the net assets as of 31.03.24.



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

Investments included under “other” as of 31.03.24, 5.06% of the net assets with notably:

- Securities without ESG rating, but still do not contribute to the production of controversial weapons, in accordance with relevant international conventions, as well as companies exposed to thermal coal, tobacco activities or non-conventional fossil energies activities, in accordance with the Edmond de Rothschild Group’s exclusion policy (0.60%);
- Deposits, money market instruments, money market funds and derivatives (4.46%);



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

The percentage of sustainable investment is monitored by the Risk Department via the investment management and control tools.

We also have dashboards that enable us to monitor climate and ESG indicators, such as the portfolio's CO2 footprint or temperature, exposure to the various United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, and the environmental and social ratings of investments. Our tools provide a consolidated view of the portfolio, as well as an issuer-by-issuer analysis. Our proprietary and/or externally sourced ESG analysis also assigns a score to each of the environmental and social themes promoted by the fund.



Reference benchmarks

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

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

- ***How does the reference benchmark differ from a broad market index?***
Not applicable
- ***How did this financial product perform with regard to the sustainability indicators to determine the alignment of the reference benchmark with the environmental or social characteristics promoted?***
Not applicable
- ***How did this financial product perform compared with the reference benchmark?***
Not applicable
- ***How did this financial product perform compared with the broad market index?***
Not applicable