ETHICAL CAPITAL OPPORTUNITY ADVISORS
NEWSLETTER — Q2 2021

June 30th, 2021

FUND PERFORMANCE SUMMARY — Q2 2021

PROTEA UCITS II – ECO ADVISORS ESG ABSOLUTE RETURN FUND	MTD	QTD	YTD	Since Inception
F Class EUR (net of fees)	0.12%	-0.11%	-1.93%	2.70%
F Class GBP (net of fees)	0.15%	0.02%	-1.67%	4.11%
F Class USD (net of fees)	0.16%	0.06%	-1.57%	0.26%
P Class EUR (net of fees)	0.11%	-0.11%	-1.93%	0.29%

Monthly Performance (1yr)	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan 2021	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
F Class EUR (net of fees)	0.58%	0.63%	0.80%	-1.18%	0.16%	-1.04%	-0.53%	-2.58%	1.31%	-0.24%	0.02%	0.12%
F Class GBP (net of fees)	0.61%	0.66%	0.86%	-1.14%	0.20%	-1.00%	-0.48%	-2.54%	1.36%	-0.20%	0.07%	0.15%

Inception dates: F Class EUR and F Class GBP - July 8th, 2019
F Class USD - Oct 1st, 2019. P Class EUR - Jan 6th, 2020
Performance is shown net of all fees. Source: ECO Advisors, FundPartner Solutions Europe (SA)

ESG Portfolio Metrics



Chart illustrates weighted average score of selected MSCI ESG key issue scores for both our long and short portfolios (LHS). WACI measures portfolio weighted average CO2 emissions <metric tonnes, scope 1&2> per $1m of revenue (RHS). Source: ECO Advisors, MSCI, Refinitiv

Gross Performance Summary

PROTEA UCITS II – ECO ADVISORS ESG ABSOLUTE RETURN	MTD	QTD	YTD	Since Inception
Gross Return	0.22%	0.25%	-1.27%	5.08%
Long Contribution	0.96%	4.22%	10.06%	25.79%
Short Contribution	-0.84%	-3.90%	-11.45%	-20.74%
FX Hedging	0.10%	-0.06%	0.12%	0.03%

The above figures are gross estimates of the fund's performance. Components may not sum due to compounding and rounding effects. Source: ECO Advisors

Gross Performance Attribution - Sectors



The above figures are estimates, gross of fees. Source: ECO Advisors

Gross Performance Attribution - Regions



The above figures are estimates, gross of fees. Source: ECO Advisors

PERFORMANCE & ATTRIBUTION SUMMARY

The Fund was broadly flat over the quarter (GBP F class +0.02%, EUR F class -0.11%, USD F class +0.06%).

On a gross sector basis, Industrials (+70bps) and Consumer Staples (+30bps) contributed, whilst Energy (-40bps) and Utilities (-10bps) detracted. On a regional basis, Asia Pacific (+100bps) and Western Europe (+20bps) contributed, whilst North America (-40bps) and Japan (-50bps) detracted. The long book contributed ca. +420bps, whilst the short book detracted ca. -390bps. The cumulative contribution of risk factor exposures such as sector, style, country and residual beta was positive over the quarter (+100bps), whilst ESG selection detracted slightly (-70bps), primarily driven by the underperformance of 'Green' vs. 'Brown' names in Utilities & Energy.

Global equity markets gained for the fifth consecutive quarter with the MSCI World TR Index $ gaining +7.7%, buoyed by the successful rollout of COVID-19 vaccination programs in Europe and North America, continued recovery in economic indicators, robust corporate earnings and ongoing fiscal and monetary support. After rising sharply at the end of Q1, global sovereign bond yield curves flattened, with US longer dated yields falling and short dated yields rising as the US Fed acknowledged the recent rise in inflation and signalled its willingness to raise rates sooner than expected should the recent sharp rise in inflation persist.

Amidst the continuing global equity market rally, the exuberant market conditions which proved challenging for the short portfolio in Q1 continued to be present. For example, Q2 saw more large rallies, divorced from company fundamentals, in so-called 'meme' stocks. However, in the wake of the Fed's more hawkish commentary and increasing amounts of equity issuance by impacted companies, the magnitude and extent of such exuberance waned compared to the extraordinary conditions in Q1. In our portfolio, the additional risk controls implemented as a result of the extreme conditions in Q1 helped us to identify and avoid a small number of potential 'meme' names on the short-side in Q2. As market conditions and short side volatility normalised, our risk models better reflected factor and idiosyncratic risks and we thus increased the Fund's gross exposure to more typical levels (ca. 150%).

While it often felt that ESG considerations were almost entirely ignored in the equity market in Q1 2021, we did see some examples of ESG issues being taken into account in specific areas in Q2. For example, on the regulatory side, Chinese authorities have been particularly active in Governance related areas of antitrust and business conduct. In Industrials and Consumer Staples, the current pandemic induced stress in global supply chains handed an advantage to those firms that excel at supply chain risk management, a key S pillar metric. However, the continued rally in the oil price and outperformance of some of the most fossil fuel dependent 'dark brown' names in the Energy and Utilities sectors continued to be a headwind for our ESG stock selection in Q2. We discuss this phenomena in more detail in the next section.

OUTLOOK & POSITIONING From an individual country perspective, we maintain a limited net exposure to any individual country. This remains central to our portfolio construction methodology. On a gross basis, the US represents our largest exposure, and our geographical gross exposure is reasonably consistent with the exposure profile of major global equity benchmarks. On a regional net exposure basis, the portfolio has a modest long exposure to western Europe; albeit many of these names are international companies. This is a reflection of Europe's continued leadership in areas of ESG within the corporate sector.

We remain cognisant of our residual risk exposures, factor footprints and other associated risk drivers. After such an aggressive rally in high risk assets over the past 12 months, we do believe certain sectors appear overextended, and we are conscious of ensuring exposure to such areas is carefully managed. Travel & Leisure is a good example of a sector where where we are carefully monitoring risk exposures, as virus uncertainties and restrictions remain an atypical risk factor. In other sectors, input cost inflation may have a significant impact on business profits and performance. From a factor perspective, whilst overall exposure to factor risks is modest, the portfolio is carrying its typical net positive exposure towards higher and more stable profitability and higher RoE companies, many of which have lagged their lower quality peers in the last 9 months. Most of all, after such an extreme rally in higher risk, carbon intensive, lower quality companies, often with speculative business models (and poor ESG profiles), our exposure to such names on the short side remains undiminished and we believe that an environment of uncertain inflation outcomes, Fed tapering and a re-emergence of ESG factors as major risk drivers will reward this positioning.

LONG PORTFOLIO - SIGNIFICANT MOVERS

> EVERGREEN MARINE (+330%) The Taiwan based container shipping firm disclosed in early April that March sales were up +134.8% YoY, and Q1 earnings were also better than expected. Shipping rates have risen sharply since Q3 2020 and fierce competition for ocean freight capacity has become the new normal. With new capacity only slowly coming onstream, freight rates are expected to continue to reach new highs this year and will likely remain above their pre-pandemic levels in the longer-term. An ESG improver, Evergreen has solid corporate governance practices when compared to regional peers and is making tangible improvements to its emissions profile, including introducing slow steaming and installing emission reduction technologies.

> CYBERDYNE, (-23%) The Japanese medical robotics manufacturer fell over the quarter. The company focuses on designing wearable exoskeletons capable of performing movements for patients suffering severe physical disabilities. The company announced trial results for its developmental HAL artificial limb product to assist stroke patients. Whilst a number of key objectives were met, there were concerns around selection bias in certain key end points which may delay the product's approval.

SHORT PORTFOLIO - SIGNIFICANT MOVERS

> TAL EDUCATION (-53%) & NEW ORIENTAL EDUCATION (-42%) are private education providers with online and in-person operations in China. Both companies, along with others in the industry, fell sharply as authorities announced that multiple online after-school tutoring (AST) companies were found to have violated regulations in recent inspections. The firms were accused of poor business practices in multiple areas including advance enrolment & fee collection, selling unnecessary combo-courses, price collusion & improper advertising. The prospects of tighter regulation & AST reform continued to weigh on the sector in May, with the Central Commission of Comprehensively Deepening Reform urging stricter supervision of the industry and urging the government to root out non-compliant institutions, commenting that ASTs "should not become a profit-seeking industry". Both companies scored poorly in our ESG data analysis, notably in many of the areas cited by the regulatory authorities in their industry clampdown.

> COMSTOCK RESOURCES (+20%) The US oil exploration and production company gained over the quarter. The firm announced a Q1 loss of $134.1m after reporting a profit in the same period a year earlier, however, the results were ahead of investor expectations. The stock benefitted from a broad rally in energy stocks & indeed the oil price over the period. We see Comstock as an industry laggard in a number of key areas of ESG including carbon emissions, corporate governance and executive pay.

UPDATE ON ECO ADVISORS STEWARDSHIP, VOTING, AND ENGAGEMENT

We believe that ESG driven corporate engagement and voting in areas of environmental, social and governance risks can increase the ability of firms to create long term shareholder value. After thorough market and industry research, this year we have further developed our voting guidance on proposals relating to executive pay, as well as our guidance on proposals relating to director nominations and gender diversity.

We have voted at 100% of eligible meetings and maintain detailed documentation on voting decisions and rationales. We document all communications with companies regarding voting rationale and any responses received, as well as maintain a summary voting log, which lists every proposal where ECO Advisors has been eligible to vote, how we voted in relation to management, and a short description of voting rationale.

Out of 44 AGMs in H1, on seven occasions we abstained or voted against board nominations due to diversity concerns and on five occasions we abstained or voted against executive pay. We also voted against management in favour of shareholder ESG proposals on ten out of ten occasions. Full details are available upon request or via our investor portal.

As of June 2021, we are also members of sixteen collaborative engagement initiatives. Most recently, we have joined the 30% Club Investors Group as part of our commitment to promoting diversity in company boards, as well as the Investor Agenda, Climate Action 100+, CDP, and FAIRR. Progress and milestones reached for each of our engagements is available on our website and our investor portal.

https://www.ecoadvisors.eu/engagements-progress/

ESG RESEARCH SPOTLIGHT:

ESG, CLIMATE, AND REGULATION: GLOBAL TRENDS AND INVESTMENT IMPLICATIONS

Following the rapid growth in ESG interest and investment witnessed in 2020, the importance of ESG in the investment process has continued to gain growing acceptance amongst both investors and investment professionals in 2021. Despite this trend, H1 2021 has proven to be more challenging for investors focused on environmental ("E pillar") considerations in their investment process. The significant underperformance of the renewables sector in the U.S. and EU starting in January only tells part of the story, and the investment challenge has been more complex than a single industry or thematic effect (e.g. "tech vs. old economy", "green vs. brown").

Our research finds that in H1 2021, less efficient, higher carbon intensity companies significantly outperformed lower carbon intensity companies, not simply at the aggregate level, but importantly *within* some of the most carbon-intensive sectors such as Industrials and Materials[1]. We have seen recent underperformance of more carbon efficient companies on a sector neutral basis in key carbon intensive sectors, and in several cases with substantial contribution from adverse stock selection effects, rather than other factors. It is fair to say that for climate-conscious equity investors, it has not been easy "being green" in H1 2021.

2021 H1 TOP VS. BOTTOM DECILE PERFORMANCE BY CARBON INTENSITY: UNIVERSE & GICS SECTORS

UNIVERSE -8.5%

INDUSTRIALS -11.6%

MATERIALS -10%

UTILITIES -16.5%

ENERGY -9.6%

2021 H1 EU ETS CARBON EMISSIONS FUTURES PERFORMANCE:

+75%



[1] ECO methodology: we examined the historical performance of equally weighted top/bottom decile long/short portfolios ranked by carbon intensity (CO2 metric tonnes Scope 1+2 per $1mm revenue) from a global investable universe of ca. 5000 listed equities, and performed attribution analysis on the long/short positions. For avoidance of doubt, "top" decile consists of the most efficient, lowest carbon intensity companies, while "bottom" decile represents companies with the highest levels of carbon intensity. We also conducted this exercise creating long/short deciles *within* GICS Level 1 sectors, and found significant relative underperformance (local currency returns) of low carbon intensity names within Industrials (-11.6%), Materials (-10%), Utilities (-16.5%) and Energy (-9.6%) in H1 2021. Source: ECO Advisors, Bloomberg

This result is in stark contrast with the evolution of the EU ETS carbon futures price during 2021, which has risen steadily from ca. 32 EUR/tonne to ca. 56 EUR/tonne during H1 2021, a remarkable 75% increase. Furthermore, we find overall evidence of outperformance of lower carbon intensity companies on an aggregate basis over the last decade, until the end of 2020. It is therefore appropriate to ask if there are temporary or cyclical factors that may be favouring companies that appear inferior on important "E metrics" such as carbon intensity, or if there are any structural reasons to be wary of climate efficiency as a guide to superior performance in the future. Despite the trend amongst asset owners to divest from the "dirtiest" assets and increasing demand for climate-aware and/or Paris-aligned equity investment, recent research suggests the market is still far from "fully priced" for the potential consequences of higher costs for GHG emissions[2], and our analysis of carbon intensity in H1 2021 supports this view.

In 2021, we have begun to witness the international convergence of important regulatory trends, which will have significant implications for investors going forward, both in terms of risks and opportunities. The EU has been the clear leader in environmental regulations and initiatives for some time and has been at the forefront of defining sustainable investment and

[2] FT: "Equity Investors warned of 20% shock from Carbon Tax", https://www.ft.com/content/45752266-a711-42f4-bd44-44555024c33f?segmentId=3f81fe28-ba5d-8a93-616e-4859191fabd8

requirements of green investing. It is evident that the U.S. and China are now joining suit. **We expect the convergence of regulatory trends we are witnessing to have a long term transformative effect on company behaviour, market pricing, and investment decision making in the months and years ahead.** In this newsletter, we examine the structural backdrop which supports this view.

Europe and the EU

The EU is pushing forward with several important initiatives around climate disclosure, both by companies and investment managers. For investors, the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) and Green Taxonomy are mandatory disclosures which work in conjunction with one another and have already partially come into effect in March 2021. These initiatives are part of the EU's Action Plan on Sustainable Finance, which pursues two goals: to integrate sustainability considerations into the financial system, and to steer the flow of capital towards sustainable investments[3]. The SFDR introduces mandatory ESG disclosures for asset managers and other financial market participants on sustainability risks and 'Principal Adverse Impacts', which are the negative effects on sustainability factors that an investment decision or advice might have[4]. The green taxonomy aims to create a common framework and language as to whether an activity can be considered to be environmentally sustainable[5]. Disclosures on taxonomy alignment must be made for each financial product[6].

In the UK, we see disclosure focused around the TCFD. The Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) was created in 2015 by the Financial Stability Board to develop consistent climate-related financial risk disclosures for use by companies, banks, and investors in providing information to stakeholders[7]. The UK government is in the process of making TCFD aligned climate-related financial disclosures mandatory for publicly quoted companies, large private companies and Limited Liability Partnerships[8]. Full disclosures are expected in 2022.

In terms of carbon pricing, the theme of levelling out the playing field continues. The EU Emissions Trading System (ETS) currently covers about 40% of all EU emissions and is the world's largest ETS[9]. It works on the cap-and-trade principle, by setting a cap on companies' carbon emissions and allowing companies to sell excess reductions for profit to other companies that have failed to remain below their specified limits. By gradually reducing the number of carbon permits available each year, they create a cycle of rising prices and a greater pressure on companies to reduce their emissions and adopt clean energy technology.



The chart above provides another lens to examine the challenge faced by "Green" investors in H1 2021. The chart shows the USD performance of an index of top coal producing stocks (BICOATGC Index) and the performance of the S&P Global Clean Energy Index (BICOATGC Index). Source: ECO Advisors, Bloomberg

ETS' are designed to internalise carbon emissions externalities, meaning that companies that have historically polluted heavily for free will no longer be able to do so and will have to internalise the cost, either by reducing emissions or by purchasing polluting rights through the scheme. EU carbon prices have been steadily rising since 2018 and hit a new high in Q2 2021[10]. The EU ETS legislation provides for the possibility to link the EU ETS with other compatible emissions trading systems in the world at national or regional level[11]. In line with its commitment to achieve net-zero by 2050, the UK launched its own ETS in May, with carbon prices reaching over £50 per

[3] https://www.spglobal.com/marketintelligence/en/news-insights/blog/what-is-the-impact-of-the-eu-sustainable-finance-disclosure-regulation-sfdr

[4] https://assets.kpmg/content/dam/kpmg/ie/pdf/2021/03/ie-sustainable-finance-disclosure-reg-sfdr.pdf

[5] https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_21_1804

[6] Currently there is guidance on technical screening criteria to define which activities contribute substantially to two of the total six environmental objectives under the Taxonomy Regulation: climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation. The Taxonomy is continuously evolving, but as of right now it covers the economic activities of about 40% of listed companies, in sectors which are responsible for almost 80% of direct greenhouse gas emissions in Europe. It includes sectors such as energy, forestry, manufacturing, transport and buildings.

[7] https://www.fsb-tcfd.org/about/

[8] https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/mandatory-climate-related-financial-disclosures-by-publicly-quoted-companies-large-private-companies-and-llps

[9] https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets_en

[10] https://www.edie.net/news/11/UK-ETS--Post-Brexit-carbon-market-opens-for-first-time-with-carbon-price-topping--50-per-tonne/?adfesuccess=1

[11] https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/markets_en

tonne, making the cost of emitting in the UK higher than in the EU[12]. The ETS is set to cover 155mt of CO2e in its first year[13].

The EU is also proposing a carbon tariff, to make sure that companies based in the EU are not disadvantaged. The tariff, known as the carbon border adjustment mechanism (CBAM), is designed to put EU firms on an equal footing with competitors in countries with weaker carbon policies[14]. The proposal will take the form of a regulation setting up a carbon border adjustment mechanism authority, with the measure being phased in from 2023 and a full implementation from 2026. The tax will initially target a limited number of imports including iron, steel, cement and fertilisers, and will be based on the equivalent carbon price paid in Europe. Importers will have to buy special certificates at a price linked to the EU ETS. If countries have similar carbon pricing to Europe, the tariff will not apply, contributing to the thesis that polluting or being poorly prepared for carbon regulations will be costly going forward[15]. In the UK, the current government is coming under pressure to introduce its own carbon border tax to protect British industry from cheap competition from polluting countries. Rishi Sunak, chancellor, has ordered work to be done on the tax[16].

China

Upcoming regulations in China are keeping in line with global trends, and appear to be closely aligned with the EU's initiatives. After its rapid and heavily polluting industrialisation, China's environmental challenges are now understood to be a significant risk to China's society and economy. In a bid to tackle these challenges, China's government has declared a "war on pollution" and introduced a number of green initiatives[17]. China's president Xi Jinping told the UN General Assembly in September that China aims to hit peak CO2 emissions before 2030 and achieve carbon neutrality before 2060[18].

Christine Loh, chief development strategist at the Institute for the Environment at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, believes the decarbonisation target "confirms China's paradigm shift from polluted 'factory of the world' to clean, green producer of homegrown high-tech goods, and the world's biggest market for electric vehicles."[19]

In the EU-China Joint Statement on Climate Change adopted at the EU-China summit in 2015, the two entities agreed to further enhance their bilateral cooperation on carbon markets. Against this background, a project termed the "Platform for Policy Dialogue and Cooperation between EU and China on Emissions Trading" was envisioned[20]. The project aimed to provide capacity building and training to support Chinese authorities in their efforts to implement a Chinese ETS. The ETS is now being implemented and is expected to start trading later this year[21]. The ETS regulates more than 2,200 companies from the power sector and is estimated to cover approximately 40% of national carbon emissions, with the scope to be further expanded in the future[22] [23] [24].

In June 2021, China announced its own mandatory carbon emission disclosures after first testing it with some commercial banks and listed companies. Central bank Governor Yi Gang confirmed the trends towards regulatory convergence that we are observing, stating "our goal is to make a uniformed disclosure standard, and in the future, we will go in the direction of mandatory disclosure of climate-related information," during a panel discussion at the Green Swan conference[25]. These national and international initiatives mean that disclosures and transparency are going to have to ramp up.

---

[12] https://www.reuters.com/business/sustainable-business/britains-carbon-market-begins-trading-higher-than-eu-prices-2021-05-19/

[13] https://www.edie.net/news/11/UK-ETS--Post-Brexit-carbon-market-opens-for-first-time-with-carbon-price-topping--50-per-tonne/?adfesuccess=1

[14] https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-06-02/eu-climate-levy-to-be-linked-to-prices-in-red-hot-carbon-market

[15] https://www.euractiv.com/section/energy-environment/news/eus-carbon-border-tariff-to-target-steel-cement-power/

[16] https://www.ft.com/content/514058ab-fd27-4318-82e0-dd5501356ebc

[17] https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/12/upshot/china-pollution-environment-longer-lives.html

[18] https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-54256826

[19] https://ienv.ust.hk/news/can-china-meet-its-ambitious-decarbonization-goals

[20] https://www.eu-chinaets.org/

[21] https://www.iea.org/reports/chinas-emissions-trading-scheme

[22] https://icapcarbonaction.com/en/?option=com_etsmap&task=export&format=pdf&layout=list&systems%5B%5D=55

[23] Key pillars of the development of the national ETS include: reporting and verification of historical emissions data from eight emission-intensive sectors; development of the national registry, trading system, and national enterprise GHG reporting system; set-up of the legislative and regulatory framework; and capacity building.

[24] China is also moving to improve green investment standards. The foundation for sustainable investments in China was laid in 2016 with the "Guidelines for Establishing the Green Financial System" which aimed to mobilise and incentivise more capital to invest in green sectors through a series of policy incentives. In 2019, the Asset Management Association of China (AMAC), a self-regulating body, asked its members to carry out a self-assessment on their green investing practices. According to AMAC's report, which was released in February 2021, only 40% of 37 sampled retail fund companies reported that green investing had been incorporated into their strategic planning. Further, just one-third of the sampled group had set up green investing targets, and only 38.5% disclosed whether they had fulfilled their internal goals. The SFDR will have implications for Chinese financial entities as those that market products in the EU will fall under the umbrella of the regulation and will need to be compliant. Sources: https://www.greenfinanceplatform.org/policies-and-regulations/chinas-guidelines-establishing-green-financial-system; https://www.globalelr.com/2021/04/china-and-eu-to-collaborate-on-green-investment-standards/

[25] https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-06-04/china-to-make-climate-information-disclosure-mandatory-yi-says

Earlier this year, China's central bank also announced that it is working with the EU to adopt a common green taxonomy, aiming to implement a jointly recognised classification system. PBC Governor Yi Gang said strengthening the nation's green finance system was the central bank's priority for the next five years and that improving the taxonomy of green finance[26]. Yi said deepening international co-operation on green finance, including discussing details on the adoption and incorporation of a globally recognised green taxonomy would be discussed at the upcoming G20 summit, which is scheduled to be held in Rome in October. During the summit, the PBoC plans to set up a sustainable finance study group, with the US Treasury Department as a co-chair, to establish coordination on building a roadmap for advancing sustainable finance. "We will deepen the cooperation with Italy, US and other G20 members, to discuss and design an overall road map of sustainable finance, to further discussions with various parties about topics such as reporting and disclosure, as well as green taxonomy," Yi said[27].

U.S.

While the Trump administration rolled back environmental protections and withdrew the U.S. from the Paris Agreement, the current Biden administration has been quick to make its commitments to decarbonisation and international cooperation clear. President Biden quickly re-entered the U.S. into the Paris Agreement and stated that the main climate target of his administration is to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, and to reduce GHG emissions by 50%-52% by the year 2030 relative to 2005 levels. An important part of his climate plan involves investing in infrastructure and innovation, stating that "America must lead the critical industries that produce and deploy the clean technologies"[28].

President Biden is also calling on Congress to invest $35bn in the full range of solutions needed to achieve technology breakthroughs that address the climate crisis and position America as the global leader in clean energy technology and clean energy jobs. His climate plan includes investing $15bn in demonstration projects for climate R&D priorities, including utility-scale energy storage, carbon capture and storage, hydrogen, advanced nuclear, and floating offshore wind, amongst other technologies and materials that might be used in electric vehicle production[29].

As mentioned, the upcoming G20 summit in October may see further coordination globally and the strengthening of the trend towards regulatory convergence. Earlier this year John Kerry, President Biden's climate envoy, said the U.S. would probably "join with Europe" to begin requiring companies to disclose information on climate risk[30]. Allison Herren Lee, the acting head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, also said the U.S. securities regulator was focusing on climate-related disclosures and planned to update its guidance on the issue for the first time since 2010[31].

In May the Biden administration took the first concrete step toward enforcing climate disclosure by requiring a broad range of U.S. banks and companies to disclose the risks they face from climate change. A new executive order also instructed Treasury secretary Janet Yellen to work with the other members of the Financial Stability Oversight Council to report how they plan to reduce climate-related risks to financial stability[32]. At a press conference announcing the order, Brian Deese, director of the National Economic Council, stressed the importance of harmonising U.S. standards with those of other countries[33]. This could mean mandatory TCFD reporting, as will soon be required in the UK. Finally, John Kerry, recently confirmed that President Biden was "interested in evaluating the border adjustment mechanism" that is being pursued by the EU[34].



[26] https://www.globalelr.com/2021/04/china-and-eu-to-collaborate-on-green-investment-standards/

[27] https://www.ft.com/content/cddd464f-9a37-41a0-8f35-62d98fa0cca0?desktop=true&segmentId=d8d3e364-5197-20eb-17cf-2437841d178a#myft:notification:instant-email:content

[28] https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/22/fact-sheet-president-biden-sets-2030-greenhouse-gas-pollution-reduction-target-aimed-at-creating-good-paying-union-jobs-and-securing-u-s-leadership-on-clean-energy-technologies/

[29] https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/03/31/fact-sheet-the-american-jobs-plan/

[30] https://www.ft.com/content/77a8292d-2e7f-43a1-9062-2e639c1e6b2a

[31] https://www.sec.gov/news/speech/lee-climate-change

[32] https://www.ft.com/content/8d6d8866-46f0-4fa0-ad21-be6f106d0bd7

[33] https://www.ft.com/content/9e01478c-acf3-45f4-b17f-95748fd27141

[34] https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-04-23/biden-exploring-border-adjustment-tax-to-fight-climate-change

Implications for Investors

Until recently, focusing on carbon efficiency or implementing a Paris-aligned transition path may have been a "nice to have" for many companies; perhaps good marketing, but not necessarily impactful from an investor's standpoint. However, going forward, there is every indication that "E leadership", in its various forms, will be a source of competitive advantage globally. Current ESG reporting and disclosure standards lag market demand; incoming policies requiring more consistent and comprehensive disclosures will help with transparency, influence market prices, and assist investors in making more informed decisions. In addition, carbon pricing initiatives developing globally mean that CO2 externalities will be increasingly affecting corporate bottom lines. With increasingly stringent and converging carbon emissions regulations, as well as mandatory disclosures, we believe the equity market is likely to start to price CO2 emissions and adverse impacts to the environment more aggressively going forward.

In summary, it appears to us that the structural backdrop to support the "E pillar" as an important differentiator and driver of security alpha remains firmly intact and considerations like carbon intensity are likely to increase in importance. We feel the recent relative outperformance of companies benefiting from negative CO2 externalities is unlikely to persist. While factor timing is notoriously difficult, as we move through the cycle, we expect criteria such as carbon intensity and E pillar leadership to again start to reward investors.

"GREEN" VS. "BROWN" OPPORTUNITIES: POSITION CALLOUTS

ESG LEADER *(LONG)*:

Schneider Electric provides energy and automation digital solutions for homes, buildings, data centers, infrastructure and industry

- ✔ Clean technology innovation is the core strategy
- ✔ Solar, smartgrid, EV charging, industrial automation and demand side solutions accounted for approximately 30% revenue in 2019
- ✔ R&D/sales ratio outperforms the peer average
- ✔ Certified over 70% of its sites to ISO 14001 standards

ESG LAGGARD *(SHORT)*:

CVR Energy engages in petroleum refining and nitrogen fertilizer manufacturing

- ✖ No evidence of firm-level reduction targets for both toxic and carbon emissions
- ✖ Operations in countries with strengthening or pending carbon emissions regulation
- ✖ Refining operations present opportunities to participate in clean technology, however, company appears to be making limited efforts in this regard

APPENDIX:

Q2 2021 PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW

EXPOSURES

GICS SECTOR EXPOSURE	LONG	SHORT	NET	GROSS
Communication Services	4.9%	-5.3%	-0.3%	10.2%
Consumer Discretionary	13.4%	-11.5%	1.8%	24.9%
Consumer Staples	5.9%	-2.7%	3.2%	8.7%
Energy	2.0%	-2.8%	-0.7%	4.8%
Financials	9.3%	-8.7%	0.6%	18.0%
Health Care	9.2%	-8.2%	1.1%	17.4%
Industrials	13.6%	-9.8%	3.8%	23.4%
Information Technology	10.6%	-6.5%	4.1%	17.1%
Materials	8.6%	-8.5%	0.1%	17.1%
Utilities	3.9%	-2.5%	1.5%	6.4%
TOTAL	**81.6%**	**-66.5%**	**15.1%**	**148.1%**

Source: ECO Advisors. Data as of June 30th 2021

REGIONAL EXPOSURES	LONG	SHORT	NET	GROSS
Japan	8.5%	-8.3%	0.2%	16.8%
Asia Pacific	9.8%	-6.5%	3.3%	16.3%
Western Europe	21.2%	-8.9%	12.3%	30.2%
Eastern Europe & Africa	0.8%	-0.7%	0.1%	1.5%
North America	40.3%	-40.5%	-0.2%	80.7%
Latin America	1.0%	-1.6%	-0.6%	2.6%
TOTAL	**81.6%**	**-66.5%**	**15.1%**	**148.1%**

Source: ECO Advisors. Data as of June 30th 2021

KEY METRICS

STRATEGY VALUATION METRICS (WEIGHTED AVERAGE)	LONG	SHORT
P/E (1FY)	17.8	15.9
P/B	2.5	2.0
Net Debt / EBITDA	1.3	1.9
Dividend Yield	2.0%	2.5%
Free Cash Flow Yield	4.3%	3.0%
Return on Equity	9.0%	4.0%
Beta Adj Exposure (vs. MSCI World, ex-ante)	0.07	
Ann. volatility (ex-ante)	3.4%	
1 day VAR (99% monte carlo)	-0.53%	
1 month VAR (99% monte carlo)	-2.4%	

KEY PORTFOLIO METRICS	LONG	SHORT
No. of positions	119	149
Largest position size	1.13%	-0.72%
Top 10 positions weight	9.5%	-6.7%

Source: Bloomberg, MSCI, ECO Advisors.
Data as of June 30th 2021

Note: Strategy valuation metrics are weighted averages, and not all metrics are necessarily comparable across companies in different sectors. Outliers can have a material impact on aggregate statistics.

KEY FUND INFORMATION

TERMS	PROTEA UCITS II - ECO ADVISORS ESG ABSOLUTE RETURN FUND
Management Fee (M) share class	1.1% management fee
Performance Fee (P) share class	0.60% mgt. fee, 15% perf. fee (HWM + rate hurdle)
Founder's (F) share class	0.60% management fee (in perpetuity)
Administration and other fees	0.39%
Investor liquidity	Daily
Share class currencies	EUR, GBP, CHF, SEK, USD
Domicile	Luxembourg
Launch date	July 8th, 2019
Vehicle	Protea UCITS II SICAV
Distribution type	Accumulation
SERVICE PROVIDERS	
Administrator	FundPartner Solutions (Europe) S.A.
UCITS management company	FundPartner Solutions (Europe) S.A.
Depositary	Pictet & Cie (Europe) S.A.
Prime brokers	JP Morgan, Goldman Sachs

SHARE CLASS	ISIN	HEDGED
F Class EUR	LU2002381171	n/a
F Class GBP	LU2002381254	Yes
F Class USD	LU2002381502	Yes
P Class EUR	LU2002382492	n/a
M Class EUR	LU2002381684	n/a
M Class GBP	LU2002381767	Yes
M Class CHF	LU2002382062	Yes

OTHER INFORMATION	
Corporate engagement	ESG driven voting & engagement for longs
Fund AUM (EUR)	€147.9m as of June 30th, 2021
ESG long book exclusion policy	Tobacco, weapons, adult entertainment, gambling, thermal coal, tar sands, arctic drilling, UNGC violations
Morningstar category	Alt - Market Neutral - Equity
SFDR category	Article 8

German, UK, Austrian, Belgian tax reporting available upon request.

The Key Investor Information Document and Prospectus are available at www.ecoadvisors.eu and investors should read these documents prior to investing. F Class shares are open for subscriptions from existing F Class investors only. P & M Class shares are open to subscription from new investors.

For further information, please contact ECO Advisors:
email: info@ecoadvisors.eu, tel: +44 203 903 5371

WWW.ECOADVISORS.EU

PRI Principles for Responsible Investment

ESG LUXFLAG Label

UKSIF UK Sustainable Investment and Finance Association

DISCLAIMER

The information in this presentation is confidential and is intended solely for the persons to whom it has been delivered. It is not to be disclosed, duplicated, transmitted or otherwise given in whole or in part, to third parties without the prior written consent of all parties. All persons receiving this presentation are advised that information provided herein is preliminary only and is not intended to be an invitation or inducement to make any investment. It is not intended to be, and should not be, considered a substitute for a Prospectus or Offering Memorandum and should not be relied upon as a basis for investment. To the extent of any inconsistency or discrepancy between any Prospectus / Offering Memorandum and this presentation, the Prospectus / Offering Memorandum shall prevail.

PROTEA UCITS II – ECO ADVISORS ESG ABSOLUTE RETURN FUND (the "Fund") is defined as an "Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities Fund" ("UCITS Fund") and the promotion of a UCITS Fund is restricted by regulation. Consequently, this document is only intended for professional investors and eligible counterparties.

No reliance may be placed for any purpose on the information and opinions contained in this document or their accuracy or completeness. No representation, warranty or undertaking, express or implied, is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in this document by any of ECO Advisors, its members, employees or affiliates and no liability is accepted by such persons for the accuracy or completeness of any such information or opinions.

This document does not constitute an offer of solicitation in a jurisdiction where to do so is unlawful or the person making the offer or solicitation is not qualified to do so or a person receiving the offer or solicitation may not lawfully do so. Prospective investors should inform themselves and should take appropriate advice on the legal requirements and as to possible tax consequences, foreign exchange restrictions or exchange control requirements that they might encounter under the laws of the countries of their citizenship, residence or domicile and that might be relevant to the subscription, purchase, holding, exchange, redemption or disposal of any investments.

Except as otherwise specified herein, the information contained herein is believed to be accurate as of the date indicated on each page. No assurance is made as to its continued accuracy after such date, and there is no obligation to notify any recipients of this presentation should there be any changes to the information contained herein. All information is subject to revision without notice.

The Strategy outlined in the presentation is speculative, involves a substantial degree of risk and may be leveraged. Investment losses may occur and investors may lose all or a substantial amount of his or her investment. In no event shall anything contained herein be construed as an express or an implied promise, guarantee or implication that you will profit or that losses can or will be limited in any manner whatsoever. Investment returns can be volatile and its fees and expenses may offset gains.

To ensure you understand whether this fund is suitable for you, please read the Key Investor Information Document 'KIID' and the Prospectus, which can be obtained from our website www.ecoadvisors.eu or by emailing <info@ecoadvisors.eu>.

The value of any investment, and any income from it, can rise and fall with movements in stock markets, currencies and interest rates. These can move irrationally and can be affected unpredictably by diverse factors, including political and economic events. This could mean that you won't get back the amount you originally invested. The fund's past performance should not be considered a guide to future returns. The fund will invest in emerging markets, which can involve greater risk than investing in developed markets. In particular, more volatility (sharper rises and falls in unit/share prices) can be expected. The fund may use derivatives (financial instruments whose value is linked to the expected price movements of an underlying asset) for investment purposes, including taking long and short positions, and may use borrowing from time to time. It may also invest in derivatives to protect the value of the fund, reduce costs and/or generate additional income. Investing in derivatives also carries risks, however. In the case of a 'short' position, for example, where the fund aims to profit from falling prices, if the price of the underlying asset rises in value, the fund will lose money. Any research and analysis in this document has been obtained by Ethical Capital Opportunity Advisors 'ECO' for its own use. Although this communication is based on sources of information that ECO believes to be reliable, no guarantee is given as to its accuracy or completeness. Any forward-looking statements are based on ECO's current expectations and projections and are subject to change without notice. Issued by Ethical Capital Opportunity Advisors which is authorised and regulated in the UK by the Financial Conduct Authority.

Information containing any historical information, data or analysis should not be taken as an indication or guarantee of any future performance, analysis, forecast or prediction. Past performance does not guarantee future results. The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information. NONE OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDERS MAKES ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION (OR THE RESULTS TO BE OBTAINED BY THE USE THEREOF), AND TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW, EACH INFORMATION PROVIDER EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.