

Declaration of Compliance 2021
with the German Corporate Governance Code Pursuant to
Section 161 Paragraph 1 of the German Stock Corporation Act (AktG)

.....

The Executive Board and the Supervisory Board of Epigenomics AG hereby declare that, since the last declaration of compliance in October 2020, the recommendations of the German Government Commission on the German Corporate Governance Code as amended on December 16, 2019 (hereinafter also "Code") have been complied with, with the exceptions set forth below:

Recommendation A.2 sentence 2 of the Code

The company does not have a separate system that employees can use to report, in a protected manner, suspected breaches of the law within the company. Owing to its size and organization, the company does not believe that it is necessary to implement such a system. Accordingly, the company deviated from the recommendation pursuant to Section A.2 sentence 2 half-sentence 1 of the Code.

Recommendations B.1, B. 5, C. 1 and C. 2 of the Code

In the past, when filling the positions in its bodies, the Executive Board and the Supervisory Board considered the company-specific situation, and also made allowances for potential conflicts of interest as well as the international activities of the company through an appropriate diversity of their members as well as the appointment of an adequate number of independent Supervisory Board members. Furthermore, the Supervisory Board has set a standard limit for the length of membership of the Supervisory Board as well as a competence profile for the entire body. In deviation from the recommendations B.5 and C.2 of the Code, we however consider the commitment to institute special age limits for members of the Executive Board and the Supervisory Board as an inadequate limitation of the voting rights of our shareholders. Accordingly, contrary to recommendations B.5 and C.2 of the Code, no such age limits are stated in the corporate governance declaration. In addition, we are convinced that sweeping requirements for the composition of the Executive Board as requested in B.1 of the Code, constrain the Supervisory Board inadequately in its selection of suitable members of the Executive Board. The same applies to blanket requirements for the composition of the Supervisory Board, as required by recommendation C.1 sentences 1 and 2 of the Code. We strive to achieve an appropriate diversity in the Executive Board and the Supervisory Board and to ensure that an adequate number of independent Supervisory Board members is elected. However, it is ultimately in the corporate interest to appoint the most suitable male or female candidates. Furthermore, the Supervisory Board has defined gender diversity objectives for the proportion of women in both the Executive Board and the Supervisory Board in accordance with Section 111 paragraph 5 of the Stock Corporation Act. We therefore believe that (additional) sweeping requirements constitute an inadequate limitation of the individual selection of suitable male and female candidates for the Executive Board or the Supervisory Board. Furthermore, a target requirement regarding the composition of the Supervisory Board also inadequately impairs our shareholders' right to elect the Supervisory Board members. Accordingly, we did not and will not comply with these recommendations of the Code. Finally, in the absence of concrete targets for the composition of the Supervisory Board, and contrary to recommendation C.1 sentence 4 of the Code, the status of the implementation of such targets is not published in the corporate governance statement.

Recommendations D.2 sentence 1 and D.5 of the Code

Due to the size of the company, the Supervisory Board did not and does not consider it necessary to form a Nomination Committee composed exclusively of shareholder representatives to recommend suitable Supervisory Board candidates for the proposals of the Supervisory Board to the general shareholders' meeting. Rather, this task is performed by the full Supervisory Board. Owing to the size of the company and of the Supervisory Board, the Supervisory Board considers it adequate and

appropriate to form only an Audit Committee. In contrast, the implementation of further committees was, in the opinion of the Supervisory Board, not necessary. Hence, the Company has deviated from the recommendations pursuant to D.2 sentence 1 and D.5 of the Code.

Recommendations G.1, G.3, G.4 and G.11 sentence 2 of the Code

On 27 April 2021, the Supervisory Board resolved a new system for the remuneration of the members of the Executive Board and submitted it to the Annual General Shareholders' Meeting for approval on 16 June 2021. The Annual General Shareholders' Meeting approved the submitted remuneration system for members of the Executive Board. This approved remuneration system, like the previously existing remuneration system, does not contain any non-financial performance criteria, in deviation from recommendation G.1 third indent, because the pursuit of certain financial and strategic objectives appears to be urgent in view of the Company's situation. In all other respects, the approved system complies with the recommendations of the Code.

The previously existing remuneration system for Executive Board members, on the other hand, deviated from the following further recommendations of the Code:

- Recommendation G.1 first indent of the Code: The company's remuneration system did not contain any provisions on the (individual) maximum remuneration of the members of the Executive Board or on non-financial performance criteria for the granting of variable remuneration components. The Supervisory Board agreed with each member of the Executive Board a maximum amount for each compensation component, from which the maximum remuneration could be derived mathematically. However, the remuneration system did not provide for an additional separate determination of a maximum remuneration.
- Recommendations G.3 and G.4 of the Code: No peer group of other third-party entities was used to assess the customary level of the Executive Board remuneration, nor was a vertical remuneration comparison carried out. In the absence of a peer group of other third-party entities, their composition was not disclosed. Horizontal and vertical comparisons previously did not appear to be meaningful due to the special characteristics of the company and its size.
- Recommendation G.11 sentence 2 of the Code: The Supervisory Board did not have a possibility to retain or reclaim variable remuneration in justified cases. The introduction of such a possibility was refrained from against the background of legal uncertainties existing in the past.

Recommendation G. 11 sentence 1 of the Code

The remuneration system for Executive Board members resolved by the Supervisory Board on 27 April 2021 and approved by the Annual General Meeting on 16 June 2021 provides for the possibility of adjusting variable remuneration "downwards" and "upwards" in the event of extraordinary developments. The existing contracts, on the other hand, do not contain any provision allowing the Supervisory Board to "upwardly" adjust compensation that is inappropriately low due to extraordinary developments. Until now, the regulatory framework for such an "upward" adjustment option has seemed unclear and the practical need not urgent. In future contracts with Executive Board members, however, such an "upward" adjustment option will be regulated in accordance with the remuneration system approved by the Annual General Meeting on 16 June 2021.

Berlin, October 2021

For the Supervisory Board:

For the Executive Board:

Heino von Prondzynski
(Chairman of the Supervisory Board)

Gregory Hamilton
(CEO)

Albert Weber
(Member of the Executive Board)