

Shaw (S&W) Pension Plan (the “Plan”)

Implementation Statement for the year ended 31 December 2020

Purpose

This Implementation Statement provides information on how, and the extent to which, the Trustee of the Shaw (S&W) Pension Plan (“the Plan”) has followed its policy in relation to the exercising of rights (including voting rights) attached to the Plan’s investments, and engagement activities during the year ended 31 December 2020 (“the reporting year”). In addition, the statement provides a summary of the voting behaviour and most significant votes cast during the reporting year.

Background

At the meetings of 12 February 2019 and 14 May 2019, the Trustee received training on Environmental, Social and Governance (“ESG”) issues from its Investment Adviser, XPS Investment (“XPS”) and discussed its beliefs around those issues. This enabled the Trustee to consider how to update its policy in relation to ESG and voting issues which, up until that point, had simply been a broad reflection of the investment managers’ own equivalent policies. The Trustee’s new policy was documented in the Statement of Investment Principles; latest dated September 2020.

The Trustee’s updated policy

The Trustee has considered its approach to environmental, social and corporate governance (“ESG”) factors and believes there can be financially material risks relating to them. The Trustee has delegated the ongoing monitoring and management of ESG risks and those related to climate change to the Plan’s investment managers. The Trustee requires the Plan’s investment managers to take ESG and climate change risks into consideration within their decision-making, recognising that how they do this will be dependent on factors including the characteristics of the asset classes in which they invest.

As the Plan invests in pooled funds, the Trustee acknowledges that it cannot directly influence the policies and practices of the companies in which the pooled funds invest. It has therefore delegated responsibility for the exercise of rights (including voting rights) attached to the Plan’s investments to the Investment Managers.

The Trustee encourages them to engage with investee companies and vote whenever it is practical to do so on financially material matters such as strategy, capital structure, conflicts of interest policies, risks, social and environmental impact and corporate governance as part of their decision-making processes. The Trustee requires the Investment Managers to report on significant votes made on behalf of the Trustee.

If the Trustee becomes aware of an Investment Manager engaging with the underlying issuers of debt or equity in ways that they deem inadequate or that the results of such engagement are mis-aligned with the Trustee’s expectations and the investment mandate guidelines provided, then the Trustee may consider terminating the relationship with that Investment Manager.

Manager selection exercises

One of the main ways in which this updated policy is expressed is via manager selection exercises: the Trustee will seek advice from XPS on the extent to which their views on ESG and climate change risks may be taken into account in any future investment manager selection exercises. During the reporting year, there have been no such manager selection exercises.

When considering the selection, retention or realisation of investments, the Trustee has a fiduciary responsibility to act in the best interests of the beneficiaries of the Plan, although it has neither sought, nor taken into account, the beneficiaries’

views on matters including (but not limited to) ethical issues and social and environmental impact. The Trustee will review this policy if any beneficiary views are raised in future.

Ongoing governance

The Trustee, with the assistance of XPS, monitor the processes and operational behaviour of the investment managers from time to time, to ensure they remain appropriate and in line with the Trustee's requirements as set out in this statement. In addition, XPS help the Trustee to monitor the investment managers' processes on a regular basis as part of their quarterly governance reporting. Over the reporting period, the Trustee has commissioned an ESG report from XPS into the Plan's holdings, to be presented in the new year.

XPS has initially reported to the Trustee at meetings that the ESG processes of the Plan's LGIM funds are at least satisfactory; referencing XPS's rating system for the analysis of funds. Beyond the governance work currently undertaken, the Trustee believes that their approach to, and policy on, ESG matters will evolve over time based on developments within the industry and, at least partly, on a review of data relating to the voting and engagement activity conducted annually.

Adherence to the Statement of Investment Principles

During the reporting year the Trustee is satisfied that it followed its policy on the exercise of rights (including voting rights) and engagement activities to an acceptable degree

Voting activity

The main asset class where the investment managers will have voting rights is equities. The Plan has specific allocations to pooled equity funds, and investments in equities will also form part of the strategy for the diversified growth funds in which the Plan invests. Therefore, a summary of the voting behaviour and most significant votes cast by each of the relevant investment manager organisations is shown below. Based on this summary, the Trustee concludes that the investment managers have exercised their delegated voting rights on behalf of the Trustee in a way that aligns with the Trustee's relevant policies in this regard. Below is the voting activity for equity focused funds within the portfolio.

Please note that all information provided on voting activity has been written by the investment managers, and this is reflected in the use of "we" throughout. Any views expressed are not necessarily those of the Trustee.

Legal & General Investment Management
Voting Information
Legal and General Investment Management Japan Equity Index Fund

The manager voted on 100% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 6538 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM's voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account. For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association consultation (PLSA). This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;

- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;
- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship’s 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found on the following page:

<https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM’s Investment Stewardship team uses ISS’s ‘ProxyExchange’ electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients’ shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
Olympus Corporation	'Resolution 3.1: Elect Director Takeuchi, Yasuo' at the company's annual shareholder meeting held on 30 July 2020.	We voted against the resolution.	94.90% of shareholders supported the election of the director

LGIM will continue to engage with and require increased diversity on all Japanese company boards.

<p>Fast Retailing Co. Limited.</p>	<p>Resolution 2.1: Elect Director Yanai Tadashi.</p>	<p>LGIM voted against the resolution.</p>	<p>Shareholders supported the election of the director.</p>
<p>LGIM will continue to engage with and require increased diversity on all Japanese company boards, including Fast Retailing.</p>			

Voting Information

Legal and General Investment Management North America Equity Index Fund

The manager voted on 100% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 9634 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM's voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account. For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association consultation (PLSA). This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;

- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship’s 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found on the following page:

<https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM’s Investment Stewardship team uses ISS’s ‘ProxyExchange’ electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients’ shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
Medtronic plc	Resolution 3 - Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation.	LGIM voted against the resolution.	The voting outcome was as follows: For: 91.73%; against: 8.23%.

LGIM will continue to monitor this company.

Amazon	Shareholder resolutions 5 to 16	Of 12 shareholder proposals, we voted to support 10. We looked into the individual merits of each individual proposal, and there are two main areas which drove our decision-making: disclosure to encourage a better understanding of process and performance of material issues (resolutions 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15 and 16) and governance structures that benefit long-term shareholders (resolutions 9 and 14).	Resolution 5 to 8, and 14 to 16 each received approx. 30% support from shareholders. Resolutions 9 and 10 received respectively 16.7 and 15.3% support. Resolution 11 received 6.1% support. Resolution 12 received 1.5 % support. Resolution 13 received 12.2% support. (Source: ISS data)
Despite shareholders not giving majority support to the raft of shareholder proposals, the sheer number and focus on these continues to dominate the landscape for the company. Our engagement with the company continues as we push it to disclose more and to ensure it is adequately managing its broader stakeholders, and most importantly, its human capital.			
Cardinal Health	Resolution 3, Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation.	LGIM voted against the resolution.	The resolution encountered a significant amount of oppose votes from shareholders, with 38.6% voting against the resolution and 61.4% supporting the proposal.
LGIM continues to engage with US companies on their pay structures and has published specific pay principles for US companies.			
ExxonMobil	Resolution 1.10 - Elect Director Darren W. Woods	Against	93.2% of shareholders supported the re-election of the combined chair and CEO Darren Woods. Approximately 30% of shareholders supported the proposals for independence and lobbying. (Source: ISS data)
We believe this sends an important signal, and will continue to engage, both individually and in collaboration with other investors, to push for change at the company. Our voting intentions were the subject of over 40 articles in major news outlets across the world, including Reuters, Bloomberg, Les Echos and Nikkei, with a number of asset owners in Europe and North America also declaring their intentions to vote against the company.			
The Procter & Gamble Company (P&G)	Resolution 5 Report on effort to eliminate deforestation.	LGIM voted in favour of the resolution.	The resolution received the support of 67.68% of shareholders (including LGIM).
LGIM will continue to engage with P&G on the issue and will monitor its CDP disclosure for improvement.			

Voting Information

Legal and General Investment Management Europe (ex UK) Equity Index

The manager voted on 99.88% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 10402 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM's voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account. For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association consultation (PLSA). This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;

- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship's 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found on the following page:

<https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM's Investment Stewardship team uses ISS's 'ProxyExchange' electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients' shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
Lagardere	Shareholder resolutions A to P. Activist Amber Capital, which owned 16% of the share capital at the time of engagement, proposed 8 new directors to the Supervisory Board (SB) of Lagardere, as well as to remove all the incumbent directors (apart from two 2019 appointments).	LGIM voted in favour of five of the Amber-proposed candidates (resolutions H,J,K,L,M) and voted off five of the incumbent Lagardere SB directors (resolutions B,C,E,F,G).	Even though shareholders did not give majority support to Amber's candidates, its proposed resolutions received approx. between 30-40% support, a clear indication that many shareholders have concerns with the board. (Source: ISS data)
LGIM will continue to engage with the company to understand its future strategy and how it will add value to shareholders over the long term, as well as to keep the structure of SB under review.			

Voting Information

Legal and General Investment Management Asia Pacific (ex-Japan) Developed Equity Index

The manager voted on 100% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 3634 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM's voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account. For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association consultation (PLSA). This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;

- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship's 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found on the following page:

<https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM's Investment Stewardship team uses ISS's 'ProxyExchange' electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients' shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
Qantas Airways Limited	<p>Resolution 3 Approve participation of Alan Joyce in the Long-Term Incentive Plan</p> <p>Resolution 4 Approve Remuneration Report.</p>	<p>LGIM voted against resolution 3 and supported resolution 4.</p>	<p>About 90% of shareholders supported resolution 3 and 91% supported resolution 4. The meeting results highlight LGIM's stronger stance on the topic of executive remuneration, in our view.</p>
<p>We will continue our engagement with the company.</p>			
Whitehaven Coal	<p>Resolution 6 Approve capital protection. Shareholders are asking the company for a report on the potential wind-down of the company's coal operations, with the potential to return increasing amounts of capital to shareholders.</p>	<p>LGIM voted for the resolution.</p>	<p>The resolution did not pass, as a relatively small amount of shareholders (4%) voted in favour. However, the environmental profile of the company continues to remain in the spotlight: in late 2020 the company pleaded guilty to 19 charges for breaching mining laws that resulted in significant environmental harm. As the company is on LGIM's Future World Protection List of exclusions, many of our ESG-focused funds and select exchange-traded funds were not invested in the company.</p>
<p>LGIM will continue to monitor this company.</p>			

Voting Information

Legal and General Investment Management UK Equity Index Fund

The manager voted on 100% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 12468 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM's voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account. For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association consultation (PLSA). This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;

- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship’s 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found on the following page:

<https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM’s Investment Stewardship team uses ISS’s ‘ProxyExchange’ electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients’ shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
International Consolidated Airlines Group	Resolution 8: Approve Remuneration Report' was proposed at the company's annual shareholder meeting held on 7 September 2020.	We voted against the resolution.	28.4% of shareholders opposed the remuneration report.

LGIM will continue to engage closely with the renewed board.

Pearson	'Resolution 1: Amend remuneration policy' was proposed at the company's special shareholder meeting, held on 18 September 2020.	We voted against the amendment to the remuneration policy.	At the EGM, 33% of shareholders voted against the co-investment plan and therefore, by default, the appointment of the new CEO.
Such significant dissent clearly demonstrates the scale of investor concern with the company's approach. It is important that the company has a new CEO, a crucial step in the journey to recover value; but key governance questions remain which will now need to be addressed through continuous engagement.			
SIG plc.	'Resolution 5: Approve one-off payment to Steve Francis' proposed at the company's special shareholder meeting held on 9 July 2020.	We voted against the resolution.	The resolution passed. However, 44% of shareholders did not support it. We believe that with this level of dissent the company should not go ahead with the payment.
We intend to engage with the company over the coming year to find out why this payment was deemed appropriate and whether they made the payment despite the significant opposition.			
Barclays	Resolution 29 - Approve Barclays' Commitment in Tackling Climate Change Resolution 30 - Approve Share Action Requisitioned Resolution	LGIM voted for resolution 29, proposed by Barclays and for resolution 30, proposed by Share Action.	Resolution 29 - supported by 99.9% of shareholders Resolution 30 - supported by 23.9% of shareholders (source: Company website)
The hard work is just beginning. Our focus will now be to help Barclays on the detail of their plans and targets, more detail of which is to be published this year. We plan to continue to work closely with the Barclays board and management team in the development of their plans and will continue to liaise with Share Action, Investor Forum, and other large investors, to ensure a consistency of messaging and to continue to drive positive change.			
Rank Group	Resolution 2 Approve the remuneration report; and resolution 3 Approve remuneration policy.	LGIM supported both resolutions.	90.79% of shareholders supported resolution 2 and 96.4% supported resolution 3. However, it should be noted that a majority shareholder owned 56.15% of the voting rights shortly before the time of the vote. This remains an interesting outcome given the recommendation of a vote against both resolutions by influential proxy voting agency ISS.
Our engagement with the company on the topic of remuneration led to an informed vote decision by LGIM.			

Voting Information

Legal and General Investment Management World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund

The manager voted on 99.87% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 34537 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM's voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account. For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association consultation (PLSA). This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;

- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship’s 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found on the following page:

<https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM’s Investment Stewardship team uses ISS’s ‘ProxyExchange’ electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients’ shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result

There were no significant votes made in relation to the securities held by this fund during the reporting period.

Voting Information

Legal and General Investment Management Dynamic Diversified Fund

The manager voted on 99.86% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 81093 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM's voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account. For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association consultation (PLSA). This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;

- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship's 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found on the following page:

<https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM's Investment Stewardship team uses ISS's 'ProxyExchange' electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients' shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
Qantas Airways Limited	<p>Resolution 3 Approve participation of Alan Joyce in the Long-Term Incentive Plan</p> <p>Resolution 4 Approve Remuneration Report.</p>	<p>LGIM voted against resolution 3 and supported resolution 4.</p>	<p>About 90% of shareholders supported resolution 3 and 91% supported resolution 4. The meeting results highlight LGIM's stronger stance on the topic of executive remuneration, in our view.</p>
<p>We will continue our engagement with the company.</p>			
Whitehaven Coal	<p>Resolution 6 Approve capital protection. Shareholders are asking the company for a report on the potential wind-down of the company's coal operations, with the potential to return increasing amounts of capital to shareholders.</p>	<p>LGIM voted for the resolution.</p>	<p>The resolution did not pass, as a relatively small amount of shareholders (4%) voted in favour. However, the environmental profile of the company continues to remain in the spotlight: in late 2020 the company pleaded guilty to 19 charges for breaching mining laws that resulted in significant environmental harm. As the company is on LGIM's Future World Protection List of exclusions, many of our ESG-focused funds and select exchange-traded funds were not invested in the company.</p>
<p>LGIM will continue to monitor this company.</p>			

International Consolidated Airlines Group	Resolution 8: Approve Remuneration Report' was proposed at the company's annual shareholder meeting held on 7 September 2020.	We voted against the resolution.	28.4% of shareholders opposed the remuneration report.
LGIM will continue to engage closely with the renewed board.			
Lagardere	Shareholder resolutions A to P. Activist Amber Capital, which owned 16% of the share capital at the time of engagement, proposed 8 new directors to the Supervisory Board (SB) of Lagardere, as well as to remove all the incumbent directors (apart from two 2019 appointments).	LGIM voted in favour of five of the Amber-proposed candidates (resolutions H,J,K,L,M) and voted off five of the incumbent Lagardere SB directors (resolutions B,C,E,F,G).	Even though shareholders did not give majority support to Amber's candidates, its proposed resolutions received approx. between 30-40% support, a clear indication that many shareholders have concerns with the board. (Source: ISS data)
LGIM will continue to engage with the company to understand its future strategy and how it will add value to shareholders over the long term, as well as to keep the structure of SB under review.			
Pearson	'Resolution 1: Amend remuneration policy' was proposed at the company's special shareholder meeting, held on 18 September 2020.	We voted against the amendment to the remuneration policy.	At the EGM, 33% of shareholders voted against the co-investment plan and therefore, by default, the appointment of the new CEO.
Such significant dissent clearly demonstrates the scale of investor concern with the company's approach. It is important that the company has a new CEO, a crucial step in the journey to recover value; but key governance questions remain which will now need to be addressed through continuous engagement.			

Signed: _____, Chair of Trustee

Date: _____