

A K R O S

**Akros Indices**

**Management Statement of Adherence  
to the IOSCO Principles for Financial  
Benchmarks**

**As of March 31, 2024**

# AKROS

## Table of Contents

---

Overview of AIE .....	3
Management's Statement of Adherence .....	4
Report of the Independent Accountants .....	5
Principles and Responses .....	7
IOSCO Adherence Document Disclaimer .....	43

# Overview of AIE

---

## Introduction to Indices Administered by AIE

Akros Index Engineering Inc (“AIE” or the “Administrator”) is a U.S. subsidiary of Akros Technologies Inc (“AT”) and is the Benchmark Administrator for the following indices that are collectively referred to as the “Akros Indices”:

- KEDI Global AI Cloud Index
- KEDI Global AI Semiconductor Index
- KEDI Global Generative AI Index
- KEDI Global Longevity Bio Index
- KEDI Gold Covered Call Premium Index
- KEDI Tesla Income Premium Covered Call Index
- KEDI US AI Software Index
- KEDI US AI Tech Top 10 Index
- KEDI US AI Tech Top 10 Weekly Premium Index
- KEDI US Global Obesity Care Industry Index
- KEDI UST 20Y Covered Call Index
- KEDI UST 30 Weekly Covered Call Index
- Akros Australia Cash Cow 30 Index
- Akros Australia Enhanced All Cap 25 Index
- Akros Australia Enhanced Small Cap 25 Index
- Akros Australia Gold Covered Call Index
- Akros Australia FANG+ Covered Call Index
- Akros Japan High Consecutive Dividend 15 Index

Morningstar Indexes is the outsourced Calculation Agent of the benchmark appointed by the Administrator.

More information on the above index categories, which this report will refer to as index families, can be seen at: <https://index.engineering/>. Index Rules and Methodologies are available on the same website.

## Background to the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks

In July 2013, the Board of the International Organization of Securities Commissions (“IOSCO”) issued the Principles of Financial Benchmarks with the aim of promoting the reliability of Benchmark determinations and addressing Benchmark governance, quality, and accountability.

IOSCO issued Principles with the recommendation that they guide all financial Benchmark Administrators. The IOSCO Principles state that the application should be proportional to the size and risks posed by the relevant Benchmark and/or Benchmark Administrator and the Benchmark-setting process.

We have established control processes in relation to governance, quality and accountability activities over the indices administered by AIE which are described in more detail in the table below. Terms used but not defined in this document have the meaning given to them in the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks.

## For Further Information

AIE’s contact details for the Akros Indices are:

- By email to: [akros@index.engineering](mailto:akros@index.engineering)

Further details about AIE and the Akros Indices can be found on the AIE website.

## Management's Statement of Adherence

---

April 11, 2024

Akros Index Engineering Inc ("AIE", or the "Company") has implemented control measures for the benchmarks it manages, as listed in the "Introduction to Indices administered by AIE" and specifically in the "AIE's Relevant Control Measures" section of the accompanying "Principles and Statements" (the "Controls"). These Controls aim to provide reasonable assurance that the governance, quality, and accountability objectives included in the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) Principles for Financial Benchmarks, dated July 2013 (the "IOSCO Principles") were achieved. The effectiveness of the Controls is assessed based on the criteria specified in the "Principles and Statements" (the "Criteria").

We are responsible for designing, implementing, operating, and monitoring effective Controls. We are also responsible for identifying the risk that would threaten the achievement of the objectives of the IOSCO Principles. The Controls were designed in a manner that is specified in the IOSCO Principles, which should be proportional to the size and risks posed by each benchmark and/or administrator and the benchmark-setting process.

We have assessed whether the Controls were designed, implemented, operated and monitored effectively as of March 31, 2024 to adhere to the IOSCO Principles based on the Criteria.

Based on that assessment, we assert that the Controls were designed, implemented, operated, and monitored effectively, in all material respects, as described for the period as of March 31, 2024 to adhere to the IOSCO Principles for benchmarks administered by the Company.



Jin Chung  
Chief Executive Officer  
For and on behalf of Akros Index Engineering Inc

# Report of the Independent Accountants

Management of Akros Index Engineering Inc

## **Scope**

We have examined Akros Index Engineering Inc's ("AIE" or the "Administrator") assertion in the "Management's Statement of Adherence" that the Company's controls are designed, implemented, operated, and monitored, in all material respects, to adhere with the International Organization of Securities Commissions "IOSCO" Principles for Financial Benchmarks (July 2013) (the "Criteria") for the benchmarks administered by AIE as of March 31, 2024. Our examination does not address other criteria. Our examination covered the following areas:

- Design of the Controls presented by the Company.  
(Excluded that whether the design of the Controls alone guarantees sufficient compliance with the IOSCO Principles)
- Operation, implementation, and monitoring of the Controls presented by the Company.

The procedures we performed included, but were not limited to: inquiries of management, observation of processes performed, inspection of documents, evaluating the appropriateness of reporting policies. The specific procedures we performed are listed in the "KPMG Procedures" column of the accompanying "Principles and Responses."

## **Management's Responsibilities**

AIE's management is responsible for its assertion and having a reasonable basis for its assertion. Management is also responsible for designing, implementing, operating, and monitoring effective controls, identifying how its controls adhere to the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks, and the risks that would threaten how the Company's controls adhere to the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks.

## **Our responsibilities**

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Controls, based on our examination. Our examination was performed in accordance with International Standard on Assurance Engagements 3000, "Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information", issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Controls designed, implemented, operated and monitored as presented by the Company, in all material respects in accordance with the Criteria. An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about the Controls. The nature, timing, and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgment, including an assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the Controls, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

We are required to be independent of AIE and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements related to our examination engagement.

## **Limitations**

Because of their nature and inherent limitations, controls may not prevent, or detect and correct, all misstatements that may be considered relevant. Furthermore, the projection of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods, or conclusions about the suitability of the design of the controls to achieve how the related controls adhere to the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks, is subject

to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions or that the degree of compliance with such controls may deteriorate. Identifying the Company's control to adhere with the IOSCO Principles relied on the presentation of the Company, and the Company is responsible for identifying sufficient controls to address the risks under the IOSCO Principles, and we have examined whether controls identified to adhere with the IOSCO Principles are designed as presented by the Company.

### **Opinion**

Based on the procedures performed in accordance with our scope of work, AIE's controls to adhere with the International Organization of Securities Commissions Principles for Financial Benchmarks (July 2013) for the benchmarks administered by AIE as of March 31, 2024 are designed, implemented, operated, and monitored, in all material respects, as described in "Principles and Responses".

### **Restricted use**

This report is intended solely for the information and use of AIE, user entities and prospective user entities of AIE's benchmarks, entities providing services to such user entities, industry associations, and regulators who have sufficient knowledge and understanding of the following:

- The nature of the service provided by the administrator
- Internal control and its limitations
- The IOSCO Principles
- The risks that may threaten the adherence to the IOSCO Principles and how controls address those risks

This report is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Your faithfully



KPMG Samjong Accounting Corp.

June 11, 2024

# Principles and Responses

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>1. Overall Responsibility of the Administrator</b>		
The Administrator should retain primary responsibility for all aspects of the Benchmark determination process. For example, this includes:	AIE is the Administrator for the Akros Indices with primary responsibility for all aspects of the Benchmark determination process.	We obtained the control framework and inspected for evidence that AIE accepts responsibility as the Benchmark Administrator.
a) Development: The definition of the Benchmark and Benchmark Methodology;	AIE's Board of Directors (the "Board of Directors") has approved every methodology of the Akros Indices. Details of the methodologies are available on the <a href="#">AIE website</a> .	<p>We obtained the most recent meeting minutes and inspected for evidence that the Board of Directors reviewed new indexes that have been created.</p> <p>For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they include the benchmark definition and benchmark methodology; and</li> <li>• they are publicly available on the AIE website.</li> </ul>
b) Determination and Dissemination: Accurate and timely compilation and publication and distribution of the Benchmark;	The methodology documents describe the duties of AIE in determining the Akros Indices. These indices are calculated on every business day and are made available via the Company or the third-party calculator/publisher.	For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that they explicitly outline the responsibilities and duties of AIE in determining the Akros Indices.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>c) Operation: Ensuring appropriate transparency over significant decisions affecting the compilation of the Benchmark and any related determination process, including contingency measures in the event of absence of or insufficient inputs, market stress or disruption, failure of critical infrastructure, or other relevant factors; and</p>	<p>Significant decisions affecting the compilation of the Benchmark and any related determination process are shared with the public. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Changes to index compositions following periodic reviews, as outlined in the methodology documents.</li> <li>▪ Planned approaches to upcoming complex corporate events, as detailed in the <i>Akros Index Engineering Corporate Actions and Events Guide</i>; and</li> <li>▪ Contingency measures in the event of absence of or insufficient inputs, market stress or disruption as described in the <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy of Tradability</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>For significant decisions affecting the compilation of the benchmark and any related determination process, we obtained the following documents as described in AIE's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the methodology documents.</li> <li>• the <i>Akros Index Engineering Corporate Actions and Events Guide</i></li> <li>• the <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy of Tradability</i></li> </ul> <p>We inspected for evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• changes to index compositions following periodic reviews are outlined in the methodology documents; and</li> <li>• planned approaches to upcoming complex corporate events are detailed in the guide; and</li> <li>• contingency measures in the event of absence of or insufficient inputs, market stress or disruption are described in the policy; and</li> <li>• they are publicly available on the AIE website.</li> </ul>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
d) Governance: Establishing credible and transparent governance, oversight and accountability procedures for the Benchmark determination process, including an identifiable oversight function accountable for the development, issuance and operation of the Benchmark.	AIE has nominated an independent Compliance Officer to review the benchmark's definition and to provide challenges on legal and regulatory aspects of the benchmark determination process.	We obtained a sample of compliance review memorandums related to benchmark determination process and inspected for evidence that independent Compliance Officer reviewed new benchmark's definition and investigate legal and regulatory aspects of the benchmark determination process.  Please also refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 5.
<b>2. Oversight of Third Parties</b>		
Where activities relating to the Benchmark determination process are undertaken by third parties – for example collection of inputs, publication or where a third party acts as Calculation Agent – the Administrator should maintain appropriate oversight of such third parties. The Administrator (and its oversight function) should consider adopting policies and procedures that:	AIE follows the <i>Akros Group Outsourcing Policy</i> when entering into arrangements with third party suppliers. This policy includes the following procedures:	We obtained the <i>Akros Group Outsourcing Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that it outlines the process for entering into arrangement with third party suppliers.
a) Clearly define and substantiate through appropriate written arrangements the roles and obligations of third parties who participate in the Benchmark determination process, as well as the standards the Administrator expects these third parties to comply with;	The Compliance Officer oversees and reviews written arrangements with third parties involved in the Benchmark determination process to ensure the roles and obligations of such parties are clearly defined.	We obtained all compliance review memorandums related to arrangements with third parties and inspected for evidence that; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the roles and obligations of third parties involved in the benchmark determination process are clearly defined; and</li> <li>written arrangements have been reviewed by Compliance Officer.</li> </ul>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
b) Monitor third parties' compliance with the standards set out by the Administrator;	AIE employs automated quality assurance procedures designed to monitor third party calculators including routinely checking calculated values to mitigate the risks associated with any errors in the sourced data.	<p>We obtained a sample of operational logs and inspected for evidence that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the calculated value from third party calculators were monitored and checked for errors; and</li> <li>for a sample of errors identified, we obtained evidence that the errors was documented, investigated, and resolved, as needed.</li> </ul>
c) Make Available to Stakeholders and any relevant Regulatory Authority the identity and roles of third parties who participate in the Benchmark determination process; and	AIE keeps a record of all third parties involved in the Benchmark determination process, along with their roles. AIE discloses the involvement of any such third party to stakeholders as necessary.	We obtained the list of third parties for benchmark determination and inspected for evidence that the list is regularly maintained and updated.
<p>d) Take reasonable steps, including contingency plans, to avoid undue operational risk related to the participation of third parties in the Benchmark determination process.</p> <p>This Principle does not apply in relation to a third party from whom an Administrator sources data if that third party is a Regulated Market or Exchange.</p>	AIE takes reasonable steps to avoid undue operational risks, including the maintenance of a Business Continuity program that is reviewed and tested by the Compliance Officer on an annual basis.	We obtained a sample of compliance review memorandums related to Business Continuity program and inspected for evidence that maintenance of a Business Continuity program was reviewed and tested by the Compliance Officer.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>3. Conflicts of Interest for Administrators</b>		
<p>To protect the integrity and independence of Benchmark determinations, Administrators should document, implement and enforce policies and procedures for the identification, disclosure, management, mitigation or avoidance of conflicts of interest. Administrators should review and update their policies and procedures as appropriate.</p> <p>Administrators should disclose any material conflicts of interest to their users and any relevant Regulatory Authority, if any.</p> <p>The framework should be appropriately tailored to the level of existing or potential conflicts of interest identified and the risks that the Benchmark poses and should seek to ensure:</p>	<p>AIE has established the <i>Akros Index Engineering Conflicts of Interest Policy</i> which identify, disclose, mitigate, avoid, and manage potential and actual conflicts of interest in general. This policy is reviewed and approved annually. AIE's staff certify compliance with this policy upon joining and once per calendar year thereafter.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Conflicts of Interest Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that the documentation explicitly outlines the primary methods by which potential and actual conflicts of interest are identified, prevented, and managed within the company.</p> <p>We reviewed the <i>Akros Index Engineering Conflicts of Interest Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that it explicitly states that the processes for managing conflicts of interest will be reviewed annually by the Board of Directors, or more frequently if a potential conflict emerges.</p> <p>We obtained a sample of employees' certificates of training and inspected for evidence that they had certified their compliance with the <i>Akros Index Engineering Conflicts of Interest Policy</i> upon joining.</p>
a) Existing or potential conflicts of interest do not inappropriately influence Benchmark determinations;	All employees are required to disclose existing or potential conflicts of interest upon hire as well as on a semi-annual basis. Before trading certain securities, all AIE employees are required to obtain first approval from management and the Compliance Officer.	We obtained a sample of trades executed by employees and inspected for evidence that these trades had obtained first approval from both management and the Compliance Officer.
b) Personal interests and connections or business connections do not compromise the Administrator's performance of its functions;	All AIE employees are prohibited from participating in external business ventures or professional relationships that might conflict with their responsibilities at AIE. They must report and gain consent from management and the Compliance Officer before engaging in such activities or relationships that could appear conflicting. Furthermore, there are specific limitations for AIE staff on accepting and offering gifts and entertainment, and they must adhere to relevant anti-bribery and corruption regulations.	We conducted interviews with both management and the Compliance Officer to determine whether any AIE employees had engaged in external business ventures or professional relationships. We were clearly informed that there have been no such instances.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
c) Segregation of reporting lines within the Administrator, where appropriate, to clearly define responsibilities and prevent unnecessary or undisclosed conflicts of interest or the perception of such conflicts;	To avoid undisclosed conflicts of interest or the perception of conflicts of interests with other Akros entities, the roles and responsibilities of AIE employees are precisely outlined. The Compliance Officer will conduct an annual evaluation of AIE's roles, responsibilities, and reporting structures.	We obtained a compliance officer's annual evaluation document and inspected for evidence that the roles and responsibilities of AIE employees are precisely outlined to avoid undisclosed conflicts of interest or the perception of conflicts of interests with other Akros entities.
d) Adequate supervision and sign-off by authorized or qualified employees prior to releasing Benchmark determinations;	While index calculations are mostly automated, validation procedures are in place to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the indices that are published. Each Benchmark is signed off under the supervision of a designated delegate.	We confirmed via inquiry that each benchmark is signed off under the supervision of a designated delegate.  We observed the calculation system and inspected for evidence that only designated delegates are granted access to specific systems to support the benchmark determination process.
e) The confidentiality of data, information and other inputs submitted to, received by or produced by the Administrator, subject to the disclosure obligations of the Administrator;	AIE is subject to the <i>Akros Confidentiality Policy</i> which covers the confidentiality of data and information. Additionally, training on confidentiality obligations is a required part of the training program for all AIE employees to ensure they are fully informed about these requirements.	We obtained the <i>Akros Confidentiality Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that it comprehensively addresses the confidentiality of data and information.  We obtained a sample of employees' certificates of training and inspected for evidence that they had completed training on their confidentiality obligations.
f) Effective procedures to control the exchange of information between staff engaged in activities involving a risk of conflicts of interest or between staff and third parties, where that information may reasonably affect any Benchmark determinations; and	All AIE individuals are subject to the <i>Akros Confidentiality Policy</i> and <i>Akros Index Engineering Conflicts of Interest Policy</i> to control the exchange of information between staff and third parties.	We obtained the <i>Akros Confidentiality Policy</i> and <i>Akros Index Engineering Conflicts of Interest Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that they provide detailed guidelines on controlling the exchange of information between staff and third parties.
g) Adequate remuneration policies that ensure all staff who participate in the Benchmark determination are not directly or indirectly rewarded or incentivized by the levels of the Benchmark.	AIE staff are not rewarded or compensated based upon the level of any Benchmarks.	Through our inquiries, we confirmed that AIE employees are not remunerated based on the performance or level of any benchmarks.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>An Administrator's conflict of interest framework should seek to mitigate existing or potential conflicts created by its ownership structure or control, or due to other interests the Administrator's staff or wider group may have in relation to Benchmark determinations. To this end, the framework should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Include measures to avoid, mitigate or disclose conflicts of interest that may exist between its Benchmark determination business (including all staff who perform or otherwise participate in Benchmark production responsibilities), and any other business of the Administrator or any of its affiliates; and</li> <li>b) Provide that an Administrator discloses conflicts of interest arising from the ownership structure or the control of the Administrator to its Stakeholders and any relevant Regulatory Authority in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	<p>AIE's business is primarily in relation to the determination of Benchmarks. AIE is 100% owned by AT, and AT operates other businesses. The Board of Directors ensures that any potential conflicts of interest are considered and managed.</p> <p>Any changes to the ownership structure or control of AIE are reviewed and approved by the Board of Directors and are communicated to applicable stakeholders and/or regulators as needed.</p>	<p>We conducted interviews with management regarding any changes to the ownership structure or control of AIE and received clear confirmation that no such changes had occurred.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>4. Control Framework for Administrators</b>		
An Administrator should implement an appropriate control framework for the process of determining and distributing the Benchmark. The control framework should be appropriately tailored to the materiality of the potential or existing conflicts of interest identified, the extent of the use of discretion in the Benchmark setting process and to the nature of Benchmark inputs and outputs. The control framework should be documented and available to relevant Regulatory Authorities, if any. A summary of its main features should be Published or Made Available to Stakeholders.	<p>AIE has formally documented the control framework within the <i>Akros Index Engineering Risk and Compliance Policy</i>. This document is reviewed by the Board of Directors and the Compliance Officer.</p> <p>The framework addresses each element of the IOSCO Principles and is available to relevant Regulatory Authorities. A summary of its main features will be made available to Stakeholders on request.</p>	We obtained the control framework and related policies and inspected for evidence that the documentation identifies high risk themes alongside the associated key controls.
This control framework should be reviewed periodically and updated as appropriate. The framework should address the following areas:	The control framework is considered and approved annually by the Board of Directors.	We obtained the most recent meeting minutes and inspected for the evidence that the control framework has been reviewed by both the Board of Directors and the Compliance Officer.
a) Conflicts of interest in line with Principle 3 on conflicts of interests;	For Controls to address actual or potential conflicts of interest please refer to AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 3.	Please refer to Principle 3, as referenced by AIE's response.
b) Integrity and quality of Benchmark determination; i) Arrangements to ensure that the quality and integrity of Benchmarks is maintained, in line with principles 6 to 15 on the quality of the Benchmark and Methodology;	Benchmark determination in line with AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principles 6 to 15.	Please refer to Principle 6-15, as referenced by AIE's response.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
ii) Arrangements to promote the integrity of Benchmark inputs, including adequate due diligence on input sources;	<p>The process to check the integrity of Benchmark inputs, including adequate due diligence on input sources is carried out automatically on a daily basis.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Board of Directors convenes every two weeks, during which they review operational logs. These logs include summaries of any events connected to the review or reconstitution of indexes and the overall management of indexes. Throughout the entire process, personnel from data management and index management evaluate the reliability of input sources.</p>	<p>We obtained the most recent meeting minutes and a sample of operational logs and inspected evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>operational logs and index reviews/reconstitutions are presented; and</li> <li>operational logs include any issues related to index reviews/reconstitutions and management.</li> </ul>
iii) Arrangements to ensure accountability and complaints mechanisms are effective, in line with principles 16 to 19; and	The Board of Directors reviews complaints received from Benchmark stakeholders. Further details are provided in AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 16.	Please refer to Principle 16, as referenced by AIE's response.
iv) Providing robust infrastructure, policies and procedures for the management of risk, including operational risk.	Potential operational risk events are identified through the formal risk assessment and mitigated by controls within the control framework.	Please refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 4 above.
c) Whistleblowing mechanism: Administrators should establish an effective whistleblowing mechanism to facilitate early awareness of any potential misconduct or irregularities that may arise. This mechanism should allow for external reporting of such cases where appropriate.	AIE follows the Company's <i>Whistleblowing Policy</i> which is applied across AIE and participates in the training program AIE provides to ensure the policy is fully adhered to by AIE employees.	<p>We obtained the <i>AIE Whistleblowing Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that the documentation outlines procedures for reporting unethical behavior or breaches of the code of conduct, laws, or regulations.</p> <p>We obtained a sample of employees' certificates of training and inspected for evidence that the employees participated in the AIE training program covering the content of the <i>Akros Whistleblowing Policy</i>.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>d) Expertise:</p> <p>i) Ensuring Benchmark determinations are made by personnel who possess the relevant levels of expertise, with a process for periodic review of their competence; and</p> <p>ii) Staff training, including ethics and conflicts of interest training, and continuity and succession planning for personnel.</p>	<p>AIE ensures that employees with the necessary expertise are granted access to specific systems to support the Benchmark determination process. Assessing an individual's skills is a key component of the formal evaluation process, with records kept in the AIE performance management system. This process involves regular performance checks and identifies training needs.</p> <p>At present, AIE primarily offers on-the-job training for its employees. However, a structured training and evaluation program will be established for employees. Additionally, plans for succession and continuity will be prepared for various roles and levels within AIE.</p>	<p>We observed the calculation system and inspected for evidence that only employees with the necessary expertise are granted access to specific systems to support the benchmark determination process.</p> <p>Through our inquiries, we confirmed that assessing an individual's skills is a key component of the formal evaluation process.</p> <p>We obtained a sample of employees' certificates of training and inspected for evidence that they had completed on-the-job training related to index development and calculation.</p>
<p><b>Where a Benchmark is based on Submissions:</b> Administrators should promote the integrity of inputs by:</p> <p>a) Ensuring as far as possible that the Submitters comprise an appropriately representative group of participants taking into consideration the underlying Interest measured by the Benchmark;</p> <p>b) Employing a system of appropriate measures so that, to the extent possible, Submitters comply with the Submission guidelines, as defined in the Submitter Code of Conduct and the Administrators' applicable quality and integrity standards for Submission;</p> <p>c) Specifying how frequently Submissions should be made and specifying that inputs or Submissions should be made for every Benchmark determination; and</p> <p>d) Establishing and employing measures to effectively monitor and scrutinize inputs or Submissions. This should include pre-compilation or pre-publication monitoring to identify and avoid errors in inputs or Submissions, as well as <i>ex-post</i> analysis of trends and outliers.</p>	<p>None of the Akros Indices are based on Submissions, therefore, the additional requirements for Benchmarks based on Submissions do not apply.</p>	<p>No testing performed given the principle is not applicable.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>5. Internal Oversight</b>		
<p>Administrators should establish an oversight function to review and provide challenge on all aspects of the Benchmark determination process. This should include consideration of the features and intended, expected or known usage of the Benchmark and the materiality of existing or potential conflicts of interest identified.</p> <p>The oversight function should be carried out either by a separate committee, or other appropriate governance arrangements. The oversight function and its composition should be appropriate to provide effective scrutiny of the Administrator. Such oversight function could consider groups of Benchmarks by type or asset class, provided that it otherwise complies with this Principle.</p>	<p>Responsibility for the internal oversight of AIE lies with the Product Governance Committee. The Product Governance Committee is responsible for approving new Benchmark methodologies and changes to existing methodologies and reports to the Board of Directors.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Terms of Reference</i> and inspected for evidence that the Product Governance Committee's mandates include responsibilities for oversight, as well as approving changes to benchmark methodologies and the design of new benchmarks.</p> <p>We obtained a sample of the Board of Directors agendas and minutes and inspected for evidence of reporting from the Product Governance Committee.</p>
<p>An Administrator should develop and maintain robust procedures regarding its oversight function, which should be documented and available to relevant Regulatory Authorities, if any. The main features of the procedures should be Made Available to Stakeholders. These procedures should include:</p> <p>a) The terms of reference of the oversight function;</p> <p>b) Criteria to select members of the oversight function;</p> <p>The summary details of membership of any committee or arrangement charged with the oversight function, along with any declarations of conflicts of interest and processes for election, nomination or removal and replacement of committee members.</p>	<p>The Terms of Reference for the Product Governance Committee are available on the AIE website. The terms include the criteria used to select members. All members are subject to the conflicts of interest policies referred to in AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 3 above.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Terms of Reference</i> and inspected for evidence that they are publicly available on the AIE website and include the criteria for membership selection.</p> <p>We obtained the most recent reports from the Product Governance Committee submitted to the Board of Directors and inspected for evidence of the committee's reporting activities.</p>
<p>The responsibilities of the oversight function include:</p> <p>a) Oversight of the Benchmark design;</p>	<p>The Product Governance Committee oversees Benchmark design.</p>	<p>We obtained the most recent meeting minutes and inspected for evidence that the Product Governance Committee actively oversees benchmark design.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
i) Periodic review of the definition of the Benchmark and its Methodology;	AIE has a defined schedule for periodically reviewing the definitions of Benchmarks and their methodologies.	For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that definitions of benchmarks and their methodologies are subject to annual review.
ii) Taking measures to remain informed about issues and risks to the Benchmark, as well as commissioning external reviews of the Benchmark (as appropriate); iii) Overseeing any changes to the Benchmark Methodology, including assessing whether the Methodology continues to appropriately measure the underlying Interest, reviewing proposed and implemented changes to the Methodology, and authorizing or requesting the Administrator to undertake a consultation with Stakeholders where known or its Subscribers on such changes as per Principle 12; and	AIE implemented the <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy for Benchmark Methodology Changes</i> which sets out the procedures for making material changes to its Methodologies. Please see AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 12 for further information.	We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy for Benchmark Methodology Changes</i> and inspected for evidence that it sets out the procedures for implementing material changes to its methodologies.  Please also refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 12 for further details.
iv) Reviewing and approving procedures for termination of the Benchmark, including guidelines that set out how the Administrator should consult with Stakeholders about such cessation	This situation has not happened so far. However, AIE intends to release a statement about decommissioning an Index Series, with a summary available on the AIE website. The process will undergo review and receive approval from the Board of Directors. For more details, please refer to AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 13.	Please refer to Principle 13, as referenced by AIE's response.
b) Oversight of the integrity of Benchmark determination and control framework: i) Overseeing the management and operation of the Benchmark, including activities related to Benchmark determination undertaken by a third party;	The Product Governance Committee convenes ad-hoc meetings to oversee the management and operation of Akros Indices and review operational reports including calculation issues, client complaints and Benchmark reviews.	Through our inquiries, we confirmed that there had been no instances of errors that would necessitate review by the Product Governance Committee.
ii) Considering the results of internal and external audits, and following up on the implementation of remedial actions highlighted in the results of these audits; and	Along with the Product Governance Committee, the Board of Directors reviews the results of internal and external audit reports and actions taken as appropriate with a view to enhancing operational procedures. Please see AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 17 for further information.	Please refer to Principle 17, as referenced by AIE's response.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>iii) Overseeing any exercise of Expert Judgement by the Administrator and ensuring Published Methodologies have been followed.</p>	<p>The Product Governance Committee oversees the framework that allows for the use of Expert Judgement.</p> <p>This situation has not happened so far. However, use of Expert Judgement is defined in the <i>Exercise of Expert Judgement in Akros Indices</i> document and is reported retrospectively to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors will consider whether the Benchmark methodology should be clarified in case of future events. Further details are provided in AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 9.</p> <p>The Board of Directors reviews operational reports which highlight where any exceptions to the published methodology may have arisen and stipulates any remedial actions to be taken.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Exercise of Expert Judgement in Akros Indices</i> document and inspected for evidence that it clearly defines the use of expert judgement.</p> <p>We inquired with management whether there were any identified operational events impacting benchmarks and were informed that there have been no such instances.</p> <p>Please also refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 9 for further details.</p>
<p><b>Where conflicts of interests may arise in the Administrator due to its ownership structures or controlling interests, or due to other activities conducted by any entity owning or controlling the Administrator or by the Administrator or any of its affiliates:</b> the Administrator should establish an independent oversight function which includes a balanced representation of a range of Stakeholders where known, Subscribers and Submitters, which is chosen to counterbalance the relevant conflict of interest.</p>	<p>The Board of Directors reviews the <i>Conflicts Register</i> which includes conflicts that may arise due to the ownership structure of controlling interests. To mitigate any potential conflicts, The Compliance Officer ensures that the Akros Indices are operated in the interests of a range of stakeholders including subscribers.</p>	<p>We inquired with management regarding the existence of any Conflicts Registers and were informed that no such instances have been recorded.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p><b>Where a Benchmark is based on Submissions:</b> the oversight function should provide suitable oversight and challenge of the Submissions by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Overseeing and challenging the scrutiny and monitoring of inputs or Submissions by the Administrator. This could include regular discussions of inputs or Submission patterns, defining parameters against which inputs or Submissions can be analyzed, or querying the role of the Administrator in challenging or sampling unusual inputs or Submissions;</li> <li>b) Overseeing the Code of Conduct for Submitters;</li> <li>c) Establishing measures to detect potential anomalous or suspicious Submissions and in case of suspicious activities, to report them, as well as any misconduct by Submitters of which it becomes aware to the relevant Regulatory Authorities, if any.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A – None of the Akros Indices are based on Submissions, therefore the additional requirements for Benchmarks based on Submissions do not apply.</p>	<p>No testing performed given the principle is not applicable.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>6. Benchmark Design</b>		
The design of the Benchmark should seek to achieve, and result in an accurate and reliable representation of the economic realities of the Interest it seeks to measure, and eliminate factors that might result in a distortion of the price, rate, index or value of the Benchmark.	<p>The Benchmark design and the interest the Benchmark is intended to measure are detailed in the Benchmark's methodology documents.</p> <p>Each Benchmark's methodology includes eligibility criteria which seek to eliminate factors that may lead to distortions are considered in the design of each Benchmark.</p> <p>Other methods such as free float weightings to ensure the investability of the Benchmark are used as well in order to seek to achieve and result in an accurate and reliable representation of the economic realities of the Interest it seeks to measure.</p>	For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that eligibility criteria as described by AIE are clearly specified.
<p>Benchmark design should take into account the following generic non-exclusive features, and other factors should be considered, as appropriate to the particular Interest:</p> <p>a) Adequacy of the sample used to represent the Interest;</p>	<p>Before launching a Benchmark, the Board of Directors approves the methodology and ensures that the universe of constituents adequately reflects the Benchmark's intended Interest. Furthermore, AIE will conduct an Annual Methodology Review, along with any necessary ad hoc reviews, under the oversight of the Board of Directors. These reviews are intended to reassess if the constituents still accurately represent the Interest.</p> <p>The Board of Directors also monitors the performance of the securities or constituents within its Benchmarks for any unusual activity and regularly checks to ensure the structural integrity and relevance of the methodology. This is to make certain that the Benchmark continues to meet its intended objective.</p>	<p>We obtained the most recent meeting minutes and inspected for evidence that the Board of Directors approved the new methodology before launching a benchmark.</p> <p>As the initial annual review period had not occurred by March 31, 2024, there was no material requirement to perform testing.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>b) Size and liquidity of the relevant market (for example whether there is sufficient trading to provide observable, transparent pricing);</p> <p>c) Relative size of the underlying market in relation to the volume of trading in the market that references to the Benchmark;</p> <p>d) The distribution of trading among Market Participants (market concentration);</p>	<p>AIE considers i) size and liquidity of the relevant market, ii) relative size of the underlying market, iii) the distribution of trading among Market Participants in relations to markets that Akros Indices intend to measure when designing the Benchmark.</p> <p>During the design phase of a Benchmark, the Board of Directors examines factors associated with the Benchmark's marketability.</p>	<p>We obtained a sample of the market analysis documents for the benchmark and inspected for evidence that factors associated with the benchmark's marketability are considered when designing the benchmark.</p>
<p>e) Market dynamics (e.g. to ensure that the Benchmark reflects changes to the assets underpinning a Benchmark).</p>	<p>The composition of Benchmarks is periodically reviewed to ensure that the Benchmarks remain representative of the market. In the period between index reviews, the methodology documents set out how Benchmark will respond to new issues, changes to the constituent weightings and constituent deletions, for example, bankruptcies and mergers for equities.</p>	<p>For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that the methodology documents comprehensively outline how the benchmark will address new issues, changes to the constituent weightings and constituent deletions. This includes scenario such as bankruptcies and mergers for equity benchmarks.</p>
<b>7. Data Sufficiency</b>		
<p>The data used to construct a Benchmark determination should be sufficient to accurately and reliably represent the Interest measured by the Benchmark and should:</p> <p>a) Be based on prices, rates, indices or values that have been formed by the competitive forces of supply and demand in order to provide confidence that the price discovery system is reliable; and,</p> <p>b) Be anchored by observable transactions entered into at arm's length between buyers and sellers in the market for the Interest the Benchmark measures in order for it to function as a credible indicator of prices, rates, indices or values.</p>	<p>The Benchmark methodology documents describe the treatment of the data used in the Benchmark calculation.</p> <p>Management of the data sourced from third parties is governed by the Board of Directors, which meets fortnightly and for which Terms of Reference have been set (for more information please refer to AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 15)</p>	<p>For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that the methodology documents describe the treatment of the data used in the Benchmark calculation.</p> <p>We obtained the most recent meeting minutes and inspected for evidence that the Board of Directors meets fortnightly and is mandated to provide oversight over the data sourced from third parties.</p> <p>Please also refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 15 for further details.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>This Principle requires that a Benchmark be based upon (i.e., anchored in) an active market having observable Bona Fide, Arms-Length Transactions. This does not mean that every individual Benchmark determination must be constructed solely of transaction data. Provided that an active market exists, conditions in the market on any given day might require the Administrator to rely on different forms of data tied to observable market data as an adjunct or supplement to transactions. Depending upon the Administrator's Methodology, this could result in an individual Benchmark determination being based predominantly, or exclusively, on bids and offers or extrapolations from prior transactions. This is further clarified in Principle 8.</p> <p>Provided that subparagraph (a) and (b) above are met, Principle 7 does not preclude Benchmark Administrators from using executable bids or offers as a means to construct Benchmarks where anchored in an observable market consisting of Bona Fide, Arms-Length transactions.</p> <p>This Principle also recognizes that various indices may be designed to measure or reflect the performance of a rule-based investment strategy, the volatility or behaviour of an index or market or other aspects of an active market. Principle 7 does not preclude the use of non-transaction data for such indices that are not designed to represent transactions and where the nature of the index is such that non-transactional data is used to reflect what the index is designed to measure. For example, certain volatility indices, which are designed to measure the expected volatility of an index of securities transactions, rely on non-transactional data, but the data is derived from and thus "anchored" in an actual functioning securities or options market.</p>	<p>Akros Indices are calculated on transactions executed on regulated trading venues and no discretion is exercised by the Administrator in determination process, consistent with Principle 8. This is explained in the methodology.</p>	<p>For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that Akros Indices are calculated on transactions executed on regulated trading venues and no discretion is exercised by the Administrator in determination process.</p> <p>Please also refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 8 for further details.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>8. Hierarchy of Data Inputs</b>		
<p>An Administrator should establish and Publish or Make Available clear guidelines regarding the hierarchy of data inputs and exercise of Expert Judgment used for the determination of Benchmarks. In general, the hierarchy of data inputs should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Where a Benchmark is dependent upon Submission s, the Submitters' own concluded arms-length trans actions in the underlying interest or related markets;</li> <li>b) Reported or observed concluded Arm's-length Trans actions in the underlying interest;</li> <li>c) Reported or observed concluded Arm's-length Trans actions in related markets;</li> <li>d) Firm (executable) bids and offers; and</li> <li>e) Other market information or Expert Judgments.</li> </ul>	<p>The data inputs for the Akros Indices are those required to fulfill the criteria laid out in each Benchmark's methodology documents to ensure the Benchmark meets the design objective. The methodology documents are published on the AIE website.</p> <p>Equity Benchmarks of the Akros Indices are based on traded prices sourced from regulated trading venues and hence use minimal Expert Judgment over data inputs. In exceptional circumstances, for example, where securities have stopped trading because they have been suspended, or because a market has been unexpectedly closed, the use of judgment is set out in the <i>Akros Index Engineering Corporate Actions Methodology</i> which is available on the AIE website.</p>	<p>For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they state the data inputs required to fulfill the criteria in the methodology documents; and</li> <li>• they are published on the AIE website.</li> </ul> <p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Corporate Actions Methodology</i> and inspected for evidence that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it states AIE's use of expert judgment to exceptional circumstances; and</li> <li>• it is publicly available on the AIE website.</li> </ul>
<p>Provided that the Data Sufficiency Principle is met (i.e., an active market exists), this Principle is not intended to restrict an Administrator's flexibility to use inputs consistent with the Administrator's approach to ensuring the quality, integrity, continuity and reliability of its Benchmark determinations, as set out in the Administrator's Methodology. The Administrator should retain flexibility to use the inputs it believes are appropriate under its Methodology to ensure the quality and integrity of its Benchmark. For example, certain Administrators may decide to rely upon Expert Judgment in an active albeit low liquidity market, when transactions may not be consistently available each day. IOSCO also recognizes that there might be circumstances (e.g., a low liquidity market) when a confirmed bid or offer might carry more meaning than an outlier transaction. Under these circumstances, non-transactional data such as bids and offers and extrapolations from prior transactions might predominate in a given Benchmark determination.</p>	<p>For Options Benchmarks, transaction prices and observable market inputs are generally used. For certain Benchmarks using synthetic options we derive theoretical option values using observable market inputs, parameters specified in Index Methodologies, and mathematical formulae.</p>	<p>We confirmed via inquiry that all the Akros Indices are calculated on transactions executed on regulated trading venues and no discretion is exercised by the Administrator in determination process.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>9. Transparency of Benchmark Determinations</b>		
The Administrator should describe and publish with each Benchmark determination, to the extent reasonable without delaying an Administrator publication deadline:	AIE provides and publishes various documents on its website that describe how Benchmark determinations are made.	We confirmed that the AIE's index methodology documents are publicly available on the website.
<p>a) A concise explanation, sufficient to facilitate a Stakeholder's or Market Authority's ability to understand how the determination was developed, including, at a minimum, the size and liquidity of the market being assessed (meaning the number and volume of transactions submitted), the range and average volume and range and average of price, and indicative percentage of each type of market data that have been considered in a Benchmark determination; terms referring to the pricing Methodology should be included (i.e., transaction-based, spread-based or interpolated/extrapolated);</p> <p>b) A concise explanation of the extent to which and the basis upon which Expert Judgment if any, was used in establishing a Benchmark determination.</p>	<p>The methodology documents provide sufficient information to allow Stakeholders and Market Authorities to understand the process used to make determinations for each Benchmark.</p> <p>Subscribing clients are provided with data files that allow them to validate how the Benchmark has been determined. These include data files containing the constituent weights and prices for each Benchmark at the open and close of markets. Additional files provide advance notice of constituent changes including constituent additions and deletions and changes arising from corporate events; these files allow tracking portfolios to replicate the Benchmark.</p> <p>The extent to which Expert Judgment is used in the pricing of Benchmark constituents is set out in AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 8.</p>	<p>For a selection of key benchmarks, we inspected the specific information that is provided sufficiently to Stakeholders and Market Authorities to understand the process used to make determinations for each benchmark. Details are following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The latest portfolio: component's ticker, weight, and name etc.</li> <li>▪ The latest rebalancing information</li> <li>▪ A selection of data files provided to subscribing clients and inspected for evidence that they contain details as described in AIE's response.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding of the Expert Judgment, please refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 8.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>10. Periodic Review</b>		
The Administrator should periodically review the conditions in the underlying Interest that the Benchmark measures to determine whether the Interest has undergone structural changes that might require changes to the design of the Methodology. The Administrator also should periodically review whether the Interest has diminished or is non-functioning such that it can no longer function as the basis for a credible Benchmark.	The Board of Directors are responsible for methodologies that govern the relevant groups of the Akros Indices for which they oversee. Such responsibility involves meeting as often as appropriate at the Board of Director's discretion but at least annually, to evaluate risks to the Benchmark, assess whether the methodology continues to appropriately measure the underlying Interest and achieve its stated objective, and analyze a variety of criteria to help assess whether the data and methodology are still effective.	We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Terms of Reference</i> and inspected evidence for that AIE's Board of Directors have responsibilities on making decisions of determining Benchmark. In specifically, AIE's Board of Directors review the operational logs in every two weeks. We obtained the Board of Directors Meeting Minutes and inspected evidence for that periodic review has been performed. We inquired the frequency of assessing risks regarding determining index methodology and decisions and confirmed that it will be held annually. Risk assessment will consider four different factors: Market Risk, Credit Risk, Liquidity Risk, and Operational Risk. We obtained the <i>Exercise of Expert Judgment in Akros Indices</i> and inspected for evidence that ad hoc review can be held by the Board of Directors when the unaddressed situation in determining Index is escalated by the Index management team.
<b>11. Content of Methodology</b>		
The Administrator should document and Publish or Make Available the Methodology used to make Benchmark determinations. The Administrator should provide the rationale for adopting a particular Methodology. The Published Methodology should provide sufficient detail to allow Stakeholders to understand how the Benchmark is derived and to assess its representativeness, its relevance to particular Stakeholders, and its appropriateness as a reference for financial instruments.	The methodology documents detail the Benchmark determination process of each Akros Indices and provide sufficient information for users to understand how the Benchmark is constructed and maintained. These documents are published on AIE's website.	For a selection of key benchmarks, we obtained the methodology documents and inspected for evidence that it sets out the methodology of each benchmark is documented including details of its construction and maintenance and publicly available on the AIE's website.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
At a minimum, the Methodology should contain: a) Definitions of key terms;	Key terms are defined in each methodology documents.	We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Terms of Reference</i> and inspected for evidence that key terms have been defined and are publicly available on AIE's website.
b) All criteria and procedures used to develop the Benchmark, including input selection, the mix of inputs used to derive the Benchmark, the guidelines that control the exercise of Expert Judgment by the Administrator, priority given to certain data types, minimum data needed to determine a Benchmark, and any models or extrapolation methods;	The criteria and hierarchy of inputs are described in the published methodology documents.	We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy of Tradability</i> and inspected for evidence that it sets out the actions to be taken in response to external operational events in determining benchmark as described in AIE's response.
c) Procedures and practices designed to promote consistency in the exercise of Expert Judgment between Benchmark determinations;	The Benchmark methodology documents are constructed so as to reduce subjectivity and limit Expert Judgment.	
d) The procedures which govern Benchmark determination in periods of market stress or disruption, or periods where data sources may be absent (e.g. theoretical estimation models);	External events can make it difficult or impossible for AIE clients to trade securities on certain markets. External operational events can also impact the supply of data sources used as part of a Benchmark calculation.  The <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy of Tradability</i> outlines AIE's approach in these circumstances.	
e) The procedures for dealing with error reports, including when a revision of a Benchmark would be applicable;	Where an inaccuracy in a Benchmark determination is identified, AIE will follow the steps set out in the <i>Akros Index Engineering Recalculation Policy and Guidelines documents</i> based on the nature of the inaccuracy. Examples of actions which may be taken include recalculation, revision of the float adjustment or a restatement.	We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Recalculation Policy and Guidelines</i> and inspected for evidence that it sets out the actions to be taken if inaccuracy in a benchmark determination is identified as described in AIE's response.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
f) Information regarding the frequency for internal reviews and approvals of the Methodology. Where applicable, the Published Methodologies should also include information regarding the procedures and frequency for external review of the Methodology;	<p>The Akros Indices methodology documents are reviewed and approved by the Board of Directors on an annual basis.</p> <p>The frequency of review is included in the published methodology. Any required changes to the methodology will be in accordance with Principle 12.</p>	Regarding of the material change in Index Methodology and the <i>Akros Index Engineering Consultation Policy</i> , please refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 12.
g) The circumstances and procedures under which the Administrator will consult with Stakeholders, as appropriate; and	The circumstances and procedures under which AIE consults with stakeholders on material changes to the Akros Indices are set out in the <i>Akros Index Engineering Consultation Policy</i> which is available on the AIE website.	
h) The identification of potential limitations of a Benchmark, including its operation in illiquid or fragmented markets and the possible concentration of inputs.	Limitations of the Akros Indices are set out in the methodology documents where applicable. These limitations are primarily regarding the number of qualifying constituents and diversification.	Please refer to KPMG's procedures to Principle 11 above.
<p><b>Where a Benchmark is based on Submission, the additional Principle also applies:</b> The Administrator should clearly establish criteria for including and excluding Submitters. The criteria should consider any issues arising from the location of the Submitter, if in a different jurisdiction to the Administrator. These criteria should be available to any relevant Regulatory Authorities, if any, and Published or Made Available to Stakeholders. Any provisions related to changes in composition, including notice periods should be made clear.</p>	None of the Akros Indices are based on Submissions, therefore the additional requirements for Benchmarks based on Submissions do not apply.	No testing performed given the principle is not applicable.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
12. Changes to the Methodology		
<p>An Administrator should Publish or Make Available the rationale of any proposed material change in its Methodology, and procedures for making such changes. These procedures should clearly define what constitutes a material change, and the method and timing for consulting or notifying Subscribers (and other Stakeholders where appropriate, taking into account the breadth and depth of the Benchmark's use) of changes.</p> <p>Those procedures should be consistent with the overriding objective that an Administrator must ensure the continued integrity of its Benchmark determinations. When changes are proposed, the Administrator should specify exactly what these changes entail and when they are intended to apply.</p> <p>The Administrator should specify how changes to the Methodology will be scrutinized, by the oversight function.</p>	<p>AIE publishes on its website the <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy for Benchmark Methodology Changes</i> which sets out the procedures for making material changes to its Methodologies. The procedures include what constitutes a material change and the method and timing for consulting Subscribers and Stakeholders.</p> <p>All changes to the Methodologies of the Akros Indices are approved by the Board of Directors following the procedures described by AIE's Relevant Control Measures on Principle 10. Approved methodology changes to indexes are announced to the market through Technical Notices and Client Notices which include the rationale underlying the changes and the timetable for their implementation.</p> <p>Depending on the impact of a change, implementation may be immediate or may be preceded by advance notification.</p> <p>Changes to the procedures used to conduct Benchmark reviews will be announced typically three months in advance of implementation to allow users time to prepare.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Policy for Benchmark Methodology Changes</i> and inspected for evidence that it sets out the procedures for making material changes to its methodologies. This includes defining what constitutes a material change, the method and timing for consulting Subscribers and Stakeholders, and confirmation that this information is available on AIE's website.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>The Administrator should develop Stakeholder consultation procedures in relation to changes to the Methodology that are deemed material by the oversight function, and that are appropriate and proportionate to the breadth and depth of the Benchmark's use and the nature of the Stakeholders. Procedures should:</p> <p>a) Provide advance notice and a clear timeframe that gives Stakeholders sufficient opportunity to analyze and comment on the impact of such proposed material changes, having regard to the Administrator's assessment of the overall circumstances; and</p> <p>b) Provide for Stakeholders' summary comments, and the Administrator's summary response to those comments, to be made accessible to all Stakeholders after any given consultation period, except where the commenter has requested confidentiality.</p>	<p>Material changes to the Index methodologies follow <i>Akros Index Engineering Consultation Policy</i> which is made publicly available on the AIE website.</p> <p>The <i>Akros Index Engineering Consultation Policy</i> defines a "material change" and sets out the process by which AIE makes such changes.</p> <p>AIE prepares proposals for material changes which are presented to the Board of Directors for consideration and approval. For custom indices, or in cases where only a limited number of Stakeholders or Subscribers are impacted, the affected entities are directly consulted. Otherwise, a public consultation is performed where feedback on the proposed change is sought.</p> <p>The consultation period is specified in the consultation notice.</p> <p>AIE reviews the feedback and presents the recommended changes and consultation findings to the Board of Directors. All adopted changes are reviewed and approved by the Board of Directors prior to implementation.</p> <p>Details of the finalized changes and their timeline for implementation are publicly announced to the market on the AIE website.</p> <p>Identities of respondents are kept confidential unless otherwise advised. Immaterial changes to the methodology, which include clarifications in the documentation or changes that are cosmetic or minor in nature, are not published for consultation, but are announced to market participants using the same process.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Consultation Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that it sets out the criteria and specific procedures to be taken regarding material changes in Index Methodology.</p> <p>We inquired if there were any material changes to the methodology within the period. There were no such occurrences.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
13. Transition		
<p>Administrators should have clear written policies and procedures, to address the need for possible cessation of a Benchmark, due to market structure change, product definition change, or any other condition which makes the Benchmark no longer representative of its intended Interest. These policies and procedures should be proportionate to the estimated breadth and depth of contracts and financial instruments that reference a Benchmark and the economic and financial stability impact that might result from the cessation of the Benchmark. The Administrator should take into account the views of Stakeholders and any relevant Regulatory and National Authorities in determining what policies and procedures are appropriate for a particular Benchmark.</p> <p>These written policies and procedures should be Published or Made Available to all Stakeholders.</p>	<p>AIE intends to release a statement about decommissioning an Index Series, with a summary available on the AIE website. The policy sets out the reasons that might cause AIE to cease publication of a Benchmark, for example, an inability to source adequate input data or the lack of revenues associated with a Benchmark.</p> <p>AIE will follow a structured process to consider and then communicate the decision to terminate a Benchmark. Any proposal for the decommissioning of a Benchmark is considered by the Board of Directors. If the Board of Directors is satisfied that the Benchmark should be decommissioned, AIE will follow the documented procedure. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AIE should use reasonable endeavors to establish whether the Benchmark is being used as a reference for financial products or financial instruments, or as the basis of investment mandates;</li> <li>▪ AIE should usually and where possible provide a minimum of three months' notice of its intention to terminate the calculation and publication of a Benchmark to allow stakeholders that may be affected to make representations to AIE;</li> <li>▪ AIE should issue a reminder notice one month before the decommissioning date;</li> <li>▪ AIE should issue a final notice one week before the decommissioning date; and</li> <li>▪ The day after the decommissioning, AIE should issue a completion notice to confirm the Benchmark has been decommissioned and also complete various administrative steps such as the removal of the daily files from the live production environment.</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Index Series Decommissioning Statement</i> and inspected for evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ it contains a structured process for cessation of publication of a Benchmark as described in AIE's response; and</li> <li>▪ a summary of the procedure is publicly available on the AIE website.</li> </ul>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>Administrators should encourage Subscribers and other Stakeholders who have financial instruments that reference a Benchmark to take steps to make sure that:</p> <p>a) Contracts or other financial instruments that reference a Benchmark, have robust fall-back provisions in the event of material changes to, or cessation of, the referenced Benchmark; and</p>	<p>AIE's license agreements with its clients provide for the termination of Benchmarks, typically on provision of up to three months' notice. The notice period may be shorter, or immediate, if (i) AIE service is dependent on the provision of data from an external supplier that ceases to become available (ii) AIE reasonably believes termination or suspension of its services is necessary to maintain the security or integrity of such services; (iii) AIE services become illegal or contrary to any laws or regulations. AIE also retains the right to change the composition or method of calculation of its Benchmarks, or update its Benchmarks, at any time.</p>	<p>We obtained a selection of AIE's license agreements with its clients and inspected for evidence that the termination notice period and the exceptions to this notice period align with the descriptions provided in AIE's response.</p>
<p>b) Stakeholders are aware of the possibility that various factors, including external factors beyond the control of the Administrator, might necessitate material changes to a Benchmark.</p>	<p>Methodology documents are publicly available on the AIE website and make stakeholders aware that external factors may necessitate material changes to a Benchmark.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Index Series Decommissioning Statement</i> and inspected for evidence that it sets out factors to evaluate deciding index decommissioning.</p>
<p>Administrators' written policies and procedures to address the possibility of Benchmark cessation could include the following factors, if determined to be reasonable and appropriate by the Administrator:</p> <p>a) Criteria to guide the selection of a credible, alternative Benchmark such as, but not limited to, criteria that seek to match to the extent practicable the existing Benchmark's characteristics (e.g., credit quality, maturities and liquidity of the alternative market), differentials between Benchmarks, the extent to which an alternative Benchmark meets the asset/liability needs of Stakeholders, whether the revised Benchmark is investable, the availability of transparent transaction data, the impact on Stakeholders and impact of existing legislation;</p>	<p>AIE's procedures as set out in the <i>Akros Index Engineering Index Series Decommissioning Statement</i> provide for consideration as to whether an alternative Benchmark may be suitable for any user. The decommissioning proposal should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reasons for proposed decommissioning;</li> <li>▪ Details as to any identified users of the products;</li> <li>▪ Alternative benchmarks that could be used by identified users of the products;</li> <li>▪ Consideration of running the benchmark in parallel; and</li> <li>▪ Proposed timescales.</li> </ul>	<p>We inquired if there were any indexes which were decommissioned (or proposed to be decommissioned) within the period and confirmed that there were no such occurrences.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>b) The practicality of maintaining parallel Benchmarks (e.g., where feasible, maintain the existing Benchmark for a defined period of time to permit existing contracts and financial instruments to mature and publish a new Benchmark) in order to accommodate an orderly transition to a new Benchmark;</p> <p>c) The procedures that the Administrator would follow in the event that a suitable alternative cannot be identified;</p> <p>d) In the case of a Benchmark or a tenor of a Benchmark that will be discontinued completely, the policy defining the period of time in which the Benchmark will continue to be produced in order to permit existing contracts to migrate to an alternative Benchmark if necessary; and</p> <p>e) The process by which the Administrator will engage Stakeholders and relevant Market and National Authorities, as appropriate, in the process for selecting and moving towards an alternative Benchmark, including the timeframe for any such action commensurate with the tenors of the financial instruments referencing the Benchmarks and the adequacy of notice that will be provided to Stakeholders.</p>	<p>The Board of Director is required to consider whether it would be practicable to maintain the Benchmark to be decommissioned in parallel with a successor or alternative for a period of time to allow users to make the transition to that successor or alternative Benchmark.</p> <p>The procedures also provide for communication with external stakeholders and include a minimum of three months' notice to allow users to transition to a successor or an alternative Benchmark, and/or make representations to AIE.</p>	

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>14. Submitter Code of Conduct</b>		
<p><b>Where a Benchmark is based on Submissions, the following additional Principle also applies:</b></p> <p>The Administrator should develop guidelines for Submitters ("Submitter Code of Conduct"), which should be available to any relevant Regulatory Authorities, if any and Published or Made Available to Stakeholders.</p> <p>The Administrator should only use inputs or Submissions from entities which adhere to the Submitter Code of Conduct and the Administrator should appropriately monitor and record adherence from Submitters. The Administrator should require Submitters to confirm adherence to the Submitter Code of Conduct annually and whenever a change to the Submitter Code of Conduct has occurred</p> <p>The Administrator's oversight function should be responsible for the continuing review and oversight of the Submitter Code of Conduct.</p> <p>The Submitter Code of Conduct should address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The selection of inputs;</li> <li>b) Who may submit data and information to the Administrator;</li> <li>c) Quality control procedures to verify the identity of a Submitter and any employee(s) of a Submitter who report(s) data or information and the authorization of such person(s) to report market data on behalf of a Submitter;</li> <li>d) Criteria applied to employees of a Submitter who are permitted to submit data or information to an Administrator on behalf of a Submitter;</li> </ul>	<p>None of the Akros Indices are based on Submissions. The input data used by AIE in the indices is readily available and not solely provided to AIE for the purposes of determining a Benchmark.</p>	<p>No testing performed given the principle is not applicable.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>e) Policies to discourage the interim withdrawal of Submitters from surveys or Panels;</p> <p>f) Policies to encourage Submitters to submit all relevant data; and</p> <p>g) The Submitters' internal systems and controls, which should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Procedures for submitting inputs, including Methodologies to determine the type of eligible inputs, in line with the Administrator's Methodologies;</li> <li>ii. Procedures to detect and evaluate suspicious inputs or transactions, including intergroup transactions, and to ensure the Bona Fide nature of such inputs, where appropriate;</li> <li>iii. Policies guiding and detailing the use of Expert Judgment, including documentation requirements;</li> <li>iv. Record keeping policies;</li> <li>v. Pre-Submission validation of inputs, and procedures for multiple reviews by senior staff to check inputs;</li> <li>vi. Training, including training with respect to any relevant regulation (covering Benchmark regulation or any market abuse regime);</li> <li>vii. Suspicious Submission reporting;</li> <li>viii. Roles and responsibilities of key personnel and accountability lines;</li> <li>ix. Internal sign off procedures by management for submitting inputs;</li> <li>x. Whistle blowing policies (in line with Principle 4); and</li> </ul>		

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p>xi. Conflicts of interest procedures and policies, including prohibitions on the Submission of data from Front Office Functions unless the Administrator is satisfied that there are adequate internal oversight and verification procedures for Front Office Function Submissions of data to an Administrator (including safeguards and supervision to address possible conflicts of interests as per paragraphs (v) and (ix) above), the physical separation of employees and reporting lines where appropriate, the consideration of how to identify, disclose, manage, mitigate and avoid existing or potential incentives to manipulate or otherwise influence data inputs (whether or not in order to influence the Benchmark levels), including, without limitation, through appropriate remuneration policies and by effectively addressing conflicts of interest which may exist between the Submitter's Submission activities (including all staff who perform or otherwise participate in Benchmark Submission responsibilities), and any other business of the Submitter or of any of its affiliates or any of their respective clients or customers.</p>		

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>15. Internal Controls over Data Collection</b>		
<p>When an Administrator collects data from any external source the Administrator should ensure that there are appropriate internal controls over its data collection and transmission processes. These controls should address the process for selecting the source, collecting the data and protecting the integrity and confidentiality of the data. Where Administrators receive data from employees of the Front Office Function, the Administrator should seek corroborating data from other sources.</p>	<p>AIE maintains quality assurance processes and procedures for the collection of its data/inputs to maintain integrity and confidentiality. The quality assurance processes and procedures include; (1) the selection and monitoring of data/inputs, (2) the comparison of inputs from different data sources (when available), (3) the analysis of detected incidents/errors, (if any) and (4) the monitoring and review of output data provided by Benchmark calculation agents (e.g., Benchmark level data and percentage change in Benchmark value day over day to check for anomalies).</p>	<p>We inquired to the Compliance Officer and confirmed the details of the followings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data is received by selective two different vendors with external reliability.</li> <li>▪ Cross-validation is performed on the value of external source data transmitted through the automatic calculation system.</li> </ul>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>16. Complaints Procedures</b>		
The Administrator should establish and Publish or Make Available a written complaints procedures policy, by which Stakeholders may submit complaints including concerning whether a specific Benchmark determination is representative of the underlying Interest it seeks to measure, applications of the Methodology in relation to a specific Benchmark determination(s) and other Administrator decisions in relation to a Benchmark determination.	<p>AIE has established and documented the <i>Akros Index Engineering Benchmark Determination Complaints-Handling Policy</i> which is published on the AIE website and that sets out the steps to be taken on receipt of a complaint or query in relation to any matter including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Benchmark determination issues including the application of the approved methodology;</li> <li>▪ The suitability of the Benchmark in measuring the underlying interest; and</li> <li>▪ Service delivery issues.</li> </ul>	We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Benchmark Determination Complaints-Handling Policy</i> which is publicly available on the AIE website. We inspected the document and confirmed that it contains the following details:
<p>The complaints procedures policy should:</p> <p>a) Permit complaints to be submitted through a user-friendly complaints process such as an electronic Submission process;</p>	<p>The <i>Akros Index Engineering Benchmark Determination Complaints-Handling Policy</i> defines how stakeholders can submit a complaint or query to AIE and sets out AIE's procedures for resolving a complaint or answering a query.</p> <p>AIE also has a dedicated email address (<a href="mailto:akros@index.engineering">akros@index.engineering</a>) to which stakeholders can submit a complaint or query.</p>	a) How to submit a complaint or inquiry - through dedicated email address to which stakeholders can submit a complaint or query
<p>b) Contain procedures for receiving and investigating a complaint made about the Administrator's Benchmark determination process on a timely and fair basis by personnel who are independent of any personnel who may be or may have been involved in the subject of the complaint, advising the complainant and other relevant parties of the outcome of its investigation within a reasonable period and retaining all records concerning complaints;</p>	<p>AIE has a Compliance Officer who monitors the email inbox and responds to and/or escalates complaints and queries received in accordance with the <i>Akros Index Engineering Benchmark Determination Complaints-Handling Policy</i>. The Compliance Officer is independent of the teams involved in the Benchmark determination process.</p> <p>All complaints and queries are logged on a dedicated system for issue tracking and reference.</p>	b) Formal complaint handling process - investigation subject and period of response to the complaints raised

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
c) Contain a process for escalating complaints, as appropriate, to the Administrator's governance body; and	The <i>Akros Index Engineering Benchmark Determination Complaints-Handling Policy</i> contains escalation procedures which are dependent upon the nature of the complaint or query. Complaints are received by the whole employees of AIE and reviewed for their potential severity and managed and escalated in accordance with the policy. A summary of any complaint is considered at the Board of Directors.	c) Escalation process to the Compliance Officer
d) Require all documents relating to a complaint, including those submitted by the complainant as well as the Administrator's own record, to be retained for a minimum of five years, subject to applicable national legal or regulatory requirements.	All correspondence and documents relating to complaints and queries are required to be logged and stored and the records are kept for a minimum of five years.  <i>Akros Index Engineering Benchmark Determination Complaints-Handling Policy</i> applies to all complaints and queries raised by stakeholders.	d) Relevant document retention policy - 5 years to preserve the record
Disputes about a Benchmarking determination, which are not formal complaints, should be resolved by the Administrator by reference to its standard appropriate procedures. If a complaint results in a change in a Benchmark determination, that should be Published or Made Available to Subscribers and Published or Made Available to Stakeholders as soon as possible as set out in the Methodology.	During the resolution of a Benchmark determination issue, clients are provided with regular updates. Responsibility for closing a complaint rests with the Compliance Officer which allows for follow-up with the complainant as to how the issue has been resolved.  If, following the investigation of a complaint, AIE determines that the Benchmark in question should be recalculated or restated, the <i>Akros Index Engineering Benchmark Determination Complaints-Handling Policy</i> requires that a notice be issued to the market in line with AIE's standard operating procedures.	We inquired if there were any submitted complaints or inquires within the period. There weren't any occurrences.

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>17. Audits</b>		
The Administrator should appoint an independent internal or external auditor with appropriate experience and capability to periodically review and report on the Administrator's adherence to its stated criteria and with the Principles. The frequency of audits should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the Administrator's operations.	<p>AIE will be undertaking periodic reviews of its business as part of its 3-year internal audit cycle. The program of reviews covers the governance and operational processes for important areas of the business. The reviews are prepared for internal purposes as well as in support of AIE's compliance with the IOSCO Principles and any other regulatory framework.</p> <p>Results of the internal audit reviews will be considered by the Board of Director.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Internal Audit Policy</i> and inspected evidence for that the following reviews will be conducted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessing risk management systems</li> <li>▪ Ensuring compliance with internal and regulatory requirements</li> <li>▪ Safeguarding AIE's and client's assets</li> </ul>
Where appropriate to the level of existing or potential conflicts of interest identified by the Administrator (except for Benchmarks that are otherwise regulated or supervised by a National Authority other than a relevant Regulatory Authority), an Administrator should appoint an independent external auditor with appropriate experience and capability to periodically review and report on the Administrator's adherence to its stated Methodology. The frequency of audits should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the Administrator's Benchmark operations and the breadth and depth of Benchmark use by Stakeholders.	AIE has engaged KPMG to carry out a reasonable assurance review with regard to their 2023 Statement of Adherence to the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks.	

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<b>18. Audit Trail</b>		
<p>Written records should be retained by the Administrator for five years, subject to applicable national legal or regulatory requirements on:</p> <p>a) All market data, Submissions and any other data and information sources relied upon for Benchmark determination;</p>	<p>All data relied upon for AIE end-of-day Benchmark determination is retained for at least five years. Backups are taken daily and stored. Real-time data is kept for a minimum of two weeks.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Incident Management and Record Retention Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that all kinds of relevant written records including potentially significant information that has been disposed of should be retained for at least five years, subject to applicable national legal or regulatory requirements.</p>
<p>b) The exercise of Expert Judgment made by the Administrator in reaching a Benchmark determination;</p>	<p>AIE stores and records documentation in relation to areas where Expert Judgment is used. Such judgment is documented in relevant Technical Notices, Client Notices and data files.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Exercise of Expert Judgment in Akros Indices</i> and inspected for evidence that it sets out the actions to be taken when the unusual or complex corporate actions which is not addressed happens.</p>
<p>c) Other changes in or deviations from standard procedures and Methodologies, including those made during periods of market stress or disruption;</p>	<p>In the event of a failure or delay in the receipt of input data, or if there is a disruption in the market affecting any of the indices, such incidents are logged, escalated and retained in accordance with <i>Akros Index Engineering Incident Management Policy</i>. Any changes in or deviations from standard procedures and methodologies are documented and stored in the relevant index calculation system in accordance with <i>Akros Index Engineering Record Retention Policy</i>.</p>	<p>As the real-time index operating records are shared to the Directors of Board and the Compliance Officer through encrypted message, the event of failure or delay occurred in the overall process of determining benchmark can be escalated and retained as described in AIE's response. We reviewed the cumulative messenger records to look over the AIE's real-time reporting system.</p>
<p>d) The identity of each person involved in producing a Benchmark determination; and</p>	<p>The calculation system used to determine the Indices log the identity of users who have access and also log the actions users take throughout the day.</p>	
<p>e) Any queries and responses relating to data inputs. If these records are held by a Regulated Market or Exchange the Administrator may rely on these records for compliance with this Principle, subject to appropriate written record sharing agreements.</p>	<p>All queries and responses relating to data inputs are logged and tracked internally by AIE staff and retained. All actions, decisions and responses are retained in the central customer contact system.</p>	<p>We observed the retained backups of input/output data regarding index calculation as described in AIE's response. For a selection of key benchmarks, we observed queries and responses relating to data inputs are logged and tracked internally by AIE staff and retained.</p>

IOSCO Principle	AIE's Response	KPMG Procedures
<p><b>When a Benchmark is based on Submissions, the following additional Principle also applies:</b></p> <p>Submitters should retain records for five years subject to applicable national legal or regulatory requirements on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The procedures and Methodologies governing the Submission of inputs;</li> <li>b) The identity of any other person who submitted or otherwise generated any of the data or information provided to the Administrator;</li> <li>c) Names and roles of individuals responsible for Submission and Submission oversight;</li> <li>d) Relevant communications between submitting parties;</li> <li>e) Any interaction with the Administrator;</li> <li>f) Any queries received regarding data or information provided to the Administrator;</li> <li>g) Declaration of any conflicts of interests and aggregate exposures to Benchmark related instruments;</li> <li>h) Exposures of individual traders/desks to Benchmark related instruments in order to facilitate audits and investigations; and</li> <li>i) Findings of external/internal audits, when available, related to Benchmark Submission remedial actions and progress in implementing them.</li> </ul>	<p>None of the Akros Indices are based on Submissions, therefore the additional requirements for Benchmarks based on Submissions do not apply.</p>	
<b>19. Cooperation with Regulatory Authorities</b>		
<p>Relevant documents, Audit Trails and other documents subject to these Principles shall be made readily available by the relevant parties to the relevant Regulatory Authorities in carrying out their regulatory or supervisory duties and handed over promptly upon request.</p>	<p>AIE confirms that all relevant documents and audit trails can be made available to relevant Regulatory Authorities on request.</p>	<p>We obtained the <i>Akros Index Engineering Incident Management and Record Retention Policy</i> and inspected for evidence that AIE as the Benchmark Administrator has noted its obligation to make relevant documents available to Regulatory Authorities.</p>

# IOSCO Adherence Document Disclaimer

---

This document contains information that is confidential and proprietary property and/or trade secret of Akros Index Engineering Inc. and/or its affiliates and is not to be published, reproduced, copied, disclosed or used without the express written consent of Akros Index Engineering Inc. This document is provided for information purpose only. The information contained herein is, to the knowledge of Akros Index Engineering Inc., current as of the date hereof, but is subject to change without notice and does not constitute any form of warranty, representation, or undertaking. Nothing herein should in any way be deemed to alter the legal rights and obligations contained in agreements between Akros Index Engineering Inc. and/or any of their affiliates and their respective clients relating to any of the products or services described herein. Nothing herein is intended to constitute legal, tax, accounting, investment or other professional advice. Clients should consult with an attorney, tax, or accounting professional regarding any specific legal, tax or accounting situation.

The content in this document is provided on an “AS IS” basis. Akros Index Engineering Inc. and/or its affiliates make no warranties whatsoever, either express or implied, as to merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or any other matter. Without limiting the foregoing, Akros Index Engineering Inc. and/or its affiliates make no representation or warranty that any data or information (including but not limited to evaluated pricing) supplied to or by it are complete or free from errors, omissions, or defects. In no event shall Akros Index Engineering Inc. and/or any of its affiliates be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental, exemplary, compensatory, punitive, special or consequential damages, costs, expenses, legal fees, or losses (including, without limitation, lost income or lost profits and opportunity costs) in connection with any use of the content in this document even if advised of the possibility of such damages.

This document is © Akros Index Engineering Inc. 2024 except those portions prepared by KPMG LLP. All rights reserved.

Other products, services, or company names mentioned herein are the property of, and may be the service mark or trademark of, their respective owners.