



RITRANSPARENCY REPORT 2016

Perpetual Investments





About this report

The PRI Reporting Framework is a key step in the journey towards building a common language and industry standard for reporting responsible investment (RI) activities. This RI Transparency Report is one of the key outputs of this Framework. Its primary objective is to enable signatory transparency on RI activities and facilitate dialogue between investors and their clients, beneficiaries and other stakeholders. A copy of this report will be publicly disclosed for all reporting signatories on the PRI website, ensuring accountability of the PRI Initiative and its signatories.

This report is an export of the individual Signatory organisation's response to the PRI during the 2016 reporting cycle. It includes their responses to mandatory indicators, as well as responses to voluntary indicators the signatory has agreed to make public. The information is presented exactly as it was reported. Where an indicator offers a response option that is multiple-choice, all options that were available to the signatory to select are presented in this report. Presenting the information exactly as reported is a result of signatory feedback which suggested the PRI not summarise the information. As a result, the reports can be extensive. However, to help easily locate information, there is a **Principles index** which highlights where the information can be found and summarises the indicators that signatories complete and disclose.

Understanding the Principles Index

The Principles Index summarises the response status for the individual indicators and modules and shows how these relate to the six <u>Principles for Responsible Investment</u>. It can be used by stakeholders as an 'at-a-glance' summary of reported information and to identify particular themes or areas of interest.

Indicators can refer to one or more Principles. Some indicators are not specific to any Principle. These are highlighted in the 'General' column. When multiple Principles are covered across numerous indicators, in order to avoid repetition, only the main Principle covered is highlighted.

All indicators within a module are presented below. The status of indicators is shown with the following symbols:

| Symbol | Status |
|--------------|---|
| ✓ | The signatory has completed all mandatory parts of this indicator |
| Ø | The signatory has completed some parts of this indicator |
| & | This indicator was not relevant for this signatory |
| - | The signatory did not complete any part of this indicator |
| Ъ | The signatory has flagged this indicator for internal review |

Within the table, indicators marked in blue are mandatory to complete. Indicators marked in grey are voluntary to complete.



Principles Index

| Organisational Overview | | | | | Principle | | | | | General |
|-------------------------|---|--------|------------------------------------|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|----------|
| Indicator | Short description | Status | Disclosure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| OO 01 | Signatory category and services | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 02 | Headquarters and operational countries | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 03 | Subsidiaries that are separate PRI signatories | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 04 | Reporting year and AUM | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 05 | Breakdown of AUM by asset class | ~ | Asset mix disclosed in OO 06 | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 06 | How would you like to disclose your asset class mix | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 07 | Fixed income AUM breakdown | ✓ | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 08 | Segregated mandates or pooled funds | ✓ | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 09 | Breakdown of AUM by market | ✓ | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 10 | Additional information about organisation | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| 00 11 | RI activities for listed equities | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| 00 12 | RI activities in other asset classes | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| OO 13 | Modules and sections required to complete | ✓ | n/a | | | | | | | ✓ |

| Strategy | Strategy and Governance | | | | Principle | | | | | General |
|-----------|--|----------|------------|----------|-----------|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Indicator | Short description | Status | Disclosure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| SG 01 | RI policy and coverage | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 02 | Publicly available RI policy or guidance documents | 1 | Public | | | | | | ✓ | |
| SG 03 | Conflicts of interest | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 04 | RI goals and objectives | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 05 | Main goals/objectives this year | ✓ | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 06 | RI roles and responsibilities | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 07 | RI in performance management, reward and/or personal development | 1 | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 08 | Collaborative organisations / initiatives | ✓ | Public | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| SG 09 | Promoting RI independently | ✓ | Public | | | | ✓ | | | |
| SG 10 | Dialogue with public policy makers or standard setters | 1 | Private | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| SG 11 | ESG issues in strategic asset allocation | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| SG 12 | Long term investment risks and opportunity | 1 | Private | ~ | | | | | | |
| SG 13 | Allocation of assets to environmental and social themed areas | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| SG 14 | ESG issues for internally managed assets not reported in framework | 8 | n/a | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 15 | ESG issues for externally managed assets not reported in framework | 8 | n/a | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 16 | RI/ESG in execution and/or advisory services | ✓ | Private | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | |
| SG 17 | Innovative features of approach to RI | ✓ | Public | | | | | | | ✓ |
| SG 18 | Internal and external review and assurance of responses | ✓ | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |

| Direct - Listed Equity Incorporation | | | | | | rin | cip | le | | General |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------|------------|----------|---|-----|-----|----|---|----------|
| Indicator | Short description | Status | Disclosure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| LEI 01 | Breakdown by passive, quantitative, fundamental and other active strategies | ✓ | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |
| LEI 02 | Reporting on strategies that are <10% of actively managed listed equities | ✓ | Private | | | | | | | ✓ |
| LEI 03 | Percentage of each incorporation strategy | ✓ | Public | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 04 | Type of ESG information used in investment decision | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 05 | Information from engagement and/or voting used in investment decision-making | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 06 | Types of screening applied | ✓ | Public | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 07 | Processes to ensure screening is based on robust analysis | ✓ | Public | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 08 | Processes to ensure fund criteria are not breached | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 09 | Types of sustainability thematic funds/mandates | 8 | n/a | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 10 | Review ESG issues while researching companies/sectors | ✓ | Public | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 11 | Processes to ensure integration is based on robust analysis | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 12 | Aspects of analysis ESG information is integrated into | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 13 | ESG issues in index construction | 8 | n/a | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 14 | How ESG incorporation has influenced portfolio composition | ✓ | Public | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 15 | Measurement of financial and ESG outcomes of ESG incorporation | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 16 | Examples of ESG issues that affected your investment view / performance | ✓ | Private | ✓ | | | | | | |
| LEI 17 | Disclosure of approach to ESG incorporation | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |

| Direct - L | Direct - Listed Equity Active Ownership | | | | | Principle Genera | | | General | |
|------------|--|--------|------------|----------|----------|------------------|---|---|---------|--|
| Indicator | Short description | Status | Disclosure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| LEA 01 | Description of approach to engagement | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 02 | Reasoning for interaction on ESG issues | ✓ | Public | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| LEA 03 | Process for identifying and prioritising engagement activities | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 04 | Objectives for engagement activities | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 05 | Process for identifying and prioritising collaborative engagement | 8 | n/a | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 06 | Objectives for engagement activities | 8 | n/a | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 07 | Role in engagement process | 8 | n/a | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | |
| LEA 08 | Monitor / discuss service provider information | 8 | n/a | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |
| LEA 09 | Share insights from engagements with internal/external managers | ✓ | Private | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 10 | Tracking number of engagements | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 11 | Number of companies engaged with, intensity of engagement and effort | 8 | n/a | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 12 | Engagement methods | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 13 | Engagements on E, S and/or G issues | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 14 | Companies changing practices / behaviour following engagement | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 15 | Examples of ESG engagements | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 16 | Disclosure of approach to ESG engagements | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |
| LEA 17 | Voting policy & approach | ✓ | Public | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| LEA 18 | Typical approach to (proxy) voting decisions | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 19 | Percentage of voting recommendations reviewed | 8 | n/a | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 20 | Confirmation of votes | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 21 | Securities lending programme | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 22 | Informing companies of the rationale of abstaining/voting against management | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 23 | Percentage of (proxy) votes cast | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 24 | Proportion of ballot items that were for/against/abstentions | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 25 | Shareholder resolutions | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 26 | Examples of (proxy) voting activities | ✓ | Private | | ✓ | | | | | |
| LEA 27 | Disclosing voting activities | ✓ | Public | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |

Perpetual Investments

Reported Information

Public version

Organisational Overview

PRI disclaimer

This document presents information reported directly by signatories. This information has not been audited by the PRI Secretariat or any other party acting on their behalf. While this information is believed to be reliable, no representations or warranties are made as to the accuracy of the information presented, and no responsibility or liability can be accepted for any error or omission.



| | Basic | Infor | nation | | |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------|
| 00 01 | | Man | datory | Gateway/Peering | General |
| | 00 | 01.1 | Select the services you offer. | | |
| | ✓ F | -und m | anagement | | |
| | | | % of assets under manager | nent (AUM) in ranges | |
| | • | 0 <1 | 0% | | |
| | | O 10- | 50% | | |
| | | >5 | 0% | | |
| | ✓ F | und of | funds, manager of managers, sub-a | advised products | |
| | | | % of assets under manager | nent (AUM) in ranges | |
| | | ⊚ <10 | | | |
| | | 10. | | | |
| | | O >5 | | | |
| | | Other, s | | | |
| | | | on and advisory services | | |
| | | | • | | |
| 00 02 | | Man | datory | Peering | General |
| | 00 02 | 2.1 | Select the location of your organis | ation's headquarters. | |
| A | ustralia | 1 | | | |
| , | | • | | | |
| | 00 02 | 2.2 | Indicate the number of countries in | n which you have offices (including your he | eadquarters). |
| | ● 1 | | | | |
| | O 2-5 | | | | |
| | O 6-1 | 0 | | | |
| | O >10 |) | | | |
| | 00 02 | 2.3 | Indicate the approximate number | of staff in your organisation in full-time equ | uivalents (FTE). |
| | -0002 | | | | (/- |
| | | | FTE | | |
| | 155 | | | | |
| 00.03 | | Man | datory | Descriptive | General |



00 03.1

Indicate whether you have subsidiaries within your organisation that are also PRI signatories in their own right.

O Yes

No

OO 04 Mandatory Gateway/Peering General

00 04.1

Indicate the year end date for your reporting year.

30/06/2015

00 04.2

Indicate your total AUM at the end of your reporting year, excluding subsidiaries you have chosen not to report on, and advisory/execution only assets.

| | trillions | billions | millions | thousands | hundreds |
|---------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Total AUM | | 29 | 296 | 992 | 299 |
| Currency | AUD | | | | |
| Assets in USD | | 21 | 451 | 243 | 808 |

00 04.4

Indicate the total assets at the end of your reporting year subject to an execution and/or advisory approach.

| | trillions | billions | millions | thousands | hundreds |
|---------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Total AUM | | | 41 | 634 | 180 |
| Currency | AUD | | | | |
| Assets in USD | | | 30 | 484 | 527 |

OO 06 Mandatory Descriptive General

OO 06.1

To contextualise your responses to the public, indicate how you would like to disclose your asset class mix.

- O Publish our asset class mix as percentage breakdown
- Publish our asset class mix as broad ranges

| | Internally managed (%) | Externally managed (%) |
|----------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Listed equity | >50% | 0 |
| Fixed income | <10% | <10% |
| Private equity | 0 | 0 |



| Property | 0 | <10% |
|--------------------|--------|------|
| Infrastructure | 0 | <10% |
| Commodities | <10% | 0 |
| Hedge funds | 0 | 0 |
| Forestry | 0 | 0 |
| Farmland | 0 | 0 |
| Inclusive finance | 0 | 0 |
| Cash | 10-50% | <10% |
| Other (1), specify | 0 | 0 |
| Other (2), specify | 0 | 0 |

OO 06.2

Publish our asset class mix as per attached image [Optional].

OO 10 Voluntary Descriptive General

00 10.1

Provide any additional information about your organisation, its mission, strategies, activities or investments which are important to contextualise your responsible investment activities.

Perpetual Investments is part of Perpetual Limited, a widely-recognised and respected financial services organisation. Perpetual Limited is one of Australia's largest independent wealth managers, an expert adviser to high net worth individuals, families and businesses, and a leading provider of corporate trustee services. Perpetual Limited listed on the Australian Securities Exchange (ASX.PPT) in 1964.

Perpetual Investments is one of Australia's most highly regarded investment fund managers, offering a broad range of products for personal investment, superannuation and retirement to individuals, advisers and institutions. We have strong investment capabilities across a range of asset classes including equities, fixed income, global and diversified strategies.

Perpetual Investments has a long-standing commitment to responsible investment, and in 2009 Perpetual Investments became a signatory to the United Nations supported Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI).

| Gateway asset class | implementation indicators | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | | |

OO 11 Mandatory Gateway General



| | 00 11.1 | Select your direct or indirect ESG incorporation activities your organisation implemented, for listed equities in the reporting year. |
|------|---|--|
| ' | ☑ We inc | orporate ESG in our investment decisions on our internally managed assets |
| | | not incorporate ESG in our directly managed listed equity and/or we do not address ESG tion in our external manager selection, appointment and/or monitoring processes. |
| | 00 11.2 | Select your direct or indirect engagement activities your organisation implemented for listed equity in the reporting year. |
| | ☑ We en | gage with companies on ESG issues via our staff, collaborations or service providers |
| | □ We do | not engage directly and do not require external managers to engage with companies on ESG factors. |
| | 00 11.3 | Select your direct or indirect voting activities your organisation implemented for listed equity in the reporting year |
| | ☑ We cas | st our (proxy) votes directly or via dedicated voting providers |
| | \square We do | not cast our (proxy) votes directly and do not require external managers to vote on our behalf |
| | | |
| 00 1 | 2 Mar | ndatory Gateway General |
| | 00 12.1 | Select internally managed asset classes where you implemented responsible investment into your investment decisions and/or your active ownership practices (during the reporting year) |
| | ☐ Fixed inco | ome – corporate (financial) |
| | ☐ Fixed inco | ome – corporate (non-financial) |
| | ☐ Fixed inco | ome – securitised |
| | ☐ Commodi | ties |
| | ☐ Cash | |
| | ✓ None of the state of the | ne above |
| | 00 12. | If your organisation does not integrate ESG factors into investment decisions on your internally managed assets, explain why not. |
| | Our appro | each to ESG integration in these asset classes is still being developed |
| | 00 12.2 | Select externally managed assets classes where you addressed ESG incorporation and/or active ownership in your external manager selection, appointment and/or monitoring processes (during the reporting year) |
| | ☐ Fixed inco | ome – corporate (financial) |
| | ☐ Property | |
| | ☐ Infrastruc | ture |
| | ☐ Cash | |
| | ✓ None of tl | ne above |



OO 12.3b

Externally-managed funds make up less than 1% of our total funds under management, and include asset classes where ESG integration concepts are still developing.



Perpetual Investments

Reported Information

Public version

Strategy and Governance

PRI disclaimer

This document presents information reported directly by signatories. This information has not been audited by the PRI Secretariat or any other party acting on their behalf. While this information is believed to be reliable, no representations or warranties are made as to the accuracy of the information presented, and no responsibility or liability can be accepted for any error or omission.



Responsible investment policy O1 Mandatory Core Assessed General SG 01.1 Indicate if you have an investment policy that covers your responsible investment approach.

Yes

SG 01.2 Indicate the components/types and coverage of your policy.

Select all that apply

| Policy components/types | Coverage by AUM | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| ☑ Policy setting out your overall approach | O Applicable policies cover all AUM | | |
| ☑ Formalised guidelines on environmental factors | Applicable policies cover a majority of AUM | | |
| ☑ Formalised guidelines on social factors | O Applicable policies cover a minority of AUM | | |
| ☑ Formalised guidelines on corporate governance factors | | | |
| ☑ Asset class-specific guidelines | | | |
| ☑ Sector specific RI guidelines | | | |
| ☑ Screening / exclusions policy | | | |
| ☑ Engagement policy | | | |
| ☑ (Proxy) voting policy | | | |
| ☐ Other, specify (1) | | | |
| ☐ Other, specify(2) | | | |

| SG 01.3 | Indicate what norms have you used to develop your RI policy. |
|------------------|--|
| □ UN Glo | obal Compact Principles |
| □ UN Gu | iding Principles on Business and Human Rights |
| ☐ Univers | sal Declaration of Human Rights |
| □ Interna | ational Bill of Human Rights |
| □ Interna | tional Labour Organization Conventions |
| □ United | Nations Convention Against Corruption |
| □ OECD | Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises |
| \square Other, | specify (1) |
| \square Other, | specify (2) |
| \square Other, | specify (3) |
| ☑ None o | of the above |



SG 01.4

Provide a brief description of the key elements of your investment policy that covers your responsible investment approach [Optional].

PERPETUAL INVESTMENTS

RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT POLICY

This policy sets out Perpetual Investments' approach and expectations for considering ESG factors in our investment decision-making and ownership practices.

It is our policy that, to the extent that information is available, investment managers should incorporate ESG issues into investment analysis and decision-making.

Our duty to our clients requires us to seek the best risk-adjusted investment returns over specified time periods. We satisfy this obligation by focusing on both the quality and value of possible investments. For us, the consideration of ESG factors does not include making ethical or moral judgements on particular practices or issues. Instead, when deciding whether to buy, retain or sell an investment, our investment managers consider those ESG risks that are relevant to the current or future value of the investment.

It is our policy that investment managers have a duty to use their influence as a shareholder (i.e. in equity strategies) in order to achieve better investment outcomes over the long term (i.e. engagement).

To demonstrate our commitment to responsible investment, we became a signatory to the PRI on 21 October 2009.

Also see our CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND PROXY VOTING POLICY.

URL: https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

 \bigcirc No

SG 02 **Mandatory Core Assessed** PRI 6 Indicate which of your investment policy documents (if any) are publicly available. Provide URL and SG 02.1 an attachment of the document. ☑ Policy setting out your overall approach **URL** https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/ ☑ Formalised guidelines on environmental factors **URL** https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/ ☑ Formalised guidelines on social factors **URL** https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/



☑ Formalised guidelines on corporate governance factors

URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

☑ Asset class-specific guidelines

URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

☑ Sector specific RI guidelines

URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

☑ Screening / exclusions policy

URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

☑ Engagement policy

URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

☑ (Proxy) voting policy

URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

 $\hfill\square$ We do not publicly disclose our investment policy documents

SG 03 Mandatory Core Assessed General

SG 03.1

Indicate if your organisation has a policy on managing potential conflicts of interest in the investment process.

Yes

SG 03.2

Describe your policy on managing potential conflicts of interest in the investment process.

Group Policy - Conflicts of Interest (Personal)

A personal conflict of interest arises when an employee of Perpetual has individual interests which conflict or compete with their duty and obligations to act in the best interests of Perpetual's stakeholders. All Perpetual employees are expected to act in the best interests of Perpetual and its stakeholders. As such, employees



should at all times be conscious of circumstances that create or could potentially create a personal conflict of interest, such as office holdings (e.g. directorships), related parties, material personal interests and receiving gifts.

The policy covers:

- · Identifying and Reporting Conflicts of Interest
- · Managing Conflicts of Interest
- Directors and Responsible Managers specific responsibilities
- Roles and Responsibilities

Group Policy - Conflicts of Interest (Corporate)

A corporate conflict of interest arises when Perpetual has competing interests or duties which impair or interfere with its ability to exercise independent judgement in decision-making processes.

The policy covers:

- Categories of Corporate Conflicts of Interest
- Identifying and Reporting Conflicts of Interest
- Managing Conflicts of Interest
- The Conflicts of Interest Committee
- · Roles and Responsibilities

Governance and human resources

- Consequences of Non-Compliance with Policy
- Corporate Conflicts of Interest Register

O No

Objectives and strategies SG 04 Mandatory Gateway/Core Assessed General SG 04.1 Indicate if and how frequently your organisation sets and reviews objectives for its responsible investment activities. Quarterly or more frequently Biannually Annually Less frequently than annually Ad-hoc basis It is not reviewed

| Mandatory | Core Assessed | General |
|-----------|---------------|---------|

SG 06.1

SG 06

Indicate the roles present in your organisation and for each, indicate whether they have oversight and/or implementation responsibilities for responsible investment.



Roles present in your organisation

| ☑ Board members or trustees |
|--|
| ☑ Oversight/accountability for responsible investment |
| ☐ Implementation of responsible investment |
| $\hfill\square$ No oversight/accountability or implementation responsibility for responsible investment |
| ☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Investment Officer (CIO), Investment Committee |
| ☑ Oversight/accountability for responsible investment |
| ☑ Implementation of responsible investment |
| $\hfill\square$ No oversight/accountability or implementation responsibility for responsible investment |
| \square Other Chief-level staff or head of department, specify |
| ☑ Portfolio managers |
| ☐ Oversight/accountability for responsible investment |
| ☑ Implementation of responsible investment |
| $\hfill \square$ No oversight/accountability or implementation responsibility for responsible investment |
| ☑ Investment analysts |
| ☐ Oversight/accountability for responsible investment |
| ☑ Implementation of responsible investment |
| $\hfill\square$ No oversight/accountability or implementation responsibility for responsible investment |
| ☑ Dedicated responsible investment staff |
| ☑ Oversight/accountability for responsible investment |
| ☑ Implementation of responsible investment |
| $\hfill \square$ No oversight/accountability or implementation responsibility for responsible investment |
| ☑ External managers or service providers |
| ☐ Oversight/accountability for responsible investment |
| ☑ Implementation of responsible investment |
| $\hfill\square$ No oversight/accountability or implementation responsibility for responsible investment |
| □ Investor relations |
| ☐ Other role, specify |
| ☐ Other role, specify |

SG 06.2

For the roles for which you have RI oversight/accountability or implementation responsibilities, indicate how you execute these responsibilities.

- Board members ultimate oversight/accountability for responsible investment
- CEO accountable for all aspects of responsible investment policy, oversight, collaborative initiative involvement
- Portfolio managers, investment analysts implementation of responsible investment via ESG integration
- Dedicated responsible investment staff accountability for responsible investment framework, assist in implementation of responsible investment
- · Service providers assist in implementation of responsible investment via specialist research



| SG 06.3 | Indicate the number of dedica | ited responsible investment staff your organisat | ion has. |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | | | |
| | Number | | |
| 1 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Promotin | g responsible investment | | |
| 8 Ma | andatory | Core Assessed | PRI 4,5 |
| | | | |
| New selection | on options have been added to t | this indicator. Please review your prefilled re | esponses carefully. |
| | Oalast the sallshand for any | to the second to the the three second to the second to | den te e company en esta |
| SG 08.1 | | isation and/or initiatives of which your organisa e reporting year, and the role you played. | non is a member or in |
| | | | |
| Select all | that apply | | |
| | es for Responsible Investment | | |
| | V | | (C. 10) |
| | Your organisation's role in | n the initiative during the reporting period (see o | lefinitions) |
| ☑ [| Basic | | |
| □ I | Moderate | | |
| | Advanced | | |
| | La Commission ESG | | |
| | orporate Governance Association | | |
| ☑ Australia | an Council of Superannuation Inve | estors | |
| | Your organisation's role in | n the initiative during the reporting period (see c | lefinitions) |
| | | The initiative during the reporting period (see c | eminoris) |
| | Basic | | |
| | Moderate | | |
| □ / | Advanced | | |
| | Provide a brief commenta | ary on the level of your organisation's involveme | ent in the initiative |
| | [Optional] | .,, | |
| - Partici | pation in ACSI ESG initiatives such | h as the Board Confidence Index - Consultation | and collaboration re |
| | ESG issues, e.g. ESG Reporting G | | |
| | Deep engible layer-turning Addi | . Doord | |
| | Responsible Investment Advisory | y board | |
| M CDL CII | mate Change | | |



| Your organisation's role in the initiative during the reporting period (see definitions) | |
|--|--|
| ☑ Basic | |
| ☐ Moderate | |
| ☐ Advanced | |
| □ CDP Forests | |
| □ CDP Water | |
| ☐ CFA Institute Centre for Financial Market Integrity | |
| ☐ Code for Responsible Investment in SA (CRISA) | |
| ☐ Council of Institutional Investors (CII) | |
| ☐ ESG Research Australia | |
| □ Eumedion | |
| □ EVCA – Responsible Investment Roundtable | |
| ☐ Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) | |
| ☐ Global Investors Governance Network (GIGN) | |
| ☐ Global Impact Investing Network (GIIN) | |
| ☐ Global Real Estate Sustainability Benchmark (GRESB) | |
| ☐ Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC) | |
| ☐ Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR) | |
| ☐ International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN) | |
| ☑ Investor Group on Climate Change, Australia/New Zealand (IGCC) | |
| | |
| Your organisation's role in the initiative during the reporting period (see definitions) | |
| | |
| ✓ Basic | |
| ☑ Basic □ Moderate | |
| | |
| □ Moderate | |
| ☐ Moderate ☐ Advanced | |
| ☐ Moderate ☐ Advanced ☐ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) | |
| ☐ Moderate ☐ Advanced ☐ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) ☐ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES | |
| ☐ Moderate ☐ Advanced ☐ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) ☐ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES ☐ Local Authority Pension Fund Forum | |
| ☐ Moderate ☐ Advanced ☐ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) ☐ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES ☐ Local Authority Pension Fund Forum ☐ Principles for Financial Action for the 21st Century | |
| □ Moderate □ Advanced □ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) □ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES □ Local Authority Pension Fund Forum □ Principles for Financial Action for the 21st Century □ Regional or National Social Investment Forums (e.g. UKSIF, Eurosif, ASRIA, RIAA), specify | |
| □ Moderate □ Advanced □ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) □ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES □ Local Authority Pension Fund Forum □ Principles for Financial Action for the 21st Century □ Regional or National Social Investment Forums (e.g. UKSIF, Eurosif, ASRIA, RIAA), specify □ Shareholder Association for Research and Education (Share) | |
| □ Moderate □ Advanced □ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) □ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES □ Local Authority Pension Fund Forum □ Principles for Financial Action for the 21st Century □ Regional or National Social Investment Forums (e.g. UKSIF, Eurosif, ASRIA, RIAA), specify □ Shareholder Association for Research and Education (Share) □ United Nations Environmental Program Finance Initiative (UNEP FI) | |
| ☐ Moderate ☐ Advanced ☐ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) ☐ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES ☐ Local Authority Pension Fund Forum ☐ Principles for Financial Action for the 21st Century ☐ Regional or National Social Investment Forums (e.g. UKSIF, Eurosif, ASRIA, RIAA), specify ☐ Shareholder Association for Research and Education (Share) ☐ United Nations Environmental Program Finance Initiative (UNEP FI) ☐ United Nations Global Compact | |
| | |
| | |
| □ Advanced □ International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) □ Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES □ Local Authority Pension Fund Forum □ Principles for Financial Action for the 21st Century □ Regional or National Social Investment Forums (e.g. UKSIF, Eurosif, ASRIA, RIAA), specify □ Shareholder Association for Research and Education (Share) □ United Nations Environmental Program Finance Initiative (UNEP FI) □ United Nations Global Compact ☑ Other collaborative organisation/initiative, specify FSC (Financial Services Council) ESG Working Group | |
| Moderate Advanced International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR)/CERES Local Authority Pension Fund Forum Principles for Financial Action for the 21st Century Regional or National Social Investment Forums (e.g. UKSIF, Eurosif, ASRIA, RIAA), specify Shareholder Association for Research and Education (Share) United Nations Environmental Program Finance Initiative (UNEP FI) United Nations Global Compact Other collaborative organisation/initiative, specify FSC (Financial Services Council) ESG Working Group Your organisation's role in the initiative during the reporting year (see definitions) | |



Provide a brief commentary on the level of your organisation's involvement in the initiative. [Optional]

Provided Chairman and additional member to ESG working group, and significant content re submissions, etc.

 $\ensuremath{\,\boxtimes\,}$ Other collaborative organisation/initiative, specify

| Responsible Ir | nvestment Association of Australia | (RIAA) | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| | Your organisation's role in the ini | itiative during the reporting year (see defini | tions) |
| ☐ Basic | | | |
| ✓ Modera | ate | | |
| □ Advan | ced | | |
| | | | |
| | Provide a brief commentary on the [Optional] | ne level of your organisation's involvement | in the initiative. |
| RIAA certificat | tion on PI's ESG specialist investm | ent products (e.g Ethical SRI share strateg | y). |
| | rative organisation/initiative, specify | / | |
| | | | PRI 4 |
| Mandate | | Core Assessed | PRI 4 |
| Mandato | ory | | |
| Mandato | ory dicate if your organisation promote | Core Assessed | |
| Mandate SG 09.1 | ory dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. | Core Assessed s responsible investment, independently of | collaborative |
| Mandate SG 09.1 Indini Yes SG 09.2 | dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of collection or training the collection of training the collection of the supported education or training the collection of the collection of the | Core Assessed s responsible investment, independently of | ote responsible |
| Mandate SG 09.1 Indini Yes SG 09.2 Provide broker/de | dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of collection or training ealers, investment consultants, legal | Core Assessed s responsible investment, independently of ctions your organisation has taken to prom llaborative initiatives. ng programmes for clients, investment mar | ote responsible |
| Mandato SG 09.1 Indini Yes SG 09.2 Provide broker/de Provide Encour | dicate if your organisation promote stratives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of collection or training ealers, investment consultants, legaled financial support for academic | Core Assessed s responsible investment, independently of ctions your organisation has taken to promillaborative initiatives. ng programmes for clients, investment manal advisers or other investment organisation | ote responsible nagers, |
| Mandate SG 09.1 Incini Yes SG 09.2 Provide broker/decomplies Provided Encourainvestment | dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of collection or trainicalers, investment consultants, legaled financial support for academic raged better transparency and discont industry | Core Assessed s responsible investment, independently of ctions your organisation has taken to prom llaborative initiatives. ng programmes for clients, investment mar al advisers or other investment organisation or industry research on responsible investi | ote responsible nagers, |
| Mandate SG 09.1 Inc ini Yes SG 09.2 ✓ Provide broker/de ─ Provide ✓ Encour investmer ✓ Spoke | dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of collection or trainicalers, investment consultants, legaled financial support for academic raged better transparency and discont industry | Core Assessed s responsible investment, independently of ctions your organisation has taken to promillaborative initiatives. In g programmes for clients, investment man all advisers or other investment organisation or industry research on responsible investment closure of responsible investment practices is to promote responsible investment | ote responsible nagers, |
| Mandate SG 09.1 Indini Yes SG 09.2 Provide broker/de Provide Encourinvestme Spoke Wrote | dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of collection or training ealers, investment consultants, legaled financial support for academic raged better transparency and discont industry publicly at events and conferences | Core Assessed s responsible investment, independently of ctions your organisation has taken to promillaborative initiatives. In g programmes for clients, investment man all advisers or other investment organisation or industry research on responsible investment closure of responsible investment practices is to promote responsible investment | ote responsible nagers, |
| Mandate SG 09.1 Indini Yes SG 09.2 Provide broker/ded Provide Encourainvestment Spoke Wrote Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment | dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of colled or supported education or trainicalers, investment consultants, legaled financial support for academic raged better transparency and discont industry publicly at events and conferences and published in-house research promote itiatives. | ctions your organisation has taken to promallaborative initiatives. Ing programmes for clients, investment manal advisers or other investment organisation or industry research on responsible investment practices to promote responsible investment practices as to promote responsible investment practices appears on responsible investment | ote responsible nagers, |
| Mandate SG 09.1 Indini Yes SG 09.2 Provide broker/ded Provide Encourainvestment Spoke Wrote Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment Encourainvestment | dicate if your organisation promote itiatives. Indicate which of the following a investment, independently of collection or training ealers, investment consultants, legaled financial support for academic raged better transparency and discont industry publicly at events and conferences and published in-house research praged the adoption of the PRI articles on responsible investment | ctions your organisation has taken to promallaborative initiatives. Ing programmes for clients, investment manal advisers or other investment organisation or industry research on responsible investment practices to promote responsible investment practices as to promote responsible investment practices appears on responsible investment | ote responsible nagers, |

SG 09.3

Additional information, [Optional

- ESG training including conferences, etc
- Educational documents on ethical/SRI investing
- Ethical and other ESG related speeches and presentations
- Thought leadership and other ESG external papers



- Internal ESG research notes
- ESG engagement

Innovation

SG 17

Voluntary

Descriptive

General

SG 17.1

Indicate whether any specific features of your approach to responsible investment are particularly innovative.

Yes

SG 17.2

Describe any specific features of your approach to responsible investment that you believe are particularly innovative.

Better ESG Engagement Outcomes - our policy is that investment managers have a duty to use their influence as a shareholder/asset manager in order to achieve better investment outcomes over the long term. This includes ESG issues. This engagement is possible due to our large experienced equities team, and more effective due to our size (we often own 10-15% of small companies) which gives us unparalleled access to company management and Boards. Thus we are able to formulate and execute innovative engagement strategies to leverage better shareholder outcomes, for example:

- sharing our industry knowledge and contacts with the company to facilitate change;
- influencing AGM (shareholder voting) issues;
- · calling our own shareholder meetings; and
- · public campaigns (using media), etc.

ESG Dashboards - list material ESG risks (or 'red-flags') for each investee company, drawing on both internal and external research sources. The Dashboards plus the raw ESG data is fully integrated into our front office investment management system (FactSet), and all Dashboards are immediately broadcast/available to the entire equities team, including via mobile devices. This promotes the consideration of ESG risks (i.e. PRI Principle 1) as a truly mainstream activity for all equities analysts and portfolio managers.

O No



Perpetual Investments

Reported Information

Public version

Direct - Listed Equity Incorporation

PRI disclaimer

This document presents information reported directly by signatories. This information has not been audited by the PRI Secretariat or any other party acting on their behalf. While this information is believed to be reliable, no representations or warranties are made as to the accuracy of the information presented, and no responsibility or liability can be accepted for any error or omission.



ESG incorporation in actively managed listed equities

| | | | Gateway | PRI |
|-------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----|
| LEI | 03.1 your active | | on strategy and/or combination of strates and (2) the breakdown of your action of strategies (+/- 5%) | |
| ES | G incorporation strat | egy (select all that app | ly) | |
| | ☐ Screening alone (| .e. not combined with ar | ny other strategies) | |
| | ☐ Thematic alone (i. | e. not combined with an | y other strategies) | |
| | ☐ Integration alone (| i.e. not combined with a | ny other strategies) | |
| | ☑ Screening + Integ | ration strategies | | |
| Perce | ntage of active listed e | quity to | | |
| | the strategy is applied | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | 98 | | |
| | ☐ Thematic + integra | ation strategies | | |
| | ☐ Screening + them | atic strategies | | |
| | ☐ All three strategies | combined | | |
| | ☑ No incorporation s | trategies applied | | |
| | | | | |
| | ntage of active listed e | | | |
| wnich | no strategy is applied | % | | |
| | | 2 | | |
| | | | | |

LEI 03.2

Describe your organisation's approach to incorporation and the reasons for choosing the particular ESG incorporation strategy/strategies.

- All of the Australian equities managed by Perpetual's Investments internal equities team (the above 98% of FUM) is covered by the ESG incorporation process (Quality Filters exclusion screen and ESG Dashboard integration process) as described in this module. This is consistent with our approach to responsible investment and ESG issues as described in previous modules.
- Note that a small (<10%) of this AUM is managed in two specialist ESG equities strategies our Sustainable Shares and Ethical SRI strategies, where additional ESG exclusion screens apply.
- The remaining 2% of our FUM above where no ESG incorporation applies is managed internally in smaller funds, (e.g. passive/smart Beta strategies).



LEI 03.3

Where assets are managed using a combination of ESG incorporation strategies, briefly describe how these combinations are used. [Optional]

Sustainable Shares and Ethical SRI strategies

The general ESG incorporation processes as described in this module also apply to the above two strategies, i.e. all companies must pass our Quality Filters and portfolio managers need to consider ESG risks in their decision-making. However for the above two strategies only, the portfolio managers have a reduced opportunity set of companies they may consider for investment, as we exclude a significant number of companies which fail specific ESG screens for each strategy. This is an independent process run by the Manager, Responsible Investment, where companies that rate poorly on sustainability and ethical SRI issues respectively are identified and excluded, using external ESG research. These strategies suit a range of investors who require a 'higher standard' of ESG filtering, e.g. they may not be permitted or have decided not to invest in tobacco, munitions or nuclear companies or those who rank poorly on sustainability or social responsibility measures.

(A) Implementation: Screening **LEI 06** PRI 1 **Mandatory Descriptive** Indicate and describe the type of screening you apply to your internally managed active listed **LEI 06.1** Type of screening ✓ Negative/exclusionary screening Screened by ✓ Product ☐ Sector ☐ Country/geographic region ☑ Environmental and social practices and performance ☑ Corporate governance Description

We negatively screen by:

- Our Quality Filters (which apply to all the funds/products managed by our equities team) include ESG issues. The first of our Quality Filters, Sound Management, includes an assessment of the governance (G) practices of a company and management. The third of our quality filters, Quality of Business, includes an assessment of issues such as environmental (E) and social (S) factors that may impact the future performance of a company. Companies that fail our Quality Filters are not considered for investment.
- In addition, two of these strategies (Sustainable and Ethical SRI) have additional screens to
 exclude a further set of companies that rate poorly on sustainability and ethical SRI issues
 respectively (for these two strategies only).



| ☐ Positive/best-in-class screening |
|------------------------------------|
| ☐ Norms-based screening |

LEI 06.2

Describe how the screening criteria are established, how often the criteria are reviewed and how you notify clients and/or beneficiaries when changes are made.

Quality Filters

Our Quality Filters (which apply to all the funds/products managed by our equities team) include ESG issues. The first of our Quality Filters, Sound Management, includes an assessment of the governance (G) practices of a company and management. The third of our quality filters, Quality of Business, includes an assessment of issues such as environmental (E) and social (S) factors that may impact the future performance of a company. Companies that fail our Quality Filters are not considered for investment. These filters have been a core element of Perpetual's investment process for many years.

Sustainable Shares and Ethical SRI strategies

The Manager, Responsible Investment has formulated filtering processes for these strategies to identify and exclude companies that rate poorly on sustainability and ethical SRI issues respectively, using external ESG research. The portfolio managers of these strategies are subsequently prohibited from buying these companies, and must divest any such companies already held.

The Manager, Responsible Investment is responsible for ensuring these filters are up-to-date (by design) and are regularly re-run to capture new companies and new company or external research information.

Any criteria changes are processed through a defined internal approval process and communicated to clients as needed.

| Mandat | ory | Core Assessed | PRI 1 |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | |
| LEI 07.1 | Indicate which processes your organisat analysis. | ion uses to ensure that screening | g is based on robust |
| ☑ Compreh | nensive ESG research is undertaken or sou | rced to determine companies' ac | tivities and products. |
| | ies are given the opportunity by you or your inaccuracies | research provider to review ESC | G research on them |
| | research and data used to identify compan staff, the internal audit function or similar | ies to be excluded/included is su | bject to internal audit |
| ☑ Companies ☐ Companies | y ESG information/ratings are updated regu | larly to ensure that portfolio hold | lings comply with fund |
| | ttee or body with representatives independence or all screening decisions | ent of the individuals who conduc | ct company research |
| ☑ A period | c review of the quality of the research unde | rtaken or provided is carried out | |
| ☐ Other, sp | pecify | | |
| □ Name of | the above | | |

Please note, the above responses apply only to the screening processes that apply to our two specialist ESG screened strategies (Sustainable and Ethical SRI).

The Quality Filters (including ESG) screening that applies across all equities products managed by the team is conducted based only on internal research. The more intensive ESG research occurs through the ESG Dashboard (ESG integration) process described in this module, which applies to all stocks passing the Quality Filters.



(C) Implementation: Integration of ESG issues

LEI 10

Mandatory

Core Assessed

PRI 1

LEI 10.1

Indicate if E, S and G issues are reviewed while researching companies and/or sectors in active strategies.

| ESG issues | Coverage/extent of review on these issues | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | Environmental | Environmental |
| | | We systematically review the potential significance of environmental issues and investigate them accordingly |
| | | We occasionally review the potential significance of environmental issues and investigate them accordingly |
| | | O We do not review environmental issues |
| | Social | Social |
| | | We systematically review the potential significance of social issues and investigate them accordingly |
| | | We occasionally review the potential significance of social issues and investigate them accordingly |
| | | ○ We do not review social issues |
| | Corporate Governance | Corporate Governance |
| | | We systematically review the potential significance of corporate governance issues and investigate them accordingly |
| | | We occasionally review the potential significance of corporate governance issues and investigate them accordingly |
| | | O We do not review corporate governance issues |

LEI 10.2

Additional information, [Optional

Our Quality Filters and ESG Dashboard processes address these ESG risks systematically.

| O114611 | - | 0.11 | | |
|---------|---|------|------------|-----|
| Output | | | E 94 9 1 1 | nes |

LEI 14 Voluntary Descriptive PRI 1



LEI 14.1

Indicate how your ESG incorporation strategies have influenced the composition of your portfolio(s) or investment universe.

Describe any reduction in your starting investment universe or other effects.

ESG issues have always been considered in our assessment of the quality of a company through our extensive fundamental research. The first of our Quality Filters, Sound Management, includes an assessment of the governance (G) practices of a company and management. The third of our quality filters, Quality of Business, includes an assessment of issues such as environmental (E) and social (S) factors that may impact the future performance of a company. Companies that fail our Quality Filters are not considered for investment.

Specify the percentage reduction (+/- 5%)

%

Integration of ESG issues

☑ Integration of ESG issues

Select which of these effects followed your ESG integration:

- ☑ Reduce or prioritise the investment universe
- ☐ Overweight/underweight at sector level
- ☑ Overweight/underweight at stock level
- ☑ Buy/sell decisions
- ☐ Other, specify
- ☐ None of the above

LEI 14.2

Additional information

Our analysts consider key ESG risks (contained in our ESG Dashboards) in stock ranking (over or underweight) recommendations which are communicated to portfolio managers.

Portfolio construction - our ESG Dashboards communicate key ESG risks to portfolio managers so they may consider same in their investment decision-making.

Communication

LEI 17 Mandatory Core Assessed PRI 2,6

LEI 17.1

Indicate if your organisation proactively discloses information on your approach to ESG incorporation in listed equity.

We disclose it publicly



Provide URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

LEI 17.2

Indicate if the information disclosed to the public is the same as that disclosed to clients/beneficiaries.

- O Yes
- No

LEI 17.3

Indicate the information your organisation proactively discloses to the public regarding your approach to ESG incorporation.

- Broad approach to ESG incorporation
- O Detailed explanation of ESG incorporation strategy used

LEI 17.4

Indicate how frequently you typically report this information to the public.

- Quarterly or more frequently
- Biannually
- Annually
- O Less frequently than annually
- O Ad-hoc/when requested

LEI 17.5

Indicate the information your organisation proactively discloses to clients/ beneficiaries regarding your approach to ESG incorporation.

- O Broad approach to ESG incorporation
- Detailed explanation of ESG incorporation strategy used

LEI 17.6

Indicate how frequently you typically report this information to clients/beneficiaries.

- O Quarterly or more frequently
- Biannually
- Annually
- O Less frequently than annually
- O Ad-hoc/when requested
- O We disclose it to clients and/or beneficiaries only
- O We do not proactively disclose it to the public and/or clients/beneficiaries

LEI 17.7

Additional information. [Optional]

We highly value our clients and provide additional information and support to them (over and above our public disclosure). However we believe our public disclosure on ESG integration is sufficient.



Perpetual Investments

Reported Information

Public version

Direct - Listed Equity Active Ownership

PRI disclaimer

This document presents information reported directly by signatories. This information has not been audited by the PRI Secretariat or any other party acting on their behalf. While this information is believed to be reliable, no representations or warranties are made as to the accuracy of the information presented, and no responsibility or liability can be accepted for any error or omission.



Engagement Overview LEA 01 Mandatory Core Assessed PRI 2 **LEA 01.1** Indicate whether your organisation has a formal engagement policy. Yes Indicate what your engagement policy covers: **LEA 01.2** $\hfill\square$ Conflicts of interest ☐ Prioritisation of engagements ☑ Environmental factors ☑ Governance factors ☐ Other, describe ☐ None of the above Please attach or provide a URL to your engagement policy. [Optional] **LEA 01.3**

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

LEA 01.4 Provide a brief overview of your organization's approach to engagement

Please note both our Responsible Investment Policy and Corporate Governance and Proxy Voting Policy (both available at the URL in LEA 01.3) specify our corporate engagement policy activities.

It is our policy that investment managers have a duty to use their influence as a shareholder/asset manager in order to achieve better investment outcomes over the long term. From an ESG perspective this means encouraging the Boards and management of investee companies to:

- have the processes and systems in place to identify and manage relevant ESG risks and opportunities effectively;
- be transparent, honest and accountable, which includes providing the level of disclosure necessary for informed investment decision-making; and
- implement corporate structures and management incentives which ensure the company is managed in the long-term interests of shareholders (which includes sustainable business practices).

For equity investments our investment managers have a number of forums in which they can exercise their influence, including:

- Expressing concerns to the company's management directly
- Expressing concerns through the company's advisers



- Meeting with the Chairman, senior independent director or with other independent directors to express concerns directly
- · Exercising our voting rights regarding management resolutions at shareholder's meetings
- · Engaging in 'active public intervention', and
- Full or partial divestment.

O No

LEA 01.5

Additional information [optional]

Please note both our Responsible Investment Policy and Corporate Governance and Proxy Voting Policy (both available at the URL in LEA 01.3) specify our corporate engagement policy activities.

LEA 02 Mandatory Gateway PRI 1,2,3

LEA 02.1

Indicate your reasons for interacting with companies on ESG issues and indicate who carries these interactions out.

| Type of engagement | Reason for interaction |
|------------------------------|---|
| Individual/Internal staff | $\ensuremath{\square}$ To influence corporate practice (or identify the need to influence) on ESG issues |
| engagements | $\ensuremath{\boxtimes}$ To encourage improved/increased ESG disclosure |
| | ☐ Other, specify |
| | \square We do not engage via internal staff |
| Collaborative engagements | ☐ To influence corporate practice (or identify the need to influence) on ESG issues |
| | \square To encourage improved/inreased ESG disclosure |
| | ☐ Other, specify |
| | $\overline{\!$ |
| Service provider engagements | ☐ To influence corporate practice (or identify the need to influence) on ESG issues |
| | $\hfill\Box$ To encourage improved/increased ESG disclosure |
| | ☐ Other, specify |
| | |

| Ρ | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | | |

Process for engagements run internally

LEA 03 Mandatory Core Assessed PRI 2



LEA 03.1

Indicate whether your organisation has a formal process for identifying and prioritising engagement activities carried out by internal staff.

O Yes

No

LEA 03.3

Additional information. [Optional]

We continue to note this indicator is not helpful in communicating how Perpetual undertakes corporate engagement.

This indicator may be valid for a small fund manager or asset owner with limited ESG engagement resources (i.e. who needs to prioritise), or for a signatory with a separate ESG engagement team (i.e. with priorities that may differ from investment decision-makers as per below).

However, Perpetual's engagement activities (including ESG) are an integrated part of our large equity team's investment process. Having our investment decision-makers carry out engagement (where it is material and relevant to their analysis and investment decision-making), rather than by a separate ESG team, we strongly believe is more valid and effective. That is because the 'change message' is being communicated to the company by the same individuals who control our buy/sell/hold decision (i.e. whether to provide or withdraw capital to the company). Clearly this will increase the motivation of company Boards/management to consider change. In summary, we engage on a 'bottom-up', company-by-company basis as needed, rather than running 'top-down' ESG 'campaigns' on the same issue across multiple companies at the same time.

Therefore, for us it is unnecessary and impractical to institute'a formal process for identifying and prioritising engagement activities' as per this question. This would mean in practise our equity professionals debating the worth of their respective proposed company engagements against other equity professionals' proposed engagements. We doubt any equity team would manage money in this way. At Perpetual, equity professionals are given trust to achieve their performance objectives via different approaches, not micromanaged in this way.

| 4 04 | Mandato | ory | Core Assessed | PRI 2 |
|-------------|-----------------------|--|--|-----------|
| | LEA 04.1 | Indicate if you define specific objectives for | your engagement activities. | |
| | Yes | | | |
| | | es, for all engagement activities | | |
| | O Ye | es, for the majority of engagement activities | | |
| | O Ye | es, for a minority of engagement activities | | |
| | ○ No | | | |
| | | | | |
| | LEA 04.2 | Indicate if you monitor the actions that comp | panies take following your engagements | S. |
| | Yes | | | |
| | ○ Ye | es, in all cases | | |
| | | es, in the majority of cases | | |
| | ○ Ye | es, in the minority of cases | | |
| | ○ No | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Indicate whether your organization defines | milectones and goals for engagement a | otivition |



carried out by internal staff.

LEA 04.3

Yes

| LEA 04.4 | Indicate if you do any of the following to monitor and evaluate the progress of your engagement activities. | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| □ Define | ☐ Define timelines of the milestones and goals | | | |
| ☐ Trackir | ☐ Tracking, monitoring progress against defined milestones and goals | | | |
| □ Establi | ☐ Establish a process for when the goals are not met | | | |
| ☐ Revisit | ☐ Revisit and revise if necessary goals on continuous basis | | | |
| ☑ Other, | please specify | | | |
| | | | | |
| | other description | | | |

Specific to the engagement, depending on complexity, importance, etc.

 \bigcirc No

LEA 04.5 Additional information. [Optional]

While it might be considered best practise, setting up a rigorous engagement tracking process as encouraged here can be problematic, due to:

- In our experience corporate engagement (on ESG or other matters) is an inexact science which can in some cases take years to bear fruit (if at all), so the frequent re-analysis of engagements above may not be productive, especially the above 'Revisit and revise if necessary goals on continuous basis'. As already discussed in this module (LEA 03.3), this would represent more 'process' and we question the benefit to our clients of our equity professionals in particular spending time implementing a process to this degree, at the expense of focussing on clearly value-adding work. Some larger signatories with dedicated ESG teams may be able to achieve this level of process for their engagements, but we question to what end? Do they achieve better outcomes?
- Engagements are often sensitive (e.g. Board changes) so external disclosure (especially public) of
 progress can in practise jeopardise outcomes we do so occasionally but always think very carefully
 before going down this adversarial route (i.e. essentially putting public pressure on companies to
 encourage change). We often achieve better outcomes with a constructive confidential approach.
- We are usually unaware if other shareholders are engaging (and if so to what degree) on the same issue, hence are often reluctant to claim sole credit for a positive engagement outcome merely to complete the engagement 'process'.

| General processes for all three groups of engagers | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---|--|-------|--|--|
| LEA 10 | Mandato | ory | Gateway | PRI 2 | | |
| | LEA 10.1 | Indicate if you track the number of engager | nents your organisation participates in. | | | |



| Type of engagement | Tracking engagements |
|---|---|
| Individual / Internal staff engagements | Yes, we track the number of our engagements in full Yes, we partially track the number of our engagements We do not track |

LEA 10.2 Additional information. [OPTIONAL]

This would be yet more 'process for process sake'. See LEA 03.3 and LEA 04.5.

Perpetual's analysts and portfolio managers conduct and participate in hundreds of company meetings a year, with listed companies themselves, related peers/suppliers and other relevant groups, on a broad range of ESG and non-ESG issues, at a range of forums, individually and collectively, and for both information-gathering and engagement purposes. We typically do not 'segregate' meetings by the above aims, nor by issue categorization (ESG and non-ESG) as this would often be impractical. We believe it would be unworkable to impose a rigid, time-consuming process where it is mandatory for investment professionals to document every single company engagement point relating to every company. Analysts and portfolio managers share relevant, material ESG and other company information with the rest of the team via the IRN (Internal Research Note) and other systems/forums as needed. We see no value to our clients of tracking engagements in this manner.

We believe it is only reliable to highlight specific engagement examples and outcomes (see LEA 15) where we are confident we have had a degree of influence.

| (| Communic | ation | | | |
|--------|---------------------------|------------|--|--|---------|
| LEA 16 | Man | datory | | Core Assessed | PRI 2,6 |
| | LEA 16.1 | Indi | cate whether your organisation proactively | discloses information on its engageme | ents. |
| | ○ We disc | close it p | publicly | | |
| | We disc | close it t | o clients and/or beneficiaries only | | |
| | LEA | 16.5 | Indicate what engagement information yo clients/beneficiaries. | ur organisation proactively discloses to | |
| | | | chenta/penencianes. | | |
| | | | Engagement information disclosed | | |
| | \checkmark | Details | of the selections, priorities and specific goa | als of engagement | |
| | | Numbe | of engagements | | |
| | | Breakdo | own of engagements by type/topic | | |
| | | Breakdo | own of engagements by region | | |
| | \checkmark | An asse | essment of the current status of the engage | ement | |
| | \checkmark | Outcom | es that have been achieved from the enga | gement | |
| | | Other in | formation | | |



| LEA 16.6 | Indicate how frequently you typically rep | ort engagements information | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------|--|--|--|
| O Disclo | Disclosed continuously (prior to and post engagements) | | | | | |
| O Disclo | sed quarterly or more frequently | | | | | |
| O Disclo | sed biannually | | | | | |
| Disclo | sed annually | | | | | |
| O Disclo | sed less frequently than annually | | | | | |
| O Ad ho | c/when requested | | | | | |
| ○ We do not pro | pactively disclose it to the public and/or clied | nts/beneficiaries. | | | | |
| LEA 16.8 A | dditional information. [Optional] | | | | | |
| of progress can this adversarial i achieve better o | gagements are often sensitive (e.g. Board of ieopardise outcomes - we do so occasional route (i.e. essentially putting public pressure utcomes with a constructive confidential apart of the confidence | lly but always think very carefully before on companies to encourage change). \ | going down | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| verview | | | | | | |
| Mandator | y | Gateway | PRI 1,2,3 | | | |
| LEA 17.1 In | dicate whether your organisation has a forr | nal voting policy. | | | | |
| Yes | | | | | | |
| LEA 17.2 | Indicate what your voting policy covers: | | | | | |
| □ Conflicto | -6:-44 | | | | | |

☑ Conflicts of interest
 ☑ Prioritisation of voting activities
 ☑ Transparency
 ☑ Decision making processes
 ☐ Environmental factors
 ☐ Social factors
 ☑ Governance factors
 ☐ Securities lending process
 ☐ Other, describe

LEA 17.3

☐ None of the above

Please attach or provide a URL to your voting policy. [Optional]



LEA 17

URI

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

LEA 17.4

Provide a brief overview of your organization's approach to (proxy) voting (including the filing and/or co-filing of shareholder resolutions if applicable).

Voting rights are a valuable asset of the investor and are intrinsically linked to the expression of our views on corporate governance practices and to our monitoring of the governance of the companies we invest in.

Perpetual supports governance standards and commonly accepted good governance practices including the following areas:

- · Respect for shareholders
- Board function
- Audit
- Remuneration

We will always consider a company's governance practices in the context of what is in the best interests of our clients, and have appropriate regard to the company's circumstances. Where we perceive a company's governance has some material deficiencies we will normally seek to engage with the company.

Voting at company meetings is carried out by us on all resolutions where Perpetual has the voting authority and responsibility to do so (where practical). All resolutions are considered on a case by case basis. Voting decisions will be made in the clients' best interests. To assist in decision making we subscribe to independent external proxy advisory services.

The policy includes processes for managing conflicts of interests for short positions.

Infrequently we file our own shareholder resolutions or called our own shareholder meetings.

 \bigcirc No

| LEA 18 | Manc | latory | Descriptive | PRI 2 |
|--------|----------|--|---|------------|
| | LEA 18.1 | Indicate how you typically make your (proxy) on. | voting decisions and what this approach | n is based |
| | | Approach | | |

- \odot We use our own research or voting team and make our own voting decisions without the use of service providers.
- We hire service provider(s) that make voting recommendations or provide research that we use to inform our voting decisions.



Based primarily on

- O the service provider voting policy signed off by us
- our own voting policy
- O our clients' requests or policy
- O other, explain
- O We hire service provider(s) that make voting decisions on our behalf, except for some pre-defined scenarios for which we review and make voting decisions.
- O We hire service provider(s) that make voting decisions on our behalf.

LEA 18.2

Additional information.[Optional]

On all proxy voting decisions, our Head of Equities makes the final voting decision after consideration of:

- the voting and governance principles set out in Our Corporate Governance and Proxy Voting Policy (https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/) - an internal ESG resource (The Manager, Responsible Investment) assists in this process;
- · the internal views of relevant company analysts and portfolio managers; and
- the proxy report, including recommendations, from our external proxy adviser this includes
 consideration of current governance norms and standards (e.g. on executive remuneration, director
 independence, etc.).

Paramount in this process is the principle that voting decisions are be made in the clients' best interests.

LEA 22 Mandatory Core Assessed PRI 2

LEA 22.1

Indicate if you ensure that companies are informed of the rationale when you and/or the service providers acting on your behalf abstain or vote against management recommendations.

- Yes, in most cases
- O Sometimes, in the following cases:
- \circ No
- O Not applicable as we and/or our service providers do not abstain or vote against management recommendations

Outputs and outcomes

LEA 23

Mandatory

Core Assessed

PRI 2

LEA 23.1

For listed equities where you and/or your service provider have the mandate to issue (proxy) voting instructions, indicate the percentage of votes cast during the reporting year.

We do track or collect this information

Votes cast (to the nearest 1%)



%

100

Specify the basis on which this percentage is calculated

- of the total number of ballot items on which you could have issued instructions
- O of the total number of company meetings at which you could have voted
- O of the total value of your listed equity holdings on which you could have voted
- O We do not track or collect this information

Communication

LEA 27

Mandatory

Core Assessed

PRI 2,6

LEA 27.1

Indicate if your organisation proactively discloses information on your voting activities.

We disclose it publicly

provide URL

https://www.perpetual.com.au/Investments/Institutional-Investors/Responsible-Investing/

LEA 27.2

Indicate if the information disclosed to the public is the same as that disclosed to clients/beneficiaries.

- O Yes
- No

LEA 27.3

Indicate the voting information your organisation proactively discloses to the public.

Indicate how much of your voting record you disclose

- All voting decisions
- O Some voting decisions
- Only abstentions and opposing vote decisions
- O Summary of votes only

Indicate what level of explanation you provide

- O Explain all voting decisions
- O Explain some voting decisions
- Only explain abstentions and votes against management
- No explanations provided



| LEA 27.4 | Indicate how frequently you typically report voting information to the public. | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| O Contin | uously (primarily before meetings) | | | | | |
| ○ Contin | O Continuously (soon after votes are cast) | | | | | |
| ○ Quarte | erly or more frequently | | | | | |
| ○ Biannı | ually | | | | | |
| Annua | lly | | | | | |
| O Less f | requently than annually | | | | | |
| ○ Ad ho | c/as requested | | | | | |
| LEA 27.5 | Indicate the voting information your organisation proactively discloses to clients/beneficiaries. | | | | | |
| | Indicate how much of your voting record you disclose | | | | | |
| | voting decisions | | | | | |
| ○ Son | ne voting decisions | | | | | |
| O Only | y abstentions and opposing vote decisions | | | | | |
| ○ Sun | nmary of votes only | | | | | |
| | Indicate what level of explanation you provide | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| • | lain all voting decisions | | | | | |
| • | lain some voting decisions | | | | | |
| | y explain abstentions and votes against management | | | | | |
| O No | explanations provided | | | | | |
| LEA 27.6 | Indicate how frequently you typically report voting information to clients/beneficiaries. | | | | | |
| ○ Contin | uously (primarily before meetings) | | | | | |
| Contin | Continuously (soon after votes are cast) | | | | | |
| ○ Quarte | O Quarterly or more frequently | | | | | |
| ○ Biannı | ○ Biannually | | | | | |
| O Annua | ○ Annually | | | | | |
| O Less f | requently than annually | | | | | |
| O Ad hoo | c/as requested | | | | | |
| disclose it to cl | ients/beneficiaries only | | | | | |
| do not proactiv | ely disclose our voting activities to the public and/or to clients/beneficiaries | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

LEA 27.8 Additional information. [Optional

Perpetual considered and voted on thousands of separate resolutions over the year, so composing and publishing an explanation on every single voting decisions is unrealistic.



○ We○ We