

# The Crown Estate Pension Scheme Implementation Statement 2022

## 1. Introduction

On 6 June 2019, the UK Government published the Occupational Pension Schemes (Investment and Disclosure) (Amendment) Regulations (the “Regulations”). The Regulations require that the Trustees of the Crown Estate Pension Scheme (the “Scheme”) report how, and the extent to which, the policies as set out in the Scheme’s Statement of Investment Principles (“SIP”) have been complied with during the year. This includes the exercise of rights (including voting) and undertaking of engagement activities in respect of the Scheme’s investments.

This Statement has been prepared by the Trustees, with the assistance of their Investment Consultant (Quantum Advisory), and covers both the Defined Benefit (“DB”) and Defined Contribution (“DC”) sections of the Scheme.

References herein to the actions, review work or determinations of the Trustees refer to activity that has been carried out by either the Trustees or the Investment Adviser on their behalf.

## 2. Executive summary

Over the Scheme year, the Trustees:

- Have reviewed voting and engagement activity of the funds that invest in equities. The Trustees are generally content that the Scheme’s investment managers have appropriately carried out their stewardship duties.
- Are of the opinion that they have complied with the relevant policies and procedures as identified in the SIP.
- Have remained aware of the relevant policies and procedures as identified in the SIP and received input from their Investment Adviser to aid ongoing compliance.

It should be noted that the funds that do not hold equities have not been reviewed, as these have fewer (if any) voting opportunities. Further detail on each of these matters is presented in the pages that follow.

## 3. Reviews of the SIP over the Scheme year

The SIP was last reviewed in September 2020.

The Trustees confirm that:

- There have been no amendments to the SIP over the year.
- The SIP will be reviewed in the near future. This will ensure any amendments to investment policy resulting from a review of investment strategy that is ongoing are reflected. The Trustees will seek advice from their Investment Adviser on the SIP and the suitability of the investments.

## 4. Investment Manager's voting policies and activity

This section of the statement covers both the DB and DC sections of the Scheme.

### Trustees' voting and stewardship policies

The Trustees consider how stewardship factors are integrated into the investment processes when: (i) appointing new investment managers; and (ii) monitoring existing investment managers. The Trustees have provided the appointed investment managers with full discretion concerning voting and engagement decisions.

As part of this exercise, the Trustees reviewed the voting activity of funds where there is an increased ability to influence positive practises (namely those that invest in equities). The following funds have been reviewed:

- Specific to the DB section are:
  - Legal & General Investment Management ("LGIM") Future World Global Equity Index Fund
  - LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund
  - Partners Group Generations Fund
- Specific to the DC section are:
  - LGIM Global Equity Fixed Weights 50:50 Index
  - LGIM World (ex UK) Equity Index
  - LGIM UK Equity Index
  - LGIM Ethical UK Equity Index
  - BlackRock Aquila Life Balanced Fund
  - Schroder Life Sustainable Future Multi-Asset Fund
  - LGIM Retirement Income Multi Asset Fund
  - LGIM Future World Fund

## Voting statistics

The table below sets out the key statistics on voting eligibility and action over the year.

Statistic	Schroder Life Sustainable Future Multi-Asset Fund	BlackRock Aquila Life Balanced Fund	LGIM Global Equity Fixed Weights (50:50) Index Fund	LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund	Partners Generations Fund <sup>2</sup>
Number of equity holdings	675	N/A <sup>1</sup>	2,785	6,747	60
Meetings eligible to vote at	811	2,959	3,175	7,193	68
Resolutions eligible to vote on	10,354	36,325	39,493	71,658	931
Proportion of eligible resolutions voted on	92.6%	99.0%	99.9%	99.8%	100.0%
Votes with management	88.3%	92.0%	82.9%	80.2%	94.0%
Votes against management	10.5%	7%	17%	18.9%	4.0%
Votes abstained from	0.7%	1.0%	0.2%	0.9%	2.0%
Meetings where at least one vote was against management	53.6%	34.0%	69.4%	65.0%	31.0%
Votes contrary to the recommendation of the proxy adviser	N/A <sup>1</sup>	0%	11.7%	11.3%	1.0%

Source: Scheme's underlying investment managers. <sup>1</sup>Please note that, as at the date of this report, this information is unavailable. <sup>2</sup>Please note that Partners Group report on their voting activity on a semi-annual basis and as such the firm's voting statistics reported in this table cover the 12 month period ending 31 December 2021.

Statistic	LGIM FW Global Equity Index Fund	LGIM World (ex UK) Equity Index	LGIM Ethical UK Equity Index	LGIM UK Equity Index	LGIM Retirement Income Multi Asset Fund	LGIM Future World Fund
Number of equity holdings	2,953	2,488	210	566	6,750	1,569
Meetings eligible to vote at	4,465	2,931	271	772	10,487	2,621
Resolutions eligible to vote on	47,851	34,024	4,442	10,813	105,734	32,190
Proportion of eligible resolutions voted on	99.9%	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%	99.8%
Votes with management	81.7%	79%	93.6%	93.1%	80.0%	80.8%
Votes against management	17.4%	20.1%	6.4%	6.9%	19.3%	18.2%
Votes abstained from	0.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.0%
Meetings where at least one vote was against management	61.9%	74.6%	45.0%	43.6%	67%	70.5%
Votes contrary to the recommendation of the proxy adviser	10.7%	14.1%	4.8%	5.4%	11.4%	12.1%

Source: Scheme's underlying investment managers.

The Trustees are satisfied with the level of voting activity that has been undertaken.

### Significant votes

The Trustees have reviewed the significant votes cast by the investment managers and are generally satisfied with their voting behaviour. The Trustees are mindful of the link between the Scheme's stewardship priorities and voting behaviour. A cross section of the most significant votes cast is contained in Appendix 2.

## 5. Conflicts of interest

This section reviews whether the managers are affected by the following conflicts of interest, and how these are managed.

1. The asset management firm overall having an apparent client-relationship conflict e.g. the manager provides significant products or services to a company in which they also have an equity or bond holding;

2. Senior staff at the asset management firm holding roles (e.g. as a member of the Board) at a company in which the asset management firm has equity or bond holdings;
3. The asset management firm's stewardship staff having a personal relationship with relevant individuals (e.g. on the Board or the company secretariat) at a company in which the firm has an equity or bond holding;
4. A situation where the interests of different clients diverge. An example of this could be a takeover, where one set of clients is exposed to the target and another set is exposed to the acquirer; and
5. Differences between the stewardship policies of managers and their clients.

### **LGIM**

LGIM have refrained from directly commenting on which of the conflicts of interest, detailed above, they are impacted by. Instead, LGIM refer investors to their conflicts of interest policy, which includes several examples of conflicts and how these might be managed. This is available here: <https://www.lgim.com/api/epi/documentlibrary/view?id=1116980ea5bf43fa9801c212be73f487&old=literature.html?cid=> The Trustees have received a copy of the conflicts of interest policy.

### **Partners Group**

With regards to Partners Group's listed exposure, to the best of their knowledge, they are not affected by points 1, 3, 4 and 5. With regards to point 2, Partners Group notes that for direct investments in private equity and private infrastructure they typically look to acquire companies where they have a majority equity position, and control of that business (70-90%+ equity). With this, Partners Group appoint their senior employees (such as senior investment professionals) to take positions on the boards of the companies. In addition, Partners Group would also appoint operating Directors. The Trustees are of the view this is appropriate for this asset class.

### **Schroders**

Schroders confirmed there were no conflicts of interest over the period.

If Schroders were to have a conflict of interest with a fund, a client, or a company being voted on, they will follow the voting recommendations of a third party (which will be the supplier of their proxy voting processing and research service). If Schroders believes it should override the recommendations of the third party in the interests of the fund/client and vote in a way that may also benefit, or be perceived to benefit, its own interests, then Schroders will obtain the approval of the decision from the Schroders' Global Head of Equities with the rationale of such vote being recorded in writing. If the third-party recommendation is unavailable, they will vote as they see is in the interests of the fund. If, however, this vote is in a way that might benefit, or be perceived to benefit, Schroders' interests, they will obtain approval and record the rationale in the same way as described above.

### **BlackRock**

BlackRock confirmed there were no conflicts of interest over the period.

BlackRock maintains a compliance program for identifying, escalating, avoiding and/or managing potential or actual conflicts of interest. The program is carried out through their employees' adherence to relevant policies and procedures, a governance and oversight structure and employee training.

Among the various policies and procedures that address conflicts of interest is BlackRock's Global Conflicts of Interest Policy. This policy governs the responsibility of BlackRock and its employees to place their clients' interests first and to identify and manage any conflicts of interest that may arise in the course of their business.

## 6. Implementation of policies contained within the Scheme’s SIP – DC sections

This section sets out the various policies within the Scheme’s SIP (that was in place as at 31 March 2022 – i.e. the end of the Scheme year), and the actions that the Trustees have taken in respect of them over the year to this date.

SIP policy	Comments
<b>1. Investment processes and governance</b>	
<p><b><u>Investment Strategy</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees, in consultation with their investment adviser, set the investment strategy for the Scheme’s DC section. The primary objective of the DC section is to provide, on a DC basis, benefits for members on their retirement or benefits for their dependants on death before retirement. The Trustees have sought to provide members with appropriate investment choices.</p> <p>The Trustees select investment managers and funds which are appropriate to implement the investment strategy. The Trustees have also selected a range of funds from which members may self-select. This range is intentionally diverse but not considered by the Trustees to be unduly so.</p> <p>It is the policy of the Trustees, after taking appropriate written advice from their Investment Adviser, and in consultation with the Sponsoring Employer, to set the investment strategy for the Scheme, following a consideration of their objectives and other related matters. The Trustees review their objectives and investments at regular intervals and amend them accordingly.</p> <p>The Trustees have signed the appropriate policy documents, agreements and application forms with Mobius Life Limited.</p>	<p><b><u>Investment Strategy</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees considered each investment manager prior to appointment and have received advice from their Investment Adviser on their appropriateness as part of such considerations.</p> <p>The Trustees have undertaken regular reviews of the Scheme’s DC investment strategy (both at a strategic level and at a fund level) and, where necessary, have placed funds offered to members as investment choices under a ‘watching-brief’ where concerns around the continued viability of any investment product have arisen.</p> <p>During the period, the Trustees reviewed the appropriateness of the responsible investing policies of the investment funds.</p>

<p><b><u>Performance monitoring</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees monitor the performance of the Scheme’s DC investments on a frequent basis. They also review the continued appropriateness of the targeted retirement outcome at appropriate frequencies. Written advice is received as required from the Investment Adviser.</p> <p>The Trustees have agreed the appropriateness of the benchmarks, performance objectives and the various controls adopted by the incumbent manager in managing each fund in which members can invest.</p> <p><b><u>Conflict of Interest</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees consider any potential and actual conflicts of interest (subject to reasonable levels of immateriality) at the start of each Trustees' meeting and document these in the minutes.</p> <p><b><u>Charges</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees consider the fees and charges associated with each investment before investing. The Trustees will compare the annual turnover and associated costs for each fund with previous years to ensure each investment manager’s process and philosophy remain consistent.</p> <p><b><u>Statement of Investment Principles</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees review the SIP periodically for good governance and to ensure their policies remain appropriate and are being adhered to. The Trustees may also review the SIP following specific events, so as to ensure its ongoing appropriateness.</p> <p>Reviews of the SIP will occur no less frequently than every three years, and without delay after any significant change in investment policy.</p>	<p><b><u>Performance monitoring</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees review the performance of the Scheme’s DC investments on a quarterly basis through the investment monitoring reports provided to them by the Investment Adviser.</p> <p>The Trustees keep the appointment of all investment managers under review and will seek to replace any managers, or funds, which no longer remain appropriate to implement the Scheme’s investment strategy.</p> <p><b><u>Conflicts of interest</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees continued to document any known material conflicts of interest at each Trustees’ meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Charges</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees receive, in conjunction with their Scheme year, an Annual Chairs Statement which contains information of charges and other costs the Scheme has incurred over the year.</p> <p><b><u>Statement of Investment Principles</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees review and update the SIP on a periodic basis. The SIP was last reviewed, and subsequently updated, during September 2020 to reflect new requirements for Trustees with respect to the Shareholder Rights Directive II.</p>
<p><b>2. Responsible Investment</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Financially material considerations</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Financially material considerations</u></b></p>

<p>The Trustees acknowledge the potential impact upon the Scheme’s investments and members arising from financially material matters. The Trustees define these as including, but not limited to ESG matters.</p> <p>With specific regard to ESG factors, the Trustees consider how these are integrated into the investment processes when: (i) appointing new investment managers; and (ii) monitoring existing investment managers. The Trustees have provided the appointed investment managers with full discretion concerning the evaluation of ESG factors. Representatives of the incumbent investment managers attend Trustees’ meetings, at a frequency determined by the Trustees, to present on various matters including their ESG policies. The Trustees also periodically consider publicly available ESG related publications pertaining to the incumbent investment managers.</p> <p>The Trustees consider ESG factors when determining future strategy decisions.</p> <p><b><u>Stewardship</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees consider how stewardship factors are integrated into the investment processes when: (i) appointing new investment managers; and (ii) reviewing existing investment managers. The Trustees have provided the appointed investment managers with full discretion concerning the stewardship of their investments. Representatives of the incumbent investment managers attend Trustees’ meetings, at a frequency determined by the Trustees, in order to present on various matters including their stewardship policies.</p> <p><b><u>Non-financial matters</u></b></p> <p>The Trustees do not consider non-financial factors and do not employ a formal policy in relation to this when selecting, retaining and realising investments. However, where members have been forthcoming with their views, the Trustees may consider these when setting investment strategy.</p>	<p>During the period, the Trustees reviewed the appropriateness of more explicitly incorporating responsible investing objectives into the Scheme’s investment strategy. The Trustees received a report from the Investment Adviser on the ESG policies employed by the investment managers.</p> <p><b><u>Stewardship</u></b></p> <p>The stewardship reports for the investment managers are available to the Trustees. In addition, the investment managers’ voting activity has been reviewed in section 4 of this Statement.</p> <p>During the year, LGIM attended a Trustees’ meetings and presented on developments regarding ESG integration into investment funds.</p> <p><b><u>Non-financial matters</u></b></p> <p>Over the period, no members expressed any view with respect to non-financial factors.</p>
<p><b>3. Risk management</b></p>	
<p>The Trustees have identified a range of risks within the SIP and seek to minimise them as far as possible by regularly monitoring the investment funds.</p>	<p>The Trustees reviewed the performance of the Scheme’s investments during the course of their meetings and through quarterly investment monitoring reports. The Trustees were generally content with the performance delivered.</p>

# Appendix 1 – investment manager voting policies and procedures

## **LGIM voting policies and process**

LGIM's Investment Stewardship team make all voting decisions, in accordance with LGIM's 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.

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 strategic decisions are not outsourced. The use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment LGIM's own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of IVIS to supplement the research reports that are received from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions.

To ensure the proxy provider votes in accordance with LGIM's position on ESG, LGIM have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what LGIM consider are minimum best practice standards which LGIM believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice. LGIM retain the ability in all markets to override any voting decisions, which are based on their custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information that allows LGIM to apply a qualitative overlay to their voting judgement. LGIM have strict monitoring controls to ensure their votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with their voting policies by their service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform them of rejected votes which require further action.

## **Partners Group voting policies and process**

Where Partners Group's client accounts contain listed equity securities in dedicated programs/allocation buckets ("Liquid Private Markets investments") and Partners Group has discretion to vote on a proxy stemming from such securities (a "Proxy Request"), Partners Group will make a decision on such Proxy Requests to protect and promote the economic value of the securities held in such client accounts.

Proxy Requests related to Liquid Private Markets investments may be administered by third party service providers (currently, Glass Lewis). These service providers will follow Partners Group's Proxy Voting Directive in all instances. Should a voting recommendation by a service provider be against the recommendation by the respective company's management, Partners Group will vote manually on those proposals.

In certain circumstances, Partners Group receives Proxy Requests for publicly traded securities. When such Proxy Requests arise, the recipient, typically the respective investment team or Partners Group Guernsey serving as administrator, will forward it to be reviewed and evaluated by Transactions Services together with the relevant investment team and/or the relevant Investment Committee. Partners Group have a group form which seeks to ensure that all Proxy Requests, included in the broader term 'corporate actions', are reviewed and processed in a timely manner.

## **Schroders' voting policies and process**

The overriding principle governing Schroders' approach to voting is to act in the best interests of their clients. Where proposals are not consistent with the interests of shareholders and their clients, they are not afraid to vote against resolutions.

Schroders vote on a variety of issues; however, the majority of resolutions target specific corporate governance issues which are required under local stock exchange listing requirements, including but not limited to: approval of directors, accepting reports and accounts, approval of incentive plans, capital allocation, reorganisations and mergers.

Schroders evaluate voting issues arising at their investee companies and, where they have the authority to do so, vote on them in line with their fiduciary responsibilities in what they deem to be the interests of their clients. They utilise company engagement, internal research, investor views and governance expertise to confirm their intention.

In applying the policy, Schroders consider a range of factors, including the circumstances of each company, its performance, governance, strategy and personnel. Their specialists may draw on external research, such as the Investment Association's Institutional Voting Information Services and the ISS, and public reporting. Their own research is also integral to their process; this will be conducted by both the financial and ESG analysts. For contentious issues, their Corporate Governance specialists consult with the relevant analysts and portfolio managers to seek their view and better understand the corporate context. Schroders make use of proxy advisory services as a compliment to their own research and voting engagement processes. However, as at the date of this report, they have yet to confirm if any proxy advisers undertook voting on Schroders behalf during the period in question.

Any UK company which in Schroders' opinion meets the spirit of the UK Corporate Governance Code should, in the absence of other factors, expect to be supported on corporate governance issues covered by the Code. Where a company does not comply with the spirit of the Code, Schroders will consider the company's explanation and circumstances, and then react accordingly in a manner they deem most appropriate. If the company provides a convincing justification and/or the issue is not material to the value of its shares, Schroders would ordinarily expect to support the company. Where Schroders are not satisfied with the explanation and they view the departure from the Code as material, they will engage further with the company and or non-executive directors, and may vote against management.

### **BlackRock's voting policies and process**

BlackRock have developed high-level principles ("BlackRock's Global Corporate Governance and Engagement Principles") which set the framework for their voting. These are publicly accessible on the following website (<https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/literature/fact-sheet/blk-responsible-investment-engprinciples-global.pdf>).

Their voting guidelines are market specific, and take into account a company's unique circumstances, where relevant. BlackRock inform their voting decision through research and engage as necessary. BlackRock determines which companies to engage directly based on their assessment of the materiality of the issue for sustainable long-term financial returns and the likelihood of their engagement being productive.

BlackRock's proxy voting process is led by the BlackRock Investment Stewardship team ("BIS"), which consists of three regional teams – Americas ("AMRS"), Asia-Pacific ("APAC"), and Europe, Middle East and Africa ("EMEA") – located in seven offices around the world. The analysts with each team will generally determine how to vote at the meetings of the companies they cover. Voting decisions are made by members of the BIS with input from investment colleagues as required, in each case, in accordance with BlackRock's Global Corporate Governance and Engagement Principles and market-specific guidelines.

While BlackRock subscribe to research from the proxy advisory firms ISS and Glass Lewis (also a voting proxy advisory firm), they do not follow any single proxy research firm's voting recommendations. BlackRock use several other inputs, including a company's own disclosures, and their record of past engagements, in their voting and engagement analysis.

Blackrock use ISS's electronic platform to execute their vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting. In certain markets, they work with proxy research firms who apply their proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform their voting decision.

## Appendix 2 – Most significant votes

The tables below set out a cross section of significant votes undertaken by the investment managers of the funds held by the Scheme. Information on further significant votes undertaken by the Scheme’s investment managers has been reviewed by the Trustees.

Please note that, due to the ‘common building block’ structure of LGIM’s passive equity funds (including the LGIM DDF which gains its equity exposure passively) there is a degree of overlap between the most significant votes cast within each fund. We have therefore sought to provide different examples within each fund that are of relevance.

### Schroder Sustainable Future Multi-Asset Fund

Schroder does not currently have a process for identifying the 10 most significant votes within the Fund. Instead, Schroder has provided a number of examples of votes that it deems to be significant. This has been challenged by the Trustees and Schroder has confirmed that it is working with various internal stakeholders to develop a process of best-practice and will update the Trustees in due course.

Generally, the most significant votes cast by Schroder tend to involve some form of material controversy in relation to governance, ethics, ESG/Climate Change, or alignment of interest.

Company Name	Microsoft Corporation	Alphabet
Date of Vote	November 2021	June 2021
Summary of the resolution	Report on Gender/Racial Pay Gap	Require Independent Director Nominee with Human and/or Civil Rights Experience
How the firm voted	For the proposal	For the proposal
On which criteria has the vote been deemed as ‘significant?’	Reputational and operational risk associated with the matter.	Ongoing concerns around human and civil rights.
Outcome of the vote	N/A	N/A

Source: Investment Manager. Please note, information on the outcome of the votes was pending at the time of writing.

### BlackRock Aquila Life Balanced Fund

BlackRock Investment Stewardship prioritises its work around themes that they believe will encourage sound governance practices and deliver sustainable long-term financial performance. These themes in turn shape their Global Principles, market-specific Voting Guidelines and Engagement Priorities, which form the benchmark against which they look at the sustainable long-term financial performance of investee companies.

BlackRock periodically publish “vote bulletins” setting out detailed explanations of key votes relating to governance, strategic and sustainability issues that it considers, based on its Global Principles and Engagement Priorities, material to a company’s sustainable long-term financial performance.

Company Name	VINCI SA	Jardine Strategic Holdings
Date of Vote	April 2021	April 2021
Summary of the resolution	Climate risk	Approve the Amalgamation Agreement
How the firm voted	For the proposal	Against the proposal
On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?	Climate ambitions and targets goals of the Paris Agreement.	Conflicts of interests inherent in this related party transaction.
Outcome of the vote	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager

### LGIM Global Equity Fixed Weights (50:50) Index Fund

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team consider the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association ("PLSA") consultation. 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 LGIM note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement; and
- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship's 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

Company Name	Apple Inc.	Microsoft Corporation
Date of Vote	March 2022	November 2021
Summary of the resolution	Report on Civil Rights Audit	Governance proposal
How the firm voted	For the proposal	Against the proposal
On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?	Gender diversity as a financially material issue.	In line with the manager's ESG priority engagement themes.
Outcome of the vote	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager

### Partners Group Generations Fund

Please note the votes below are examples of the private market investments in The Partners Group Generations Fund. Private markets investments are the largest exposure within the fund and these are typically held directly, where Partners Group controls the board and therefore direction / strategy of the business. The Generation Fund's exposure in listed equity is usually less than 10%.

In determining the most significant votes, Partners Group consider the size of the holding relative to the fund itself.

Company Name	VSB Renewables Platform	United States Infrastructure Corporation
Date of Vote	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>
Summary of the resolution	ESG and health and safety.	Climate change engagement and carbon reduction
How the firm voted	Partners Group controls the Board	Partners Group controls the Board
On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?	Material impact – overall size of the position within the Fund.	Material impact – overall size of the position within the Fund.
Outcome of the vote	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager. <sup>1</sup>Please note, the firm maintains a controlling level of private investment in the company and as such the resolution was not proposed at a single formal meeting of investors.

#### LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund

Company Name	Barrick Gold Corporation	Wheaton Precious Metals Corp.
Date of Vote	May 2021	May 2021
Summary of the resolution	Governance proposal	Governance proposal
How the firm voted	Withheld	Withheld
On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?	Gender diversity as a financially material issue	Gender diversity as a financially material issue
Outcome of the vote	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager

#### LGIM World (ex UK) Equity Index Fund

Company Name	JPMorgan Chase & Co.	NVIDIA Corporation
Date of Vote	May 2021	June 2021
Summary of the resolution	Governance proposal	Governance proposal
How the firm voted	Against the proposal	Against the proposal
On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?	Combination of the board chair and CEO	LGIM views gender diversity as a financially material issue

<b>Outcome of the vote</b>	The vote passed	The vote passed
----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Source: Investment Manager

### LGIM Ethical UK Equity Index Fund

<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Informa Plc</b>	<b>The Sage Group Plc</b>
<b>Date of Vote</b>	June 2021	February 2022
<b>Summary of the resolution</b>	Governance proposal	Governance proposal
<b>How the firm voted</b>	Against the proposal	Against the proposal
<b>On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?</b>	LGIM took the rare step of publicly pre-declaring it before the shareholder meeting	LGIM views gender diversity as a financially material issue
<b>Outcome of the vote</b>	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager

### LGIM Future World Global Equity Index Fund

<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Bank of America Corporation</b>	<b>The Home Depot, Inc.</b>
<b>Date of Vote</b>	April 2021	February 2022
<b>Summary of the resolution</b>	Governance proposal	Governance proposal
<b>How the firm voted</b>	Against the proposal	Against the proposal
<b>On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?</b>	Combination of the board chair and CEO	Combination of the board chair and CEO
<b>Outcome of the vote</b>	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager

### LGIM UK Equity Index Fund

<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Informa Plc</b>	<b>3i Infrastructure Plc</b>
<b>Date of Vote</b>	June 2021	July 2021
<b>Summary of the resolution</b>	Governance proposal	Governance proposal
<b>How the firm voted</b>	Against the proposal	Against the proposal
<b>On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?</b>	LGIM considered this vote to be significant as they took the rare step of publicly pre-declaring it before the shareholder meeting.	LGIM views gender diversity as a financially material issue.

<b>Outcome of the vote</b>	The vote passed	The vote passed
----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Source: Investment Manager

### LGIM Retirement Income Multi Asset Fund

<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Prologis, Inc.</b>	<b>Duke Energy Corporation</b>
<b>Date of Vote</b>	April 2021	May 2021
<b>Summary of the resolution</b>	Governance proposal	Governance proposal
<b>How the firm voted</b>	Against the proposal	Withheld
<b>On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?</b>	Combination of the board chair and CEO	Combination of the board chair and CEO
<b>Outcome of the vote</b>	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager

### LGIM Future World Fund

<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Johnson &amp; Johnson</b>	<b>Accenture plc</b>
<b>Date of Vote</b>	April 2021	January 2022
<b>Summary of the resolution</b>	Governance proposal	Governance proposal
<b>How the firm voted</b>	Against the proposal	Against the proposal
<b>On which criteria has the vote been deemed as 'significant'?</b>	Combination of the board chair and CEO	Combination of the board chair and CEO
<b>Outcome of the vote</b>	The vote passed	The vote passed

Source: Investment Manager