Sustainable

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

The EU Taxonomy

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

Product Name: HSBC Global Funds ICAV - Global Sustainable Government Bond UCITS ETF

Legal Entity Identifier: 213800VD7NNXQHMT9M96

Did this financial product have a sustainable investment objective? No Yes It made sustainable investments It promoted Environmental/ with an environmental objective: Social (E/S) characteristics and while it did not have as its objective _% a sustainable investment, it had a proportion of 3.54% of sustainable in economic activities that qualify as investments environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy with an environmental objective in economic activities that qualify as in economic activities that do not environmentally sustainable under the qualify as environmentally sustainable EU Taxonomy under the EU Taxonomy with an environmental objective in economic activities that do not qualify as environmentally sustainable under the EU Taxonomy with a social objective It made sustainable investments It promoted E/S characteristics, but with a social objective: _% did not make any sustainable investments



Sustainability

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

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

In tracking the performance of the Bloomberg MSCI Global Treasury ESG Weighted Bond Index (total return hedged to USD) (the "Index"), the Sub-Fund promoted environmental and/or social characteristics:

An improvement the of the MSCI ESG rating against that of the Bloomberg Global Aggregate Treasuries Index (the "Parent Index").

The Sub-Fund sought to achieve the promotion of this characteristics by tracking the performance of the Index which used MSCI ESG sovereign scores to tilt country allocations above or below their market value weights in the Parent Index in order to reduce exposure to countries with high exposure to and/or low management of ESG risks and to improve the exposure to countries with favorable ESG ratings.

The Sub-Fund did not use derivatives to attain the environmental and/or social characteristics of the Sub-Fund.

Environmental and/or social characteristics

The performance of the sustainability indicators used to measure the attainment of the environmental and/or social characteristics promoted by the Sub-Fund can be seen in the table below. The sustainability indicators were calculated by the Investment Manager and utilises data from third party data vendors.

The data can be based on company/issuer disclosures, or estimated by the data vendors in the absence of company/ issuer reports. Please note that it was not always possible to guarantee the accuracy, timeliness or completeness of data provided by third party vendors.

How did the sustainability indicators perform?

Indicator	Sub-Fund	Broad Market Index
ESG Score	6.65	5.83

The data is based on the four-quarter average holdings of the financial year ending on 31 December 2024.

Broad Market Index - Bloomberg Global Aggregate Treasuries Index

...and compared to previous periods?

Indicator	Period Ending	Sub-Fund	Broad Market Index
ESG Score	31 December 2024	6.65	5.83
	31 December 2023	6.64	5.74
	31 December 2022	6.57	5.82

Broad Market Index - Bloomberg Global Aggregate Treasuries Index. The Sub-Fund recalculated figures for 2022 Reporting Year with figures for ESG Score - 6.57.

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

The objectives of the sustainable investments in the Sub-Fund were, amongst others: 1. Companies with sustainable product and/or services or quantifiable projects (e.g. identified through CAPEX, OPEX and turnover) linked to sustainable goals or outcomes;

2. Companies that demonstrated qualitative alignment and/or convergence with United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) or sustainable themes (e.g. Circular Economy); and

3. Companies that were transitioning with credible progress. (e.g the transition to or use of renewable energy or other low-carbon alternatives).

4. Sustainable Bonds as defined by bonds with specific uses of proceeds aligned to supporting sustainability goals (e.g. Green Bonds, Social Bonds).

By replicating the performance of the Index, the Sub-Fund invested in sustainable investments that contributed to the above sustainable objectives.

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

The principle of 'do no significant harm' applied only to the underlying sustainable investments of the Sub-Fund. The sustainable investments were deemed to not have caused significant harm against any environmental or social sustainable investment objective following assessment against the below considerations:

- Flagged for social violations; and
- Countries on the HSBC sanctions list.

Principal adverse

impacts are the most significant negative impacts of investment decisions on sustainability factors relating to environmental, social and employee matters, respect for human rights, anticorruption and antibribery matters. How were the indicators for adverse impacts on sustainability factors taken into account?

The indicators for adverse impacts on sustainability factors were taken into account through assessment of companies against the involvement considerations detailed above.

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

Sustainable investments were assessed for compliance with UN Global Compact principles and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.

The EU Taxonomy sets out a "do no significant harm" principle by which Taxonomyaligned investments should not significantly harm EU Taxonomy objectives and is accompanied by specific Union criteria.

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

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



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

The Bloomberg (BBG) index was constructed using a combination of BBG and MSCI data. The MSCI proprietary data on each country provided MSCI ESG Government Rating scores and rated countries on a seven-point scale from 'AAA' (best) to 'CCC' (worst). Ratings were derived from 0-10 scores on underlying factors in three pillars: Environmental, Social, and Governance. The model contained scores on all these sub-factors to provide granular insight on a country's performance on the issues.

The risk factors included in the assessment of a country's MSCI ESG government rating score were:

1) Environmental risks; Natural resources & Environmental externalities and vulnerability. These risk factors cover how countries effectively managed water use, land use and mineral resources (PAI 5) and impact on environmental externalities (PAI 7,8), it also includes energy resource management and conservation (PAI 1,2)

2) Social Risk; Human Capital and Economic environment.

3) Governance Risk; Financial governance & political governance. The risk factors included politic rights and civil liberties, corruption control and stability and peace (PAI 10) Included are a set of screening factors for each country which shows the profile of a country's status with respect to various values-and mission-based issues and controversies, such as child or forced labour and armed conflicts, and whether the country is a party to international conventions related to endangered species, biological diversity, chemical and biological weapons (PAI 7, 14). The methodology used the ESG Government rating score (as calculated by MSCI) to apply tilt factors to increase weight to those countries with more robust ESG characteristics.



The list includes the investments constituting **the greatest proportion of investments** of the financial product during the reference period which is: Based on the fourquarter average holdings of the reference period as at 31/12/2024

What were the top investments of this financial product?

Largest Investments	Sector	% Assets	Country
Government Of United Kingdom 0.375% 22-oct-2026	Government	0.88%	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Government Of United Kingdom 4.625% 31-jan-2034	Government	0.68%	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Government Of United Kingdom 0.875% 22-oct-2029	Government	0.61%	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Government Of Germany 0.25% 15- feb-2027	Government	0.60%	Germany
Government Of Germany 2.6% 15- aug-2033	Government	0.55%	Germany
Government Of France 3.5% 25- apr-2026	Government	0.54%	France
Government Of Germany 0.0% 09- oct-2026	Government	0.54%	Germany
Government Of The United States Of America 1.5% 15-aug-2026	Government	0.53%	United States of America
Government Of United Kingdom 3.75% 22-oct-2053	Government	0.53%	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Government Of Germany 2.5% 15- aug-2046	Government	0.52%	Germany
Government Of South Korea 1.875% 10-mar-2051	Government	0.50%	Korea
Government Of Germany 0.0% 15- aug-2026	Government	0.48%	Germany
Government Of Germany 1.7% 15- aug-2032	Government	0.48%	Germany
Government Of Germany 2.4% 19- oct-2028	Government	0.48%	Germany
Government Of The United States Of America 4.625% 30-sep-2028	Government	0.48%	United States of America

Cash and derivatives were excluded



What was the proportion of sustainability-related investments?

3.54% of the portfolio was invested in sustainable investments.



What was the asset allocation?



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

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

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

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

*A company or issuer considered as a sustainable investment may contribute to both a social and environmental objective, which can be aligned or non-aligned with the EU Taxonomy. The figures in the above diagram take this into account, but one company or issuer may only be recorded once under the sustainable investments figure (#1A Sustainable).

The percentages of Taxonomy-aligned and Other Environmental, do not equal #1A Sustainable investment due to differing calculation methodologies of sustainable investments and Taxonomy-aligned investments.

In which economic sectors were the investments made?

Sector / Sub-Sector	% Assets
Government	99.69%
Cash & Derivatives	0.31%
Total	100.00%

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

Taxonomy-aligned activities are expressed as a share of:

- **turnover** reflects the "greenness" of investee companies today.

- capital expenditure

(CapEx) shows the green investments made by investee companies, relevant for a transition to a green economy.

- operational expenditure (OpEx) reflects the green operational activities of investee companies.

Transitional activities are

activities are activities for which low-carbon alternatives are not yet available and among others have greenhouse gas emission levels corresponding to the best performance. To what extent were sustainable investments with an environmental objective aligned with the EU Taxonomy?

The Sub-Fund did not make sustainable investments aligned with the EU Taxonomy.

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



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

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



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

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

For the reference period the Sub-Fund's share of investment in transitional activities was 0.00% and the share of investment in enabling activities was 0.00%.

Enabling activities

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



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



Indicator	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22
Revenue - Taxonomy-aligned: Fossil gas	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Revenue - Taxonomy-aligned: Nuclear	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Revenue - Taxonomy-aligned (no gas and nuclear)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Revenue - Non Taxonomy-aligned	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CAPEX - Taxonomy-aligned: Fossil gas	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CAPEX - Taxonomy-aligned: Nuclear	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CAPEX - Taxonomy-aligned (no gas and nuclear)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CAPEX - Non Taxonomy-aligned	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
OPEX - Taxonomy-aligned: Fossil gas	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
OPEX - Taxonomy-aligned: Nuclear	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
OPEX - Taxonomy-aligned (no gas and nuclear)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
OPEX - Non Taxonomy-aligned	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

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

The sustainable investments with an environmental objective not aligned with the EU Taxonomy were 3.54%. Due to lack of coverage and data, the Sub-Fund did not commit to making any EU Taxonomy aligned investments.

What was the share of socially sustainable investments?

The Sub-Fund did not invest in socially sustainable investments.

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

Cash and other instruments such as Eligible Collective Investment Schemes and/or financial derivative instruments such as currency forwards may have been used for hedging and efficient portfolio management in respect of which there were no minimum environmental and/or social safeguards.

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

The Sub-Fund was passively managed and aimed to track the performance of the Index while minimising as far as possible the tracking error between the Sub-Fund's performance and that of the Index and promoting ESG characteristics within the meaning of Article 8 of SFDR. The Sub-Fund used optimisation techniques which take account of tracking error and trading costs when constructing a portfolio. The Index measured the performance of investment grade, fixed-rate, taxable securities issued by government and government-related issuers using ESG sovereign scores to tilt country allocations above or below their market value weights in the Bloomberg Global Aggregate Treasury Index. The Index achieved this in the following way: On a monthly basis, the Index used fixed multipliers to adjust the weight of each eligible security in the Index above or below their market value weights in the Parent Index. Security weights were then normalized using these adjusted market values.



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

See below for details on how the Sub-Fund performed compared to the reference benchmark.

Reference benchmarks are

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

How does the reference benchmark differ from a broad market index?

The Index measures the performance of investment grade, fixed-rate, taxable securities issued by government and government-related issuers using MSCI Government ESG scores to tilt country allocations above or below their market value weights in the Bloomberg Global Aggregate Treasury Index. On a monthly basis, the Index used fixed multipliers to adjust the weight of each eligible security in the Index above or below their market value weights in the Parent Index. Security weights were then normalized using these adjusted market values.

How did this financial product perform with regard to the sustainability indicators to determine the alignment of the reference benchmark with the environmental or social characteristics promoted?

In seeking to achieve its investment objective, the Sub-Fund invests in the constituents of the Index in generally the same proportions in which they were included in the Index.

In doing so, the performance of the sustainability indicators of the Sub-Fund was similar to the performance of the sustainability indicators of the Index, as shown below.

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

Indicator	Sub-Fund	Reference Benchmark
ESG Score	6.65	6.81

The data is based on the four-quarter average holdings of the financial year ending on 31 December 2024.

Reference Benchmark - Bloomberg MSCI Global Treasury ESG Weighted Bond Index

How did this financial product perform compared with the broad market index?

Indicator	Sub-Fund	Broad Market Index
ESG Score	6.65	5.83

The data is based on the four-quarter average holdings of the financial year ending on 31 December 2024.

Broad Market Index - Bloomberg Global Aggregate Treasuries Index