

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 Invest Top Dividend

Legal entity identifier: 5493003XYDKBDCH55556

ISIN: LU0507265923

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 19.43 % 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?

This sub-fund promoted environmental and social characteristics related to climate, governance and social norms as well as sovereign matters through the avoidance of (1) issuers exposed to excessive climate and transition risks, (2) issuers exposed to highest severity of norm issues (i.e. as regards compliance with international standards of corporate governance, human rights and labour rights, customer and environment safety and business ethics), (3) sovereign issuers with high or excessive controversies regarding political and civil liberties, (4) issuers moderately, highly or excessively exposed to controversial sectors and controversial activities, and/or (5) issuers involved in controversial weapons.

This sub-fund further promoted a minimum proportion of sustainable investments with a positive contribution to one or several of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs). This sub-fund had not designated a reference benchmark for the purpose of attaining the environmental and/or social characteristics promoted.

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

How did the sustainability indicators perform?

Please see the section entitled “What actions have been taken to meet the environmental and/or social characteristics during the reference period?” for detailed descriptions of the binding elements of the investment strategy used to select the investments for attaining the environmental and/or social characteristics promoted and the assessment methodology for determining whether and to what extent assets and indicators met the defined ESG standards.

The ESG ratios are calculated based on the valuation prices for the assets, which are recorded in the front office system. This can lead to slight variations from the other market prices presented in the annual report, which are taken from the fund accounting system.

DWS Invest Top Dividend

Indicators	Description	Performance
Sustainability indicators		
Climate and Transition Risk Assessment A		0 % of assets
Climate and Transition Risk Assessment B		8.5 % of assets
Climate and Transition Risk Assessment C		44.81 % of assets
Climate and Transition Risk Assessment D		24.44 % of assets
Climate and Transition Risk Assessment E		20.52 % of assets
Climate and Transition Risk Assessment F		0 % of assets
ESG Quality Assessment A		54.19 % of assets
ESG Quality Assessment B		17.9 % of assets
ESG Quality Assessment C		24.61 % of assets
ESG Quality Assessment D		3.43 % of assets
ESG Quality Assessment E		0 % of assets
ESG Quality Assessment F		0 % of assets
Norm Assessment A		12.61 % of assets
Norm Assessment B		11.33 % of assets
Norm Assessment C		33.45 % of assets
Norm Assessment D		30.13 % of assets
Norm Assessment E		10.25 % of assets
Norm Assessment F		0 % of assets
Sovereign Freedom Assessment A		0 % of assets
Sovereign Freedom Assessment B		0.5 % of assets
Sovereign Freedom Assessment C		0 % of assets
Sovereign Freedom Assessment D		0 % of assets
Sovereign Freedom Assessment E		0 % of assets
Sovereign Freedom Assessment F		0 % of assets
Involvement in controversial sectors		
Civil firearms C		0 % of assets
Civil firearms D		0 % of assets
Civil firearms E		0 % of assets
Civil firearms F		0 % of assets
Coal C		4.22 % of assets
Coal D		3.66 % of assets
Coal E		1.8 % of assets
Coal F		0 % of assets
Military Defense C		3.€1 % of assets
Military Defense D		0.84 % of assets
Military Defense E		0 % of assets
Military Defense F		0 % of assets
Oil sands C		6.1 % of assets
Oil sands D		0 % of assets
Oil sands E		0 % of assets
Oil sands F		0 % of assets
Tobacco C		0 % of assets
Tobacco D		0 % of assets
Tobacco E		0 % of assets
Tobacco F		0 % of assets
Involvement in controversial weapons		
Anti-personnel mines D		0 % of assets
Anti-personnel mines E		0 % of assets
Anti-personnel mines F		0 % of assets
Cluster munitions D		0 % of assets
Cluster munitions E		0 % of assets
Cluster munitions F		0 % of assets
Depleted uranium weapons D		0 % of assets
Depleted uranium weapons E		0 % of assets
Depleted uranium weapons F		0 % of assets
Nuclear weapons D		0 % of assets
Nuclear weapons E		0 % of assets
Nuclear weapons F		0 % of assets

Indicators	Description	Performance
Principal Adverse Impact		
PAII - 02. Carbon Footprint - EUR	The carbon footprint is expressed as tonnes of CO ₂ emissions per million EUR invested. The CO ₂ emissions of an issuer are normalised by its enterprise value including cash (EVIC)	682.23
PAII - 03. Carbon Intensity	Weighted average carbon intensity scope 1+2+3	1853.52
PAII - 04. Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector	Share of investments in companies active in the fossil fuel sector	26.91 %
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, 2022

The Principal Adverse Impact Indicators (PAII) are calculated on the basis of information available within DWS back-office and front-office systems, that are amongst others based on information sourced from external ESG data vendors. In case individual securities or issuers related to such securities do not have information related to an individual PAII, either through a lack of data availability or through the non-applicability of the PAII to that individual issuer or security, the PAII calculation methodology for individual indicators may consider such securities or issuers with a value of 0. For Target Fund investments, a “look-through” into target fund holdings is performed subject to data availability, amongst others related to reasonable actual information of target fund holdings as well as the related security or issuer information. The calculation methodology for the individual PAII indicators may change in subsequent reporting periods as a consequence of evolving market standards, a change of treatment of securities of specific instrument types (such as derivatives), an increase in data coverage or through regulatory clarifications.

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	Climate & 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		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% -15%)	Owning ³ /Owned ⁴		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 ⁵ producer	High severity or re-assessed highest severity 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?

The sub-fund invested partially in sustainable investments according to article 2(17) SFDR. Such sustainable investments contributed to at least one of the UN SDGs that relate to 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 10: Reduced inequality
- Goal 11: Sustainable cities and communities
- Goal 12: Responsible consumption
- Goal 13: Climate action
- Goal 14: Life below water
- Goal 15: Life on land

The extent of contribution to individual UN SDGs varied based on the actual investments in the portfolio.

DWS measured the contribution to the UN SDGs via its sustainability investment assessment which evaluated potential investments in relation to different criteria to conclude that an economic activity can be considered as sustainable. Via this assessment, the sub-fund management evaluated (1) whether an economic activity contributed to one or several of the UN SDGs, (2) whether the economic activity or other economic activities of that company significantly harmed any of these objectives (Do Not Significantly Harm (DNSH) assessment) and (3) whether the company as such was in line with the DWS safeguard assessment.

The sustainability investment assessment used data from multiple data providers, public sources and internal assessments (based on a defined assessment and classification methodology) to determine if an activity was sustainable. Activities that contributed positively to the UN SDGs were measured in terms of revenues, capital expenditure (CapEx) and/or operational expenditure (OpEx). If a positive contribution was determined, the activity was considered sustainable if the company passed the DNSH assessment and complied with the DWS safeguard assessment (as detailed in the section “Were sustainable investments aligned with the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights?”).

The sub-fund did not commit to target 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 DNSH assessment was integral part of the sustainability investment assessment and evaluated whether an economic activity with a contribution to an UN SDG caused significant harm to any of these objectives. In case that a significant harm was identified, the economic activity failed the DNSH assessment and could not be considered as sustainable economic activity.

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

As part of the DNSH assessment under article 2(17) SFDR, the sustainability investment assessment systematically integrated all mandatory principal adverse indicators from Table 1 and relevant indicators from Tables 2 and 3 of Annex I of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 supplementing the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR). Taking into account these adverse impacts, DWS established quantitative thresholds and/or qualitative values to determine if an investment significantly harmed any of the environmental or social objectives. These values were set based upon various external and internal factors, such as data availability or market developments.

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 its sustainability investment assessment, DWS further evaluated through its safeguard assessment the alignment of a company with international norms. This included checks in relation to adherence to international norms, for example, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the principles of the United Nations Global Compact and the standards of the International Labour Organization. Companies with assessed and reconfirmed highest violations of one of the international norms were considered as non-compliant to the safeguards and their economic activities could not be considered sustainable.

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 sub-fund management considered the following principle adverse impacts on sustainability factors from Annex I of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1288 supplementing the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation:

- Carbon footprint (no. 2);
- GHG intensity of investee companies (no. 3);
- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector (no. 4);
- Violation of UN Global Compact principles and OECD Guidelines for multinational enterprises (no. 10); and
- Exposure to controversial weapons (no. 14).

The above principal adverse impacts were considered at product level through the exclusion strategy for the sub-fund's assets that were aligned with environmental and social characteristics via the proprietary ESG assessment methodology as detailed in section "What actions have been taken to meet the environmental and/or social characteristics during the reference period?".

For sustainable investments, the principal adverse impacts were further considered in the DNSH assessment as described above in section "How were the indicators for adverse impacts on sustainability factors taken into account?".



What were the top investments of this financial product?

DWS Invest Top Dividend

Largest investments	Breakdown by sector / issuer	in % of average portfolio volume	Breakdown by country
Newmont	Basic Resources	2.7 %	United States
Johnson & Johnson	Health Care	2.6 %	United States
Nutrien	Chemicals	2.6 %	Canada
Nextera Energy Inc.	Utilities	2.4 %	United States
TC Energy	Energy	2.4 %	Canada
Nestlé Reg.	Food, Beverage & Tobacco	2.3 %	Switzerland
The Procter & Gamble	Personal Care, Drug & Grocery Stores	2.3 %	United States
Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co.	Technology	2.3 %	Taiwan
TotalEnergies	Energy	2.1 %	France
BHP Group	Basic Resources	2.0 %	Australia
BCE (new)	Telecommunications	2.0 %	Canada
Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corp.	Telecommunications	1.9 %	Japan
Pfizer	Health Care	1.9 %	United States
Merck & Co.	Health Care	1.9 %	United States
WEC Energy Group	Utilities	1.9 %	United States

for the period from January 01, 2022, through December 30, 2022

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, 2022, through December 31, 2022




What was the proportion of sustainability-related investments?

Asset allocation describes the share of investments in specific assets.

What was the asset allocation?

This sub-fund invested 100% of its net assets in investments that were aligned with the promoted environmental and social characteristics (#1 Aligned with E/S characteristics). Within this category, 19.43% of the sub-fund's assets qualified as sustainable investments (#1A Sustainable).

0% of the investments were not aligned with these characteristics (#2 Other). A more detailed description of the specific asset allocation of this sub-fund can be found in the Special Section of the Sales Prospectus.



#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 Invest Top Dividend

Breakdown by sector / issuer

in % of portfolio volume

Information Technology	11.5 %
Telecommunication Services	10.1 %
Consumer Discretionaries	10.0 %
Energy	8.1 %
Consumer Staples	7.1 %
Financials	6.1 %
Basic Materials	5.1 %
Industrials	4.1 %
Utilities	3.1 %
Central governments	2.1 %
Equity funds	1.1 %
Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector	26.91 %

As of: December 31, 2022



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

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.

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.

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

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.


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 0.00%
■ Non Taxonomy-aligned 100.00%

2. Taxonomy-alignment of investments excluding sovereign bonds*



■ Taxonomy-aligned 0.00%
■ Non Taxonomy-aligned 100.00%

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

Due to a lack of reliable data the sub-fund did not commit to invest a minimum proportion of sustainable investments with an environmental objective aligned with the EU Taxonomy. Therefore, the percentage of environmentally sustainable investments aligned with the EU Taxonomy was 0% of the sub-fund's net assets. However, there may have been instances in which part of the investments' underlying economic activities were aligned with the EU Taxonomy.



are sustainable investments with an environmental objective that **do not take into account the criteria** for environmentally sustainable economic activities under the Regulation (EU) 2020/85.

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

The sub-fund did not have a minimum share of investments in transitional and enabling activities, as it did not commit to a minimum proportion of environmentally sustainable investments aligned with the EU Taxonomy.



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

The sub-fund did not intend to make a minimum allocation to environmentally or socially sustainable investments pursuant to Article 2(17) SFDR. However, the share of environmentally and socially sustainable investments in total was 19.43 % of the net assets of the sub-fund.



What was the share of socially sustainable investments?

The sub-fund did not intend to make a minimum allocation to environmentally or socially sustainable investments pursuant to Article 2(17) SFDR. However, the share of environmentally and socially sustainable investments in total was 19.43 % of the net assets of the sub-fund.



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

This sub-fund promoted a predominant asset allocation in investments that were aligned with environmental and social characteristics (#1 Aligned with E/S characteristics). In addition, and on an ancillary basis, this sub-fund invested into investments that are not considered aligned with the promoted characteristics (#2 Other). These remaining investments could include all asset classes as foreseen in the specific investment policy including cash and derivatives.

In line with the market positioning of this sub-fund, the purpose of these remaining investments was to provide investors with an exposure to non-ESG aligned investments while at the same time ensuring a predominant exposure to environmentally and socially aligned investments. Remaining investments could be used by the portfolio management for performance, diversification, liquidity and hedging purposes.

This sub-fund did not consider any minimum environmental or social safeguards on these remaining investments.



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

This sub-fund pursued a strategy based on equities as main investment strategy. At least 70% of the sub-fund's assets were invested in equities of international issuers that were expected to deliver an above-average dividend yield. When selecting equities, the following criteria should be of decisive importance: dividend yield above the market average, sustainability of dividend yield and growth, historical and future earnings growth as well as price/earnings ratio.

Further details regarding the main investment strategy are specified in the Special Section of the Sales Prospectus.

The sub-fund's assets were predominantly allocated into investments that complied with the defined standards in respect to the promoted environmental and social characteristics as described in the following sections. The sub-fund's strategy in relation to the promoted environmental or social characteristics was integral part of the ESG assessment methodology, which was continuously monitored via the sub-fund's investment guidelines.

ESG assessment methodology

The portfolio management of this sub-fund 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. This methodology was based on the ESG database, which used data from multiple ESG data providers, public sources and internal assessments (based on a defined assessment and classification methodology) to derive combined scores. The ESG database was therefore constituted by data and figures as well as on internal assessments that took into account factors beyond the processed data and figures, 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 dialogues on ESG matters or corporate decisions.

The ESG database derived "A" to "F" letter coded assessments within different categories as further detailed below. Within each category, issuers received one of six possible scores, with "A" being the highest score and "F" being the lowest score. If an issuer's score in one category was deemed insufficient, the portfolio management was prohibited from investing in that issuer, even if it was eligible according to other categories. For exclusion purposes, each letter score in a category was considered individually and may result might have resulted in exclusion of an issuer.

The ESG database used a variety of assessment categories to assess the attainment of the promoted environmental and social characteristics, including amongst others:

• DWS Climate and Transition Risk Assessment

The DWS Climate and Transition Risk Assessment evaluated issuers in relation to climate change and environmental changes, e.g. in respect to greenhouse gas reduction and water conservation. Issuers that contributed less to climate change and other negative environmental changes or were less exposed to such risks received better evaluations. Issuers with excessive climate risk profile (i.e. a letter score of "F") were excluded as an investment.

• DWS Norm Assessment

The DWS Norm Assessment evaluated the behaviour of issuers, for example, within the framework of the principles of the United Nations Global Compact, the standards of the International Labour Organization and behaviour within generally accepted international standards and principles. The Norm Assessment examined, for example, human rights violations, violations of workers' rights, child or forced labour, adverse environmental impacts and business ethics. Issuers with highest severity of norm issues (i.e. a letter score of "F") were excluded as an investment.

• DWS Sovereign Assessment

The DWS Sovereign Assessment evaluated the assessment of political and civil liberties. Sovereign issuers with high or excessive controversies regarding political and civil liberties (i.e. a letter score of "E" or "F") were excluded as an investment.

• Exposure to controversial sectors

The ESG database defined certain business areas and business activities as relevant. Business areas and business activities were defined as relevant if they involve the production or distribution of products in a controversial area ("controversial sectors"). Controversial sectors were defined, for example, as the civil firearms industry, military defence and tobacco. Other business sectors and business activities that affect the production or distribution of products in other sectors were defined as relevant. Other relevant sectors were, for example, coal mining and coal-based power generation. Issuers were evaluated according to the share of total revenues they generate in controversial business areas and controversial business activities. The lower the percentage of revenues from the

controversial business areas and controversial business activities, the better the score.

As regards the involvement in tobacco and civil firearms, issuers (excluding target funds) with a moderate, high or excessive exposure (i.e. a letter score of "D", "E" or "F") were excluded as an investment.

As regards the involvement in the military defence industry, issuers (excluding target funds) with high or excessive exposure (i.e. a letter score of "E" or "F") were excluded as an investment.

As regards the involvement in coal mining and coal-based power generation or other controversial sectors and controversial business practices, issuers (excluding target funds) with excessive exposure (i.e. a letter score "F") were excluded as an investment.

• **Involvement in controversial weapons**

The ESG database assessed a company's involvement in the business of controversial weapons. Controversial weapons included for example anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, depleted uranium weapons, nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons.

Issuers were assessed based on their degree of involvement (production of controversial weapons, component production, etc.) in the manufacturing of controversial weapons, regardless of total revenues they generate from controversial weapons. Issuers (with the exception of target funds) with medium, high or excessive involvement (i.e., a letter score of "D", "E" or "F") were excluded as an investment.

To the extent that the sub-fund sought to attain the promoted environmental and social characteristics as well as corporate governance practices by means of an investment in target funds, the latter must meet the DWS standards on Climate and Transition Risk- and Norm Assessment outlined above.

Derivatives were not used to attain the environmental or social characteristics promoted by the sub-fund and were therefore not taken into account for the calculation of the minimum share of assets complying with these characteristics. However, derivatives on individual issuers could only be acquired for the sub-fund if the issuers of the underlying comply with the ESG assessment methodology.

Sustainability investment assessment methodology

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 economic activity 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?"

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

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

Further, the management company considered active ownership as a strong driver to improve governance, policies and practices, and thus for a better long-term performance of investee companies. Active ownership meant using the position as shareholders to influence the activities or behaviour of the investee companies. An engagement activity could have been initiated with the investee companies regarding matters such as strategy, financial and non-financial performance, risk, capital structure, social and environmental impact as well as corporate governance including topics like disclosure, culture and remuneration. The engagement activity could have been undertaken via, e.g., issuer meetings or engagement letters. Furthermore, for equity investments it could also be an interaction with the company resulting from proxy voting activities or participation at general meetings.



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

This sub-fund had not designated a reference benchmark to determine whether it was aligned with the environmental and/or social characteristics that it promoted.

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