

Marks & Clerk Retirement and Death Benefits Scheme ('the Scheme') – Implementation Statement 6th April 2022 – 5th April 2023

An Implementation Statement ('Statement') has been prepared in accordance with applicable legislation, taking into account guidance from The Pensions Regulator for the period from 6th April 2022 – 5th April 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 is set out below.

Legal and General Investment Management ('LGIM')

In relation to LGIM's Diversified Fund, World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund and World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant), voting information was provided but for a slightly different reporting period (01/04/22 to 31/03/23). Minerva confirmed that the manager's voting policies and disclosures broadly comply with the ICGN Voting Guidelines Principles and good corporate governance practices. They were also able to confirm the manager's voting activity has followed the Trustee's policy. LGIM provided engagement information at a fund level but only included basic information.

Both LGIM's voting and engagement information covered a period that is not in line with the Scheme's reporting period as the manager was not able to provide monthly data, only quarterly. The Trustee will continue to encourage LGIM to provide detailed information, in line with the Scheme's reporting period, but acknowledge that the information provided was in line with the Trustee's own policies.

In relation to LGIM's Matching Core LDI Funds, it was determined that the Scheme's holdings had no voting or engagement information to report due to the nature of the underlying holdings.

Engagement activity information was provided for LGIM's Managed Property Fund and Sterling Liquidity Fund, noting that the coverage period was slightly different to the Scheme Year. Due to the nature of these funds, it was concluded that there was no voting activity to report.

BNY Mellon

The Trustee believes its voting and engagement policies were followed. However, the following points were noted:

- 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.

Payden & Rygel

Payden & Rygel stated that there was no voting information to report, however, information was provided on engagements, albeit at a summarised fund level, and covering a period (01/01/22 to 31/12/22) that is not in line with the Scheme's investment holding period (06/04/22-01/08/22). However, from this, Minerva was able to conclude that the manager had followed the Trustee's engagement policy.

Vontobel

Due to the nature of the underlying holdings, Vontobel stated that there was no voting information to report, however, information was provided on engagements covering fund level engagement for the full Scheme Year. From this, Minerva was able to conclude that the manager had followed the Trustee's engagement policy.

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

Since last year, there has been some improvement in the information provided from LGIM, who continue to provide limited engagement information. LGIM previously provided basic voting and engagement information at firm level only. Further improvement is needed to provide this information at a more detailed fund level and to provide both voting and engagement information in line with the Scheme's reporting period. However, Payden & Rygel provided a response this year. BNY Mellon and Vontobel continued to provide good levels of information.

Minerva will seek any outstanding information and will agree a way forward on any actions identified with the Trustee once this information is available.

Marks & Clerk Retirement and Death Benefits Scheme

Dalriada Trustees Limited

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

Scheme Reporting Period:
6th April 2022 to 5th April 2023

3rd June 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	41

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:

*Marks and Clerk Retirement and Death Benefits Scheme
Statement of Investment Principles
August 2022*



1.1 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 that it is 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 it cannot directly influence the environmental, social and governance policies and practices of the companies in which the pooled funds invest. However, the Trustee does expect its investment 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 its 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 signatories for the United Nations Principles of Responsible Investment ('UN PRI') or other similarly recognised standards.

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.

1.2 Non-Financial Considerations

The Trustee has 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 Trustee's policies

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

The Trustee uses the fund objective/benchmark as a guide on whether the Scheme's 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 it believes should include assessing the long term financial and non-financial performance of the underlying company.

The Trustee also considers each manager's voting and ESG policies and how it engages with the investee company as it believes that these can factors can improve the medium to long-term performance of the investee companies.

The Trustee will monitor the investment managers' engagement and voting activity on an annual basis as it believes this can improve long term performance. The Trustee expects its 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 it achieves, but does expect that investing in companies with better financial and non-financial performance over the long term will lead to better returns for the Scheme. The Trustee believes the annual fee paid to the investment managers incentivises them to execute their investment policies consistently, as the longer the units are held the larger income to the investment manager.

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, it will use these factors in deciding whether to retain or terminate a manager.

How the method (and time horizon) of the evaluation of the investment 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 individual funds over at least a 3-5 year period or over a market cycle, if appropriate, 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 a percentage of the assets held in each fund so the amount each manager receives is based upon the value of assets held with them. The remuneration paid out by the Scheme will depend upon the asset allocation. The charges are considered as part of the manager selection process. The

charges are monitored regularly with the help of the investment consultant to ensure they are in line with the Trustee's policies for each fund. The Trustee believes that its own and each investment manager's goals are aligned.

How the Trustee monitors portfolio turnover costs incurred by the investment 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 its investment consultant

The duration of the arrangement with the investment managers

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

Changes in investment strategy or change in the view of the investment manager 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
BNY Mellon	Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund	Full Info Available	No Info to Report	Full Info Available
	Diversified Fund	Part Info Available	Full Info Available	Part Info Available
LGIM*	Managed Property Fund	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	Part Info Available
	Matching Core LDI Fund (4 funds)	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	No Info to Report
	Sterling Liquidity Fund	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	Part Info Available
	World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	Part Info Available	Full Info Available	Part Info Available
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Part Info Available	Full Info Available	Part Info Available
Payden & Rygel	Absolute Return Bond Fund	No Info to Report	No Info to Report	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 Scheme's investments in the following funds:

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

Significant Votes

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

- LGIM Diversified Fund
- LGIM World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund
- LGIM World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)

Engagement Activity

There was reportable engagement information provided for the Scheme's investments with the following managers:

- BNY Mellon Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund
- LGIM Diversified Fund
- LGIM Managed Property Fund
- LGIM Sterling Liquidity Fund
- LGIM World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund
- LGIM World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)
- Payden & Rygel Absolute Return Bond Fund
- Vontobel TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund

3 Voting and Engagement

The Trustee is 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 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 Voting and Engagement Policy and Funds

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, as the Trustee believes this will be beneficial to the financial interests of members over the long term. The Trustee will review the investment managers' voting policies, with the help of its investment consultant, and decide if they are appropriate.

The Trustee also expects the investment 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 Trustee will engage with the investment manager, with the help of its investment consultant, to influence the investment manager's 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.

Table 3.1 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	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	05/04/2023	N/A
	Diversified Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	05/04/2023	ISS
	Managed Property Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	05/04/2023	N/A
LGIM	Matching Core LDI Fund (4 funds)	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	05/04/2023	N/A
	Sterling Liquidity Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	01/08/2022	05/04/2023	N/A
	World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	05/04/2023	ISS
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	05/04/2023	ISS
Payden & Rygel	Absolute Return Bond Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	01/08/2022	N/A
Vontobel	TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund	Mobius Platform	DB Fund	06/04/2022	05/04/2023	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.
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"> ▪ Diversified Fund ▪ World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund ▪ 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

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

Minerva Says

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

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 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
BNY Mellon	Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund	2	22	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Comments						
	The manager provided a summarised voting record for the Global Dynamic Bond Fund that covered the Scheme's investment holding period. From the summarised information provided, we can see that the manager has voted at all investee company meetings for the Fund, which is in line with the Trustee's expectations of its managers.						
LGIM	Diversified Fund	9,541	99,252	99.8%	77.4%	21.9%	0.7%
	World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	4,231	36,506	99.9%	79.5%	18.4%	2.1%
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	3,145	38,823	99.9%	78.8%	20.5%	0.7%
	Comments						
The manager provided summarised voting records for the 3 funds shown above, for the period from 01/04/22 to 31/03/23, rather than for the actual investment holding periods of 06/04/22 to 05/04/23 (the manager does not provide part period information). 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	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	Diversified Fund	Alphabet Inc.	01/06/22	0.10%	Resolution 7 - Report on Physical Risks of Climate Change	For	17.7% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote?'

LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of our climate-related engagement activity and our public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.

Manager's Vote Rationale:

Shareholder Resolution - Climate change: A vote in favour is applied as LGIM expects companies to be taking sufficient action on the key issue of climate change.

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	Diversified Fund	Royal Dutch Shell Plc	24/05/22	0.33%	Resolution 20 - Approve the Shell Energy Transition Progress Update	Against	79.9% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote'?

LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of our climate-related engagement activity and our public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.

Manager's Vote Rationale:

Climate change: A vote against is applied, though not without reservations. We acknowledge the substantial progress made by the company in strengthening its operational emissions reduction targets by 2030, as well as the additional clarity around the level of investments in low carbon products, demonstrating a strong commitment towards a low carbon pathway. However, we remain concerned about the disclosed plans for oil and gas production, and would benefit from further disclosure of targets associated with the upstream and downstream businesses.

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

Voted in line with management.

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	Diversified Fund	Rio Tinto Plc	06/04/22	0.30%	Resolution 17 - Approve Climate Action Plan	Against	84.3% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote?

LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of our climate-related engagement activity and our public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.

Manager's Vote Rationale:

Climate change: We recognise the considerable progress the company has made in strengthening its operational emissions reduction targets by 2030, together with the commitment for substantial capital allocation linked to the company's decarbonisation efforts. However, while we acknowledge the challenges around the accountability of scope 3 emissions and respective target setting process for this sector, we remain concerned with the absence of quantifiable targets for such a material component of the company's overall emissions profile, as well as the lack of commitment to an annual vote which would allow shareholders to monitor progress in a timely manner.

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	Diversified Fund	Prologis, Inc.	04/05/22	0.26%	Resolution 1.9 - Elect Director Michael W. Ranger	Against	92.9% of votes cast were in support of the resolution
Why a 'Significant Vote?							
<p>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). 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.</p>							
Manager's Vote Rationale:							
<p>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. Independence: 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.</p>							
Were Votes Against Company Management Communicated to the Company Ahead of the Meeting?							
<p>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		
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 Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	Meituan	15/05/22	1.3%	Resolution 2 - Elect Wang Xing as Director	Against	91.8% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote'?

LGIM views diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf. LGIM also 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). 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.

Manager's Vote Rationale:

Diversity: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a company to have at least one female on the board. Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects the roles of Chair and CEO to be separate. These two roles are substantially different and a division of responsibilities ensures there is a proper balance of authority and responsibility on the board. A vote AGAINST the election of Xing Wang and Rongjun Mu is warranted given that their failure to ensure the company's compliance with relevant rules and regulations raise serious concerns on their ability to fulfill fiduciary duties in the company.

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 Policy, 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 Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	China Construction Bank Corporation	23/06/22	1.1%	Resolution 10 - Elect Graeme Wheeler as Director	Against	95.5% 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 under LGIM's Climate Impact Pledge as the Company has not published a clear thermal coal policy and no disclosure of scope 3 emissions associated with investments. As members of the Risk Committee, these directors are considered accountable for the bank's 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 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 Policy, 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 Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	Xiaomi Corporation	02/06/22	0.3%	Resolution 2 - Elect Lei Jun as Director	Against	98.9% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote'?

LGIM views diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf. LGIM also 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). 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.

Manager's Vote Rationale:

Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects the roles of Chair and CEO to be separate. These two roles are substantially different and a division of responsibilities ensures there is a proper balance of authority and responsibility on the board. Remuneration Committee: A vote against has been applied because LGIM expects the Committee to comprise independent directors. Diversity: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a company to have at least one female on the board. Board mandates: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a CEO not to hold too many external roles to ensure they can undertake their duties effectively.

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 Policy, 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 Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	Macrotech Developers Ltd.	10/08/22	0.01%	Resolution 2 - Reelect Rajinder Pal Singh as Director	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:

Audit Committee: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects the Committee to be comprised of independent directors. Remuneration Committee: A vote against has been applied because LGIM expects the Committee to comprise independent directors. Additionally, a vote AGAINST the following nominee is warranted because: The board does not have an independent female director and Rajinder Pal Singh is the most senior member of the nomination 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 Policy, 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 Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	Sempra Energy	13/05/22	<0.01%	Resolution 4 - Require Independent Board Chair	LGIM voted in favour of the shareholder resolution	37.9% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote?'

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.

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 Policy, 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)	Amazon.com, Inc.	25/05/22	1.8%	Resolution 1f - Elect Director Daniel P. Huttenlocher	Against	93.3% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote'?

LGIM pre-declared its vote intention for this resolution, demonstrating its significance.

Manager's Vote Rationale:

Human rights: A vote against is applied as the director is a long-standing member of the Leadership Development & Compensation Committee which is accountable for human capital management failings.

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)	Meta Platforms, Inc.	25/05/22	0.78%	Resolution 5 - Require Independent Board Chair	LGIM voted in favour of the shareholder resolution	16.7% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote'?

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.

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)	Demant A/S	08/03/23	0.01%	Resolution 6.a - Reelect Niels B. Christiansen as Director	Abstain	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:							
Audit Committee independence: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects the Committee to be comprised of independent directors. Remuneration Committee independence: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects the Committee to be comprised of independent directors. Remuneration - Accountability - Escalation - A vote against is applied as LGIM has had concerns with remuneration practices for consecutive years. Diversity: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a company to have a diverse board, with at least one-third of board members being women. We expect companies to increase female participation both on the board and in leadership positions 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 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)	Cyrela Brazil Realty SA Empreendimentos e Participacoes	22/04/22	0.001%	Resolution 6 - Elect Directors	Against	76.3% of votes cast were in support of the resolution

Why a 'Significant Vote?

LGIM views diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf.

Manager's Vote Rationale:

Bundled: Independence: A vote against is applied as the board is not sufficiently independent which is a critical element of a board to protect shareholders minority shareholder's interests. Bundled: Diversity: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a company to have a diverse board, including at least one woman. We expect companies to further increase female participation on the board and leadership positions over time. Bundled: Board mandates: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a CEO or a non-executive director not to hold too many external roles to ensure they can undertake their duties effectively.

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)	Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc.	16/09/22	0.04%	Resolution 1a - Elect Director Strauss Zelnick	Against	93.0% 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:

Transparency: A vote against has been applied as the company has failed to report on their material ESG factors in line with the GRI or SASB reporting framework. 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. Independence: 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.

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 has 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, as the Trustee believes this will be beneficial to the financial interests of members over the long term. The Trustee also expects the investment manager to engage with investee companies on the capital structure and management of conflicts of interest.

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 (Newton)	YES	FUND	YES	The manager provided <i>detailed fund level engagement information</i> covering the Scheme's reporting period
LGIM	YES	FUND	YES	The manager provided <i>basic fund level information</i> for period from 01/04/22 to 31/03/23, which does not precisely match the Scheme's individual investment holding periods
Payden & Rygel	YES	FUND	YES	The manager provided <i>summarised fund level engagement information</i> for period from 01/01/22 to 31/12/22, which does not precisely match the Scheme's investment holding period
Vontobel (TwentyFour)	YES	FUND	YES	The manager provided <i>detailed fund level engagement information</i> covering 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

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	06/04/22	05/04/23	20	55.0%	20.0%	25.0%	0.0%	Not Stated	Not Stated

Aspect of Engagement Activity	Details
Key Points of the Manager's Engagement Policy	<p>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:</p> <p><i>'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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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'</i></p> <p>From Newton's most recent 'Responsible Investment and Stewardship' report the manager identified the following key engagement themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 / Related-party transactions / Remuneration / Shareholder communications / Shareholder rights / Strategy and risk / Tax

<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 Trustee’s policy</p>	<p>An example of a reported engagement for the Global Dynamic Bond Fund is:</p> <p><u>Q4 2022 - HSBC – Engagement on Environmental Issues</u></p> <p>Engagement Activity: <i>‘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.</i></p> <p><i>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.’</i></p> <p>Engagement Outcome: Not disclosed by the manager.</p>
<p>Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustee’s Policy?</p>	<p>The engagement activity is consistent with the Manager’s stated engagement approach, and so is also consistent with the Scheme’s approach.</p>

LGIM

Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements	Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered				Outcomes	
				Environmental	Social	Governance	Other	Resolved	Open
Diversified Fund	01/04/22	31/03/23	1,547	37.2%	18.4%	36.5%	7.9%	Not Stated	Not Stated

Managed Property Fund	01/04/22	31/03/23	50	58.0%	4.0%	34.0%	4.0%	Not Stated	Not Stated
Sterling Liquidity Fund	01/04/22	31/03/23	50	58.0%	4.0%	34.0%	4.0%	Not Stated	Not Stated
World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	01/04/22	31/03/23	295	43.1%	24.1%	21.4%	11.5%	Not Stated	Not Stated
World Equity Index Fund (including GBP Hedged variant)	01/04/22	31/03/23	591	43.3%	19.1%	32.3%	5.2%	Not Stated	Not Stated

Aspect of Engagement Activity	Details
Key Points of the Manager's Engagement Policy	<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
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

<p>Comparison of the Manager's Engagement Activity vs the Trustee's policy</p>	<p>Set out below is an example of engagement activity reported by LGIM in the World Equity Index Fund:</p> <p><u>05/10/22 - Procter & Gamble Co – Environmental-themed Engagement Activity</u></p> <p><i>Engagement Type: Conference Call.</i></p> <p><i>Issue Theme: Deforestation / Biodiversity.</i></p> <p><i>Engagement Details: Not provided.</i></p> <p><i>Engagement Outcome: Not provided.</i></p>
<p>Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustee's Policy?</p>	<p>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.</p>

Payden & Rygel

Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements	Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered				Outcomes	
				Environmental	Social	Governance	Other	Resolved	Open
Absolute Return Bond Fund	01/01/22	31/12/22	165	63.6%	24.2%	12.1%	0.0%	Not Stated	Not Stated

Aspect of Engagement Activity	Details
<p>Key Points of the Manager's Engagement Policy</p>	<p>Payden & Rygel has the following to say in terms of its engagement approach, which is set out in their Issuer Engagement Policy:</p> <p>'...the firm does seek to engage with investee companies both in respect of its fixed income and public equities' investment management. In addition to the exercise of voting rights where these are applicable, we approach engagement and stewardship through both ongoing due diligence research/meetings with corporate management and the new issue channel. This approach involves direct engagement with issuers during their debt issuance process. We are active members of external shareholder engagement related organizations in order to align ourselves with industry practice. These organisations include being a signatory to the Principles for Responsible Investment and an alliance member of the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board. The Firm's parent company, Payden & Rygel, has constituted both an ESG Group and a Proxy Voting Committee, the remit of both of which extends to consideration of governance issues including monitoring and dialogue with investee companies as well as the analysis of voting issues. The firm has representation on both these committees.'</p>

	<p>Dialogue with investee companies</p> <p><i>It is the Firm's policy to engage with numerous investee companies (both private sector corporates and quasi-sovereigns) each year as part of our normal course of business. We base our engagement on the SASB Engagement Guide, a standardized, industry-specific framework aimed at driving issuer transparency. We monitor the number of meetings we conduct with issuers' teams. Our engagement activity and discussions are an important part of our fundamental analysis. This engagement includes in-person and conference call meetings, as well as through meeting with management through conferences. Not only do these discussions enhance our analysis, they also provide an avenue for us to promote ESG values to issuers.'</i></p> <p>We were unable to locate any further information relating to the specific nature, or priorities, of the manager's engagement policy on their website.</p>
<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 Trustee's policy</p>	<p>An example of a reported engagement undertaken for the Absolute Return Bond Fund is:</p> <p><u>2022 – AstraZeneca – Environmental and Social-themed Engagement on Carbon Emissions & Workforce Diversity</u></p> <p><u>Engagement Details:</u> <i>'We engaged management in discussions regarding both traditional financial factors and ESG topics. The ESG topics included:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Environmental goals – 2 reports on ESG; have sustainability report; got data KPI summary 100% renewable electricity;</i> ▪ <i>Verified CO2 emissions - carbon neutral by 2026 (Scope 1 and Scope 2); carbon negative by 2045 (apply stricter criteria). Carbon neutral includes in management compensation and direct incentive; and</i> ▪ <i>Ethics and transparency – 48% women in senior and middle management roles; no racial target goal on inclusion and diversity; ethnic minority for US employees at 32% at end of 2021'</i> <p><u>Engagement Outcome:</u> <i>'The engagement met our objectives and was included as part of the credit research process to inform our view of the company.'</i></p>
<p>Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustee's Policy?</p>	<p>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.</p>

Vontobel

				Breakdown of Engagement Topics Covered				Outcomes	
				Environmental	Social	Governance	Other	Resolved	Open
Fund(s)	Period Start	Period End	No. of Engagements						
TwentyFour Strategic Income Fund	06/04/22	05/04/23	98	53.0%	38.8%	8.2%	-	Not Stated	Not Stated
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 								
Comparison of the Manager's	<p>An example of a reported engagement undertaken for the Strategic Income Fund is:</p> <p><u>14/12/22 – Barclays Bank – Social and Governance-themed Engagement on Executive Remuneration & Russian Exposure</u></p>								

<p>Engagement Activity vs the Trustee's policy</p>	<p><u>Engagement Details:</u> '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'</p> <p>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.'</p> <p><u>Engagement Outcome:</u> Not stated.</p>
<p>Is Engagement Activity in Line with the Trustee's Policy?</p>	<p>The engagement activity is consistent with the Manager's stated Engagement Policy, and so is also consistent with the Scheme's approach.</p>

Minerva Says

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

9 Conclusions

9.1 Assessment of Compliance

In this report, Minerva has undertaken an independent review of the Scheme's external investment 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?'		
BNY Mellon	Newton Global Dynamic Bond Fund	YES	N.I.R.	YES	N/A	YES	COMPLIANT
	Diversified Fund	YES	YES	YES	ISS		COMPLIANT
	Managed Property Fund	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A		COMPLIANT
	Matching Core LDI Fund (4 funds)	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	N/A		N.I.R.
LGIM*	Sterling Liquidity Fund	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A	YES	COMPLIANT
	World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	YES	YES	YES	ISS		COMPLIANT
	World Equity Index Fund (including GBP hedged variant)	YES	YES	YES	ISS		COMPLIANT
Payden & Rygel	Absolute Return Bond Fund	N.I.R.	N.I.R.	YES	N/A	YES	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:
 - There was nothing to report for a number of the Scheme's investments, due to the nature of those investments (e.g., LGIM LDI Funds)
 - For the managers where Voting and 'Significant Vote' information was available, their overall approaches are in step with the Scheme's requirements
 - For the managers where Engagement information was available, their overall approaches are also in step with the Scheme's requirements
- 2) All of the Scheme's investment managers are signatories to the UK Stewardship Code.
- 3) We remain disappointed with LGIM's inability to provide bespoke reporting that matches their clients' own reporting periods, and with LGIM and Payden & Rygel in terms of limited engagement information provided.

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 a 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.

