

# Social Bond / Social Bond Programme

## **External Review Form**

#### Section 1. Basic Information

**Issuer name:** Far Eastern New Century Corporation (FENC)

Social Bond ISIN or Issuer Social Bond Framework Name, if applicable: Far Eastern New Century

Corporation (FENC) Framework for Sustainable Bonds

Independent External Review provider's name: Ernst & Young

Completion date of this form: May 4<sup>th</sup> 2021

Publication date of review publication: May 4th 2021

#### Section 2. Review overview

#### **SCOPE OF REVIEW**

The following may be used or adapted, where appropriate, to summarise the scope of the review.

The review assessed the following elements and confirmed their alignment with the SBPs:

$\boxtimes$	Use of Proceeds	$\boxtimes$	Process for Project Evaluation and Selection
$\boxtimes$	Management of Proceeds	$\boxtimes$	Reporting
ROLE(	S) OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROVIDER		
	Second Party Opinion		Certification
$\boxtimes$	Verification		Scoring/Rating
	Other (please specify):		

Note: In case of multiple reviews / different providers, please provide separate forms for each review.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REVIEW and/or LINK TO FULL REVIEW** (if applicable)

Based on Ernst & Young's ("EY") procedures performed, as described in the report as of May 4<sup>th</sup> 2021, nothing has come to EY's attention that causes EY to believe that the bonds issuance process of the FENC's 2021 Social Bond, so far as the use of proceeds, process for evaluation and selection, management of proceeds, and information reporting are concerned, in all material respects, does not meet the criteria as set out in the Social Bond Principles (2020)'s pre-issuance requirement

Latest update: June 2020

### Section 3. Detailed review

Reviewers are encouraged to provide the information below to the extent possible and use the comment section to explain the scope of their review.

#### 1. USE OF PROCEEDS

#### **Overall comment on section** (if applicable):

Based on Ernst & Young's ("EY") procedures performed, as described in the report as of May 4th 2021, nothing has come to EY's attention that causes EY to believe that the bonds issuance process of the FENC's 2021 Social Bond, so far as the use of proceeds is concerned, in all material respects, does not meet the criteria as set out in the Social Bond Principles (2020)'s pre-issuance requirement

Use of proceeds categories as per SBP:					
$\boxtimes$	Affordable basic infrastructure	$\boxtimes$	Access to essential services		
	Affordable housing		Employment generation / programs designed to prevent and/or alleviate unemployment stemming from socioeconomic crises		
	Food security and sustainable food systems		Socioeconomic advancement and empowerment		
	Unknown at issuance but currently expected to conform with SBP categories, or other eligible areas not yet stated in SBPs		Other (please specify):		
If applicable please specify the social taxonomy, if other than SBPs: None					
Targe	t populations:				
⊠l	iving below the poverty line	☐ Exclud	ded and/or marginalised populations and munities		
□ F	People with disabilities	☐ Migra	nts and /or displaced persons		
	Jndereducated	☑ Underserved, owing to a lack of quality access to essential goods and services			
⊠l	Jnemployed	□ Wom	en and/or sexual and gender minorities		
	Aging populations and vulnerable youth		vulnerable groups, including as a result al disasters		
☑ Other <i>(please specify)</i> : According to the listed item of Social Bond Principles (2020), the target population includes general public in Taiwan.					

#### 2. PROCESS FOR PROJECT EVALUATION AND SELECTION

unallocated proceeds

2. I ROCESS FOR FROSECT EVALUATION AND SELECTION				
<b>Overall comment on section</b> ( <i>if applicable</i> ):  Based on Ernst & Young's ("EY") procedures performed, as described in the report as of May 4th 2021, nothing has come to EY's attention that causes EY to believe that the bonds issuance process of the FENC's 2021 Social Bond, so far as the project evaluation and selection is concerned, in all material respects, does not meet the criteria as set out in the Social Bond Principles (2020)'s pre-issuance requirement				
Evalua	ation and selection			
$\boxtimes$	Credentials on the issuer's social objectives Defined and transparent criteria for		Documented process to determine that projects fit within defined categories Documented process to identify and manage	
	projects eligible for Social Bond proceeds Summary criteria for project evaluation and selection publicly available		potential ESG risks associated with the project Other (please specify):	
Inforn	nation on Responsibilities and Accountab	ility		
	Evaluation / Selection criteria subject to external advice or verification Other (please specify):		In-house assessment	
3. MA	NAGEMENT OF PROCEEDS			
Based nothin 2021 S	I comment on section (if applicable): on Ernst & Young's ("EY") procedures perform g has come to EY's attention that causes EY to ocial Bond, so far as the management of proce he criteria as set out in the Social Bond Princip	believ eeds is	e that the bonds issuance process of the FENC's concerned, in all material respects, does not	
Trackir	ng of proceeds:			
$\boxtimes$	Social Bond proceeds segregated or tracked	by the	e issuer in an appropriate manner	
$\boxtimes$	Disclosure of intended types of temporary in	-		
	Other (please specify):			
Additio	onal disclosure:			
	Allocations to future investments only	$\boxtimes$	Allocations to both existing and future investments	
	Allocation to individual disbursements	$\boxtimes$	Allocation to a portfolio of disbursements	
$\boxtimes$	Disclosure of portfolio balance of		Other (please specify):	

### 4. REPORTING

### **Overall comment on section** (if applicable):

Based on Ernst & Young's ("EY") procedures performed, as described in the report as of May 4th 2021, nothing has come to EY's attention that causes EY to believe that the bonds issuance process of the FENC's 2021 Social Bond, so far as the reporting is concerned, in all material respects, does not meet the criteria as set out in the Social Bond Principles (2020)'s pre-issuance requirement

Use of	proceeds reporting:				
	Project-by-project	$\boxtimes$	On a project portfolio basis		
	Linkage to individual bond(s)		Other (please specify):		
	Information reported:				
	☑ Allocated amounts		Social Bond financed share of total investment		
	☐ Other (please specify):				
	Frequency:				
			Semi-annual		
	$\square$ Other (please specify):				
Impac	t reporting:				
	Project-by-project	$\boxtimes$	On a project portfolio basis		
	Linkage to individual bond(s)		Other (please specify):		
	Frequency:				
	⊠ Annual		Semi-annual		
	☐ Other (please specify):				
	Information reported (expected or ex-post):				
	☑ Number of beneficiaries		Target populations		
	☐ Other ESG indicators (please specify):				
Means	of Disclosure				
	Information published in financial report		Information published in sustainability report		
	Information published in ad hoc	$\boxtimes$	Other (please specify): Government Requirement		
$\boxtimes$	documents  Reporting reviewed (if yes, please specify which parts of the reporting are subject to external review):				
Where	appropriate, please specify name and date of	fpublica	ation in the useful links section.		
USEFU	L LINKS (e.g. to review provider methodology or	credenti	ials, to issuer's documentation, etc.)		
			<del></del>		

Type(s) of Review provided:			
	Second Party Opinion		Certification
$\boxtimes$	Verification		Scoring/Rating
	Other (please specify):		
Review provider(s):			Date of publication:
Ernst & Young			May 4th 2021

#### ABOUT ROLE(S) OF REVIEW PROVIDERS AS DEFINED BY THE SBP

- 1. **Second Party Opinion**: An institution with social expertise, that is independent from the issuer may issue a Second Party Opinion. The institution should be independent from the issuer's adviser for its Social Bond framework, or appropriate procedures, such as information barriers, will have been implemented within the institution to ensure the independence of the Second Party Opinion. It normally entails an assessment of the alignment with the Social Bond Principles. In particular, it can include an assessment of the issuer's overarching objectives, strategy, policy and/or processes relating to social sustainability, and an evaluation of the social features of the type of projects intended for the Use of Proceeds.
- 2. Verification: An issuer can obtain independent verification against a designated set of criteria, typically pertaining to business processes and/or social criteria. Verification may focus on alignment with internal or external standards or claims made by the issuer. Also, evaluation of the socially sustainable features of underlying assets may be termed verification and may reference external criteria. Assurance or attestation regarding an issuer's internal tracking method for use of proceeds, allocation of funds from Social Bond proceeds, statement of social impact or alignment of reporting with the SBP, may also be termed verification.
- 3. **Certification**: An issuer can have its Social Bond or associated Social Bond framework or Use of Proceeds certified against a recognised external social standard or label. A standard or label defines specific criteria, and alignment with such criteria is normally tested by qualified, accredited third parties, which may verify consistency with the certification criteria.
- 4. **Social Bond Scoring/Rating**: An issuer can have its Social Bond, associated Social Bond framework or a key feature such as Use of Proceeds evaluated or assessed by qualified third parties, such as specialised research providers or rating agencies, according to an established scoring/rating methodology. The output may include a focus on social performance data, process relative to the SBP, or another benchmark. Such scoring/rating is distinct from credit ratings, which may nonetheless reflect material social risks.