Section 8 - Implementation Statement

Introduction

This Implementation Statement has been prepared by the Trustee of the Morgan Group Senior Staff Pension and Life Assurance Scheme ("the Trustee") and relates to the Morgan Group Senior Staff Pension and Life Assurance Scheme ("the Scheme").

Under regulatory requirements, the Trustee is required to produce an annual Implementation Statement setting out how the stewardship and engagement policies described in the Scheme's Statement of Investment Principles ("the SIP") have been followed. This statement covers the period from 1st April 2021 to 31st March 2022, the Scheme year-end.

This document aims to set out, at a high level, how the Trustee's policies on stewardship and engagement under the terms of the SIP have been implemented. Where relevant, this document describes the areas of the portfolio where stewardship and engagement are most likely to be financially material. Also disclosed is the Trustee's opinion on the outcomes of voting and engagement activity for managers that hold listed equities. This document also summarises changes to the Scheme's governance structure or investment strategy over the period.

Changes to the SIP over the period

The Scheme's SIP was last updated in October 2021 to reflect two changes:

During the period, the Trustee made the decision to amalgamate the duties of the Joint Funding and Investment Committee ("JFIC") and the Trustee Board, owing to the large overlap in membership of each body. This change in governance structure was effective from the Trustee Board meeting on the 24 March 2021 and has been reflected in the SIP accordingly.

As explained in the "Investment Strategy and Risk Management" section of this Implementation Statement, a de-risking trigger process has been put in place and the SIP has been updated to describe this de-risking trigger process.

Summary of how investment decisions are taken for the Scheme

The Trustee Board considers issues, including investment issues, which face the Trustee. The Trustee Board's has responsibility for implementing strategy, monitoring Scheme progress against the Scheme's journey plan, and monitoring investment advisers, fund managers and investments. The Trustee Board oversees any strategic investment changes, such as investing in a new asset class, disinvesting from an existing investment manager and appointing a new investment manager or other investment-related service provider.

The investment strategy is set with the aim of ensuring that sufficient assets are available to pay members' and dependents' benefits as and when they fall due in accordance with the Scheme's rules. To meet the agreed long-term funding objective within a level of contributions that the Sponsor has indicated it is willing to make, the Trustee takes investment risks relative to the liabilities in order to target a greater return than matching assets would provide whilst maintaining a prudent approach to meeting the Scheme's liabilities.

The Trustee seeks guidance and written advice from its investment adviser as appropriate when undertaking these activities.

The Trustee manages the Scheme's investment strategy in accordance with the policies set out in the SIP.

How the Trustee has implemented its investment policies

How the Trustee has implemented its investment policies

Governance:

In March 2022 the Trustee agreed a protocol for confirming whether to implement pre-agreed de- risking actions. The protocol allows for a subset of the Trustee Board, including the Company Representative, to agree by a simple majority the proposed de-risking provided it remains consistent with previously agreed parameters. The aim is to facilitate swift implementation to help the Scheme reduce risk when it can afford to do so, in a timely manner.

There were no other changes to the Scheme's governance structure over the year to 31 March 2022.

Investment Strategy and Risk Management:

During the period and following formal advice from the investment adviser, the Scheme disinvested from three mandates – Schroders Multi-Asset Total Return ("MATR") Fund, Artemis Emerging Market Equities Fund ("Artemis") and Man Diversified Risk Premia Fund ("DRP"). The proceeds of the MATR and Artemis divestments were invested in two new mandates: Amundi Multi Strategy Growth Fund and Schroders Securitised Income Fund. The proceeds of the Man DRP investment were invested in a new strategy, the Man Progressive DRP ("PDRP") fund. The implementation of all these changes was completed during June 2021.

The Scheme put in place a trigger process whereby the Trustee may decide to reduce the allocation to higher-returning assets when the expected return on assets exceeds the return on assets required to meet the funding target. The purpose of this process is to reduce investment risk when the Scheme can afford to do so from an asset return perspective.

There have been no other investment strategy changes over the year to 31 March 2022.

In accordance with the SIP, the Trustee receives a quarterly written report on the performance of the Scheme's investment managers against their relevant benchmarks from its investment adviser, using information provided by the investment managers.

Also, in accordance with the SIP, the Trustee receives a quarterly written report on the performance of the Scheme's investment strategy and position against agreed objectives, including risk, return and liquidity metrics, from its investment adviser.

All the Scheme's investment mandates are held in pooled funds, which is appropriate due to the size of the mandates. Investment manager guidelines have been reviewed at the outset by the investment adviser and the Scheme's legal adviser prior to Trustee approval. Any updates to the guidelines

undergo a review process with advice from relevant advisers before being approved and signed by relevant Trustee representatives.

Manager fees are reviewed at the implementation of mandates with relevant turnover costs disclosed by the investment managers to the Trustee. Periodically, the Trustee reviews the manager fees paid by the Scheme and transaction costs incurred by the funds to ensure they are in keeping with the asset class.

Stewardship, engagement and voting behaviour

Over the period, the Scheme invested in three new investment mandates, the Amundi Multi Strategy Growth Fund, Schroders Securitised Income Fund and Man PDRP Fund. As per the Trustee's policy in the SIP, prior to appointing these managers, the Scheme's investment adviser assessed their ability to factor in engagement and environmental, social and governance ("ESG") risks into the decision- making process in an appropriate manner for the given asset class.

Direct engagement with underlying companies (as well as other relevant persons) of which the Trustee owns shares and debt is carried out by the Scheme's investment managers. The Trustee recognises that its ability to influence investment managers' stewardship activities will depend on the nature of the investments held. As the Scheme's assets are wholly invested in pooled funds – where the Trustee holds units in a fund rather than having any direct ownership rights over the underlying assets – the Trustee has limited scope to influence managers' stewardship activities.

The Trustee's policy is to delegate responsibility for the engagement with relevant persons, which includes delegating the exercise of rights (including voting rights) attaching to investments to the investment managers. Each investment manager is expected to exercise voting rights in accordance with their guidelines. The Trustee encourages its managers to engage with investee companies and promote adherence to best practice in corporate governance. The Trustee meets its managers periodically, where the managers are required to present on these activities and the Trustee holds the managers accountable to the standards expected by the Trustee.

Stewardship and engagement (including the use of voting rights) is most likely to be financially material in the sections of the portfolio where physical equities are held. Over the period these were: Artemis Emerging Market Equity Fund, Man Diversified Risk Premia Fund, Man Progressive Diversified Risk Premia Fund, Schroder MATR Diversified Growth Fund and Amundi Multi-Strategy Growth Fund. Regardless, engagement is also considered to be of importance for all the Scheme's investment managers.

All the Scheme's investment managers are signatories of the UK Stewardship Code. The code sets out a clear benchmark for stewardship as the responsible allocation, management, and oversight of capital to create long-term value. The Scheme's managers have not flagged any non-compliance with the principles of the code and the Trustee is comfortable they provide good quality and transparent reporting of their approach to stewardship. More information on how each of the Scheme's managers have followed the stewardship and engagement policies set out by the Trustee can be found in the appendix.

For the Scheme's managers that hold physical equities, we have included further detail and an overview of votes cast during the year.

Environmental, social and governance issues

In March 2022 the Trustee received training from its investment adviser on the Taskforce on Climate- related Financial Disclosures ("TCFD"). The training covered climate change as a financial risk to pension schemes and steps the Scheme could take to mitigate climate risk.

Prior to appointing Amundi and Schroders for the new mandates - chosen during the previous Scheme year and implemented in June 2021 - the Scheme's investment adviser assessed their ability to incorporate all financially material considerations, including ESG considerations, into their investment process at an appropriate level for the asset class in question. In this way, the Trustee is satisfied that the ESG policy as set out in the SIP has been followed.

In June 2021, the Scheme transitioned from the Man DRP Fund to the ESG-focused Man Progressive Diversified Risk Premia Fund. Compared to the original Man DRP Fund, the PDRP Fund has enhanced ESG risk management credentials. It applies negative screens (tobacco, nuclear weapons and companies highly dependent on coal-based revenues). It also intends to use ESG as a diversifying risk factor that can provide risk/return benefits uncorrelated to traditional quantitative models.

The Scheme's investment adviser continues to regularly monitor the Scheme's existing managers, with financially material ESG considerations in mind. Regular updates regarding this are relayed to the Trustee. Financially material ESG considerations are also discussed during the Trustee's periodic meetings with their managers.

Over the period the Trustee did not factor non-financial decisions (such as ethical or moral beliefs) into their investment decision-making, in line with the SIP.

Concluding remarks

The Trustee is comfortable that the voting and engagement policies in the SIP have all been adequately followed over the Scheme year. The Trustee is satisfied that the implementation of the Trustee's policies for the Scheme is consistent with the SIP and is appropriate for the circumstances of the Scheme.

Appendix

Each of the Scheme's investment managers has provided a statement on their stewardship approach. These can be found below.

Amundi

For the specific investment strategy, engagement and voting is conducted at the Group level. Please find detailed information on our engagement and voting activities in the Annual Engagement Report available on the Amundi website: https://www.amundi.com/institutional/Responsible-investment- documentation

The subject of engagement is linked to the double materiality perspective. Engagement with issuers should not only be on how sustainability issues may affect the company (sustainability risk) or the material issues that affect profit & loss, cash flows, balance sheet or valuation. Engagement is also about how the company affects society and the elements of sustainability (such as impacts on environmental, social and employee matters, respect for human rights, anti-corruption and anti- bribery matters), material to society and the global economy even though they might not be material for the financial statements of the company, on a short to medium term horizon.

Artemis

"Artemis Global Emerging Markets is a systematic strategy which uses an in-house proprietary model known as SmartGARPTM. Given the nature of this strategy, Artemis do not meet company management as part of their stock selection process. However, they do vote on all holdings, unless restricted from doing so. Artemis has its own voting policy which is informed by external research providers and internal analysis of global best practice, most notably Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS).

Artemis believe that companies with good and improving performance on material ESG issues are shareholder-value enhancing and therefore portfolio performance is viewed as the most important metric by which to measure the impact of incorporating ESG considerations."

BlackRock

"The monitoring of investee companies on relevant matters (as defined by the SRD II) is not relevant to the UK Property Fund. However, BlackRock communicate that where possible and practical they strive to actively engage with the tenants of their Property Fund to further communicate and progress sustainability performance across their range of assets. The range of activities that may be implemented vary from asset to asset, considering factors such as property type and tenant type, but often include a combination of campaigns, activities and events that address sustainable best practice, such as energy and resource efficiency.

This aligns with firm-level efforts to encourage companies to have the corporate governance and business practices best aligned with delivering long-term sustainable growth and returns for clients."

Man Group

"Man Group believes that as stewards of our clients' capital we owe it to them to actively and responsibly manage their entrusted resources in order to unlock long term and sustained value. Man Group supports the UK Stewardship Code 2020 and is working to applying its twelve principles across the firm's investment strategies.

Man Group's investment businesses monitor their underlying companies in different ways. Because of the nature of the strategies, Man Group's systematic businesses have limited direct engagement with investee companies or other stakeholders. Instead, they apply quantitative tools to provide oversight at the portfolio level, or where appropriate in exposure to individual investee companies.

Where direct engagement does take place, a transparent and collaborative approach is favoured. This will generally involve the company being written to in the first instance with the issues that Man are keen to address being defined. Following on from this an in-person meeting or conference call will then be scheduled to discuss these matters at length, clarify our expectations, and hear what the Company has to say.

The way we choose to lead an engagement is not static, however, but varies depending on the Company's response, circumstances and type of engagement. Man Group sees merit in engagement activities that go beyond company specific meetings to address some of the themes that will shape the markets in which we invest. We recognise the benefits of different forms of engagement and the advantages of working collaboratively – from combining shareholder power and maximising influence to sharing resources and expertise.

Man Group has appointed a proxy voting service provider, Glass Lewis, to provide it with certain proxy voting services including but not limited to analyses, research, recommendations and guidelines to assist Man Group in voting proxies. Man Group has adopted the Glass Lewis standard policy with an overlay focused on ESG standards. Man Group's Stewardship and Active Ownership team oversees the proxy voting process.

We are also signatories to a number of initiatives and industry bodies aimed at formulating policy proposals to support the efficient functioning of investment markets."

Schroders

"As active investors, we continually monitor a company's management and performance, including developments which may have a significant impact on valuation or risk profile, as part of our investment process and ownership responsibilities. Our analysts publish their research on our centralised global research platform which is accessible to all investors. The extent and frequency of monitoring depends on the type of investment.

Further to this, as active owners we recognise our responsibility to making considered use of voting rights. We therefore vote on all resolutions at all AGMs/EGMs globally unless we are restricted from doing so (e.g. as a result of share blocking).

We aim to take a consistent approach to voting globally, subject to regulatory restrictions that is in line with our published ESG policy. The overriding principle governing our voting is to act in the best interests of our clients. We accept that conflicts of interest arise in the normal course of business. To address these we have a documented Group wide policy, covering such occasions, to which all employees are expected to adhere. Training on this is provided and the policy is reviewed on an annual basis.

Our Corporate Governance analysts are responsible for making voting decisions. We currently use Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS) as our service provider for the processing of proxy votes in all markets. ISS delivers vote processing through their internet-based platform (Proxy Exchange), and Schroders receives ISS research on resolutions. We complement this with analysis by our in-house ESG specialists and where appropriate with reference to financial analysts and portfolio managers."

TwentyFour

"We believe in actively engaging on behalf of our clients at a company, industry and regulatory level. As fixed income investors, our voting rights are limited, thus engagement as a fixed income manager is somewhat different to that of managers in the equity space. Our level of engagement is relatively high when appropriate. There are a number of reasons for this though central is the experience level of our partners and portfolio managers who can easily engage with companies or industry bodies at the highest levels.

It is a requirement of the Portfolio Managers to meet the management of every company that issues, manages or services any instrument in which we invest. We will not invest if any company involved in a deal does not pass our rigorous due diligence, including (but not limited to) formal ESG questions.

The Portfolio Managers are responsible for ESG assessment and engagement for the bonds that they cover. ESG factors are discussed in each individual bond's write-up and the proposer of any bond is challenged on their ESG credentials. We then engage on a broad range of ESG issues on companies that we can invest with by face to face meetings (or virtually where social distancing measures are in place) and correspondence over email. All email correspondence is logged in our internal system so that the whole investment team can access them."

Voting Disclosures and Significant Votes

The use of voting rights is applicable to sections of the portfolio where physical equities are held. For The Morgan Group Senior Staff Pension and Life Assurance Scheme this applies to four asset managers: Artemis Emerging Market Equity, Amundi Multi Strategy Growth Fund, Man Diversified Risk Premia (Man DRP), Man Progressive Diversified Risk Premia (Man PDRP) and Schroder Multi-Asset Total Return ("MATR") Diversified Growth Fund. This appendix details voting behaviour and significant votes undertaken by these asset managers on behalf of the Scheme.

Artemis

Voting Disclosure

The Scheme divested from the Artemis Emerging Market Equity as at the 30 June 2021, hence we have quoted the significant votes for the period of 1 April 2021 – 30 June 2021.

Artemis Emerging Market Equity (1 April 2021 – 30 June 2021)	
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at over the period?	88
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on over the period?	1,082
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	100.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	89.9%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	10.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you abstain from?	0.1% (1 proposal)
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	59.0%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	Artemis have their own proxy voting policy. Artemis use ISS to facilitate the implementation of this policy but their recommendations do not make up part of their decision-making process.
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	0.1% (1 proposal)

Significant Votes

Artemis defines a significant vote as votes against management and where Artemis was voting in excess of 1% of the issued share capital.

Significant Vote	Summary of the resolution	Artemis Vote	Rationale
1	Approve Estimated Connected Transactions	Against	A vote AGAINST this proposal is warranted because the proposed related-party transactions include financial services with the group finance company, which may expose the company to unnecessary risks.
2	Approve Issuance of Equity or Equity-Linked Securities without Pre-emptive Rights	Against	A vote AGAINST this resolution is warranted for the following: - The share issuance limit is greater than 10 percent of the relevant class of shares. - The company has not specified the discount limit.
3	Approve Estimated Guarantees of the Company	Against	A vote AGAINST this resolution is warranted since the company will be taking in a disproportionate amount of risk relative to its ownership stake without compelling justification.
4	Approve Issuance of Equity or Equity-Linked Securities without Pre-emptive Rights	Against	A vote AGAINST this resolution is warranted for the following: - The share issuance limit is greater than 10 percent of the relevant class of shares. - The company has not specified the discount limit.
5	Elect Jerry Hsu as Director	Against	A vote against is warranted as the director's attendance has been unsatisfactory over the last two years without a reasonable explanation.

Amundi

Voting Disclosure

The Scheme invested in the Amundi Multi Strategy Growth Fund as at the 15 June 2021, hence we have quoted the significant votes for the period of 15 June 2021 – 31 March 2022.

Amundi Multi Strategy Growth Fund (15 June 2021 – 31 March 2022)	
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at over the period?	15
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on over the period?	185
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	100.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	86.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	14.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you abstain from?	0.0%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	53.0%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	Amundi uses its firm wide Proxy Voting Policy, please refer to policy here: https://www.amundi.com/institutional /Responsible-investment- documentation. The team uses the ISS Proxyexchange platform to send its voting instructions. Analysis from ISS, Glass Lewis, and ECGS is available to identify problematic resolutions more efficiently, while retaining complete autonomy from their recommendations.
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	N/A

Significant Votes

Amundi have no significant vote examples to report on within the reporting period.

Man

The Scheme moved their allocation in the Man DRP Fund to Man PDRP Fund on the 16 June 2021. Hence, we have quoted the significant votes for the period of 1 April 2021 – 16 June 2021 for Man DRP and significant votes for the period 16 June 2021 – 31 March 2022 for Man PDRP.

Voting Disclosure Man DRP

Man Diversified Risk Premia (1 April 2021 – 16 June 2021)	
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at over the period?	518
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on over the period?	6,429
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	100.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	89.7%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	10.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you abstain from?	0.3%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	52.0%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	Man use Glass Lewis, with their own bespoke policy as a service according to Man Group's ESG Voting Policy
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	0.03%

Significant Votes

To determine “most significant votes” Man’s proxy voting framework comprises a bespoke screening system that identifies ‘high-value meetings’. This screening combines the ESG rating from a third- party provider with an internal metric on deemed importance of the meeting. If a company falls below a certain threshold score in any area (ESG rating) and/ or is considered materially important based on the % of shares outstanding held by Man or fund’s AUM, the meeting will be flagged to Man’s Stewardship Team and be considered ‘high-value’. In addition to this, all meetings with shareholder proposals are also flagged to the Stewardship Team and reviewed.

We have included Man DRP’s most significant votes for the period 1 April 2021 – 16 June 2021 below.

Significant Vote	Summary of the resolution	Man Vote	Rationale
1	Shareholder Proposal Regarding GHG Reduction Targets	For	Favour increased environmental reporting/responsibility.
2	Shareholder Proposal Regarding Disclosure of Business Alliance Agreements	For	Favour improved disclosure around shareholder rights.
3	Shareholder Proposal Regarding issuance of a Climate Transition Report	For	Favour increased environmental reporting/responsibility.
4	Shareholder Proposal Regarding Median Gender and Racial Pay Equity Report	For	Favour increased disclosure and reporting over gender and racial pay disparity.
5	Shareholder Proposal Regarding Median Gender and Racial Pay Equity Report	For	Favour increased disclosure and reporting over gender and racial pay disparity.
6	Election of director	Against	No independent lead or presiding director; Vote results not disclosed

Man PDRP

Man Progressive Diversified Risk Premia (16 June 2021 – 31 March 2022)	
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at over the period?	228
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on over the period?	2,363
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	100.0%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	90.4%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	9.6%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you abstain from?	0.3%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	51.0%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	Man use Glass Lewis, with their own bespoke policy as a service according to Man Group's ESG Voting Policy
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	0.0%

Significant Votes

To determine "most significant votes" Man's proxy voting framework comprises a bespoke screening system that identifies 'high-value meetings'. This screening combines the ESG rating from a third- party provider with an internal metric on deemed importance of the meeting. If a company falls below a certain threshold score in any area (ESG rating) and/ or is considered materially important based on the % of shares outstanding held by Man or fund's AUM, the meeting will be flagged to Man's Stewardship Team and be considered 'high-value'. In addition to this, all meetings with shareholder proposals are also flagged to the Stewardship Team and reviewed.

We have included Man PDRP's most significant votes for the period 16 June 2021 – 31 March 2022 below.

Significant Vote	Summary of the resolution	Man Vote	Rationale
1	Shareholder Proposal Regarding Disclosure of Business Alliance Agreements	For	Favour improved disclosure around shareholder rights.
2	Shareholder Proposal Regarding issuance of a Climate Transition Report	For	Favour increased environmental reporting/responsibility.
3	Shareholder Proposal Regarding Median Gender and Racial Pay Equity Report	For	Favour increased disclosure and reporting over gender and racial pay disparity.
4	Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation	Against	The Company has pay for performance issues and does not link any long-term incentive grant to sustainability metrics.

Schroders

Voting Disclosure

Multi-Asset Total Return Fund (MATR)

Schroders Multi-Asset Total Return Fund (1 April 2021 – 30 June 2021)	
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at over the period?	774
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on over the period?	1,150
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	93.23%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	83.50%

Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	9.74%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you abstain from?	6.76%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	N/A
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	*'Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS) act as our one service provider for the processing of all proxy votes in all markets. ISS delivers vote processing through their Internet- based platform Proxy Exchange.* *Schroder's receives ISS's research on resolutions. This is complemented with analysis by our in house ESG specialists and where appropriate with reference to financial analysts and portfolio managers. For our smallest holdings in the US, Hong Kong, Japan, Australia and New Zealand, ISS implements a custom Schroders voting policy for us, with only a few resolutions referred to Schroders for a final decision.* *ISS automatically votes all our holdings of which we own less than 0.5% (voting rights) excluding merger, acquisition and shareholder resolutions. This ensures consistency in our voting decisions as well as creating a more formalised approach to our voting process.'*
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	4.80%

Significant Votes

Schroders believe that all votes against management should be classified as a significant vote. However, they believe resolutions related to certain topics carry particular significance. Schroders therefore rank the significance of their votes against management, firstly by management say on climate votes, secondly environmental and social shareholder resolutions, thirdly any shareholder resolutions and finally by the size of our holding.

Significant Vote	Summary of the resolution	Schroders Vote	Rationale
1	Report on Government Financial Support and Access to COVID-19 Vaccines and Therapeutics	For	The resolution requests that the company provide information on how government funding received by the company and its business partners for Covid- 19 vaccine development will impact its access strategies.
2	Report on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Disclosure	For	The company is asked to publish an annual report on its GHG emissions levels in line with TCFD recommendations, including its reduction strategy and progress – and to give shareholders a non-binding vote on the reduction plan.
3	Emission Reduction Targets	For	The company is being asked to report on plans to reduce total contribution to climate change and align its operations with the Paris Agreement goals.
4	Instruct Company to Set Short, Medium, and Long- Term Targets for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions of the Company’s Operations and the Use of Energy Products	For	The company is being asked to set short, medium and long-term targets for GHG emissions of the company's operations and the use of energy products.
5	Ratify PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP as Auditors	Against	Excessive auditor tenure.
6	Report on Access to COVID- 19 Products	For	The resolution requests that the company provide information on if and how government funding received by the company during the pandemic will impact its access strategies.
7	Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation	Against	Lack of performance conditions attached to NEO LTI awards.
8	Approve the Company's Sustainable Development and Energy Transition	Against	The company is seeking approval of its sustainable development and energy transition strategy.
9	Report on Annual Climate Transition	For	The company is being asked to issue an annual climate transition report.
10	Annual Investor Advisory Vote on Climate Plan	For	The company is being asked to provide shareholders with the opportunity of an annual advisory vote on the company's climate-related policies and strategies.