

Rexel UK Pension Scheme

Implementation Statement (forming part of the Trustee's report)

Scheme year ended 5 April 2023

This Implementation Statement has been approved by the Trustee of the Rexel UK Pension Scheme ("the Scheme") and sets out the following information over the year to 5 April 2023:

- A summary of how the Trustee's policies, as included in their Statement of Investment Principles ("SIP"), have been followed over the year.
- A summary of any review of, or changes to, the SIP over the period.
- A summary of how the Trustee's policies on exercising rights (including voting rights) and engagement activities have been followed over the year.
- The voting activity undertaken by the Scheme's investment managers on behalf of the Trustee over the year, including information regarding the most significant votes and the use of proxy voting services.

Additional Voluntary Contributions are not covered by this Statement as they are not considered to be material in the context of the overall Scheme.

Stewardship policy

The Scheme's SIP in force at the time of preparing this Statement describes the Trustee's policy on the exercise of rights (including voting rights) and engagement activities. The SIP has been made available online here:

<https://corporate.rexel.co.uk/pensions-report/>

The SIP has been updated following the Scheme year end (agreed in June 2023) and the new SIP will be made available at the above address in due course.

The Trustee has delegated the exercise of rights attaching to investments (including voting rights) and in undertaking engagement activities to the Scheme's investment managers.

The Trustee has decided not to set stewardship priorities for the DB section of the Scheme at present because the Scheme solely invests through pooled investment vehicles where the Scheme's asset only represents a small proportion of the capital invested in the funds, and the Trustee understands that they are constrained by the policies of the managers. However, the Trustee takes the managers' stewardship priorities and approach to climate risk and ESG factors into account at manager selection. The Trustee also reviews the stewardship and engagement activities of the investment managers annually with the help of their investment adviser, via their annual Sustainability Monitoring Report and during the production of the Implementation Statement.

Additionally, given the DC section's imminent transfer to a Master Trust, the Trustee decided not to set stewardship priorities within the DC section at this time.

Summary of how the SIP has been followed over the year

The Scheme's SIP was updated during the year to 5 April 2023. The update was agreed in June 2022 and reflected the fact that the Scheme had ceased to invest in passive equities and had added an investment in a closed-ended fund.

The SIP has also been updated after the year end, with the update agreed in June 2023. This update reflects the acquisition of BMO Global Asset Management (EMEA) by Columbia Threadneedle, the disinvestment from the Columbia Threadneedle Dynamic Real Return Fund and some other minor changes to the strategic asset allocation.

In the Trustee's opinion, the SIP has been followed over the year in the following ways:

- The investment strategy for the DB section of the Scheme has been set with regard to the Scheme's investment objectives, taking into account factors including (but not limited to) the level of expected investment return, the level of acceptable risk, the cashflow profile of the Scheme and the selection of appropriate investment managers.
- The defined contribution ("DC") section of the Scheme offers a suitable default strategy for members. During the year, the Trustee agreed that the DC section would transfer to a Master Trust operated by Scottish Widows during 2023. Whilst it is three years since the Trustee reviewed the composition of the Default fund, given the imminent transfer to a Master Trust, the Trustee decided at the March 2023 meeting that the review should be deferred and considered as part of the transition.
- The Trustee monitors the performance of the DB and DC funds quarterly to ensure that the funds are meeting their stated objectives and that the risk/return characteristics of the funds remain appropriate for the Scheme. The Scheme's Investment Consultant provides quarterly performance reports for the Trustee to review which consider the ongoing suitability of the funds in which the Scheme invests.
- The creditworthiness of the Employer is monitored on a regular basis through reporting provided by the Scheme's Actuarial Advisors.
- There were no new manager appointments over the year, therefore policies which relate to new manager appointments do not apply during the period.

The Trustee considers the voting and engagement policies set out in the SIP to have been met in the following ways:

- The Scheme invests entirely in pooled funds and, as such, the Trustee delegates responsibility for carrying out voting and engagement activities to the Scheme's investment managers.
- The Trustee reviewed the stewardship and engagement activities of their managers via their annual "ESG monitoring report", dated September 2022, which included stewardship activities applicable to the time horizon of the Scheme, including voting and engagement activity, and were satisfied that no remedial action was required at the time.
- As part of ongoing monitoring of the Scheme's managers, the Trustee uses ESG ratings information available within the pensions industry and provided by its Investment Consultant to assess how the Scheme's managers take account of ESG issues.
- Annually the Trustee receives and reviews voting information and engagement policies from the managers, which it reviews to ensure alignment with its own policies. Based on the information provided, the Trustee is satisfied that the managers' behaviour for this Scheme year is consistent with the Trustee's

policies for both financially material and non-financial matters, as set out in the SIP.

The subsequent sections of this Statement set out the voting behaviour of the managers over the year, including a summary of significant votes and engagement activities.

Summary

Based on the information contained within this Statement, the Trustee is comfortable with how the SIP has been followed over the year and believes that the managers have acted in accordance with the Scheme's ESG and stewardship policies. The Trustee is supportive of the key voting action taken by the applicable managers over the period to encourage positive governance changes in the companies in which they hold shares.

The Trustee and their Investment Consultant are working with the managers to provide additional information in the future in order to enhance their ability to assess the managers' actions.

Approved by the Trustee of the Rexel UK Pension Scheme

September 2023

Voting data

The voting data collated for the Scheme is given over the year to 31 March 2023 as this is the nearest quarter-end date to the Scheme's year-end.

There are no voting rights attached to the Columbia Threadneedle liability-driven investment ("LDI") funds, the Columbia Threadneedle Sterling Liquidity Fund or the credit funds in which the Scheme invests (the Barings Global High Yield Credit Strategies Fund, the Columbia Threadneedle Global Absolute Return Bond Fund, the Insight Buy & Maintain Credit funds, the Insight Global ABS Fund and the Janus Henderson Multi-Asset Credit Fund). As such, these funds are not included in the tables below.

As the Scheme disinvested from the Columbia Threadneedle Diversified Real Return Fund early in the reporting period, this fund is not included in the tables below.

Manager	Abrdn	Legal & General Investment Management	Legal & General Investment Management
Fund name	Diversified Growth Fund	Multi-Asset Fund (Formerly Consensus Fund)	UK Equity Index Fund
Structure	Pooled		
Ability to influence voting behaviour of the manager	The pooled fund structure means that there is limited scope for the Trustee to influence the manager's voting behaviour		
Number of company meetings the manager was eligible to vote at over the year	605	9,817	733
Number of resolutions the manager was eligible to vote on over the year	8,561	100,084	10,870
Percentage of resolutions voted on (for which the manager was eligible)	98%	> 99%	100%
Percentage of resolutions the manager abstained from * †	< 1%	< 1%	0%
Percentage of resolutions voted with management * †	86%	78%	94%
Percentage of resolutions voted against management * †	13%	22%	6%
Proxy voting advisor employed	ISS, with bespoke policy, for all voting requirements	ISS, with bespoke policy, for both advice and execution	ISS, with bespoke policy, for both advice and execution
Percentage of resolutions voted contrary to the recommendation of the proxy advisor	9%	12%	4%

* As a percentage of the resolutions on which the investment manager voted.

† Figures may not sum due to rounding.

Source: Information provided by the investment managers.

Manager	Legal & General Investment Management	Partners Group
Fund name	World (ex UK) Equity Index Fund	Partners Fund ^{††}
Structure	Pooled	
Ability to influence voting behaviour of the manager	The pooled fund structure means that there is limited scope for the Trustee to influence the manager's voting behaviour	
Number of company meetings the manager was eligible to vote at over the year	3,008	58
Number of resolutions the manager was eligible to vote on over the year	36,202	853
Percentage of resolutions voted on (for which the manager was eligible)	>99%	100%
Percentage of resolutions the manager abstained from * [†]	<1%	2%
Percentage of resolutions voted <i>with</i> management * [†]	78%	94%
Percentage of resolutions voted <i>against</i> management * [†]	22%	4%
Proxy voting advisor employed	ISS, with bespoke policy, for both advice and execution	Glass Lewis, with in-house policy, for advice and execution; Partners vote manually where GL recommendation differs from their in-house policy
Percentage of resolutions voted contrary to the recommendation of the proxy advisor	15%	1%

* As a percentage of the resolutions on which the investment manager voted.

[†] Figures may not sum due to rounding.

^{††} The voting information for the Partners Fund relates to the year to 31 December 2022 and only to the listed equity components of the portfolio (i.e. the voting information excludes the private equity components).

Source: Information provided by the investment managers.

Significant votes

The change in Investment and Disclosure Regulations that came into force from October 2020 requires information on significant votes carried out on behalf of the Trustee over the year to be set out. The guidance does not currently define what constitutes a “significant” vote. However, recent guidance states that a significant vote is likely to be one that is linked to one or more of a scheme’s stewardship priorities or themes.

At this time, the Trustee has not set stewardship priorities or themes for the Scheme, so, for this Implementation Statement, the Trustee has asked the investment managers to determine what they believe to be a “significant vote” and a sample of the most significant of these (determined by size of holding where available) over the year to 5 April 2023 across each of the relevant funds in which the Scheme invests is set out below. Abrdn and Partners were unable to provide details which would allow for an assessment of which votes may be most significant (as per the approach outlined above) and therefore the sample of votes shown has been selected to represent a variety of themes. The Trustee, through its investment consultant, has provided feedback to Abrdn and Partners on their reporting in the hope of being able to reflect the most significant votes going forwards.

The Trustee has not communicated voting preferences to their investment managers over the period, as the Trustee is yet to develop a specific voting policy.

Abrdn Diversified Growth Fund

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Berkeley Group Holdings Plc	Walmart Inc.	General Mills, Inc.
Date of vote	6 September 2022	1 June 2022	27 September 2022
Approximate size of Fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	Not provided		
Summary of the resolution	Approve remuneration policy	Prepare report on health care reform	Report on Absolute Plastic Packaging Use Reduction
How the manager voted	Against	Abstain	For
If the vote was against management, did the manager communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Not provided		
Rationale for the voting decision	Abrdn voted against this resolution as the new remuneration policy would facilitate a generous one-off long-term incentive plan award which Abrdn did not consider to be appropriate.	While Abrdn recognises the potential risks that a change in legislation could pose, they believed that the nature of the proposal made it unclear as to how the company could quantify and report on such risks and hence they abstained from voting on this proposal. Abrdn encourages the company to take the steps it deems necessary to uphold this commitment and be prepared for potential legislative change.	The environmental impacts of plastic are a growing societal concern, with regulators taking action in multiple jurisdictions. While the company's targets on recycled packaging are strong, in Abrdn's view information on absolute plastic packaging would help shareholders to better assess potential risks and competitive positioning. Abrdn therefore voted for this proposal.
Outcome of the vote	Passed	Failed	Passed
Implications of the outcome	Not provided		
Criteria on which the vote is considered “significant”	High profile vote	High profile vote	Shareholder and environmental & social resolutions

Source: Information provided by the investment manager. Where information is not provided, this is because Abrdn were not able to make the information available in a usable format for inclusion. We understand that Abrdn are working to improve their processes in this regard.

Legal & General Multi-Asset Fund (formerly Consensus Fund)

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Royal Dutch Shell Plc	Prologis, Inc.	NextEra Energy, Inc.
Date of vote	24 May 2022	4 May 2022	19 May 2022
Approximate size of Fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	0.55%	0.44%	0.33%
Summary of the resolution	Approve the Shell Energy transition progress update	Elect Director Hamid R. Moghadam	Elect Director Rudy E. Schupp
How the manager voted	Against	Against	Against
If the vote was against management, did the manager communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote?	LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is their policy not to engage with investee companies in the three weeks prior to an Annual General Meeting ("AGM") as their engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.		
Rationale for the voting decision	Climate change: A vote against was applied, though not without reservations. LGIM acknowledged 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, LGIM remained 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.	Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against was applied as LGIM expects companies to separate the roles of Chair and CEO due to risk management and oversight. Independence: A vote against was applied as LGIM expects a board to be regularly refreshed in order to maintain an appropriate mix of independence, relevant skills, experience, tenure, and background.	Diversity: A vote against was applied as LGIM expects a company to have at least 25% women on the board with the expectation of reaching a minimum of 30% of women on the board by 2023. LGIM is targeting the largest companies as they believe that these should demonstrate leadership on this critical issue. Independence: A vote against was 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.
Outcome of the vote	Around 80% of shareholders supported.	Around 93% of shareholders supported.	Around 86% of shareholders supported.
Implications of the outcome	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.
Criteria on which the vote is considered "significant"	LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of their climate-related engagement activity and our public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.	LGIM considers this vote to be significant as it is in application of an escalation of their vote policy on the topic of the combination of the board chair and CEO (escalation of engagement by vote).	LGIM views diversity as a financially material issue for their clients, with implications for the assets they manage.

Source: Information provided by the investment manager.

Legal & General UK Equity Index Fund

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Royal Dutch Shell Plc	BP Plc	Rio Tinto Plc
Date of vote	24 May 2022	12 May 2022	8 April 2022
Approximate size of Fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	6.78%	3.06%	2.68%
Summary of the resolution	Approve the Shell Energy Transition Progress Update	Approve Net Zero - From Ambition to Action Report	Approve Climate Action Plan
How the manager voted	Against	For	Against
If the vote was against management, did the manager communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote?	LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is their policy not to engage with investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as their engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.		
Rationale for the voting decision	Climate change: A vote against was applied, though not without reservations. LGIM acknowledges 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, LGIM remains 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.	Climate change: A vote for was applied, though not without reservations. While LGIM notes the inherent challenges in the decarbonization efforts of the Oil & Gas sector, LGIM expects companies to set a credible transition strategy, consistent with the Paris goals of limiting the global average temperature increase to 1.5 C. It is their view that the company has taken significant steps to progress towards a net zero pathway, as demonstrated by their most recent strategic update where key outstanding elements were strengthened. Nevertheless, LGIM remains committed to continuing their constructive engagements with the company on its net zero strategy and implementation, with particular focus on its downstream ambition and approach to exploration.	Climate change: LGIM recognises 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 LGIM acknowledges the challenges around the accountability of scope 3 emissions and respective target setting process for this sector, they 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.
Outcome of the vote	Around 80% of shareholders supported the resolution.	Around 89% of shareholders supported the resolution.	Around 84% of shareholders supported the resolution.
Implications of the outcome	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.
Criteria on which the vote is considered "significant"	LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of their climate-related engagement activity and their public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.	LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of their climate-related engagement activity and their public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.	LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of their climate-related engagement activity and their public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.

Source: Information provided by the investment manager.

Legal & General World (ex UK) Equity Index Fund

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Amazon.com, Inc.	Alphabet Inc.	NVIDIA Corporation
Date of vote	25 May 2022	1 June 2022	2 June 2022
Approximate size of Fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	1.91%	1.24%	0.81%
Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Daniel P. Huttenlocher	Report on Physical Risks of Climate Change	Elect Director Harvey C. Jones
How the manager voted	Against	For	Against
If the vote was against management, did the manager communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote?	LGIM publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is their policy not to engage with investee companies in the three weeks prior to an Annual General Meeting as their engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.		
Rationale for the voting decision	Human rights: A vote against was applied as the director is a long-standing member of the Leadership Development & Compensation Committee which is accountable for human capital management failings.	Shareholder Resolution - Climate change: A vote in favour was applied as LGIM expects companies to be taking sufficient action on the key issue of climate change.	Diversity: A vote against was applied as LGIM expects a company to have at least 25% women on the board with the expectation of reaching a minimum of 30% of women on the board by 2023. LGIM is targeting the largest companies as they believe that these should demonstrate leadership on this critical issue. 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.
Outcome of the vote	Around 93% of shareholders supported.	Around 18% of shareholders supported.	Around 84% of shareholders supported.
Implications of the outcome	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.	LGIM will continue to engage with their investee companies, publicly advocate their position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.
Criteria on which the vote is considered "significant"	LGIM pre-declared its vote intention for this resolution, demonstrating its significance.	LGIM considers this vote significant as it is an escalation of their climate-related engagement activity and their public call for high quality and credible transition plans to be subject to a shareholder vote.	LGIM views diversity as a financially material issue for their clients, with implications for the assets they manage on their behalf.

Source: Information provided by the investment manager.

Partners Group Partners Fund

Partners Group controls the board in the examples of significant votes provided below, hence aspects of the vote

such as communication of intent to the company, outcome of the vote and date are not applicable, whilst the resolution summary and rationale are described by ESG efforts undertaken.

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Confluent Health	PremiStar	Pharmathen
Date of vote	n/a	n/a	n/a
Approximate size of Fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Summary of the resolution	ESG impact of the company's operations	ESG impact of the company's operations	ESG impact of the company's operations
How the manager voted	Control of board	Control of board	Control of board
If the vote was against management, did the manager communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote?	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rationale for the voting decision	Confluent has an environmental impact assessment underway and has also engaged a third-party consultant to determine its greenhouse gas footprint. Meanwhile, Confluent has established a Diversity, Equity & Inclusion council, which is currently creating goals and roadmaps with a target to complete by the end of the third quarter of 2022. Thereafter, ownership of each initiative will be identified	Due to the early stage of the investment, ESG initiatives are yet to be introduced. ESG initiatives are expected to be set forth in the second quarter of 2023 after its first ESG key performance indicator survey	In May 2022, Pharmathen launched a sustainability assessment with EcoVadis. The results will be incorporated into Pharmathen's ESG Strategy
Outcome of the vote	n/a	n/a	n/a
Implications of the outcome	Confluent has also expanded its stakeholder benefits program. For instance, in 2022, the company launched stock options for all physical therapists and made significant investments in benefits, including reduced Eligible Employee premiums and increased communication around its wellness programs	In the meantime, Premistar has engaged a third party ESG consultant to identify material sustainability topics and craft a longer term ESG journey and strategy. Premistar is looking to hire an ESG manager and sales strategy employee, as the company aims to launch an energy efficiency sales strategy with customers	The company has a strong ESG culture as reflected in its core mission of making a positive impact on the lives of people by ensuring that they enjoy better health
Criteria on which the vote is considered "significant"	Size of holding	Size of holding	Size of holding

Source: Information provided by the investment manager.

Engagement data

The investment managers may engage with their investee companies on behalf of the Trustee. The tables below provide a summary and examples of the engagement activities undertaken by each of the relevant managers during the year to 31 March 2023.

Manager	Abrdn*	Barings Asset Management	Columbia Threadneedle*	Columbia Threadneedle*
Fund name	Diversified Growth Fund	Global High Yield Credit Strategies Fund	Global Absolute Return Bond Fund	LDI funds
Does the manager perform engagement on behalf of the holdings of the Fund?	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/a **
Has the manager engaged with companies to influence them in relation to ESG factors in the year?	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/a **
Number of engagements undertaken on behalf of the holdings in the Fund in the year	Data not provided	457 across the fixed income platform	102	n/a **
Number of engagements undertaken at a firm level in the year	2,484	741	1,965	
Example engagement undertaken within the Fund	<p>Abrdn did not provide example engagements for the specific Fund,</p> <p>However, at a firm-level, Abrdn have provided details of engagements relating to improving ESG practices and goals. For example, they influenced firms they engaged with to pursue climate goals and move towards net zero</p>	<p>Barings have engaged with Ineos to express concerns regarding the use of dividends to fund other projects and ventures within the wider group. Barings requested further disclosure on the likelihood of the business increasing the size of future dividends to fund any potential bid for a Premier League Football club by a principal shareholder. The company indicated that there will be no future dividends from the group to fund the potential football club bid, which Barings viewed positively.</p>	<p>Columbia Threadneedle did not provide example engagements for specific funds.</p> <p>However, at a firm-level, Columbia Threadneedle have provided details of collaborative engagements in order to persuade 167 target companies to make net zero pledges as part of the Climate Action 100+ initiative</p>	

* Abrdn and Columbia Threadneedle only provide engagement information for complete calendar years and so the information shown above is for the year to 31 December 2022.

** Engagement activities are expected to be limited for the Scheme's LDI portfolio due to the nature of the underlying holdings. Therefore, these categories have been considered to be not applicable.

Manager	Columbia Threadneedle*	Insight Investment	Insight Investment	Janus Henderson Global Investors
Fund name	Sterling Liquidity Fund	Maturing Buy & Maintain Credit funds	Global ABS Fund **	Multi Asset Credit Fund
Does the manager perform engagement on behalf of the holdings of the Fund?	Yes	Yes	Data unavailable	Yes
Has the manager engaged with companies to influence them in relation to ESG factors in the year?	Yes	Yes	Data unavailable	Yes
Number of engagements undertaken on behalf of the holdings in the Fund in the year	33	2021-2025 Fund: 122 2026-2030 Fund: 166 2031-2035 Fund: 105	Data unavailable	56
Number of engagements undertaken at a firm level in the year	1,965		1178	~680*
Example engagement undertaken within the Fund	<p>Columbia Threadneedle did not provide example engagements for specific funds.</p> <p>However, at a firm-level, Columbia Threadneedle have provided details of collaborative engagements in order to persuade 167 target companies to make net zero pledges as part of the Climate Action 100+ initiative.</p>	<p>Insight did not provide example engagements for specific funds.</p> <p>However, at a firm-level, Insight engaged with Equinor and challenged them to improve their environmental targets in order to be aligned with the 1.5 degree Paris agreement.</p>		<p>Janus Henderson engaged with Volkswagen following MSCI's recent move to flag VW as a "FAIL" in respect of Global Compact Compliance Principle 4 "Businesses should uphold the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour". This stemmed from allegations, refuted by VW, of the use of forced labour at its JV plant in China, and in the plant's supply chain. JH requested clarity on what steps are being taken by the company to investigate these claims.</p>

* Abrdn and Columbia Threadneedle only provide engagement information for complete calendar years and so the information shown above is for the year to 31 December 2022.

** Information in relation to the Insight Global ABS Fund was requested, but Insight were not able to provide it in time for the production of this Statement.

Source: Information provided by the investment managers.

Manager	Legal & General Investment Management	Legal & General Investment Management	Legal & General Investment Management
Fund name	Multi-Asset Fund (Formerly Consensus Fund)	UK Equity Index Fund	World (ex UK) Equity Index Fund
Does the manager perform engagement on behalf of the holdings of the Fund?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Has the manager engaged with companies to influence them in relation to ESG factors in the year?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of engagements undertaken on behalf of the holdings in the Fund in the year	981	332	478
Number of engagements undertaken at a firm level in the year	1088	1088	1088
Example engagement undertaken at Firm Level during the year*	<p>LGIM have been engaging with a number of leading global chemical companies, including BASF, to encourage them to implement credible decarbonisation strategies. LGIM collaborated with other investors to request that the company formulates strategies to electrify chemical production processes, increase their use of renewable energy sources, and set Scope 3 targets aligned with net zero pathways. As a result, BASF has confirmed plans to reach net zero by 2050.</p>		

Source: Information provided by the investment managers.

* LGIM did not provide examples of engagements undertaken at the Fund level during the year, so an example at the Firm level is provided instead.

Manager	Partners Group
Fund name	Partners Fund
Does the manager perform engagement on behalf of the holdings of the Fund?	Yes
Has the manager engaged with companies to influence them in relation to ESG factors in the year?	Yes
Number of engagements undertaken on behalf of the holdings in the Fund in the year	<i>Data not provided</i>
Number of engagements undertaken at a firm level in the year	<i>Data not provided</i>
Example engagement undertaken within the Fund	<p>The Partners Group engaged with EOLO during the year. EOLO is on an ESG Journey to obtain the 'B Corp Certification', a private certification relating to companies' social and environmental performance. In Italy, more than 9 million people live in towns of fewer than 5,000 inhabitants. These towns are dramatically depopulating and the digital divide is one of the main causes of this phenomenon. For this reason, and congruent with its mission, EOLO has created the project 'Missione Comune'. The goal of the project is to help small municipalities (less than 5,000 inhabitants) prevent the growing depopulation, offering technological devices and connectivity that can lead even the smallest communities to innovate and transform into smart towns.</p>