

APPENDIX 3

The Interfloor Limited Final Salary Scheme ('the Scheme') – Implementation Statement 1st August 2022 – 31 July 2023

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 Trustees' policy in relation to exercising voting rights has been followed during the year by describing the voting behaviour on behalf of the Trustees of the Scheme.

The Trustees have 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 Trustees 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 Cash Fund or Matching Core LDI Funds.

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, Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant) and the World Equity Index Fund (including GBP Hedged variant), although this was not in line with the Scheme's reporting period. Despite this, Minerva was able to confirm the manager's voting activity was in line with the Trustees' policy.

LGIM provided basic fund level engagement that was not in line with the Scheme's reporting period. The Trustees 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 Trustees' own policies.

BNY Mellon

Minerva concluded that the Trustees' 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 Trustees' own policies.

Vontobel

Vontobel stated that there was no voting information to report. However, detailed fund level information was provided on engagements. From this, Minerva was able to conclude that the manager had followed the Trustees' engagement policy.

Columbia Threadneedle

Due to the nature of the underlying holdings, there was no voting information to report. Summarised firm-level information was provided on engagements, although this did not cover the Scheme's reporting period. The Trustees will continue to encourage Columbia Threadneedle to provide detailed fund-level information, in line with Scheme's reporting period, but acknowledge that the information provided was in line with the Trustees' own policies.

BlackRock

Due to the nature of the underlying holdings, there was no voting information to report. Basic fund-level information was provided on engagements, although this was not in line with the Scheme's reporting period. The Trustees will continue to encourage BlackRock to provide more detailed information, in line with Scheme's reporting period, but acknowledge that the information provided was in line with the Trustees' own policies.

Final Comments

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



Interfloor Limited Final Salary Scheme

Spence & Partners Limited

Implementation Statement (IS):
Voting & Engagement Information (VEI) Report

Scheme Reporting Period:
1st August 2022 to 31st July 2023

2nd November 2023

Contents

1	SIP Disclosures	3
2	Sourcing of Voting and Engagement Information	7
3	Voting and Engagement	9
4	Exercise of Voting Rights	11
5	Manager Voting Policy	13
6	Manager Voting Behaviour	15
7	Significant Votes	17
8	Manager Engagement Information	33
9	Conclusion	42

1 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:

*The Interfloor Limited Final Salary Scheme
Statement of Investment Principles
April 2021*



1.1 Financially Material Considerations

The Trustees have 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. They believe that financially material considerations (including climate change) are implicitly factored into the expected risk and return profile of the asset classes that they are investing in.

In endeavouring to invest in the best financial interests of the beneficiaries, the Trustees have elected to invest through pooled funds. The Trustees acknowledge that they cannot directly influence the environmental, social and governance policies and practices of the companies in which the pooled funds invest. However, the Trustees do expect their fund managers and investment adviser to take account of financially material considerations when carrying out their respective roles.

The Trustees accept that the Scheme's assets are subject to the investment manager's own policy on socially responsible investment. The Trustees will assess that this corresponds with their responsibilities to the beneficiaries of the Scheme with the help of their investment adviser.

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 adviser. The Trustees will only invest with investment managers that are signatories for the United Nations Principles of Responsible Investment ('UN PRI') or other similarly recognised standards.

The Trustees 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 their investments;
- Use ESG ratings information provided by their investment adviser, 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 their investment adviser.

If the Trustees determine that financially material considerations have not been factored into the investment managers' process, they will take this into account on whether to select or retain an investment.

1.2 Non-Financial Considerations

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

1.3 Investment Manager Arrangements

Incentives to align investment managers' investment strategies and decisions with the Trustees' policies

The Scheme invests in pooled funds and so the Trustees acknowledge the funds' investment strategies and decisions cannot be tailored to the Trustees' policies. However, the Trustees set their investment strategy and then select managers that best suits their strategy taking into account the fees being charged, which acts as the fund manager's incentive.

The Trustees use 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 Trustees select 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 Trustees also consider the managers' voting and ESG policies and how they engage with the company as they believe that these factors can improve the medium to long-term performance of the investee companies.

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

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

If the Trustees feel that the fund 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 Trustees' policies

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

The Trustees assess 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 fund managers' remuneration is considered as part of the manager selection process and is also monitored regularly with the help of their investment adviser to ensure it is in line with the Trustees' policies.

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

The Trustees monitor the portfolio turnover costs on an annual basis.

The Trustees define 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 Trustees have delegated the responsibility of monitoring portfolio turnover costs and target portfolio turnover to their investment adviser and this is reported to the Trustees so they too can monitor this.

The duration of the arrangement with the fund managers

The Trustees plan 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 fund 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
BlackRock	Corporate Bond Up to 5 Year Index Fund	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	Part Info Available
BNY Mellon	Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund	Full Info Available	No Info to Report	Full Info Available
Columbia Threadneedle	Threadneedle Pensions Property Fund	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	Part Info Available
	Cash Fund	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	Part Info Available
	Dynamic Diversified Fund	Part Info Available	Full Info Available	Part Info Available
LGIM*	Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)	Part Info Available	Full Info Available	Part Info Available
	LDI Matching Core Fund (4 funds)	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	Part Info Available
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Part Info Available	Full Info Available	Part Info Available
Vontobel	TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	Full 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 data that precisely matches the specific investment's holding / reporting period

Part Info Available

The manager has provided either a PLSA Voting Template or voting data that partially matches the specific investment's holding / reporting period

No Info to Report

The manager has explicitly stated that there is no voting or engagement information to report for this specific investment or that it is not expected there will be any voting or engagement information to report due to the nature of the underlying investments

No Info Provided

At the time of preparing this report, the manager has either not formally responded to the information request or has not provided information when we believe there should be information to report

Minerva Says:



Voting Activity

There was voting information disclosed for the following Scheme investments:

- BNY Mellon Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund
- LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund
- LGIM Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)
- LGIM World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)

Significant Votes

There was 'Significant Vote' information disclosed for the following Scheme investments:

- LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund
- LGIM Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)
- LGIM World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)

Engagement Activity

There was reportable engagement information provided for the following Scheme investments:

- BlackRock Corporate Bond Up to 5 Year Index Fund
- BNY Mellon Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund
- Columbia Threadneedle Pensions Property Fund
- LGIM Cash Fund
- LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund
- LGIM Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)
- LGIM LDI Matching Core Fund (4 funds)
- LGIM World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)
- Vontobel TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund

3 Voting and Engagement

The Trustees are required to disclose the voting and engagement activity over the Scheme year. The Trustees 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 inasmuch 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.

3.1 Stewardship

The Trustees' policy on Stewardship from the Scheme's SIP is set out below:

The Trustees' 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 Trustees' 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 as the Trustees believe this will be beneficial to the financial interests of members over the long term. The Trustees will review the investment managers' voting policies, with the help of their investment adviser, and decide if they are appropriate.

The Trustees also expect the fund manager to engage with investee companies on the capital structure and management of conflicts of interest.

If the policies or level of engagement are not appropriate, the Trustees will engage with the investment manager, with the help of their investment adviser, to influence the investment manager's policy. If this fails, the Trustees will review the investments made with the investment manager.

The Trustees have taken into consideration the Financial Reporting Council's UK Stewardship Code and expect investment managers to adhere to this where appropriate for the investments that 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?
BlackRock	Corporate Bond Up to 5 Year Index Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	25/08/22	N/A
BNY Mellon	Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	31/07/23	N/A
Columbia Threadneedle	Threadneedle Pensions Property Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	31/07/23	N/A
	Cash Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	20/09/22	N/A
	Dynamic Diversified Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	31/07/23	ISS
LGIM*	Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	30/08/22	31/07/23	ISS
	LDI Matching Core Fund (4 Funds)	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	31/07/23	N/A
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	31/07/23	ISS
Vontobel	TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/22	31/07/23	N/A

Note: The Scheme initially held the four LDI funds, but disinvested from one, the fixed long, on 05/09/2022



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 Trustees’ 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.
Is Voting Activity in Line with the Scheme’s Policy?	Yes 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dynamic Diversified Fund ▪ Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant) ▪ World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)
Key Points of Manager’s Voting Policy	<p>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.</p> <p>LGIM’s voting policy is built on the assessment of 5 key policy areas:</p>

#	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

Yes

Is Voting Activity in Line with the Scheme's Policy?

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



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's stewardship 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 Trustees believe 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

Manager	Fund	No. of Meetings		No. of Resolutions			
		Eligible for Voting	Eligible for Voting	% Eligible Voted	% Voted in Favour	% of Voted Against	% Abstain
	Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund	1	12	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Comments							
BNY Mellon	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 Trustees' expectations of its managers.						
	Dynamic Diversified Fund	9,368	96,858	99.8%	77.1%	22.6%	0.4%
	Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)	92	1,212	100.00%	74.42%	25.58%	0.00%
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	2,972	36,631	99.9%	79.2%	20.6%	0.2%
LGIM							
Comments							
	The manager provided a summarised voting record for the Funds shown above that covered the period from 01/07/22 to 30/06/23, rather than for the Scheme's investment holding 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 these four Funds, which is in line with the Trustees' 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.

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 ensure executive 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	
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	Infrastructure Equity Fund	Ferrovial SA	12/04/23	2.93%	Resolution 12 - Reporting on Climate Transition Plan	Against	Not stated
Why a 'Significant Vote'?							
Thematic - Climate: LGIM is publicly supportive of so called "Say on Climate" votes. We expect transition plans put forward by companies to be both ambitious and credibly aligned to a 1.5C scenario. Given the high-profile of such votes, LGIM deem such votes to be significant, particularly when LGIM votes against the transition plan.							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
Rationale: Climate Change: While the company's efforts are to be commended, a vote against is applied as LGIM expects net zero commitments, rather than carbon neutrality commitments.							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website the day after the company meeting, with a rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.							
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	Infrastructure Equity Fund	Aena S.M.E. SA	20/04/23	2.40%	Resolution 11 - Advisory Vote on Company's 2022 Updated Report on Climate Action Plan	Against	Not stated
Why a 'Significant Vote'?							
<p>Thematic - Climate: LGIM is publicly supportive of so called "Say on Climate" votes. We expect transition plans put forward by companies to be both ambitious and credibly aligned to a 1.5C scenario. Given the high-profile of such votes, LGIM deem such votes to be significant, particularly when LGIM votes against the transition plan.</p>							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
<p>Shareholder Resolution - Climate change: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects companies to introduce credible transition plans, consistent with the Paris goals of limiting the global average temperature increase to 1.5°C. This includes the disclosure of scope 1, 2 and material scope 3 GHG emissions and short-, medium- and long-term GHG emissions reduction targets consistent with the 1.5°C goal.</p>							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
<p>LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website the day after the company meeting, with a rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.</p>							
Next Steps / Implications of the Outcome:							
<p>LGIM will continue to engage with the company and monitor progress.</p>							
Relevance to Manager's Stated Policy:							
Company Board		Audit, Risk & Internal Control		Remuneration		Shareholder & Bondholder Rights	
<p>We believe this voting activity is consistent with the manager's stated approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach</p>							

Manager	Fund	Company Name	Date of Vote	Approx Size of Holding (as % of Fund)	Summary of Resolution	Voting Action	Outcome of Vote
LGIM	Infrastructure Equity Fund	Alliant Energy Corporation	23/05/23	0.66%	Resolution 1b - Elect Director Patrick E. Allen	Against	91.2% 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, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf. 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:

Remuneration - Accountability - Escalation: A vote against is applied as LGIM has had concerns with the remuneration practices for the past year. Classified Board: A vote against is applied as LGIM supports a declassified board as directors should stand for re-election on an annual basis. Diversity: A vote against is applied due to the lack of gender diversity at executive officer level. LGIM expects executives officers to include at least 1 female. 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 concerns. Future World Protection List: A vote against is applied as the company meets the criteria for inclusion in LGIM's Future World Protection List. Companies are incorporated into the List if they fail to meet minimum standards of globally accepted business practices. This includes: companies involved in the manufacture and production of controversial weapons; perennial violators of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC); and companies involved in thermal coal and oil sands.

Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?

LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website the day after the company meeting, with a rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.

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	Infrastructure Equity Fund	Xcel Energy Inc.	24/05/23	1.80%	Resolution 1c - Elect Director Bob Frenzel	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 concerns.							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website the day after the company meeting, with a rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.							
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	Infrastructure Equity Fund	American Water Works Company, Inc.	10/05/23	1.40%	Resolution 5 - Oversee and Report a Racial Equity Audit	For	Not stated
Why a 'Significant Vote'?							
Thematic - Diversity: LGIM considers this shareholder proposal significant as we view gender diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf.							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
Shareholder Resolution - Diversity: A vote in favour is applied as LGIM supports proposals related to diversity and inclusion policies as we consider these issues to be a material risk to companies.							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website the day after the company meeting, with a rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.							
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	
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	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Costco Wholesale Corporation	19/01/23	0.38%	Resolution 1h - Elect Director Jeffrey S. Raikes	Against	Not stated
Why a 'Significant Vote?'							
Thematic - Diversity: LGIM views gender diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf.							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
Diversity: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a company to have at least one-third women on the board. Average board tenure: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a board to be regularly refreshed in order to maintain an appropriate mix of independence, relevant skills, experience, tenure, and background. Diversity: A vote against is applied as the company has an all-male Executive Committee.							
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 policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.							
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	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Accenture Plc	01/02/23	0.31%	Resolution 1h - Elect Director Julie Sweet	Against	94.5% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

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 concerns.

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 policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.

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	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Hormel Foods Corporation	31/01/23	0.02%	Resolution 1j - Elect Director James P. Snee	Against	Not stated
Why a 'Significant Vote'?							
<p>Thematic - Climate: 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. 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).</p>							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
<p>Climate Change - Climate Impact Pledge - A vote against is applied as the company has failed to meet our minimum expectations under our climate impact pledge. 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 concerns.</p>							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
<p>LGIM's Climate Impact Pledge assessments are publicly available on our website, including identifying which indicators could potentially lead to a vote against. Where companies are at risk of a vote against, we generally inform the company in advance. This communication is normally sent in Q4. LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.</p>							
Next Steps / Implications of the Outcome:							
<p>LGIM will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.</p>							
Relevance to Manager's Stated Policy:							
Company Board		Audit, Risk & Internal Control	Remuneration	Shareholder & Bondholder Rights	Sustainability		
<p>We believe this voting activity is consistent with the manager's stated approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach</p>							

Manager	Fund	Company Name	Date of Vote	Approx Size of Holding (as % of Fund)	Summary of Resolution	Voting Action	Outcome of Vote
LGIM	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	KT&G Corp.	28/03/23	0.01%	Resolution 7.1 - Elect Kim Myeong-cheol as Outside Director	Against	Not stated
Why a 'Significant Vote?'							
Thematic - Nature: LGIM considers this vote to be significant as it is applied under our engagement program on deforestation, targeting companies in high-risk sectors.							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
Deforestation Policy: A vote against is applied as the company is deemed to not meet minimum standards with regard to LGIM's deforestation policy.							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
As part of our work on deforestation, engagement was undertaken in 2022 with companies that were at risk of not meeting LGIM's minimum expectations. LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management within one business day of the meeting. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.							
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	
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	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Amorepacific Corp.	17/03/23	0.01%	Resolution 1 - Approve Financial Statements and Allocation of Income	Against	Not stated
Why a 'Significant Vote'?							
Thematic - Nature: LGIM considers this vote to be significant as it is applied under our engagement program on deforestation, targeting companies in high-risk sectors.							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
Accounts: A vote against is applied as the Company has not provided the accounts in time ahead of the meeting. Deforestation Policy: A vote against is applied as the company is deemed to not meet minimum standards with regard to LGIM's deforestation policy.							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
As part of our work on deforestation, engagement was undertaken in 2022 with companies that were at risk of not meeting LGIM's minimum expectations. LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management within one business day of the meeting. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.							
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	
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 Trustees have set the following expectation in the Scheme's SIP in relation to its managers' engagement activity:

The Trustees will monitor the investment managers' engagement and voting activity on an annual basis as part of the implementation statement that supplements the Scheme's annual report and accounts.

The Trustees believe 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
BlackRock	YES	FUND	PART	The manager provided basic fund level engagement information for the period from 01/07/22 to 31/05/23 , rather than for the Scheme's reporting period
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
Vontobel	YES	FUND	YES	The manager provided detailed fund level engagement information for the Scheme's reporting period

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

BlackRock

Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements	Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered				Outcomes	
				Environmental	Social	Governance	Other	Resolved	Open
Corporate Bond Up To 5 Years Index Fund	01/07/22	31/05/23	654	21.3%	17.4%	61.3%	0.0%	Not Stated	Not Stated

Aspect of Engagement Activity	Details
-------------------------------	---------

BlackRock had the following to say with regards their approach to engagement, provided in the response to our information request:

‘Engagement is not one conversation. We have ongoing private dialogue with companies to explain our views and how we evaluate their actions on relevant ESG issues over time. Where we have concerns that are not addressed by these conversations, we stand ready to vote against proposals from management or the board. Each year we prioritize our work around engagement themes to encourage sound governance practices and deliver sustainable long-term financial performance for clients. Our approach emphasizes direct dialogue with companies.’

Key Points of the Manager’s Engagement Policy

Engagement Themes:

- 1) Board Quality and Effectiveness - Quality leadership is essential to performance. Board composition, effectiveness, diversity and accountability remain top priorities
- 2) Climate and Natural Capital - Climate action plans Bówith targets advance the transition to a low carbon economy. Managing natural capital dependencies and impacts through sustainable business practices
- 3) Strategy Purpose and Financial Resilience - A purpose driven long-term strategy, underpinned by sound capital management, supports financial resilience
- 4) Incentives Aligned with Value Creation - Appropriate incentives reward executives for delivering sustainable long-term value creation
- 5) Human Capital - Sustainable business practices create enduring value for all key stakeholders’

Additional information on Engagements provided by the Manager

Whilst the manager provided a list of engagements undertaken on investments 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

An example of a reported engagement for the Corporate Bond Up to 5 Years Index Fund is shown below:

18/05/23 – Mizuho Financial Group – E-Climatic Risk Management

Engagement Method: 1 video meeting.

Engagement Details: Governance: Risk Management / Business Oversight / Governance Structure / Remuneration

Engagement Outcome: Not stated.

Whilst we believe that the manager's engagement approach is consistent with the Scheme's approach, we are disappointed with the lack of details provided in relation to the engagement activity undertaken.

BNY Mellon

Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements	Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered				Outcomes	
				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

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 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

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

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.

The engagement activity is consistent with the Manager's stated engagement approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach.

Additional information on Engagements provided by the Manager

Comparison of the Manager's Engagement Activity vs the Trustees' policy

Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustees' Policy?

Columbia Threadneedle

Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements	Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered				Outcomes	
				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	<p>Columbia Threadneedle's general approach to engagement is set out in a document titled 'Responsible Investment: Global Policy and Approach'. They go on to say the following, but do not set out any specific engagement priorities or themes in the document:</p> <p><i>'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.'</i></p> <p>They have the following additional commentary on their engagement approach in another report, but again have not identified any specific engagement priorities or themes:</p> <p><i>'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.'</i></p> <p><i>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.'</i></p> <p><i>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.'</i></p>
Additional information on Engagements provided by the Manager	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ engagement objectives ▪ collaborative engagements

- process for escalating ineffective engagement and
- whether any fintech solution was used to facilitate engagement

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.
- 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.'

Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustees' Policy?

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

Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements	Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered					Outcomes	
				Environmental	Social	Governance	Other	Resolved	Open	
Cash Fund	01/07/22	30/06/23	14	42.8%	0.0%	51.7%	0.0%	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	
Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)	01/07/22	30/06/23	86	50.6%	4.7%	40.0%	4.7%	Not Stated	Not Stated	
LGIM LDI Matching Core Fund (4 funds)	01/07/22	30/06/23	39	61.5%	5.1%	33.3%	0.0%	Not Stated	Not Stated	
LGIM World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	01/07/22	30/06/23	1,133	33.8%	13.8%	41.7%	10.8%	Not Stated	Not Stated	

Aspect of Engagement Activity	Details
<p>Key Points of the Manager's Engagement Policy</p>	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>From LGIM's most recent Active Ownership Report the manager has identified the following as their top 5 engagement topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Climate Change 2. Remuneration 3. Diversity (Gender and Ethnicity) 4. Board Composition 5. Strategy
<p>Additional information on engagements provided by the Manager</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ engagement objectives ▪ collaborative engagements ▪ process for escalating ineffective engagement and ▪ whether any fintech solution was used to facilitate engagement
<p>Comparison of the Manager's Engagement Activity vs the Trustees' policy</p>	<p>Set out below is an example of engagement activity reported by LGIM in the World Equity Index Fund:</p> <p><u>28/03/23 - Exxon Mobil Corp – Environmental and Other-themed Engagement Activity</u></p> <p>Engagement Type: Not stated.</p> <p>Issue Theme: Environmental /Energy & Other / Strategy.</p> <p>Engagement Details: Not provided.</p>

	Engagement Outcome: Not provided.
Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustees' 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.

Vontobel

Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements	Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered				Outcomes	
				Environmental	Social	Governance	Other	Resolved	Ongoing
TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund	01/07/22	30/06/23	97	39.2%	11.3%	9.2%	40.0%	55.7%	44.3%

Aspect of Engagement Activity	Details
Key Points of the Manager's Engagement Policy	<p>TwentyFour have made the following statement in terms of their approach towards engagement activity:</p> <p><i>'The decision to engage with the management of an investee company is primarily based on what TwentyFour investment professionals believe will maximise bondholder value in the long-term, specifically the value of its clients' investments.</i></p> <p><i>TwentyFour's investment professionals may engage with company management on a variety of issues, including ESG matters that present a potential material risk to a company's financial performance. The Firm believes that its investment professionals are in the best position to evaluate the potential impact that ESG issues or the outcome of a given proposal will have on bondholder value. As such, all of the Firm's engagement activities are the responsibility of investment professionals and are fully integrated into its investment process.</i></p> <p><i>TwentyFour engages with the company management through periodic meetings, visits, and telephone calls during which Firm investment professionals discuss and pose questions on operational, strategic, and other management issues.</i></p> <p><i>TwentyFour's investment professionals communicate internally on the status of engagement activities and any outcomes arising.</i></p> <p><i>As a fixed income company TwentyFour's proxy voting rights are limited.'</i></p>

Additional information on engagements provided by the Manager	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ engagement objectives ▪ collaborative engagements
---	---

- process for escalating ineffective engagement and
- whether any fintech solution was used to facilitate engagement

An example of a reported engagement undertaken for the Strategic Income Fund is:

14/12/22 – Barclays Bank – Social and Governance-themed Engagement on Executive Remuneration & Russian Exposure

Engagement Details: 'Had a meeting with Barclays where we went through their new climate strategy. Barclays have said that they will take on no new coal clients by YE 2022 and there would be no financing to existing clients whereby more than 30% revenues came from Coal. We asked why it was not until 2035 that coal financing was completely phased out'

Barclays said that they would rather work with these companies and help them improve rather than stop financing and let these companies then go into less transparent funding. They did say that as time progresses, they would expect this target to come forward as a lot of their targets have come forward in the most recent climate action plan. We understand Barclays logic and also believe it is likely these targets will be brought forward over time.'

Engagement Outcome: Not stated.

The engagement activity is consistent with the Manager's stated Engagement Policy, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach.

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.

Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustees' Policy?

Comparison of the Manager's Engagement Activity vs the Trustees' policy



9 Conclusions

9.1 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

Fund / Product Manager	Investment Fund/ Product	Does the Manager's Reported Activity Follow the Scheme's Expectations:				UK Stewardship Code 2020 Signatory?	Overall Assessment
		Voting Activity	Significant Votes Identified	Engagement Activity	Use of a 'Proxy Voter?'		
BlackRock	Corporate Bond Up to 5 Year Index Fund	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A	YES	COMPLIANT
BNY Mellon	Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund	YES	N.I.R.	YES	N/A	YES	COMPLIANT
Columbia Threadneedle	Threadneedle Pensions Property Fund	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A		COMPLIANT
	Cash Fund	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A		COMPLIANT
	Dynamic Diversified Fund	YES	YES	YES	ISS	YES	COMPLIANT
LGIM*	Infrastructure Equity MFG Fund (GBP hedged variant)	YES	YES	YES	ISS		COMPLIANT
	LDI Matching Core Fund (4 Funds)	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A		COMPLIANT
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	YES	YES	YES	ISS		COMPLIANT
Vontobel	TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A	YES	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 BlackRock, Columbia Threadneedle and LGIM. Whilst BlackRock and 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

- i. Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) is a standard unit to compare the emissions of different greenhouse gases.
- ii. The choice of this metric follows best practice recommendations from the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures.
- iii. Data on carbon emissions from a company's operations and purchased energy is used.
- iv. 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.
- v. 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%.
- vi. 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.
- vii. 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.
- viii. 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.
- ix. 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.
- x. 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.
- xi. 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.
- xii. 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. 2022202. 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.