

Sustainability Bond / Sustainability Bond Programme

External Review Form

Section 1. Basic Information

Issuer name: Tokyo Tatemono Co., Ltd.

Sustainability Bond ISIN or Issuer Sustainability Bond Framework Name, if applicable: Sustainability Finance Framework

Independent External Review provider's name: Japan Credit Rating Agency Co., Ltd.

Completion date of this form: June 19, 2020

Publication date of review publication: June 19, 2020

Section 2. Review overview

SCOPE OF REVIEW

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

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use of Proceeds | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process for Project Evaluation and Selection |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Management of Proceeds | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reporting |

ROLE(S) OF INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL REVIEW PROVIDER

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Second Party Opinion | <input type="checkbox"/> Certification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Verification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scoring/Rating |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>please specify</i>): | |

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

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

Tokyo Tatemono Co., Ltd. (the "Company") is a comprehensive real estate company affiliated with the former Yasuda zaibatsu, which was founded by Zenjiro Yasuda in 1896. The main income drivers are the office building business, which leases office buildings in central Tokyo, and housing business, which develops condominiums and rental housing.

Tokyo Tatemono's long-term vision is "Becoming a Next-Generation Developer." In the midst of a rapidly changing external environments, the Company is striving to solve the issues for realizing a sustainable society while addressing social issues and growing as a company on a higher level. For the large-scale redevelopment projects in which the Tokyo Building participates as well as other projects in operation, the Company aims to improve the attractiveness of the area and to increase the value of the entire office building portfolio owned by the Company by incorporating a mechanism to solve social and environmental problems as "Community-building in Contribution to Solving Social Issues."

The subject to this evaluation is the sustainability finance framework established by the Company (the "Framework") in order to limit the funds raised by means such as bonds or loans to the use of proceeds that have social benefits and environmental improvement effects. JCR evaluates whether the Framework complies with the Green Bond Principles (2018 Edition), the Social Bond Principles (2018 Edition), the Sustainability Bond Guidelines (2018 Edition), the Green Loan Principles (2018 Edition), the Green Bond Guidelines (2020 Edition) and the Green Loan Guidelines and the Sustainability Link Loan Guidelines (2020 Edition). These principles are not binding in nature as they are voluntarily published principles or guidelines by the International Capital Markets Association (ICMA), the Loan Market Association (LMA) and the Asia-Pacific Loan Market Association (APLMA) and the Ministry of the Environment, respectively. However, JCR evaluates the Framework in reference to those principles and guidelines.

The Company intends to use the proceeds of sustainability finance to finance development, acquisition or refinancing of either basic infrastructure/essential services, socioeconomic improvement/empowerment, food safety or green buildings (5 stars or 4 stars in DBJ Green Building Certification, S-rank or A-rank in CASBEE-Construction (new construction), or 5 stars or 4 stars in BELS Certification). Under these criteria, it selects the following nine projects as the eligible projects under the Framework.

- Tokyo Station-Front Yaesu 1-Chome East Area Urban Redevelopment Project (Yaesu Project)
- Yaesu 1-Chome North Area Urban Redevelopment Project (Gofukubashi Project)
- Tokyo Square Garden
- Tokyo Tatemono Nihonbashi Building
- City Lab TOKYO
- TOKYO FOOD LAB
- xBridge-Tokyo/ xBridge-Tokyo Next
- Kitchen Studio SUIBA
- TOKYO IDEA EXCHANGE

JCR confirms that all the above nine projects have enough social and/or environmental improvement effects. Internal systems related to its sustainability activities are well established, and it ensures the project selection criteria and process appropriately, where the management and the department in charge with expertise in the sustainability space are systematically involved.. The framework prescribes the internal control system to manage the proceeds by the department in charge. JCR also confirms that the Company plans to disclose the clear social and environmental impact reporting appropriately. From the above considerations, JCR confirmed that the Company established a robust management and operation system and keep high transparency in the implementation of sustainability finance.

Based on the JCR Sustainability Finance Evaluation Methodology, JCR assigns "gs1 (F)" for the "Greenness and Social Beneficial Impacts Evaluation (Use of Proceeds)" and "m1 (F)" for "Management, Operation and Transparency Evaluation." Consequently, JCR assigns "SU1 (F)" for overall "JCR Sustainability Finance Framework Evaluation. The Framework is expected to meet the standards for the Green Bond Principles, the Social Bond Principles, the Sustainability Bond Guidelines and the requirements of the Ministry of the Environment's Green Bond Guidelines and the Green Loan and Sustainability Link Loan Guidelines.

<https://www.jcr.co.jp/en/greenfinance/>

Section 3. Detailed review

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

1. USE OF PROCEEDS

Overall comment on section (if applicable):

- Proceeds are used 100% for the projects, which are expected to derive high environmental improvement effects or social benefits.
- The issuer identifies environmental and social risks appropriately and takes necessary measures to avoid or mitigate them.

Use of proceeds categories as per GBP:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Renewable energy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy efficiency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pollution prevention and control | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmentally sustainable management of living natural resources and land use |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity conservation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clean transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable water and wastewater management | <input type="checkbox"/> Climate change adaptation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Eco-efficient and/or circular economy adapted products, production technologies and processes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Green buildings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown at issuance but currently expected to conform with GBP categories, or other eligible areas not yet stated in GBPs | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |

If applicable please specify the environmental taxonomy, if other than GBPs:

Use of proceeds categories as per SBP:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affordable basic infrastructure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to essential services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment generation / programs designed to prevent and/or alleviate unemployment stemming from socioeconomic crises |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food security and sustainable food systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Socioeconomic advancement and empowerment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown at issuance but currently expected to conform with SBP categories, or other eligible areas not yet stated in SBPs | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |

If applicable please specify the social taxonomy, if other than SBPs:

Target populations:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Living below the poverty line | <input type="checkbox"/> Excluded and/or marginalised populations and /or communities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> People with disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Migrants and /or displaced persons |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Undereducated | <input type="checkbox"/> Underserved, owing to a lack of quality access to essential goods and services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women and/or sexual and gender minorities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aging populations and vulnerable youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other vulnerable groups, including as a result of natural disasters |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):
Foreigner, Start-ups, local residents | |

2. PROCESS FOR PROJECT EVALUATION AND SELECTION

Overall comment on section (if applicable):

At the issuer, the roles of each organization are clearly divided, and the department and management team with specialized knowledge in the decision-making process are involved.
From this, JCR evaluates issuer's selection criteria and selection process as appropriate.

Evaluation and selection

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credentials on the issuer's social and green objectives | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Documented process to determine that projects fit within defined categories |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defined and transparent criteria for projects eligible for Sustainability Bond proceeds | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Documented process to identify and manage potential ESG risks associated with the project |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary criteria for project evaluation and selection publicly available | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |

Information on Responsibilities and Accountability

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation / Selection criteria subject to external advice or verification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-house assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): | |

3. MANAGEMENT OF PROCEEDS

Overall comment on section *(if applicable):*

Fund management is evaluated as appropriate, given that the funds procured are reliably appropriated to the target project, the funds procured are managed in an appropriate manner within the issuer, the internal control system is established, and there are no particular concerns regarding the operation of unallocated funds.

Tracking of proceeds:

- Sustainability Bond proceeds segregated or tracked by the issuer in an appropriate manner
- Disclosure of intended types of temporary investment instruments for unallocated proceeds
- Other *(please specify):*

Additional disclosure:

- Allocations to future investments only
- Allocations to both existing and future investments
- Allocation to individual disbursements
- Allocation to a portfolio of disbursements
- Disclosure of portfolio balance of unallocated proceeds
- Other *(please specify):*

4. REPORTING

Overall comment on section *(if applicable):*

a. Reporting on the Status of Appropriation of Funds

The use of proceeds under the Framework include new projects. As a result, proceeds from sustainability finance are to be disclosed on the website as to the appropriation of funds until they are fully appropriated. The issuer will also manage the proceeds from sustainability finance with cash or cash equivalents until the appropriation is completed.

If the project is no longer subject to the use of proceeds due to the sale or other reasons, the issuer uses the funds for alternative projects that satisfy the eligibility criteria. In this case, it is also assumed that it will be disclosed on the issuer's website. Based on this, it is judged that reporting on funding is appropriate.

b. Reporting on Environmental Improvement Effects and Social Benefits

The issuer plans to disclose the predetermined items as reporting on environmental improvement effects and social benefits.

Use of proceeds reporting:

- Project-by-project
- On a project portfolio basis
- Linkage to individual bond(s)
- Other *(please specify):*

Information reported:

- Allocated amounts
- Sustainability Bond financed share of total investment
- Other *(please specify):*

Frequency:

- Annual Semi-annual
 Other (please specify):

Impact reporting:

- Project-by-project On a project portfolio basis
 Linkage to individual bond(s) Other (please specify):

Frequency:

- Annual Semi-annual
 Other (please specify):

Information reported (expected or ex-post):

- GHG Emissions / Savings Energy Savings
 Decrease in water use Number of beneficiaries
 Target populations Other ESG indicators (please specify):
Acquired valid environmental certification

Means of Disclosure

- Information published in financial report Information published in sustainability report
 Information published in ad hoc documents Other (please specify):
Show on the website
 Reporting reviewed (if yes, please specify which parts of the reporting are subject to external review):

Where appropriate, please specify name and date of publication in the useful links section.

USEFUL LINKS (e.g. to review provider methodology or credentials, to issuer's documentation, etc.)

Tokyo Tatemono's website about sustainability:
<https://tatemono.com/csr/english/>

JCR's website about green finance evaluation methodology:
<https://www.jcr.co.jp/en/greenfinance/>

SPECIFY OTHER EXTERNAL REVIEWS AVAILABLE, IF APPROPRIATE

Type(s) of Review provided:

- Second Party Opinion Certification
 Verification Scoring/Rating
 Other (please specify):

Review provider(s): Japan Credit Rating Agency, Ltd.

Date of publication: June 19, 2020

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

1. Second Party Opinion: An institution with sustainability expertise that is independent from the issuer may provide a Second Party Opinion. The institution should be independent from the issuer's adviser for its Sustainability Bond framework, or appropriate procedures such as information barriers will have been implemented within the institution to ensure the independence of the Second Party Opinion.

It normally entails an assessment of the alignment with the Principles. In particular, it can include an assessment of the issuer's overarching objectives, strategy, policy, and/or processes relating to sustainability and an evaluation of the environmental and social features of the type of Projects intended for the Use of Proceeds.

2. Verification: An issuer can obtain independent verification against a designated set of criteria, typically pertaining to business processes and/or sustainability criteria. Verification may focus on alignment with internal or external standards or claims made by the issuer. Also, evaluation of the environmentally or socially sustainable features of underlying assets may be termed verification and may reference external criteria. Assurance or attestation regarding an issuer's internal tracking method for use of proceeds, allocation of funds from Sustainability Bond proceeds, statement of environmental or social impact or alignment of reporting with the Principles may also be termed verification.

3. Certification: An issuer can have its Sustainability Bond or associated Sustainability Bond framework or Use of Proceeds certified against a recognised external sustainability standard or label. A standard or label defines specific criteria, and alignment with such criteria is normally tested by qualified, accredited third parties, which may verify consistency with the certification criteria.

4. Green, Social and Sustainability Bond Scoring/Rating: An issuer can have its Sustainability Bond, associated Sustainability Bond framework or a key feature such as Use of Proceeds evaluated or assessed by qualified third parties, such as specialised research providers or rating agencies, according to an established scoring/rating methodology. The output may include a focus on environmental and/or social performance data, process relative to the Principles, or another benchmark, such as a 2-degree climate change scenario. Such scoring/rating is distinct from credit ratings, which may nonetheless reflect material sustainability risks.