The Royal London Society for the Blind Pension and Life Assurance Scheme Implementation Statement

An Implementation Statement (‘Statement’) has been prepared in accordance with applicable legislation, taking into account guidance from the Department of Work and Pensions for the period from 1st August 2022 – 31st July 2023 (‘the Scheme Year’).

The Statement sets out how, and the extent to which, the Trustee’s policy in relation to exercising voting rights has been followed during the year by describing the voting behaviour on behalf of the Trustee of the Scheme.

The Trustee has used Minerva Analytics (‘Minerva’) to obtain voting and investment engagement information (VEI) on the Scheme’s behalf.

This Statement includes Minerva’s report on key findings on behalf of the Trustee over the Scheme Year. A summary of the key points are set out below.

**LGIM**

Due to the nature of the underlying holdings, there was no voting information to report for the Over 15 Year Gilts Index Fund and the Over 5 Years Index-Linked Gilts Fund.

Minerva confirmed that the manager’s voting policies and disclosures broadly comply with the ICGN Voting Guidelines Principles and good corporate governance practices. Voting information was provided for the Dynamic Diversified Fund, although this was not in line with the Scheme’s voting period.

Voting information was also provided for the Active Corporate Bond – Over 10 Year Fund, however, there were no significant votes to report. LGIM confirmed that they do not have a formal bond voting policy. In instances where bonds have voting rights, typically in relation to corporate actions, a caseby-case approach to determine the votes to cast is adopted. Overall, Minerva was able to confirm the manager’s voting activity was in line with the Trustee’s policy.

LGIM provided basic fund level engagement that was not in line with the Scheme’s reporting period. The Trustee will continue to encourage LGIM to provide detailed information, in line with Scheme’s reporting period, but acknowledge that the information provided was in line with the Trustee’s own policies.

**BNY Mellon**

Minerva concluded that the Trustee’s voting and engagement policies were followed by the manager. However, Minerva noted the manager does not have a formal bond voting policy. In instances where bonds have voting rights, typically in relation to corporate actions, a case-by-case approach to determine the votes to cast is adopted. Given the nature of the investments in this fund, Minerva has concluded that the manager’s approach is therefore in the best financial interest of the Scheme beneficiaries. BNY Mellon provided detailed fund level engagement information, for the Scheme’s reporting period. From this, Minerva was able to confirm that the manager’s engagement activity was in line with the Trustee’s own policies.

**Columbia Threadneedle**

Due to the nature of the underlying holdings. there was no voting information to report, however, summarised firm level information was provided on engagements for a period different to the Scheme’s reporting period. The Trustee is disappointed with the lack of detail on specific engagements but acknowledge that the manager’s engagement was in line with the Trustee’s own policies.
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**AVCs**

The Scheme holds AVCs and the Trustee has determined they will not be covered in this Statement on the grounds of materiality.

**Final Comments**

Consistent with last year, BNY Mellon has continued to provide good levels of information. Columbia Threadneedle showed some improvement by providing engagement information where last year they had stated there was none to report but the only provided firm-level engagement information this year. The manager could improve further by providing fund-level engagement information with detail on specific engagements and by covering the Scheme’s reporting period. The Trustee would like to see an improvement in the information provided by LGIM as the manager again provided voting and engagement information that did not cover the Scheme’s reporting period and has continued to provide only basic information.
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# SIP Disclosures

**This section sets out the policies in the Statement of Investment Principles (‘SIP’) in force at the Scheme year-end relating to the following:**

1. **Financially Material Considerations**
2. **Non-Financial Considerations**
3. **Investment Manager Arrangements**

**Stewardship - including the exercise of voting rights and engagement activities - is set out in the ‘Voting and Engagement’ section.**

**Source of Information:**

*Royal London Society for the Blind Pension and Life Assurance Scheme Statement of Investment Principles*

*May 2022*

## Financially Material Considerations

The Trustee has considered financially material factors such as environmental, social and governance (‘ESG’) issues as part of the investment process to determine a strategic asset allocation over the length of time during which the benefits are provided by the Scheme for members. It believes that financially material considerations (including climate change) are implicitly factored into the expected risk and return profile of the asset classes they are investing in.

In endeavouring to invest in the best financial interests of the beneficiaries, the Trustee has elected to invest through pooled funds. The Trustee acknowledges that they cannot directly influence the ESG policies and practices of the companies in which the pooled funds invest. However, the Trustee does expect their fund managers and investment consultant to take account of financially material considerations when carrying out their respective roles.

The Trustee accepts that the Scheme’s assets are subject to the investment manager’s own policy on socially responsible investment. The Trustee will assess that this corresponds with their responsibilities to the beneficiaries of the Scheme with the help of its investment consultant.

An assessment of the ESG and responsible investment policies forms part of the manager selection process when appointing new managers and these policies are also reviewed regularly for existing managers with the help of the investment consultant. The Trustee will only invest with investment managers that are a signatories for the United Nations backed Principles of Responsible Investment (‘PRI’) or other similarly recognised standard.

The Trustee will monitor financially material considerations through the following means:

− Obtain training where necessary on ESG considerations in order to understand fully how ESG factors including climate change could impact the Scheme and its investments;

− Use ESG ratings information provided by its investment consultant, to assess how the Scheme's investment managers take account of ESG issues; and

− Request that all of the Scheme's investment managers provide information about their ESG policies, and details of how they integrate ESG into their investment processes, via its investment consultant.

If the Trustee determines that financially material considerations have not been factored into the investment managers’ process, it will take this into account on whether to select or retain an investment.

## Non-Financial Considerations

The Trustee has not considered non-financially material matters in the selection, retention and realisation of investments.

## Investment Manager Arrangements

### Incentives to align investment managers’ investment strategies and decisions with the Trustee’s policies

The Scheme invests in pooled funds and so the Trustee acknowledges the funds’ investment strategies and decisions cannot be tailored to the Trustee’s policies. However, the Trustee sets its investment strategy and then selects managers that best suits their strategy taking into account the fees being charged, which acts as the investment manager’s incentive.

The Trustee uses the fund objective/benchmark as a guide on whether their investment strategy is being followed and monitors this regularly.

### Incentives for the investment managers to make decisions based on assessments about medium to long-term financial and non-financial performance of an issuer of debt or equity and to engage with issuers of debt or equity in order to improve their performance in the medium to long-term

The Trustee selects managers based on a variety of factors including investment philosophy and process, which they believe should include assessing the long term financial and non-financial performance of the underlying company that they invest in.

The Trustee also considers the managers’ voting and ESG policies and how they engage with the investee company as they believe that these factors can improve the medium to long-term performance of the investee companies.

The Trustee will monitor the managers’ engagement and voting activity on an annual basis as they believe this can improve long term performance. The Trustee expects their managers to make every effort to engage with investee companies but acknowledges that their influence may be more limited in some asset classes, such as bonds, as they do not have voting rights.

The Trustee acknowledges that in the short term, these policies may not improve the returns they achieve, but do expect that investing in those companies with better financial and non-financial performance over the long term will lead to better returns for the Scheme. The Trustee believes that the annual fee paid to the investment managers incentivises them to do this.

If the Trustee feels that the investment managers are not assessing financial and non-financial performance or adequately engaging with the companies they are investing in, they will use these factors in deciding whether to retain or terminate a manager.

### How the method (and time horizon) of the evaluation of the fund managers’ performance and the remuneration for asset management services are in line with the Trustee’s policies

The Trustee reviews the performance of each fund quarterly on a net of fees basis compared to its objective.

The Trustee assesses the performance of the funds, where possible, over at least a 3-5 year period when looking to select or terminate a manager, unless there are reasons other than performance that need to be considered.

The investment managers’ remuneration is considered as part of the manager selection process and is also monitored regularly with the help of their investment

consultant to ensure it is in line with the Trustee’s policies.

### How the Trustee monitors portfolio turnover costs incurred by the fund managers, and how they define and monitor targeted portfolio turnover or turnover range

The Trustee monitors the portfolio turnover costs on an annual basis.

The Trustee defines target portfolio turnover as the average turnover of the portfolio expected in the type of strategy the manager has been appointed to manage. This is monitored on an annual basis.

The Trustee has delegated the responsibility of monitoring portfolio turnover costs and target portfolio turnover to their investment consultant and this is reported to the Trustee so it too can monitor this.

### The duration of the arrangement with the fund managers

The Trustee plans to hold each of their investments for the long term but will keep this under review.

Changes in investment strategy or changes in the view of the investment managers can lead to the duration of the arrangement being shorter than expected.

#  2 Sourcing of Voting and Engagement Information

This section sets out the availability of the information Minerva initially requested from the Scheme’s managers, to facilitate the preparation of this report:

**Table 2.1: Summary of Available Information**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fund Manager** | **Investment Fund/Product** | **Voting Information** | **Significant Votes** | **Engagement Information** |

**LGIM\***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BNY Mellon** | Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund | **Full Info Available** | **No Info to Report** | **Full Info Available** |
| **Columbia** | Overseas Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund | **No Info to Report** | **No Info to Report** | **Part Info Available** |
| **Threadneedle** | UK Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund | **No Info to Report** | **No Info to Report** | **Part Info Available** |
|  | Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund | **Part Info Available** | **No Info to Report** | **Part Info Available** |
|  | Dynamic Diversified Fund | **Part Info Available** | **Full Info Available** | **Part Info Available** |
|  | Over 15 Year Gilts Index Fund | **No Info to Report** | **No Info to Report** | **No Info to Report** |
|  | Over 5 Years Index-Linked Gilts Fund | **No Info to Report** | **No Info to Report** | **Part Info Available** |

*\* LGIM have requested that a Disclaimer be shared, which should be read in relation to any stewardship information provided by them. It can be found at the end of this report.*

***Table Key***

**Full Info Available** *The manager has provided either a PLSA Voting Template or voting datathat* ***precisely*** *matches thespecific investment’s holding / reporting period*

**Part Info Available** *The manager has provided either a PLSA Voting Template or voting datathat* ***partially*** *matches the specific investment’s holding / reporting period*

*Themanagerhas explicitly statedthatthereis novoting or engagementinformationtoreport forthis specific investment orthat it is not expected there will beanyvoting or engagement information to report duetothenature of the underlying investments*

**No Info to Report**

**No Info Provided** *At the time of preparing this report, the manager has either not formally respondedtotheinformationrequest or has not provided information when we believe there should beinformation to report*

**Minerva Says:**



|  |
| --- |
| **Voting Activity**There was voting information disclosed for the following Scheme investments:* BNY Mellon Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund
* LGIM Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund
* LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund
 |
|  |
| **Significant Votes**There was ‘Significant Vote’ information disclosed for the following Scheme investments:* LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund
 |
|  |
| **Engagement Activity**There was reportable engagement information provided for the following Scheme investments:* BNY Mellon Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund
* Columbia Threadneedle Overseas Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund (firm level information)
* Columbia Threadneedle UK Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund (firm level information)
* LGIM Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund
* LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund
* LGIM Over 5 Years Index-Linked Gilts Fund
 |

#  3 Voting and Engagement

The Trustee are required to disclose the voting and engagement activity over the Scheme year. The Trustee have used Minerva Analytics (‘Minerva’) to obtain voting and investment engagement information (VEI) on the Scheme’s behalf.

This statement provides a summary of the key information and summarizes Minerva’s findings on behalf of the Scheme over the Scheme’s reporting year.

The voting and engagement activity undertaken by the Scheme’s managers, as reported by them and set out in this document, has been in the scheme members’ best interests insomuch that it demonstrates that the Scheme’s managers have undertaken stewardship activity they deem to be appropriate and proportionate in the oversight and management of the Scheme’s investments.

## Stewardship

The Trustee’s policy on Stewardship from the Scheme’s SIP is set out below:

***The Trustee’s policy on the exercise of rights attaching to investments, including voting rights, is that these rights should be exercised by the investment manager on the Trustee’s***

***behalf, having regard to the best financial interests of the beneficiaries.***

***The investment manager should engage with companies to take account of ESG factors in the exercise of such rights. The Trustee will review the investment managers’ voting policies,***

***with the help of their investment consultant, and decide if they are appropriate.***

***The Trustee also expects the fund manager to engage with investee companies or other relevant persons on performance, strategy, capital structure, management of actual or***

***potential conflicts of interest, risks, ESG issues concerning the Trustee’s investments.***

***If they are not appropriate, the Trustee will engage with the investment manager, with the help of its investment consultant, to influence the investment managers’ policy. If this fails,***

***the Trustee will review the investments made with the investment manager.***

***The Trustee has taken into consideration the Financial Reporting Council’s UK Stewardship Code and expects investment managers to adhere to this where appropriate for the investments they manage.***

The following table sets out:

* The funds and products in which the Scheme was invested during the Scheme’s reporting period;
* The holding period for each fund or product; and
* Whether each investment manager made use of a ‘proxy voter’, as defined by the Regulations

**Table 3.1: Scheme Investment/Product Information**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fund Manager** | **Investment Fund/Product** | **Investment Made Via** | **Fund / Product Type** | **Period Start Date** | **Period End Date** | **‘Proxy Voter’ Used?** |
| **BNY Mellon** | Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund | L&G Platform | DB Fund | 01/08/22 | 31/07/23 | **N/A** |
| **Columbia Threadneedle** | Overseas Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund | L&G Platform | DB Fund | 01/08/22 | 31/07/23 | **N/A** |
| UK Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund | L&G Platform | DB Fund | 01/08/22 | 31/07/23 | **N/A** |
|  | Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund | L&G Platform | DB Fund | 01/08/22 | 31/07/23 | **N/A** |
|  | Dynamic Diversified Fund | L&G Platform | DB Fund | 01/08/22 | 31/07/23 | **ISS** |
| **LGIM** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Over 15 Year Gilts Index Fund | L&G Platform | DB Fund | 01/08/22 | 31/07/23 | **N/A** |
|  | Over 5 Years Index-Linked Gilts Fund | L&G Platform | DB Fund | 01/08/22 | 31/07/23 | **N/A** |

**Minerva Says**

As shown in the table above:

* LGIM identified Institutional Shareholder Services, or ‘ISS’, as their ‘Proxy Voter’
* The investments shown as ‘N/A’ had no listed equity voting activity associated with them, and so had no need for a proxy voter

#  4 Exercise of Voting Rights

The following tables show a comparison of each of the Scheme’s relevant manager(s) voting activity versus the Trustee’s policy (which in this instance is the manager’s own policy).

**Table 4.1: BNY Mellon’s Approach to Voting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Asset manager** | BNY Mellon (Newton) |
| **Relevant Scheme Investment(s)** | Global Dynamic Bond Fund |
| **Key Points of Manager’s****Voting Policy** | Newton have confirmed to us that they do not have a formal bond voting policy as such. Typically, bonds do not have the same kind of voting rights associated with them as listed equities. Any votes cast tend to be in relation to corporate actions that require a case-by-case approach to determine the votes to cast. |
|  | **Yes** |
| **Is Voting Activity in Line with the Scheme’s Policy?** | **By voting in the specific manner that they have in relation to corporate actions on investments, we believe that the manager is doing so in the best financial interests of the Scheme beneficiaries.** |

**Table 4.2: LGIM’s Approach to Voting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Asset manager** | LGIM (Legal & General Investment Management) |
| **Relevant Scheme Investment(s)** | * Dynamic Diversified Fund\*
 |
| **Key Points of Manager’s****Voting Policy** | LGIM’s Corporate Governance and Responsible Investing Policy sets out what the manager considers to be corporate governance best practice. It explains their expectations with respect to topics they believe are essential for an efficient governance framework, and for building a sustainable business model. LGIM expects all companies to closely align with their principles, or to engage with them where circumstances prevent them from doing so.LGIM’s voting policy is built on the assessment of 5 key policy areas: |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **#** | **Policy Area** | **Example of Topics Covered** |  |
| **1** | **Company Board** | Board Leadership, Board Independence, Board Diversity, Succession Planning and Board Evaluation |
| **2** | **Audit, Risk & Internal Control** | External Audit, Internal Audit and Whistleblowing |
| **3** | **Remuneration** | Fixed Remuneration, Incentive Arrangements and Service Contracts and Termination Payments |
| **4** | **Shareholder & Bondholder Rights** | Voting Rights and Share-class Structures, Shareholder Proposals and Political Donations |
| **5** | **Sustainability** | Material ESG Risks & Opportunities, Target Setting, Public Disclosure and Engagement |

**Is Voting Activity in Line with the Scheme’s Policy?**

**Yes**

**Some examples of the manager’s voting activity are provided in Section 7 – Significant Votes**

* *The manager also provided information on some voting activity undertaken in relation to the Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund – however, this voting activity related to corporate actions in the bond fund, for which the equity voting policy shown above does not apply*

**Minerva Says**

* Newton have confirmed that they do not have a formal bond voting policy.
* LGIM have set out how they approach their stewardship responsibilities for listed companies on behalf of their clients.
* From the information available, we believe that the voting approaches are consistent with the Scheme’s voting approach expectations of its investment

managers.

#  5 Manager Voting Policy

As the current approach of the Scheme is to use the voting policy of the external asset managers, it is important that these policies are independently reviewed to ensure that they match current good practice and the general stewardship expectations set by the Scheme. Well-managed companies that operate in a commercially, socially and environmentally responsible manner are expected to perform better over the longer term, as the Scheme believe that adopting such an approach will allow each company’s management to identify, address and monitor the widest range of risks associated with their specific business.

Set out in the following table is Minerva’s independent assessment of the Scheme’s managers’ publicly available voting policies, in the context of current good practice as represented by the ICGN Voting Guidelines, whilst also bearing the Scheme’sstewardship expectations in mind. This has been done for each manager where they have identified voting activity on behalf of the Scheme.

We have assessed each manager’s policy individually, looking at it from Minerva’s perspective of seven ‘Voting Policy Pillars’ that are at the core of our proxy voting research process, and which we have developed over the last 25 years. In using this well-tried approach, the Scheme can be sure that their investment managers voting policies are being carefully considered against current good practice.

**Table 5.1: Voting Policy Alignment**

**Manager Voting Policy Alignment with Current Good Practice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Investment Manager** | **Audit & Reporting** | **Board** | **Capital** | **Corporate Actions** | **Remuneration** | **Shareholder Rights** | **Sustainability** |
| **BNY Mellon (Newton)** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| **Comments** | Newton have confirmed to us that they do not have a formal bond voting policy as such. Typically, bonds do not have the same kind of voting rights associated with them as listed equities. Any votes cast tend to be in relation to corporate actions that require a case-by-case approach to determine the votes to cast. |
| **LGIM** | **Aligned** | **Aligned** | **Aligned** | **Aligned** | **Aligned** | **Aligned** | **Aligned** |
| **Comments** | LGIM’s voting policy and disclosures broadly comply with the ICGN Voting Guidelines Principles and good corporate governance practices. |

**Table Key**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Aligned** | This aspect of the manager’s voting policy is aligned with good practice |
| **Limited Disclosures** | This policy pillar could only be partially assessed on the information available in the manager’s voting policy |
| **No Disclosures** | This policy pillar could not be assessed due to a lack of information in the manager’s voting policy |
| **Not Available** | The manager’s voting policy was not disclosed for analysis by Minerva |

**Minerva Says**

For the Scheme's managers that responded to our information requests by providing voting information:

* BNY Mellon (Newton) have confirmed that they do not have a formal proxy voting policy for bond investments.
* LGIM's public voting policies are, in our view, broadly in line with good practice, and are what we would expect to see from such large asset stewards.

#  6 Manager Voting Behaviour

The Trustee believes that responsible oversight of investee companies is a fundamental duty of good stewardship. As such, it expects the Scheme’s managers to vote at the majority of investee company meetings every year, and to provide sufficient information as to allow for the independent assessment of their voting activity.

The table below sets out the voting behaviour as disclosed by the each of the Scheme’s managers:

**Table 6.1: Manager Voting Behaviour**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **No. of****Meetings** |  | **No. of Resolutions** |  |
| **Manager** | **Fund** | **Eligible for Voting** | **Eligible for Voting** | **% Eligible Voted** | **% Voted in Favour** | **% of Voted Against** | **% Abstain** |
| **BNY Mellon** | Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund | **1** | **12** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **0.0%** | **0.0%** |
| **Comments** |
| The manager provided a summarised voting record for the Fund that covered the Scheme’s investment holding period.From the summarised information provided, we can see that the manager has voted at most investee company meetings for the Fund, which is in line with the Trustee’s expectations of its managers. |
| **LGIM** | Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund | **3** | **4** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **0.0%** | **0.0%** |
| Dynamic Diversified Fund | **9,368** | **96,858** | **99.8%** | **77.1%** | **22.6%** | **0.4%** |
| **Comments** |
| The manager provided summarised voting records for the two Funds shown above that covered the period from 01/07/22 to 30/06/23, rather than for theScheme’s specific reporting period (the manager does not provide bespoke reporting that covers clients’ investment holding periods).From the summarised information provided, we can see that the manager has voted at almost all investee company meetings for the funds, which is in line with the Trustee’s expectations of its managers. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table Key****Available Information** matches the Scheme’s specific reporting period / investment holding period |
| **Available Information** is for a different period than the Scheme’s reporting period / investment holding period |
| **Information** was not provided by the manager |
| **Not Applicable** |

**Minerva Says**

For the Scheme's managers that responded to our information requests by providing voting information, we believe that they have followed the Scheme's requirements in relation to voting activity, as stated in the Scheme's SIP:

***The Trustee’s policy on the exercise of rights attaching to investments, including voting rights, is that these rights should be exercised by the investment manager on the***

***Trustee’s behalf, having regard to the best financial interests of the beneficiaries.***

#  7 Significant Votes

Set out in the following section are 5 examples of the Scheme’s manager(s) voting behaviour from the relevant fund(s) in which the Scheme was invested. A ‘Significant Vote’ relates to any resolution at a company that meets one of the following criteria:

1. Identified by the manager themselves as being of significance;
2. Contradicts local market best practice (e.g., the UK Corporate Governance Code in the UK);
3. Is one proposed by shareholders that attracts at least 20% support from investors;
4. Attracts over 10% dissenting votes from shareholders.

Where the manager has not provided sufficient data to identify ‘Significant Votes’ based on criteria 2-4 above, we have used manager-identified examples:

**Table 7.1 LGIM’s ‘Significant Votes’**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Manager** | **Fund** | **Company Name** | **Date of Vote** | **Approx Size of Holding****(as % of Fund)** | **Summary of Resolution** | **Voting Action** | **Outcome of Vote** |
| **LGIM** | **Dynamic Diversified Fund** | **Twitter, Inc.** | **13/09/22** | **0.4%** | Resolution 2 - Advisory Vote on Golden Parachutes | Against | 95.0% of votes cast were in support of the resolution |
| **Why a ‘Significant Vote?** |
| High Profile Meeting: LGIM considers Twitter to be significant given the high profile nature of the meeting. Golden parachute payments are lucrative settlement payments to top executives in the event that their employment is terminated. This is an issue we assess across all companies, and is particularly pertinent for Twitter at the moment as the proposed takeover by Elon Musk continues to evolve. |
| **Manager’s Vote Rationale:** |
| Remuneration: Termination: A vote against is applied as LGIM does not support the use of golden parachutes. As a long-term and engaged investor, we entrust the board to ensureexecutive directors’ pay is fair, balanced and aligned with the strategy and long-term growth and performance of the business, where this is not the case we will use our vote. |
| **Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?** |
| LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our general policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM so as to not limit our engagement to shareholder meeting topics and vote decisions. |
| **Next Steps / Implications of the Outcome:** |

|  |
| --- |
| It is worth noting that in Twitters 2022 AGM, we voted against their say on pay proposal, as did 42% of shareholders. LGIM will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress. |
| **Relevance to Manager’s Stated Policy:** |
| **Company Board** | **Audit, Risk & Internal Control** | **Remuneration** | **Shareholder & Bondholder Rights** | **Sustainability** |
| **We believe this voting activity is consistent with the manager’s stated approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach** |
|  |
| **Manager** | **Fund** | **Company Name** | **Date of Vote** | **Approx Size of Holding****(as % of Fund)** | **Summary of Resolution** | **Voting Action** | **Outcome of Vote** |
| **LGIM** | **Dynamic Diversified Fund** | **General Mills, Inc.** | **27/09/22** | **0.02%** | Resolution 1d - Elect Director Jeffrey L. Harmening | Against | Not stated |
| **Why a ‘Significant Vote?** |
| Thematic - Board Leadership: LGIM considers this vote to be significant as it is in application of an escalation of our vote policy on the topic of the combination of the board chair and CEO (escalation of engagement by vote). |
| **Manager’s Vote Rationale:** |
| Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects companies to separate the roles of Chair and CEO due to risk management and oversight. |
| **Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?** |
| LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our general policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM so to not limit our engagement to shareholder meeting topics and vote decisions. |
| **Next Steps / Implications of the Outcome:** |
| LGIM will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress. |
| **Relevance to Manager’s Stated Policy:** |
| **Company Board** | **Audit, Risk & Internal Control** | **Remuneration** | **Shareholder & Bondholder Rights** | **Sustainability** |
| **We believe this voting activity is consistent with the manager’s stated approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Manager** | **Fund** | **Company Name** | **Date of Vote** | **Approx Size of Holding****(as % of Fund)** | **Summary of Resolution** | **Voting Action** | **Outcome of Vote** |
| **LGIM** | **Dynamic Diversified Fund** | **Endeavour Group Ltd. (Australia)** | **18/10/22** | **0.02%** | Resolution 2a - Elect Duncan Makeig as Director | Against | 98.5% of votes cast were in support of the resolution |
| **Why a ‘Significant Vote?** |
| LGIM considers this vote to be significant as it is applied under the Climate Impact Pledge, our flagship engagement programme targeting some of the world's largest companies on their strategic management of climate change. |
| **Manager’s Vote Rationale:** |
| Climate Impact Pledge: A vote against is applied as the company is deemed to not meet minimum standards with regard to climate risk management. |
| **Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?** |
| LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our general policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM so to not limit our engagement to shareholder meeting topics and vote decisions. |
| **Next Steps / Implications of the Outcome:** |
| LGIM will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress. |
| **Relevance to Manager’s Stated Policy:** |
| **Company Board** | **Audit, Risk & Internal Control** | **Remuneration** | **Shareholder & Bondholder Rights** | **Sustainability** |
| **We believe this voting activity is consistent with the manager’s stated approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Manager** | **Fund** | **Company Name** | **Date of Vote** | **Approx Size of Holding****(as % of Fund)** | **Summary of Resolution** | **Voting Action** | **Outcome of Vote** |
| **LGIM** | **Dynamic****Diversified Fund** | **NetApp, Inc.** | **09/09/22** | **0.01%** | Resolution 1a - Elect Director T. Michael Nevens | Against | 93.0% of votes cast were in support of the resolution |
| **Why a ‘Significant Vote?** |
| Thematic - Diversity: LGIM views gender diversity as a financially material issue for our clients. This vote is deemed significant due to the escalation and expansion of our diversity vote to all-male Executive Committees. |
| **Manager’s Vote Rationale:** |
| Diversity: A vote against was applied as the company has an all-male Executive Committee. From 2022, we have applied voting sanctions to the FTSE 100 companies that do not have at least one woman on their executive committee, with the expectation that there should be a minimum of 33% over time |
| **Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?** |
| LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our general policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM so to not limit our engagement to shareholder meeting topics and vote decisions. |
| **Next Steps / Implications of the Outcome:** |
| LGIM will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress. |
| **Relevance to Manager’s Stated Policy:** |
| **Company Board** | **Audit, Risk & Internal Control** | **Remuneration** | **Shareholder & Bondholder Rights** | **Sustainability** |
| **We believe this voting activity is consistent with the manager’s stated approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Manager** | **Fund** | **Company Name** | **Date of Vote** | **Approx Size of Holding****(as % of Fund)** | **Summary of Resolution** | **Voting Action** | **Outcome of Vote** |
| **LGIM** | **Dynamic Diversified Fund** | **Conagra Brands, Inc.** | **21/09/22** | **<0.01%** | Resolution 5 - Require Independent Board Chair | For Shareholder Resolution | Not stated |
| **Why a ‘Significant Vote?** |
| Thematic - Board Leadership: LGIM considers this vote to be significant as it is in application of an escalation of our vote policy on the topic of the combination of the board chair and CEO (escalation of engagement by vote). |
| **Manager’s Vote Rationale:** |
| Shareholder Resolution - Joint Chair/CEO: A vote in favour is applied as LGIM expects companies to establish the role of independent Board Chair. LGIM has a longstanding policy advocating for the separation of the roles of CEO and board chair. These two roles are substantially different, requiring distinct skills and experiences. Since 2015 we have supported shareholder proposals seeking the appointment of independent board chairs, and since 2020 we have voted against all combined board chair/CEO roles. Furthermore, we have published a guide for boards on the separation of the roles of chair and CEO (available on our website), and we have reinforced our position on leadership structures across our stewardship activities –e.g. via individual corporate engagements and director conferences. |
| **Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?** |
| LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our general policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM so to not limit our engagement to shareholder meeting topics and vote decisions. |
| **Next Steps / Implications of the Outcome:** |
| LGIM will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress. |
| **Relevance to Manager’s Stated Policy:** |
| **Company Board** | **Audit, Risk & Internal Control** | **Remuneration** | **Shareholder & Bondholder Rights** | **Sustainability** |
| **We believe this voting activity is consistent with the manager’s stated approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach** |

**Minerva Says**

LGIM’s reported ‘Significant Vote’ information seems to be consistent with their stated voting policies, and so is consistent with the Scheme’s

expectations.

#  8 Manager Engagement Information

The Trustee have set the following expectation in the Scheme’s SIP in relation to its managers’ engagement activity:

***The investment manager should engage with companies to take account of ESG factors in the exercise of such rights. The Trustee will review the investment managers’ voting policies, with***

***the help of their investment consultant, and decide if they are appropriate.***

***The Trustee also expects the fund manager to engage with investee companies or other relevant persons on performance, strategy, capital structure, management of actual or potential conflicts of interest, risks, ESG issues concerning the Trustee’s investments.***

***If they are not appropriate, the Trustee will engage with the investment manager, with the help of its investment consultant, to influence the investment managers’ policy. If this fails, the***

***Trustee will review the investments made with the investment manager.***

The Trustee believes that an important part of responsible oversight is for the Scheme’s investment managers to engage with the senior management of investee companies on any perceived risks or shortcomings – both financial and non-financial – relating to the operation of the business, with a specific focus on ESG factors. As such, they expect the Scheme’s managers to engage with investee companies where they have identified any such issues.

The following table(s) summarises the engagement activity of the manager(s):

**Table 8.1: Summary of Engagement Information Provided**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Manager** | **Engagement Information Obtained** | **Level of Available information** | **Info Covers Scheme’s****Reporting Period?** | **Comments** |
| **BNY Mellon** | **YES** | **FUND** | **YES** | The manager provided ***detailed fund level*** engagement for the Scheme’s reporting period |
| **Columbia****Threadneedle** | **YES** | **FIRM** | **PART** | The manager provided ***summarised firm-level*** engagement information for the period from ***01/01/22 to******31/12/22*** rather than the Scheme’s reporting period |
| **LGIM** | **YES** | **FUND** | **PART** | The manager provided ***basic fund level*** engagement information for the period from ***01/07/22 to******30/06/23,*** rather than for the Scheme's reporting periods |

***Table Key***

**GREEN = A positive result**. The manager has provided engagement information / fund level info available / matches the Scheme’s reporting / investment holding period **ORANGE = A ‘partial’ result**. We had to try to source engagement information / firm level info available / does not match the Scheme’s reporting / investment holding period **RED = A negative result**. No engagement information was located at any level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BNY Mellon** |  |  |  |  | **Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered** | **Outcomes** |
| **Fund(s)** | **Period Start** | **Period End** | **No. of Engagements** | **Environmental** | **Social** | **Governance** | **Other** | **Resolved** | **Open** |
| **Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund** | **01/08/22** | **31/07/23** | **10** | **40.0%** | **30.0%** | **30.0%** | **0.0%** | **Not Stated** | **Not Stated** |
| **Aspect of Engagement****Activity** | **Details** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Key Points of the Manager’s Engagement Policy** | BNY states in its latest stewardship policy disclosure statement that each of the investment managers has its own unique engagement policy with issuers in all of the jurisdictions in which they invest. Accordingly, Newton’s ‘Responsible Investment Policies and Principles’ report from April 2022 has the following to say with regards the manager’s engagement approach:*‘We have long been active stewards of our clients’ assets. Undertaking considered engagement activities and exercising voting rights globally are the primary drivers to being effective stewards.**Intrinsic to the understanding of the potential of an investment in a company, whether via equity or fixed income, is an appreciation of the quality of the company’s**management, its structure, the appropriateness of its internal controls and the assurance that ESG matters are managed in the creation of long-term investor value.**We believe that responsibly managed companies should be better placed to achieve sustainable competitive advantage and provide strong long-term**growth. With respect to investments in sovereign securities (typically government bonds), we consider factors such as whether the government’s policy objectives**can support ESG-focused initiatives and the sustainability of any expenditure plans.**Our fundamental view is that a considered approach to ESG analysis enhances our investment process, and that this is particularly the case for corporate investments. This process includes identifying the ESG risks and opportunities faced by a company and ensuring that these challenges are well managed within the company’s business strategy. Engagement can play a crucial role in helping achieve this understanding and to influence change’*From Newton’s most recent [‘Responsible Investment and Stewardship’ report](https://www.newtonim.com/uk-institutional/special-document/responsible-investment-and-stewardship-annual-report/) the manager identified the following key engagement themes:* **Environmental:** Biodiversity / Carbon management / Climate change / Management systems / Pollution / Product life cycle / Water
* **Social:** Business ethics / Cybersecurity / Health and safety / Human capital management / Product access / Product suitability / Stakeholder relations / Supply chain
* **Governance**: Audit and internal controls / Board leadership / Relater-party transactions / Remuneration / Shareholder communications / Shareholder rights / Strategy and risk / Tax
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Additional information on Engagements provided by the Manager** | Whilst the manager provided a list of engagements undertaken on investments in the fund during the Scheme’s holding period, no additional information was provided in terms of:* engagement objectives
* collaborative engagements
* process for escalating ineffective engagement and
* whether any fintech solution was used to facilitate engagement
 |
| **Comparison of the Manager’s Engagement Activity vs the Trustee’s policy** | An example of a reported engagement for the Global Dynamic Bond Fund is:**Q4 2022 - HSBC – Engagement on Environmental Issues*****Engagement Activity:*** *‘We met the company to discuss its 2023 climate plan. In particular, we wanted to understand the bank’s approach to scope 3 emissions for its oil and gas customers. The company highlighted that it perceives ESG as an opportunity for it to provide guidance for customers.**We also wanted to understand the bank’s approach with its Asian customers as this is an area where we see further scope for improvement. The company acknowledged that customers in this region are not yet as progressed in their thinking on ESG matters, but it believes it is strongly placed to take advantage of the ‘ESG wave’ in Asia.* ‘***Engagement Outcome:*** Not disclosed by the manager. |
| **Is Engagement Activity in Line****with the Trustee’s Policy?** | **The engagement activity is consistent with the Manager’s stated engagement approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme’s approach.** |

**Columbia Threadneedle**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered** | **Outcomes** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fund(s)** | **Period Start** | **Period End** | **No. of Engagements** | **Environmental** | **Social** | **Governance** | **Other** | **Resolved** | **Open** |
| **Only firm level engagement info provided** | **01/01/22** | **31/12/22** | **1,920** | **61.7%** | **20.2%** | **18.1%** | **-** | **Not Stated** | **Not Stated** |
| **Aspect of Engagement Activity** | **Details** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Points of the Manager’s Engagement Policy** | Columbia Threadneedle’s general approach to engagement is set out in a document titled ‘Responsible Investment: Global Policy and Approach’. They goon to say the following, but do not set out any specific engagement priorities or themes in the document:*‘Proactive engagement is an integral part of our approach to research, investment and the stewardship of client capital. This includes a focus on sustainability risks, operational excellence, capital allocation policies and managerial incentives, among others. Underpinned by collaboration across asset classes and thematic and sectorial disciplines, we ensure an informed approach to our engagement. A consultative, research driven approach to engaging corporate leadership and management contributes to investment insights, appropriate escalation and our exercise of proxy voting rights.’*They have the following additional commentary on their engagement approach in another report, but again have not identified any specific engagement priorities or themes:*‘Having identified the ESG issues we consider material to the creation and protection of long-term investor value, we use in-depth dialogue to encourage investee companies to improve performance and move towards best practice in managing those issues. Our engagement encompasses a spectrum of ESG issues, across a range of sectors and geographies. We monitor the outcomes of our engagement and report on our progress.**In encouraging companies to move towards best practice in managing ESG issues, we refer to international codes and standards where relevant, such as the International Labour Organization Core Conventions, UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the UN Global Compact, and national corporate governance principles and codes of best practice. However, any such standards are often only a starting point, as we tailor our engagement to individual companies and to how the ESG issues under discussion apply to their specific circumstances.**Our preferred approach is to use constructive, confidential dialogue, typically working one-to-one with companies, but also taking a collaborative approach where this has more impact and is in line with our objectives. We engage at different levels within companies depending on the nature of our objectives, including the board, executive management and operational specialists.’* |
| **Additional information on Engagements provided by the Manager** | Whilst the manager provided a list of engagements undertaken on investments in the fund during the Scheme’s holding period, no additional information was provided in terms of:* engagement objectives
* collaborative engagements
* process for escalating ineffective engagement and
* whether any fintech solution was used to facilitate engagement
 |
| **Comparison of the Manager’s Engagement Activity vs the Trustee’s policy** | The following example of engagement activity was provided by the manager for the Pensions Property Fund:**Q2 2022 – Penningtons, Basingstoke – Governance-related Engagement** ***Engagement Details:**** *Penningtons occupied a self-contained c.12,300 sq ft building at Renaissance, Basingstoke and operated their break option given their requirement for additional space.*
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is Engagement Activity in Line****with the Trustee’s Policy?** | * *The Fund engaged with Penningtons relocating and upsizing them into c.14,500 sq ft at Matrix House, Basingstoke (also held by the Fund) on a new lease at a record rental level for Basingstoke (£28 psf vs ERV £20 psf) whilst simultaneously surrendering Sun Life Assurance, previous rent £17.50 psf and undertaking landlord refurbishment works as part of the agreement*

***Engagement Outcomes:*** *‘Through tenant engagement the Fund was able to retain a strong covenant within the wider portfolio on a mutually beneficial basis.’* |
| **Whilst we believe that the manager's engagement approach is consistent with the Scheme's approach, we were disappointed with the lack of****engagement details at fund level that also covered the Scheme’s investment period.** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LGIM** | **Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered** | **Outcomes** |
| **Fund(s)** | **Period Start** | **Period End** | **No. of Engagements** | **Environmental** | **Social** | **Governance** | **Other** | **Resolved** | **Open** |
| **Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund** | **01/07/22** | **30/06/23** | **186** | **37.6%** | **8.6%** | **4.2%** | **11.8%** | **Not Stated** | **Not Stated** |
| **Dynamic Diversified Fund** | **01/07/22** | **30/06/23** | **1,159** | **31.7%** | **17.2%** | **45.6%** | **5.6%** | **Not Stated** | **Not Stated** |
| **Over 5 Years Index-Linked Gilts Fund** | **01/07/22** | **30/06/23** | **50** | **32.0%** | **8.0%** | **52.0%** | **8.0%** | **Not Stated** | **Not Stated** |
| **Aspect of****Engagement Activity** | **Details** |
| **Key Points of the Manager’s Engagement Policy** | LGIM’s Investment Stewardship team focuses on client outcomes and broader societal and environmental impacts in its engagements with companies, taking the following six step approach:1. Identify the most material ESG issues
2. Formulate a strategy
3. Enhance the power of engagement (e.g., through public statements)
4. Collaborate with other stakeholders and policymakers
5. Vote
6. Report to shareholders

From LGIM's most recent Active Ownership Report the manager has identified the following as their top 5 engagement topics:* 1. Climate Change
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 1. Remuneration
2. Diversity (Gender and Ethnicity)
3. Board Composition
4. Strategy
 |
| **Additional information on engagements provided by the Manager** | Whilst the manager provided a list of engagements undertaken on investments in the fund during the Scheme’s holding period, no additional information was provided in terms of:* engagement objectives
* collaborative engagements
* process for escalating ineffective engagement and
* whether any fintech solution was used to facilitate engagement
 |
| **Comparison of the Manager’s Engagement Activity vs the Trustee’s policy** | Set out below is an example of engagement activity reported by LGIM in the Dynamic Diversified Fund:**28/03/23 - Exxon Mobil Corp – Environmental and Other-themed Engagement Activity*****Engagement Type:*** *Not stated.****Issue Theme:*** *Environmental /Energy & Other / Strategy.****Engagement Details:*** *Not provided.****Engagement Outcome:*** *Not provided.* |
| **Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustee’s Policy?** | **Whilst we believe that the manager's engagement approach is consistent with the Scheme's approach, we believe that the manager should be able to provide more information relating to engagements undertaken at fund level.** |



**Minerva Says**

As can be seen from the previous tables, the Scheme's managers’ 'Engagement Activity' appears to broadly comply with their own engagement approaches, and so also complies with the Scheme's approach.

#  9 Conclusions

## Assessment of Compliance

In this report, Minerva has undertaken an independent review of the Scheme’s external asset managers’ voting and engagement activity. The main objective of the review is for Minerva to be in a position to say that the activities undertaken on the Scheme’s behalf by its agents are aligned with its own policies.

Set out in the following table is Minerva’s assessment of each manager’s compliance with the Scheme’s approach:

**Table 9.1: Summary Assessment of Compliance**

|  |
| --- |
| **Does the Manager’s Reported Activity Follow the Scheme’s Expectations:** |
| **Fund / Product Manager** | **Investment Fund/ Product** | **Voting Activity** | **Significant Votes Identified** | **Engagement Activity** | **Use of a****‘Proxy Voter?’** | **UK****Stewardship Code 2020 Signatory?** | **Overall Assessment** |
| **BNY Mellon** | Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund | **YES** | **N.I.R.** | **YES** | **N/A** | **YES** | **COMPLIANT** |
| **Columbia Threadneedle** | Overseas Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund | **N.I.R.** | **N.I.R.** | **YES** | **N/A** |  | **COMPLIANT** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **YES** |  |
| UK Equity-Linked UK Gilt Fund | **N.I.R.** | **N.I.R.** | **YES** | **N/A** |  | **COMPLIANT** |
|  | Active Corporate Bond - Over 10 Year Fund | **YES** | **N.I.R.** | **YES** | **N/A** |  | **COMPLIANT** |
|  | Dynamic Diversified Fund | **YES** | **YES** | **YES** | **ISS** |  | **COMPLIANT** |
| **LGIM\*** |  |  |  |  |  | **YES** |  |
|  | Over 15 Year Gilts Index Fund | **N.I.R.** | **N.I.R.** | **N.I.R.** | **N/A** |  | **N.I.R.** |
|  | Over 5 Years Index-Linked Gilts Fund | **N.I.R.** | **N.I.R.** | **YES** | **N/A** |  | **COMPLIANT** |
| *\* LGIM have requested that a Disclaimer be shared, which should be read in relation to any stewardship information provided by them. It can be found at the end of this report.****Table Key*** |  |  |
| **GREEN=**Positive outcome e.g., Manager’s reported activity follows the Scheme’s expectations |  |  |
| **ORANGE=**An issue exists e.g., the information provided does not match the Scheme’s reporting / investment holding period |  |  |
| **BLUE=**Manager has confirmed that there is no voting, ‘Significant Votes’ or engagement information to report (N.I.R.) |  |  |
| **RED=**Negative outcome e.g., no information provided (N.I.P.); Manager is not a signatory to the UK Stewardship Code 2020 |  |  |
| **GREY=**Not Applicable e.g., there has been no ‘Proxy Voter’ used due to the nature of the investments held |  |  |

**Minerva Says**

**Overall Assessment:**

**We believe that the Scheme's managers have broadly complied with the Scheme's Voting and Engagement requirements of them. Notes**

1. The preceding table shows that Minerva has been able to determine that:
	* For the managers where Voting and 'Significant Vote' information was available, their overall approaches are broadly in step with the Scheme's requirements
	* For the managers where Engagement information was available, their overall approaches are also broadly in step with the Scheme's requirements
2. All of the Scheme’s investment managers are signatories to the UK Stewardship Code.
3. We were disappointed with the inability of some of the Scheme’s managers to provide reporting that specifically covered the Scheme’s individual investment holding periods, and with some of the information disclosed.
4. We were also disappointed with the limited engagement information provided by Columbia Threadneedle and LGIM. Whilst LGIM can provide information on engagements undertaken in individual funds, they are not yet able to provide much in the way of details concerning the engagements.

**LGIM Information Disclaimer**

* + 1. Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) is a standard unit to compare the emissions of different greenhouse gases.
		2. The choice of this metric follows best practice recommendations from the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures.
		3. Data on carbon emissions from a company’s operations and purchased energy is used.
		4. This measure is the result of differences in weights of companies between the index and the benchmark, and does not depend on the amount invested in the fund. It describes the relative

‘carbon efficiency’ of different companies in the index (i.e. how much carbon was emitted per unit of sales), not the contribution of an individual investor in financing carbon emissions.

* + 1. LGIM set the following threshold for our reportable funds 1) the assets eligible for coverage e.g. eligible ratio needs to be greater than or equal to 50% and 2) the carbon coverage of the eligible assets e.g. eligible coverage needs to be greater than or equal to 60%.
		2. Eligibility % represents the % of the securities in the benchmark which are eligible for reporting including equity, bonds, ETFs and sovereigns (real assets, private debt and derivatives are currently not included for carbon reporting). The Coverage % represents the coverage of those assets with carbon scores.
		3. Derivatives including repos are not presently included and the methodology is subject to change. Leveraged positions are not currently supported. In the instance a leveraged position distorts the coverage ratio over 100% then the coverage ratio will not be shown.
		4. LGIM define ‘Sovereigns’ as, Agency, Government, Municipals, Strips and Treasury Bills and is calculated by using: the CO2e/GDP, Carbon Emissions Footprint uses: CO2e/Total Capital Stock.
		5. The carbon reserves intensity of a company captures the relationship between the carbon reserves the company owns and its market capitalisation. The carbon reserves intensity of the overall benchmark reflects the relative weights of the different companies in the benchmark.
		6. Green revenues % represents the proportion of revenues derived from low-carbon products and services associated with the benchmark, from the companies in the benchmark that have disclosed this as a separate data point.
		7. Engagement figures do not include data on engagement activities with national or local governments, government related issuers, or similar international bodies with the power to issue debt securities.
		8. LGIM’s temperature alignment methodology computes the contribution of a company’s activities towards climate change. It delivers an specific temperature value that signifies which climate scenario (e.g.3°C, 1.5°C etc.) the company’s activities are currently aligned with. The implied temperature alignment is computed as a weighted aggregate of the company-level warming potential.

Third Party ESG Data Providers: Source: ISS. Source: HSBC© HSBC 2022. Source: IMF (International Monetary Fund). Source: Refinitiv. Information is for recipients’ internal use only.

Important Information: In the United Kingdom and outside the European Economic Area, this document is issued by Legal & General Investment Management Limited, Legal and General Assurance (Pensions Management) Limited, LGIM Real Assets (Operator) Limited, Legal & General (Unit Trust Managers) Limited and/or their affiliates (‘Legal & General’, ‘we’ or ‘us’). Legal & General Investment Management Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 02091894. Registered Office: One Coleman Street, London, EC2R 5AA. Authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, No. 119272. Legal and General Assurance (Pensions Management) Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 01006112. Registered Office: One Coleman Street, London, EC2R 5AA. Authorised by the Prudential Regulation Authority and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority and the Prudential Regulation Authority, No. 202202. LGIM Real Assets (Operator) Limited. Registered in England and Wales, No. 05522016. Registered Office: One Coleman Street, London, EC2R 5AA. Authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, No. 447041. Please note that while LGIM Real Assets (Operator) Limited is regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, we may conduct certain activities that are unregulated. Legal & General (Unit Trust Managers) Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 01009418. Registered Office: One Coleman Street, London, EC2R 5AA. Authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, No. 119273. In the European Economic Area, this document is issued by LGIM Managers (Europe) Limited, authorised by the Central Bank of Ireland as a UCITS management company (pursuant to European Communities (Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities) Regulations, 2011 (S.I. No. 352 of 2011), as amended) and as an alternative investment fund manager with “top up” permissions which enable the firm to carry out certain additional MiFID investment services (pursuant to the European Union (Alternative Investment Fund Managers) Regulations 2013 (S.I. No. 257 of 2013), as amended). Registered in Ireland with the Companies Registration Office (No. 609677). Registered Office: 70 Sir John Rogerson’s Quay, Dublin, 2, Ireland. Regulated by the Central Bank of Ireland (No. C173733).

Date: All features described and information contained in this report (“Information”) are current at the time of publication and may be subject to change or correction in the future. Any projections, estimate, or forecast included in the Information (a) shall not constitute a guarantee of future events, (b) may not consider or reflect all possible future events or conditions relevant to you (for example, market disruption events); and (c) may be based on assumptions or simplifications that may not be relevant to you.

Not Advice: Nothing in this material should be construed as advice and it is therefore not a recommendation to buy or sell securities. If in doubt about the suitability of this product, you should seek professional advice. The Information is for information purposes only and we are not soliciting any action based on it. No representation regarding the suitability of instruments and/or strategies for a particular investor is made in this document and you should refrain from entering into any investment unless you fully understand all the risks involved and you have independently determined that the investment is suitable for you.

Investment Performance: The value of an investment and any income taken from it is not guaranteed and can go down as well as up; you may not get back the amount you originally invested. Past performance is not a guide to the future. Reference to a particular security is for illustrative purposes only, is on a historic basis and does not mean that the security is currently held or will be held within an LGIM portfolio. The above information does not constitute a recommendation to buy or sell any security.

Confidentiality and Limitations: Unless otherwise agreed by Legal & General in writing, the Information in this document (a) is for information purposes only and we are not soliciting any action based on it, and (b) is not a recommendation to buy or sell securities or pursue a particular investment strategy; and (c) is not investment, legal, regulatory or tax advice. Any trading or investment decisions taken by you should be based on your own analysis and judgment (and/or that of your professional advisors) and not in reliance on us or the Information. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we exclude all representations, warranties, conditions, undertakings and all other terms of any kind, implied by statute or common law, with respect to the Information including (without limitation) any representations as to the quality, suitability, accuracy or completeness of the Information. Any projections, estimates or forecasts included in the Information (a) shall not constitute a guarantee of future events, (b) may not consider or reflect all possible future events or conditions relevant to you (for example, market disruption events); and (c) may be based on assumptions or simplifications that may not be relevant to you. The Information is provided ‘as is' and 'as available’. To the fullest extent permitted by law, Legal & General accepts no liability to you or any other recipient of the Information for any loss, damage or cost arising from, or in connection with, any use or reliance on the Information. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Legal & General does not accept any liability for any indirect, special or consequential loss howsoever caused and on any theory or liability, whether in contract or tort (including negligence) or otherwise, even if Legal & General has been advised of the possibility of such loss.

Source: Unless otherwise indicated all data contained are sourced from Legal & General Investment Management Limited.

# About Minerva

Minerva helps investors and other stakeholders to overcome data disclosure complexity with robust, objective research and voting policy tools. Users can quickly and easily identify departures from good practice based on their own individual preferences, local market requirements or apply a universal good practice standard across all markets.

For more information please email hello@minerva.info or call + 44 (0)1376 503500

# Copyright

This analysis has been compiled from sources which are believed to be reliable. No warranty or representation of any kind, whether express or implied, is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the report or its sources and neither Minerva Analytics nor its officers, directors, employees, or agents accept any liability of any kind

in relation to the same. All opinions, estimates, and interpretations included in this report constitute our judgement as of the publication date, information contained with this report is subject to change without notice.

Other than for the Pension Scheme for which this analysis has been provided, this report may not be copied or disclosed in whole or in part by any person without the express written authority of Minerva Analytics. Any

unauthorised infringement of this copyright will be resisted. This report does not constitute investment advice or a solicitation to buy or sell securities, and investors should not rely on it for investment information.

# Conflicts of Interest

Minerva Analytics does not provide consulting services to issuers, however issuers and advisors to issuers (remuneration consultants, lawyers, brokers etc.) may subscribe to Minerva Analytics’ research and data services.
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