Extraordinary Meeting of Shareholders

Tuesday 28 March 2023

Transcript produced by Global Lingo
London – 020 7870 7100
www.global-lingo.com

Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders

André Goedée: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to this extraordinary general meeting of shareholders of Sif Holding NV. Thank you for taking the time to attend. Every year again, it's a pleasure to personally meet our shareholders. My name is André Goedée, Chairman of Sif's Supervisory Board, and I will preside over this meeting. This meeting is attended by myself and the CEO, Fred van Beers, and the CFO, Ben Meijer, and the Secretary, Fons van Lith. With your permission, I will start this meeting.

I shall preside over this meeting in accordance with Article 26 of Sif Holding's statutes. I ask Fons to act as secretary of this meeting and to take minutes of everything discussed today and the decisions that will be taken during this meeting.

You are used to this meeting to be held in English but we've been told that today's entire audience is Dutch, so, in order to cater to you, we shall conduct it in Dutch, instead, and it's pleasant to be able to do this in our own language for a change. This needn't be argued about this time.

To ensure that this meeting is conducted in an orderly fashion, this meeting was announced on Sif Holding's website on 14th February 2023. Shareholders were invited to attend this meeting or to vote by proxy. I note that the convocation to this shareholders' meeting has been made in accordance with all legal and statutory requirements, and that the special shareholders' meeting is therefore authorised to make legally binding decisions. On the date of the convocation for this meeting, a total of 25,501,356 shares were outstanding; the same amount as today. All these shares are listed shares. 17,845,665 votes by proxy were cast via the ABN AMRO Securities Portal, which is the equivalent of 70% of the total outstanding share capital. Present or represented at this meeting are a total of 17,845,766 shares, including the shares present at this meeting, which is how many?

Fons van Lith: 301 (actually 101, FVL).

André Goedée: 301 (101). We shall report the number of votes cast for each item on the agenda, as we usually do, together with the number of votes for and against, as well as the number of abstentions.

For each agenda item, there is time for questions and answers, and after these Q&As, I shall report if the item has been adopted, if it concerns an item that must be voted on. To be clear: this meeting shall vote and decide on all agenda items, based on the agenda, and the explanation of the item that was part of the convocation for this meeting, which was announced on the company's website. These documents are deciding for the contents and scope of the resolution that is voted on. Votes are cast by raising your hand if you vote against, and we will note your name and the number of votes you represent.

This meeting shall be broadcast via audio webcast. An on-demand version of this webcast and a transcript of this meeting, as well as an English translation thereof, shall be made available on the company's website within 72 hours of the end of this meeting. We shall endeavour to place the minutes of this meeting on Sif's website within 4 weeks after today. The results of the votes on resolutions shall be communicated in a public statement immediately after this meeting is concluded and an announcement on the website of Sif Holding NV.

We will start with item 3 on the agenda, concerning an update of the strategic plans for the modification and expansion of Sif's production facilities, in order to facilitate larger and heavier foundations for offshore wind energy; the so-called Project P-11. I would like to invite Fred van Beers to present this project.

Fred van Beers: Thanks, André, I'll take it from here. I shall read this presentation to you, but there is a written version everyone can read later if they want. What's important here is that Sif is in a unique position when we look at the rest of the world and the market in which we operate. On the one hand, we see that there is a large political drive to accelerate the path towards renewable energy. Due to the climate, but also due to the geopolitical situation with regard to independence from Russia, which is an important reason for us to want to expand our production. This means that, if the challenge isn't met, we will no longer be able to operate in this market. On the other hand, the increasing size of the turbines that are used also necessitates larger foundations, which are so large that we are no longer capable of producing them in our current factories.

The second important point is that this increasing political drive and turbine size, the total demand isn't balanced with what manufacturers offer, meaning that manufacturers must ramp up their production capacity in order to meet those political goals. When you combine those two market drivers, together with our knowledge, expertise and market position, we decided to not only construct a new production facility but also to construct a facility that will make us the absolute market leader in this industry. This not only aligns with our green vision, but also with our ESG guidelines.

In the end, this will lead to our EBITDA levels will go up to more than €160 million per year – Ben will say more later – and a cash conversion of more than 90% leads us to expect to be able to recoup this investment in 3-4 years, which we plan to do, because this industry changes very quickly and is heavily subject to change. The realisation of these plans also strengthen our long-term position, allowing us to grow even more.

When we zoom in on that market, and look at the European, American and Asian markets, not including China, which is a closed market, and look at what is supplied each year, in 2021-2022, and what was installed this year, 2023, in offshore wind energy, what has to be realised this year and the expectations for the future, then we see massive growth, by a factor of 8.

Mr Dekker: When we're talking about the US, we often talk about all kinds of legal limitations, while there are often also possibilities. What is our position here? Are we talking licensing?

Fred van Beers: This is mainly about ambition. How that ambition is turned into reality is a story unto its own, about which I'll tell you more later.

Mr Dekker: Have you ever had such an adventure in America?

Fred van Beers: We did, and that lasted about 3 weeks before it was 'indefinitely postponed' – although it is currently under construction.

André Goedée: I would suggest that we first go through the presentation and that you write down or remember your questions for afterwards. Your involvement is appreciated, but I think it's better to wait with audience questions until Mr van Beers has finished, because there will undoubtedly be more questions.

Fred van Beers: Those ambitions, especially in light of the European market and the English market, which are now different markets, we can see that an enormous growth of that ambition is expected and has been announced. On the right, you'll see the Esberg Declaration, for the North Sea, which plays a major role, but also the American Inflation Reduction Act, which are both enormous drivers to achieve that growth.

Why do we see that monopile grow? On the left, you'll see a schematic representation of a monopile, installed into the seabed. The smallest image represents the current and smallest monopile, whose diameter varies from 8 metres at the top to 9 metres, a difference of 1 meter in the conical section. Based on the latest turbines available on the market, of 15-18 MW, increasing water depths and a greater variance of the seabed composition, the bottom diameter of that monopile will increase greatly. The top will not, that will stay between 8 and 9 metres because the top sections are built with those diameters, also in the case of those larger turbines, but in order to be able to create a sufficiently strong foundation for those larger depths and varying seabed compositions, the bottom diameter will become larger.

Looking at the image on the right, we can see that more than 80% will be larger than 9 metres, starting around 2025. So the volume of larger bottom diameters of monopiles is greatly increasing, currently, and the volume for those smaller diameters does not much or is even decreasing. That means that, in order to remain competitive, we'll have to adapt our production capacity in order to be able to produce those larger diameters.

Are we the only ones doing that? No. Luckily, I'd almost say, a number of competitors also do that. Moreover, more competitors are entering the market. That's a good sign, because it means that not only our analysis shows that the required number of monopiles and their diameters is growing, but that several companies think so and have decided to invest in production capacity.

On the right, you can see an index of companies we're currently watching who produce or will produce monopiles. The diagram's columns shows the total combined capacity of all those companies per year in their current state or for the near future. The red line here represents our ambition: the market demand.

As you can see, starting 2025-2026, the demand disproportionately increases compared to the supply. We approached this conservatively, meaning that we assumed that all new companies will be 100% successful in starting their production, and doing so on time.

Regarding our ambition, we assumed that a number of projects might be delayed and even when you add those two conservative approaches, we see a large discrepancy between demand and supply for the coming years, or at least until 2030. These production years will result in installed capacity at sea, two years later. Why do we think that these plans will allow us to realise an EBITDA of €160 million in 2026? A number of important, even fundamental elements are worth mentioning.

First of all, this will be the largest manufacturing facility. Volume will play a very important role – Ben will talk about this, too. We clearly see that, if you increase the volume, you still need only one CEO and CFO, but the cost/benefit balance changes completely.

Secondly, and this is represented by the block in the middle, at the bottom, is that we were able to garner incredibly strong support from large customers for this plan, to such a level that

they will finance, or help finance, it. Not only that, but they also actually committed by placing orders, and one client even entered into a long-term volume agreement, which reassures us that we will be able to use the production capacity of the new production facility, also in the longer term. The stability from the market and from our customers is an important factor in this plan.

We've been in this business for 20 years now, and have manufactured about 2,500 of these monopiles, but always by extrapolating and developing existing production capacity. This time, we wanted to make an analysis, based on our knowledge but also third parties' knowledge, which we started three years ago, in order to determine the best production method for monopiles with the dimensions we'll now need to manufacture. This internal and external expertise is the basis for the production process we'll now design.

Our half yearly numbers show that safety is very important. It always is, of course, but the increasing size of the products we'll now have to manufacture, results in greater risk of accidents, both due to natural causes and due to human error. Tolerances are shrinking, risks are increasing and we want to make certain that the foundations we'll start to manufacture are safe enough to be able to ensure safety for both man and environment.

The projects that sprout from our ambition benefit from a long and strong production pipeline that is ever increasing. The same is true for our customers, which makes us confident that we will be able to fully use this increased production capacity.

Lastly, and no less important, we were able to compose a strong financing package, together with our customers, with banks and with shareholders, for a good price, about which Ben will talk more in a moment, which also makes us confident that we will be able to bear the financial strain that this creates. Those customers are divided into 3 groups: the first two are our 'launching customers', who were the first ones to place orders for this manufacturing facility; the third group are the long-term agreement customers.

The first customer is Empire Wind, from the US. A 50/50 joint venture between Equinor and BP, who placed an order for a project that is ready to be launched, for 278 kt, and Empire Construction will participate in the financing for the sum of €50 million, in the form of an advance payment.

We have come to a similar agreement with Shell/Eneco, Ecowende, for a Dutch project, Dutch Coast West (Hollandse Kust West), lot 6 (Kavel 6): 70 kt, foundations, to be built for the Dutch coast, also with an advance payment of €50 million.

The third is the long-term agreement I mentioned earlier, with Equinor, who want to realise between 12 and 16 GW in the coming years, and who stated that a reliable supply chain is so important for them that they will enter into a long-term agreement with Sif which will, on the one hand, offer Equinor certain guarantees concerning timely delivery, if they order sufficiently early; and gives us a certain degree of commercial freedom to still be able to participate in other projects if Equinor doesn't commit early enough.

We think that this makes for a well-balanced agreement with, on the one hand, certainty for the customer, provided they commit early enough; and, on the other hand, commercial freedom for us, for market prices, so that we can also supply other customers, provided they order early enough.

We entered into this agreement with them in exchange for a €50 million preferred equity placement with Equinor as part of the financing of this project. About the competition, we will become Europe's absolute market leader, with a market share of 35%.

Who are our competitors and what does the market look like? Here, in dark orange, you can see the four companies that already manufacture monopiles. EEW is our main competitor, but Steelwind and Bladt have successfully been manufacturing monopiles since a few years now.

The companies in light orange, and the tons mentioned are companies who have started, or will soon start, construction of their manufacturing facilities, or who have recently started the production of monopiles in existing manufacturing facilities.

Here, we see European players – two in Spain, one in Germany, one in Denmark and one in the Netherlands. In the UK, there's SeAH, a Korean company, that is constructing a £400 million facility in Teeside, on the north coast of the UK.

Here, you see the companies outside of Europe. China is a large player, with Dajin. We know that Dajin scored projects for the European market and wants to build a new facility, so we certainly take them seriously and consider them in our listing.

Then there is the facility that EEW is constructing in the US, together with Orsted, and we know there's another possible start-up in Baltimore, for a facility for monopiles.

As mentioned before, even when we assume that all this planned production capacity is realised, we see a large discrepancy between supply and demand. Also, considering all this potential production capacity of our competitors, Sif will, by far, be the largest manufacturer of monopiles.

What makes Sif so competitive? What are our unique selling points?

I'll start with number 3: our relationship with our customers. Our relationship with our customers is very strong, and we are happy that Shell, Eneco, Equinor, BP and the like are committed to us and put their faith in us and our manufacturing facility and our capacity, and are taking part in this project; we're quite proud of that.

We do so in part because of the first point: because the 2,500 monopiles we have delivered, were always delivered on schedule. Delivery was never delayed. We always delivered the quality we promised – we even withheld piles of which we thought the quality was insufficient, in order to prevent any possible failure at sea, which is the last thing anyone wants to see happen.

We are the only ones who will be able to produce 4 monopiles per week. Why is that important? Because that will allow us to keep up with the speed of the installation ships, who are capable of installing an average of 4 monopiles per week.

That means we don't have to produce enough monopiles for the entire windmill park beforehand, which means that the installation can start much earlier in the production process, because we will be able to keep up with the installation speed. This means that projects can be realised quicker and that capital is tied up for a shorter period of time than if we could only produce one or two monopiles per week.

Our facility in the Maasvlakte area gives us a very strong strategic position because that's the only European port that is accessible 24/7 for ships with a large draft, because our ships, with a draft of 15 metres, are always able to dock and collect the monopiles.

With these ever increasing products, that's an enormous strategic advantage; not only from the point of view or port facilities, but also because Maasvlakte Rotterdam is located very close to any wind farm that is being built or will be built.

The last important point, that we have recognised and are investing in, is knowledge and engineering capacity. With KCI, which we acquired two years ago, we gained a lot of knowledge about the design of foundations, which allows us to optimise the production process of monopiles, to save on costs for the customer and makes the production process more efficient.

All this combined leads to higher barriers to entry, because it's not easy to get started in this market if you have to start right away with the production of 11 meter monopiles. We started with 3 meter monopiles and slowly grew towards 11 metres.

We have a track record that makes us the partner of choice for a lot of customers, which also led to those long-term agreements. We have a healthy order portfolio that allows us a look far into the future of the market. Our tenders, which we will discuss later, show a strong pipeline to fill our production capacity. When you look at ESG and the green footprint within the offshore wind sector, then this new facility is e-benchmark for everyone else.

I'll now give the floor to Ben Meijer, CEO, who will discuss the numbers with you. Ben, the floor is yours.

Ben Meijer: Fred, thanks. I'll start with a slide that illustrates what Fred already indicated: our business plan. For this investment, too, our target is to generate healthy returns for our shareholders.

This graph illustrates a number of things. First of all, our production capacity, which is currently at 220 kt. The new facility will increase this to 500 kt; more than double.

The second graph shows our contribution margin per tonne, meaning the sales prices minus your direct costs, namely, and mainly, the cost of steel and logistics. Not included are direct costs of personnel.

This graph shows – we can't show exact numbers in our business plan, but we can show that, based on the contracts we have and the tender discussions taking place at this very moment, the level of ambition, and what we think is a realistic contribution margin per tonne, is significantly higher than the current level.

Our current EBITDA is €42 million, but our ambition for 2026 and beyond is to get that up to at least €160 million. That increase, combined with a healthy cash conversion of more than 90%, and an investment payback of three to four years, should lead to attractive returns.

This graph shows where that increase in EBITDA will come from in a bit more detail. Currently, it's at €42 million. Our ambition is to increase that to at least €160 million; a difference of about €120 million.

This graph shows that, of that €120 million, about 35% will come from volume growth; 30% from a higher margin per tonne; and respectively 15% to 20% from cost savings, which I will clarify one by one.

The growth in volume. We'll construct a larger production facility. Fred already indicated that the market is huge, at this moment, so a larger production facility explains part of that larger EBITDA.

Higher margins per tonne. Important elements are, first of all, the launching order with launching customers. They reflect a certain price point that is significantly higher than the current price point. We're working hard on various tenders in advanced stages. Based on those tender discussions, you can make a reasonable estimation of the market and the realistic margin per tonne, and we see a balance between supply and demand.

For the coming years, we see that there is a higher demand for monopiles than the supply we predict, meaning attractive market conditions.

When we look at direct savings, basically the direct personnel costs per tonne, we see those direct personnel costs per tonne go down. The reason is that we will produce in a completely different way: more efficient, which will require less direct labour, because we will automate much more. The new factory will have an entirely different setup, with a higher capital investment of €328 million, but the result is a relatively low cost of labour.

The last point is savings on indirect costs. One example is needing only one CEO and CFO. When you look at Sif, the number of projects and the number of monopiles we'll produce with this new setup and new factory, will remain more or less the same; they'll just become much larger, in a much larger factory. But, in terms of supporting departments, such as commerce, finance, legal, IT, it will be about the same as for the old factory.

So we are planning, very selectively, to hire more people, but not at the same pace as our volume.

These are the 4 main drivers of our EBITDA growth.

Looking at the financing structure, this took a bit longer than we expected, but we are quite proud of the final result. And the most important thing for Sif is that that financing structure is fully committed; we know that the financing will be there.

We think we reached a relatively low cost structure, which also has to do with the balance, which is a mix of financing through launching customers, on the one hand: of the total of €328 million, €150 million comes from launching customers.

Another part comes from debt financing: – bank debt accounts for €81 million; €40 million is leasing: we'll lease certain equipment; €50 million comes from the rise issue, which we'll touch on later, and €7 million comes from own cash.

We're missing one last component. I said €150 million will come from launching customers, which is comprised of €100 million so-called 'advanced factory payments', which are cash flows that you would normally receive in 2025 or 2026, but will now receive in 2023. So in this case, the costs will precede the benefits. Through this construction, we will partially finance the costs with these advance payments. Customer financing accounts for €50 million, from Equinor, through a cum-pref mechanism – cumulative preference shares – which are linked to a long-term capacity reservation agreement, as Fred explained earlier.

All in all, we think to have struck a healthy balance and what was important for us, also concerning the new factory, was that customers participated financially. That shows

commitment, a buy-in. The worst thing that can happen is that you build a factory and then have no orders and no customers, but by partnering with two very large customers, you also commit them to you.

When you look at the total investment, of €328 million, and Sif's current market cap, which is around €300 million, you can see that the dilution of our current shareholders is relatively limited, with a rights issue of €50 million.

Lastly, we have had regular talks with Egeria, our largest shareholder, and they fully support our plans, and have made certain that our equity is fully committed.

Then risks. We started with this plan about 3 years ago. From day 1, we knew that this would be a massive investment for Sif and that there were risks we'd have to mitigate from day 1. The most important risk was delay of the construction, because certain projects have to be delivered and delays cost money. We took a number of measures to mitigate that risks as much as possible.

First, with a dedicated project team. This is such a large investment that Sif's existing team isn't capable of managing this, too; this requires dedicated resources. So we hired a number of people who have experience with large infrastructural projects whose only job is to execute this project. We built in buffers during the construction phase, but also for the first projects we'll have to deliver. We'll also have a very controlled ramp-up in the second half 2024, when we'll gradually start up production and expect to be running full speed around January 2025.

We budgeted €328 million and, of course, we do not want to go over that. Here, too, we took a number of measures: the design, which we also started with 2.5 – 3 years ago. There is a very detailed design of what we need to make this factory run, and which costs will be associated with that.

We fixed the majority of prices, in order to avoid surprises, and we've built in contingencies, so that that €328 million is a realistic budget.

Another risk is that your factory's capacity is not filled. For that, our contracts with our launching customers are very important. From the very start, it was clear to us that we should avoid FID and can't decide to invest without launching orders.

We already discussed supply / demand.

In the long-term, there's our agreement with Equinor, which gives us something of a long-term guarantee.

HR is also important: we'll need about 200 people for the factory in Rotterdam. We can get 80 from Roermond – temporary workers we won't need forever. We also have employees in Roermond that we'll always need, and part of our temporary employees, but we can transfer a part of those temporary employees to Rotterdam.

We have a detailed recruitment programme: various steps, contact with external agencies and other companies, in order to fill those 200 job positions in Rotterdam.

On a macro-economic level, there's first a certain political risk. What we see now, in contrast with a few years ago, is that there's full support, also, for offshore wind energy, of course, also under influence of the Russia/Ukraine-conflict, so we have that political support.

Another risk is inflation, so we need to have escalation mechanisms for the most important components. Looking at the most important for Sif, steel prices: we have 0% risk. If steel prices go up, our suppliers will need to pay more, and that cost is transferred to our final customers 100%.

Then the last slide: the key takeaways are these 4 points.

In summary, we can see that the market was already growing and will grow even more in the immediate future. This means attractive market conditions. This new factory will turn us into the absolute market leader. Our plans for expansion have been underway for years and well-prepared – technically, financially, the underlying business plan – so we're extremely confident.

Lastly, the returns: as discussed, we expect very attractive returns for our shareholders.

Questions and Answers

André Goedée: Then, now, I would like to invite our audience to ask questions. Who would like to go first?

Geert Koster (VEB): Thank you. My name is Geert Koster and I work for the Society of Shareholders, the VEB (Vereniging van Effectenbezitters). First, I'd like to congratulate you with the announcement of these plans. However, we do have a few critical questions, which is, of course, the role of the VEB, in name of the minority that is critical of this decision.

Initially, Sif thought that the financing need of the new factory would be between €130 million and €170 million for modifying the production capacity. How do you explain that the investment ended up being €328 million – so much higher than initially predicted?

I have a number of questions; if you agree, I'll ask five and then give you time to answer, or you could answer each of them after I've asked them.

Fred van Beers: Let me respond to that question: we never made any statement about €130-170 million.

Geert Koster: Correct: analysts and market experts talked about that.

Fred van Beers: I can't be held responsible for what they said. We were always clear about our expectations, namely that we wanted to be able to recoup our investment within 3 to 4 years, that we need sufficient support from our customers for that and that we need to take our time for plans of this magnitude. However, we will let the analysts themselves explain the numbers that they produce.

Geert Koster: I understand. I'm looking at an image that shows a trend of wind turbine becoming ever larger, which also explains the new, larger factory you plan to build, where you'll be able to build turbines with a diameter of up to 11 metres, as I understand it.

Fred van Beers: Foundations.

Geert Koster: Pardon?

Fred van Beers: The foundations, and they're 11.5 metres.

Geert Koster: I'm sorry, 'foundations', of '11.5' metres. The question – this is clearly about economy of scale, seeing wind turbines are becoming larger and larger. How much bigger will you be able to deliver? What is the maximum capacity of this factory?

Fred van Beers: There are 3 factors that determine how big a foundation must be: the size of the turbine, the water depth and the seabed conditions. These three determine the necessary size of the foundation. We know that this 11.5 metres can facilitate 20 MW turbines, provided the correct seabed and water depth. Take the North Sea. If we look at the American market, and the East Coast in particular, where the water depths vary greatly and the seabed conditions are not so good, we see that 11 or 11.5 metres only suffice for turbines of 12 or 13 MW.

That's why we paid so much attention to that future analysis, which showed that that range, of 9-11.5 metres, will accommodate 80% of the need, which, combined with that short recoup period, makes us confident.

Additionally, the factory is being built with the possibility of being able to grow towards even larger diametres, through buying additional equipment. Which diameter exactly, I can't say right now, and we first want to see if this new larger diameter will allow us to achieve the volumes we have committed to for the moment.

Geert Koster: The intricate financing structure that you constructed was already discussed by the CFO, just now, which is an accomplishment, for which I want to compliment you. However, we do have a few questions about that. The share capital of that is relatively modest, at €50 million that will be achieved through regular emission, not counting preferential shares.

Isn't it risky to finance this expansion with so little own capital?

Ben Meijer: Please allow me to respond. First of all, our own capital is €100 million, so that's €50 million through the emission of shares, and €50 million through the cum-prefs with Equinor. Those cum-prefs are also own capital, and we think that this makes the total investment less risky, because you have a strategic partner, a strategic customer, who is financially tied to you for a longer term, and add to that the capacity agreement. So the total equity is €100 million.

If you then look at the EBITDA forecast and the amount of foreign capital, we think that this is a perfectly balanced solution.

So looking at the sum of the parts: €100 million in equity, debt, leasing and advance factory payments, but also the EBITDA forecast for the coming years, we think that we struck a very good balance.

Geert Koster: The reason I asked is because the project was accelerated because Invest-NL joined, while you could have chosen to turn to your shareholders. Did you think that that wasn't wise, or…?

Ben Meijer: If you look at the amount of financing through term loan capital and the conditions we negotiated, such as a debt financing with a margin of 200 base points, which we think is a relatively solid financing, and good for the shareholders, we, again, think that this is a solid solution for all parties involved.

Geert Koster: One of our concerns is that the parties that paid up front got an exceptionally good deal, which makes us wonder how you will ensure that the interests of shareholders on the one hand; and the other credit providers, on the other hand, might possibly align themselves. How can you ensure that? For instance, I find it difficult to estimate if the fees for the credit capital are competitive, or too high.

Ben Meijer: When you look at that term loan capital, we pay EURIBOR plus 200 base points, so those are very fair conditions. That's also the feedback we receive from other market parties with whom we spoke: they also agreed that this is a sound financing structure, cost-wise.

As for your first question concerning smaller shareholders, that was a very important consideration for us. The total share emission might be relatively limited, at just €50 million, but we really wanted a rights issue, in order to give smaller, private shareholders the possibility to also participate, and at the same conditions as larger shareholders.

If, for instance, we had chosen an accelerated book building structure, we'd automatically need to look at larger parties, which wouldn't give smaller, private shareholders a chance. We chose this structure exactly so that smaller shareholders could also participate.

Geert Koster: Thank you. I have a few more questions, one of which is about the customers who also participated in the project. We just heard that the steel prices will be passed through to the end customer, so they don't get a particular advantage there. What, then, was the advantage for these parties, that made them decide to participate, and is it possible that these parties will eventually decline to purchase these monopiles?

Fred van Beers: Those are two questions. The first is basically answered by that graph we showed earlier, that showed a discrepancy between supply and demand. These parties wanted to ensure that we would be able to meet their demand and they looked at us because we already proved to them that we can meet their demand.

Secondly, about a possibility of cancellation or delay of the projects, that is a possibility, and we've had the misfortune, in the past, to experience the effects of that on our company.

That's why we agreed that if this happens, this will result in cancellation or delay fees, which can go up to the total amount of the order, meaning they'd pay for the lack of orders we'd experience.

This does two things: it give us the guarantee that we don't have to bear the costs ourselves and not use our capacity; and it gives us the confidence that the chances that projects are delayed or cancelled, is much smaller.

Geert Koster: Thank you. I'll continue with my next question. You mentioned an EBITDA of more than €160 million in 2026, which sounds great. However, EBITDA is not the same as profit or free cash flow. Can you elaborate? You have a cash conversion of 90% of the EBITDA, which would mean that 10% of the EBITDA is left for investments. Is that realistic, or do you expect that further investments will be necessary?

Ben Meijer: No, we think that, once the new facility is finished, and certainly for the years immediately after, also for the payback, 10% of the EBITDA should suffice for the maintenance capex.

Geert Koster: Okay, so you don't expect that additional investments will be needed?

Ben Meijer: No, we do not. Unless the need develops for even larger diameters, which would be a separate investment plan, but we do not expect this for the coming years.

Geert Koster: What will be the interest fees in 2026? Clearly, Sif will try to repay this debt from its free cash flow, but how realistic is that expectation?

Ben Meijer: We do have to be careful with that, but looking at the current business plan, and the jump in EBITDA, also in 2025-2026, and at the cash conversion, then we'll have a significant amount of cash to spare which will, on the one hand, be more than enough for paying regular interest rates, but also to pay back this debt relatively quickly.

Your first question was what the interest fees are. When you calculate that the total debt is €81 million, and then EURIBOR plus 200 base points, it's pretty easy to calculate your interest fees on your bank debt.

Geert Koster: That's clear.

You talked about personnel – you mentioned that there are a lot of job openings in the port of Rotterdam, so trying to find 200 people there is a fairly ambitious plan. You also mentioned that you've partnered with various organisations to this end, but what's the timeline for those plans?

Fred van Beers: We'll start this quarter. The first searches will start this quarter, and that includes training: we've already invested in new training and simulation equipment, which we'll first test and use in Roermond, and we'll gradually fill those 200 job openings.

We'll also use the knowledge of many of our people in Roermond, many of which indicated that they were prepared to travel to our Maas site for a limited period of time, in order to help start it up, so there is a lot of interest, relatively, and we will kick this off very soon.

Geert Koster: And that should be finished around 2025?

Fred van Beers: No, in the beginning of 2024. That's when we want to start our tests, which gives us a little over half a year.

Geert Koster: That's clear. My next question. Dividends will be passed on, now, which I've understood to have been one of the requirements of the financiers. Could you give an estimation of the conditions under which dividend payments might be resumed and how high those might be, in that case?

Ben Meijer: At the moment, that is undefined. At least not during the construction period, until 2024. Theoretically, the earliest date that dividend payments could be resumed is 2025, but we'll have to look at our actual cash position at that moment and if dividend payments are reasonable and, if so, how much. In any case, that's the earliest possible moment in theory. So in 2025, on book year 2024, that would be the earliest theoretical possibility.

Geert Koster: Okay, thank you. Sif's market capitalisation is currently €300 million, which seems low, considering the EBITDA outlook of €160 million. The share price doesn't seem to react to these plans. What feedback did you get from investors, and why do you think that the market doesn't give Sif a higher valuation?

André Goedée: You'll have to ask the investors for their reasons. I don't know how to answer that question.

Geert Koster: That's an answer, too. Sorry for going on but I have another question. Nitrogen is a very current topic, which also played a role in one of your recent press statements. As far as I'm aware, you don't have that permit yet.

Fred van Beers: We're a PAS-reporter. Do you know what that means?

Geert Koster: No.

Fred van Beers: Okay. Well, that means that, when the Maasvlakte was created, we were not yet subject to permits with regard to environmental acts concerning nitrogen. We were only able to register as PAS-reporter (*Programmatische Aanpak Stikstof*), which was the applicable legal norm at the time.

However, at that moment, it was not yet possible to file for any type of permit. A court rejected this PAS-structure in 2019. That's why those 3,500 farmers, who are subject to that PAS reporting, among which 500 industrial companies, of which Sif is one, are now tolerated to continue to function, and the government committed to legalising all those PAS-reporters.

That should be done somewhere in the course of 2025. We're part of that programme, but, the Port of Rotterdam has agreed to make their nitrogen depositing surplus available for Sif, and the province of South Holland has agreed to reserve that surplus for Sif, so that it can't be assigned to another company, and, in that way, provide SIF with an environmental permit via an accelerated path.

Our goal is to also file that request in the coming weeks.

Geert Koster: That's good news, thank you.

Fred van Beers: And to comment on the other necessary permits: the Environmental Act permit has been irrevocably granted and we're waiting for the construction permit to be granted irrevocably.

Geert Koster: Thank you, that's very good news. Let me see if I have more questions.

My last question is, two board members will soon step down at the yearly meeting. Will any of their replacements come from the financiers of the project, such as Invest-NL, or will you look for replacements elsewhere?

André Goedée: I'll leave it to the CEO to comment on that.

Fred van Beers: We will comment on that during that meeting.

Geert Koster: But in order to appease any possible uncertainty, they won't be coming from the financiers?

Fred van Beers: Not as far as we remember at this moment, no.

Geert Koster: Then I have no further questions, thank you for your time.

Fred van Beers: You are an audience member; do you have any questions?

Mr Dekker: I have some, if that's okay.

Fred van Beers: Of course.

Mr Dekker: My name is Dekker, for the record. I can be a bit scatter-brained, so reign me in, if necessary. The first thing I wonder about, because I was present at the introduction but not afterwards... There was Roermond, which was an interesting location but with very limited draft, as we became painfully aware in recent years, and then the location in West Rotterdam was added, the Maasvlakte. If you now look at Roermond, then how do you see that positioning when we have Maasvlakte 2 now underway? And I would like to ask another question about the Maasvlakte later.

Fred van Beers: Good question. For us, Roermond is an essential part in the supply chain for the Maasvlakte. We will continue to manufacture the transition pieces here, the top parts, and in the same diameter range, as far as we can foresee, in the coming years, decades, possibly, which can perfectly be manufactured here, in Roermond.

The top parts, as I explained earlier, of the new monopiles, in the range of 8-9 metres in diameter, can also be continued to be produced here, so that will continue.

Mr Dekker: So there's enough coverage here? There is no need to start to manufacture other parts here in order to fill production capacity?

Fred van Beers: No. Additionally, the energy crisis has caused a sort of resurgence of oil and gas activities, mainly gas, due to which we received a number of orders for the coming years.

Mr Dekker: I vaguely recollect the layout of the first Maasvlakte plant and my first critical question, which you don't necessarily need to answer, is if that layout will mean you will have to stop or reduce activities there?

Fred van Beers: The video, which is available on the website, shows an animation that shows this very clearly, but the answer is no. No mistakes were made there. Moreover, the decision to go to the Maasvlakte is one of the reasons SIF is still here.

Mr Dekker: I wondered, because this expansion seems to have become necessary very quickly, but the same location still offers enough adjacent space?

Fred van Beers: Yes. This new facility will be built next to the existing one, which is why the disruption of the current production process will be minimal.

Mr Dekker: So no part will have to be moved elsewhere in order to accommodate new or other equipment?

Fred van Beers: No.

Mr Dekker: One of the things that were unclear to me – perhaps strange, but I am a layman – is that those things are not only becoming thicker, but also a lot longer, higher.

Fred van Beers: Sooner thicker than longer, but still longer, but –

Mr Dekker: But if they have to be moved to deeper waters, then –

Fred van Beers: The production hall will need to be made longer, but I would really like to invite you to watch the video on our website, which explains this in great detail.

Mr Dekker: If I remember correctly from way back when, a problem for SIF was that the orders for windmill farms came in much less regularly than was reasonable to expect, six, seven years ago, in part due to government policies, subsidy policies and because the parties that supply electricity also have to be able to afford building completely new wind farms, although Shell's conversion certainly helped. Do you expect more regularity of such orders, at least for the coming three to four years?

Fred van Beers: That's a very important question, and that's why we chose the partners for this project: Equinor, Shell, Eneco, particularly, and BP.

That's why we chose to only commit if there are clear agreements about delays and cancellations, in which cases customers will pay substantial penalties.

Aside from that, what we see with new orders is that customers are more prepared to tune their projects to our production capacity, which makes it easier for us to fully utilise our production capacity and avoid downtime.

Mr Dekker: I have a few questions about the construction in the Maasvlakte area. I always wonder who will build that – I hope not Ballast Nedam – but is everything clearly arranged with the builder or builders?

Fred van Beers: Those conversations will take place this and the coming weeks, and we expect to sign those contracts by the end of the week regarding the construction company and steel supplier, electrician – who also plays an important role. And once those contracts have been signed, we can announce that information.

Mr Dekker: Given the current times, in which the demand for electricity has gone up across the board, I feel it's fair to ask if you have a big enough supply for not only the existing factory, but especially also for the new future facility.

Fred van Beers: At least for the beginning, yes, but we will need more capacity, and our suppliers have already committed to that.

Mr Dekker: When we look at the draft, there isn't a problem, but the market concerning installation vessels is very dynamic. Luckily, we have shipping experts right here, but those ships will also have to be built in time, and not as contracts at very different locations in the world at much higher prices, which would create its own problem.

Is there any informal contact with those parties, such as Van Oord or the Belgians?

Fred van Beers: There certainly is.

Mr Dekker: Because that should be well-coordinated, because if they start causing problems, such as delivering sub-optimal loading installations, then –

Fred van Beers: A chain is only as strong as its weakest link, and that also applies in this sector. So yes, we closely monitor the development of the construction of new installation vessels, as well as monitoring the ever increasing turbine sizes.

Mr Dekker: If I recall, you said that the market should pause to think when we're going towards 20 MW and more, and ask itself if that's even useful. As far as I know – although I'm no expert in this field – is that companies such as General Electric are now trailing turbines towards 20 MW –

Fred van Beers: They're starting production of 18 MW turbines – they announced that – but we're ready for 15-18 MW. And we know that installation vessels have basically the same diameter restrictions as we do with our factory, so we tuned that, you could say, towards installation vessels.

Mr Dekker: I've understood that Siemens Gamesa, the Spanish, have argued with General Electric about designs, or did I misunderstand?

Fred van Beers: Siemens started a court case in America, and won that case –

Mr Dekker: Yes, I was a bit worried that that might cause problems in the supply chain for –

Fred van Beers: They were allowed to build the projects they had already sold, so...

Mr Dekker: Do you expect that that will cause supply chain problems?

Fred van Beers: No, the weak link in the chain in the industry is the foundations and installation vessels, followed by cables, but not the turbines. Turbine builders will sooner worry about the number of foundations.

Mr Dekker: So you don't expect that to become a bottleneck; maybe the cables, but –

Fred van Beers: Not the turbines – at most, the vessels or foundations, those are the more critical links.

Mr Dekker: And the cables are no problem? I know that companies such as Twentsche Kabel are producing the shorter cables, but we'll now need longer cables, such as in Denmark or France...

Fred van Beers: For the moment, there are no bottlenecks regarding cables – not for our plans, at least.

André Goedée: But your question is very much justified, and we did look into this for a number of years, and one of the most important phases was the elaboration of the entire business and marketing plans. On the one hand, the graphs you saw earlier showed the market trends concerning supply and demand of monopiles, but one thing we studied in detail was all the facets of our supply chain.

You have a very good point: if we have factories and another part of our supply chain is plagued by a bottleneck, that new factory will be useless. So, we really considered the various aspects you rightfully asked about just now.

Mr Dekker: There's a lot you can't control in this sector, that's why I did worry now and then about patents, for instance, that came up quite suddenly now and then.

I already asked a question about those markets, but what is the actual situation in the US?

If you have enough work anyway, you could also license your production instead of doing it yourself, which, I think, also caused a bit of a stir-up in the Middle East... Could you comment on the dilemma of producing it yourself or outsourcing it, perhaps provide technological support and make some money from licensing?

Fred van Beers: That choice –

Mr Dekker: I ask from a geographical point of view, because the Middle East, with those transport costs, will make things difficult – which I can also imagine for the US.

Fred van Beers: The US is already a bit closer, although that's relative, of course. No, with regard to Asia; we made a clear choice to enter into a licensing agreement with GS Entec, who have experience with steel rolling and powder welding but not the production of monopiles.

We are now helping them, with our knowledge and experience, to set up their own production facilities for the Asian market. We also did this because of A) the distance; B) cultural differences; and C) the fact that we have too few personnel and knowledge owners to be able to provide support in both Europe, where the market is growing rapidly, and in Asia. We had to choose and made a clear choice for Europe, where we need to maintain or even expand our position. And from Europe, all parts will be supplied to America for the coming 4 to 5 years.

America is working hard at building its own supply chain, but that's not a given and quite difficult. Until that time, we can supply them from Europe, but we certainly think twice about which projects we can supply.

We have experience with one project, which we referred to earlier, and we have also discussed this with Equinor, to evaluate how solid that Empire project really is.

Aside from that, we're carrying out a study – for which we're taking our time and can easily take another half year to a year before we'll draw conclusions from that study – to see how that Act that Biden is implementing will work out; what the American rules are or will be; what the possibilities will be; who will be the best partner for us; and all that, to be able to take the best possible decision concerning whether or not we'll enter the American market. And, if so, how, when and with whom.

Mr Dekker: And you'll have to be on your toes when it comes to import tariffs and such, as we saw with China, to name an example.

Fred van Beers: Exactly.

Mr Dekker: What I also wondered about, in light of this: when we look at those markets, you primarily concentrate on Europe, but I wonder, in a licensing deal, you depend on third parties to supply high quality steel, certainly for structures in salt water. Can that steel quality be controlled and are there high quality suppliers?

And a connected question. Long ago, there was a tight partnership with a Belgian company, who didn't really deserve its position and reputation, so I wondered –

Fred van Beers: Smulders, yes.

Mr Dekker: Yes, Smulders. So I wondered, does that relationship still exist, or has it changed, and are there any clear agreements with them, and are they involved in the Maasvlakte?

Fred van Beers: Those are a lot of questions.

Mr Dekker: I mean logistically.

Fred van Beers: Logistically? No, we still manufacture transition pieces for Smulders and Smulders finalises them. They're shipped from here to there over the rivers, to Hoboken.

Mr Dekker: From Roermond to Antwerp?

Fred van Beers: Correct. The finished product then comes back to the Maasvlakte, where it's stored and collected by the installer, together with the monopile.

Mr Dekker: So those pieces travel from Roermond to Antwerp to the Maasvlakte?

Fred van Beers: That is correct. It's like a triangle. And that works great, to great mutual satisfaction. They're making good money. They also learned their lessons.

Ben Meijer: It might be good to mention that they've been acquired by a large French company and thus have a very strong mother (company), nowadays.

Mr Dekker: Which company?

Ben Meijer: Eiffage. They're now part of Eiffage. So they're now part of a very strong market player.

Fred van Beers: The second point was... What was the second point?

Ben Meijer: Steel.

Fred van Beers: Right. We have a long-term agreement with Dillinger Hütte, from Germany, who are specialised in supplying steel for monopiles, with whom we've worked for decades, because the quality tolerances we've agreed to with Dillinger are an important part of the quality and reliability of our products. So we take great care to maintain that relationship.

However, the new factory will enable us to accept other suppliers, too, which makes us less dependent on Dillinger, although Dillinger is still our preferred supplier.

Mr Dekker: Another loosely related question, but important nonetheless: if I'm not mistaken, you mentioned accidents in your press release. We're talking about a part of the country where, to put it bluntly, people are a bit rough around the edges and it might be challenging to have them properly follow safety regulations. How do you tackle that issue? Because that's something that is a very real concern.

Fred van Beers: Indeed, that is important, and a matter of concern. Especially in Roermond, we have to make products in a production hall that hasn't been expanded in 15, 20 years, meaning bigger risks, more accidents.

Secondly, new employees clearly have less experience and are less skilled than a few years ago. That means we have to invest heavily in pre-work training, entry exams. We have decided to limit ourselves to 3 languages – people have to speak English, German or Dutch – in order to avoid misunderstandings. And we have invested a lot of energy in toolboxes, PPE, safety features, safety of the production lines, in order to continuously focus on safety. But that is indeed a perpetual process, that we have to keep discussing and focus on every single day. We have to carry out root cause analyses if there is an accident, and because the accidents are often fairly simple, if you will, even though every accident, simple or not, is one too many and can easily be fatal, with these sizes and weights.

Mr Dekker: Especially in the Maasvlakte, that needs to be given extra attention because A) there are a lot of people there; and B) that's a very different culture than –

Fred van Beers: It's more here. At the Maasvlakte, we indeed have a lot of – we thought about the size and design of the factory, the choice of machines and where they are placed, and we explicitly thought about safety. For instance, the plates are machined at floor height, and not on elevated tables, so that heavy plates can't fall on top of people, so that –

Mr Dekker: So that it doesn't –

Fred Beers: Exactly. So we also looked at what the zones are where nobody needs to go – and nobody will go there. Steel is transported from storage to factory by automated vehicles, completely segregated from walk paths – everything to minimise risk.

Mr Dekker: And the machines that you need there, are those existing machines, or will you need machines that are still being developed, or machines that you already know and can already operate? Because prototypes, for instance, bring additional risk with them in the initial phase of learning how to properly operate them.

Fred van Beers: It's existing technology, but with a size and configuration that is unique for Sif. The manufacturer has already created this machinery for other industries, but in a slightly different configuration, in order to meet our demands.

Mr Dekker: So the manufacturer doesn't pose a risk, except for, perhaps, their delivery term?

Fred van Beers: We keep a very close eye on that. As we stated earlier, we started doing that three years ago.

André Goedée: Was that your last question?

Mr Dekker: Yes it was, but I wanted to thank the board for the very thorough handling of the, for Sif, rather sizeable project. Of course, there are also some risks involved, and I wish you success in navigating those.

André Goedée: Thank you, but we're not quite there yet, because this was only the informative part of this meeting, and we'll now go ahead with the formal part of it, because in order to facilitate the financing plan, we put a number of decisions in front of the shareholders to vote on.

One of these is the proposed modification of the articles of association of the company, according to agenda item 4.

This is a voting item. It is proposed to amend the Articles of Association of the Company to introduce preference shares, which are part of the package of equity funding options agreed to finance the P-11 Project. The proposed amendments are set out in more detail in the convocation materials.

A verbatim text of the amendments in Dutch and English is also part of the convocation materials. The proposal includes the authorisation to each member of the Executive Board and each (deputy) civil law notary and notarial assistant of Allen & Overy LLP to have the notarial deed that effects the amendment executed.

Do you or the VEB have any questions about this?

None.

If there are no further questions, I suggest we start the voting procedure with respect to the proposed amendment.

Voting will take place by acclamation. Again, if you want to vote against this agenda item or abstain from voting, please raise your hand, and we will record your name and the number of votes you represent.

We have the result of the vote for this agenda item, which is as follows: the number of yays via the portal is 17,842,159 and the number of nays is 136 and there are 3,370 abstentions. Including abstentions, the total number of votes cast via the portal was 17,842,295, which is 100%.

I establish that voting item 4 has been adopted by the meeting.

If there are no other questions, we will proceed to agenda item 5, concerning the designation of the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to issue Ordinary Shares and exclude pre-emption rights for purposes of the P-11 Project.

This is a voting item. It is proposed to designate the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to issue Ordinary Shares and/or to grant rights to subscribe for Ordinary Shares, and to exclude pre-emption rights for a placement or issuance of (rights to) Ordinary Shares in the capital of the Company to existing shareholders and third-party investors in the maximum amount of €50 million, and with a subscription price of €11.50 per share, in such allocation as the Executive Board may deem appropriate, within the limits of the designation.

Are there any questions? None?

If there are no further questions, I suggest we start the voting procedure with respect to the proposed designation. Voting will take place by acclamation. If you want to vote against this agenda item or abstain from voting, please raise your hand and we'll note your name and the number of votes you represent.

We have the result of the vote for this agenda item, which is as follows: the number of yays via the portal is 17,842,160 and the number of nays is 1,135 and there are 2,370 abstentions. Including abstentions, the total number of votes cast via the portal was 17,843,295, which is 100% of the votes cast.

I establish that voting item 5 has been adopted by the meeting

We will proceed to agenda items 6 A, B and C, all of which must be voted on, concerning the authorisations with regard to the preference shares. 6A relates to the designation of the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to issue Preference Shares.

It is proposed to designate the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to issue a total of 50,000 Preference Shares in the capital of the Company, at a subscription price of €1,000 per share.

Are there any questions?

No questions.

If there are no further questions, I propose that we start the voting procedure with regard to the proposed designation.

The vote will take place by acclamation. Again, if you want to vote against this proposal, or want to abstain from voting, then please raise your hand and we'll note your name and the number of votes you represent.

We have the result of the vote for this agenda item, which is as follows: the number of yays via the portal is 17,842,159 and the number of nays is 1,136 and there are 2,370 abstentions. Including abstentions, the total number of votes cast via the portal was 17,843,295, which is 100% of the votes cast.

I establish that voting item 6A has been adopted by the meeting.

Agenda item 6B concerns the designation of the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to repurchase Preference Shares. The Company has reserved the contractual right to repurchase the Preference Shares under certain conditions. Under mandatory Dutch law, the repurchase can only be made if the general meeting has authorised the Executive Board to repurchase the shares. It is proposed to designate the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to repurchase Preference Shares.

Are there any questions? No questions? Go ahead.

Mr Dekker: If I recall correctly, although I'm no longer current on the matter, being retired, this right can only be granted for a limited period of time, and this doesn't seem desirable, unless there is a problem with the project itself. Is there a reason that you now formally make this request?

André Goedée: I'm looking at Ben.

Ben Meijer: That's a matter of flexibility. As you said, that purchase will not take place the coming years. That would become desirable, at the earliest, in January 2025, at which moment we'll look at the then current circumstances: is it a good time to proceed with this purchase, and do the means of the company allow it?

By asking this authorisation now, we will have the flexibility to act immediately if that becomes necessary.

Mr Dekker: So if there's an interested bidding party, you could, outside of these preferential shares, come to an agreement? That is purely theoretical, of course, but that's something that could drive such a decision?

André Goedée: Not necessarily. It could also be a situation in which we, as a company, have the resources, and the cumulative preferred shares – it's a coupon of 5% that can increase to 8%, so that, if you have the resources, you can decide that the time is right to take out the shares.

Ben Meijer: And be able to act quickly.

Mr Dekker: In my philosophy, taking that preferential share package, Equinor will be more or less forced to place follow-up orders, for their own benefit. If those prefs are not on the table anymore, that could damage the relationship with that customer, but it is not desirable yet, under normal circumstances. Thank you.

André Goedée: Was that clear? Was that your last question concerning this agenda item?

If there are no further questions, I propose that we start the voting procedure with regard to the proposed designation.

Voting will take place by acclamation. If you want to vote against this agenda item or abstain from voting, please raise your hand.

The number of yays via the portal is 17,843,059 and the number of nays is 136 and there are 2,470 abstentions. Including abstentions, the total number of votes cast via the portal was 17,843,195.

I establish that voting item 6B has been adopted by the meeting.

Agenda item 6C concerns the designation of the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to grant rights to subscribe for Ordinary Shares and exclude pre-emption rights for purposes of conversion of Preference Shares.

The Preference Shares may be converted into Ordinary Shares by resolution of the Executive Board that is approved by the Supervisory Board. Technically, this is achieved by means of a right to subscribe for Ordinary Shares which is exercisable on the condition that simultaneous

to the issuance of Ordinary Shares a holder of Preference Shares transfers the Preference Shares that they intend to convert to the Company for no consideration.

It is proposed to designate the Executive Board as the corporate body authorised to grant rights to subscribe for Ordinary Shares to holders or future holders of Preference Shares.

Are there any questions?

Geert Koster: Yes. I understand that these Preference Shares will go to Equinor, but if this item is voted on, the Executive Board could decide that the Preference Shares have to be converted into Ordinary Shares, which could be advantageous because much less interest would have to be paid. Have I misunderstood, or..?

Ben Meijer: That possibility would exist. The agreement with Equinor is that, starting January 2025, as I said before, we will have the possibility to take out those Preference Shares and, starting July 2028, Equinor will have the possibility to convert their shares to Ordinary Shares.

So there's a period of 3.5 years, in between, during which both parties have the possibility to take out these shares, before they have the right to convert their Preference Shares into Ordinary Shares.

André Goedée: Any other questions? None?

If there are no further questions, I suggest we start the voting procedure with respect to the proposed amendment. Voting will take place by acclamation. If you want to vote against this agenda item or abstain from voting, please raise your hand.

We have the result of the vote for this agenda item, which is as follows: the number of yays via the portal is 17,842,059 and the number of nays is 1,136 and there are 2,470 abstentions. Including abstentions, the total number of votes cast via the portal was 17,843,195, which is 100% of the votes cast.

I establish that voting item 6C has been adopted by the meeting.

This brings us to the end of this meeting. I would like to give you the opportunity to ask whichever question you still have and have not yet been able to get an answer to. I would now like to offer you the possibility to ask your last questions to the board, or to me, while I'm still here. No questions? All right.

If there are no further questions, I would like to thank you for your attendance and close this meeting. Thank you for your dedication – I don't think it's exaggerated to call it that, because you have had to come from far. And I'm impressed by the questions that were asked today, because it shows that you understand very well what we are doing, and it is important to know that you indeed support our plans.

I hope to see you again on 12 May, at our General Shareholder Meeting. I wish you a safe trip back home and hereby close this meeting. Thank you.