



Pirelli Tyres Limited 1988 Pension and Life Assurance Fund – DC Section

Implementation Statement for the year ending 31 March 2026

Introduction

This implementation statement has been prepared by the Trustees of the Pirelli Tyres Limited 1988 Pension and Life Assurance Fund (the Fund). The statement:

- sets out how, and the extent to which, the policies set out in the Statement of Investment Principles (the SIP) have been followed during the year;
- describes any review of the SIP, including an explanation of any changes made; and
- describes the voting behaviour by, or on behalf of, the Trustees over the same period.

A copy of the SIP and a copy of this statement are available to members on request and may be accessed free of charge by visiting the publicly available website:

<https://www.pirelli.com/tyres/en-gb/learn/uk-legal-information>

The Trustees' policies contained in the SIP are underpinned by their investor beliefs, which have been developed in consultation with their investment consultant.

Trustees' overall assessment

In the opinion of the Trustees, the policies as set out in the SIP have been followed during the year ending 31 March 2026.

The Trustees have, in their opinion, followed the Fund's voting and engagement policies during the year, by continuing to delegate to each investment manager, the exercise of rights and engagement activities in relation to investments, as well as seeking to appoint managers that have strong stewardship policies and processes.

Review of the SIP

The Trustees' policies have been developed over time by the Trustees in conjunction with their investment consultant and are reviewed and updated periodically and at least every three years.

The SIP was last reviewed in August 2024.

Investment strategy

The Fund provides members with a range of funds in which to invest together with Lifestyle Strategies from which to make their investment choices. These aim to allow members to achieve the following:

- maximising the value of retirement benefits, to ensure a reasonable standard of living in retirement;
- protecting the value of benefits in the years approaching retirement against equity market falls and (should they decide to purchase an annuity) fluctuations in annuity costs; and
- tailoring a member's investments to meet his or her own needs, and to how the member intends to make use of their benefits at and through retirement.

The Trustees also provide a default strategy to provide a balanced investment strategy for members who do not make an active investment choice.

Policies in relation to the kinds of investments to be held, the balance between various kinds of investments and the realisation of investments

The Trustees have given full regard to their investment powers as set out in the Trust Deed and Rules and have considered the attributes of the various asset classes when deciding the kinds of investments to be held. The Fund invests in pooled funds to manage costs, diversify investments and improve liquidity.

During the year, the Trustees discussed the performance of the asset classes invested in and the attributes of the asset classes that contributed to that performance.

The investment managers maintain a diversified portfolio within each of the funds offered under the Fund (both within the default and self-select options). In addition, the design of the default strategy provides further diversification through the use of multiple funds throughout a member's working lifetime.

Under normal market conditions the Trustees expect to be able to realise investments within a reasonable timescale although there remains the risk that certain assets may become less liquid in times of market stress. Dealing spreads and liquidity are monitored periodically by the investment consultant, particularly during periods of heightened volatility.

No funds experienced any liquidity issues that had any impact on members during the year.

Policy in relation to the expected return on investments

The default option is expected to provide an appropriate return on members' investments, based on the Trustees' understanding of the Fund's membership and having taken into account the risk considerations set out in the SIP.

Policy in relation to risks

The Trustees have considered risk from a number of perspectives. These are the risk that:

- the investment return over members' working lives will not keep pace with inflation and does not, therefore, secure an adequate retirement income,
- investment market movements in the period prior to retirement lead to a substantial reduction in the anticipated level of pension or other retirement income,
- investment market movements in the period just prior to retirement lead to a substantial reduction in the anticipated cash lump sum benefit,
- the default option is not suitable for members who invest in it, and
- fees and transaction costs reduce the return achieved by members by an inappropriate extent.

The investment strategy for the default option has been chosen with the aim of reducing these risks.

The Trustees monitor these risks through the regular performance monitoring reports and annual cost disclosure documents provided by and discussed with the investment consultant.

Performance was monitored during the year and this process did not highlight any significant concerns over the level of risk being run within the Fund.

The self-select funds available have been chosen to provide members with the flexibility to address the above-mentioned risks for themselves.

Policies in relation to their investment manager arrangements

The Fund's assets are invested in pooled funds which have their own policies and objectives and charge a fee, set by the investment manager, for their services. The Trustees have very limited to no influence over the objectives of these funds or the fees they charge (although fee discounts can be negotiated in certain circumstances).

The Trustees, in conjunction with their investment consultant, have introduced a process to obtain and review the investment holding turnover and the associated costs incurred on the pooled funds used by the Fund on an annual basis.

The Trustees, in conjunction with their investment consultant, appoint their investment managers and choose the specific pooled funds to use in order to meet specific Fund policies. They expect that their investment managers make decisions based on

assessments about the financial performance of underlying investments, and that they engage with issuers of debt or equity to improve their performance (and thereby the Fund's performance) over an appropriate time horizon.

Trading costs are incurred in respect of member switches (including within the lifestyle strategy), and wider (Trustee-led) asset transfer work. The Trustees receive information on the expected costs of Trustee-led exercises as and when they occur, and the exercise is only undertaken if the expected benefits outweigh the expected costs. Information on potential ongoing member switching costs is included within the Chair's Statement.

The investment managers have invested the assets within their portfolio in a manner that is consistent with the guidelines and constraints set out in their appointment documentation. In return the Trustees have paid their investment managers a fee which is a fixed percentage of assets under management.

The investment consultant has reviewed and evaluated the investment managers on behalf of the Trustees, including performance reviews, manager oversight meetings and operational due diligence reviews.

As the Fund uses pooled funds, the time horizon of the underlying investments is not directly linked to those of the Fund and hence the Trustees are comfortable that the managers can take a long-term approach to stewardship matters. This is monitored through periodic discussions with each investment manager and through the information they provide for this statement.

Investment manager monitoring and changes

During the year the Trustees received regular reports from the investment consultant examining the performance of the pooled funds made available to members.

Appropriate written advice is taken from the investment consultant before the review, appointment or removal of the investment managers.

Stewardship of investments

The Trustees have a fiduciary duty to consider their approach to the stewardship of the investments, to maximise financial returns for the benefit of members and beneficiaries over the long term. The Trustees can promote an investment's long-term success through monitoring, engagement and/or voting, either directly or through their investment managers.

The Trustees, in conjunction with their investment consultant, appoint their investment managers and choose the specific pooled funds to use in order to meet specific policies. They expect that their investment managers make decisions based on assessments about the financial and non-financial performance of underlying investments (including environmental, social and governance (ESG) factors), and that they engage with issuers

of debt or equity to improve their performance (and thereby the Fund's performance) over an appropriate time horizon.

The Trustees also expect their investment managers to take non-financial matters into account as long as the decision does not involve a risk of significant detriment to members' financial interests.

Stewardship - monitoring and engagement

The Trustees recognise that investment managers' ability to influence the companies in which they invest will depend on the nature of the investment.

The Trustees' policy is to delegate responsibility for the exercising of rights (including voting rights) attaching to investments to the investment managers and to encourage the managers to exercise those rights. The investment managers are expected to provide regular reports for the Trustees detailing their voting activity.

The Trustees' also delegate responsibility for engaging and monitoring investee companies to the investment managers and they expect the investment managers to use their discretion to maximise financial returns for members and others over the long term.

The Trustees seek to appoint managers that have strong stewardship policies and processes and are supportive of their investment managers being signatories to the United Nations' Principles for Responsible Investment and the Financial Reporting Council's UK Stewardship Code 2020. Details of the signatory status of each investment manager is shown below:

Investment manager	UN PRI Signatory	UK Stewardship Code Signatory
BlackRock	Yes	Yes
L&G	Yes	Yes
MFS	Yes	Yes

The Trustees review each investment manager prior to appointment and monitor them on an ongoing basis through the regular review of the manager's voting and engagement policies, their investment consultant's ESG rating and a review of each manager's voting and engagement behaviour. The Trustees may also request their investment consultant's manager ESG ratings to aid them in the process.

If the Trustees find any manager's policies or behaviour unacceptable, they may agree an alternative mandate with the manager or decide to review or replace the manager.

As all of the investments are held in pooled vehicles, the Trustees do not envisage being directly involved with peer-to-peer engagement in investee companies.

Investment manager engagement policies

The Fund's investment managers are expected to have developed and publicly disclosed an engagement policy. This policy, amongst other things, provides the Trustees with information on how each investment manager engages in dialogue with the companies it invests in and how it exercises voting rights. It also provides details on the investment approach taken by the investment manager when considering relevant factors of the investee companies, such as strategy, financial and non-financial performance and risk, and applicable social, environmental and corporate governance aspects.

Links to each investment manager's engagement policy or suitable alternative is provided in the Appendix.

These policies are publicly available on the managers' websites.

The latest available information provided by the investment managers (for mandates that contain public equities or bonds) is as follows:

Engagement			
	BlackRock 70/30 Global Equity Index	BlackRock Dynamic Diversified Growth Fund	BlackRock Global Minimum Volatility Index Fund
Period	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026
Engagement definition	Purposeful, targeted communication with an entity (e.g. company, government, industry body, regulator) on particular matters of concern with the goal of encouraging change at an individual issuer and/or the goal of addressing a market-wide or system risk (such as climate). Regular communication to gain information as part of ongoing research should not be counted as engagement.		
Number of companies engaged with over the year	97	161	210
Number of engagements over the year	151	258	300

Engagement			
	BlackRock Environment & Low Carbon Tilt Property Securities Fund	BlackRock MSCI World Index	LGIM World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund
Period	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026
Engagement definition	Purposeful, targeted communication with an entity (e.g. company, government, industry body, regulator) on particular matters of concern with the goal of encouraging change at an individual issuer and/or the goal of addressing a market-wide or system risk (such as climate). Regular communication to gain information as part of ongoing research should not be counted as engagement.		

Implementation Statement for the year ending 31 March 2026

Number of companies engaged with over the year	62	717	504
Number of engagements over the year	71	1,042	645

**Please note that prior to May 2024 the name of the Fund was the Ethical Global Equity Index Fund.*

Engagement			
	LGIM FTSE4Good Developed Equity Index Fund*	LGIM FTSE Developed Core Infrastructure Index Fund	MFS Global Equity Fund
Period	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026
Engagement definition	Purposeful, targeted communication with an entity (e.g. company, government, industry body, regulator) on particular matters of concern with the goal of encouraging change at an individual issuer and/or the goal of addressing a market-wide or system risk (such as climate). Regular communication to gain information as part of ongoing research should not be counted as engagement.		
Number of companies engaged with over the year	480	63	26
Number of engagements over the year	899	99	29

Exercising rights and responsibilities

The Trustees recognise that different investment managers should not be expected to exercise stewardship in an identical way, or to the same intensity.

The investment managers are expected to disclose annually a general description of their voting behaviour, an explanation of the most significant votes cast and report on the use of proxy voting advisers.

The investment managers publish online the overall voting records of the firm on a regular basis.

Investment managers use proxy advisers for the purposes of providing research, advice or voting recommendations that relate to the exercise of voting rights.

The Trustees do not carry out a detailed review of the votes cast by or on behalf of their investment managers but rely on the requirement for their investment managers to provide a high-level analysis of their voting behaviour.

The Trustees consider the proportion of votes cast, and the proportion of votes against management and believe this to be an important (but not the only) consideration of investor behaviour.

The Trustees have selected the three votes affecting the largest asset holdings for inclusion in this statement. The Trustees did not communicate with the manager in advance about the votes they considered to be the most significant.

The latest available information provided by the investment managers (for mandates that contain public equities) is as follows:

Voting behaviour			
	BlackRock 70/30 Global Equity Index	BlackRock Dynamic Diversified Growth Fund	BlackRock Global Minimum Volatility Index Fund
Period	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026
Number of meetings eligible to vote at	4,943	570	372
Number of resolutions eligible to vote on	55,788	7,065	5,499
Proportion of votes cast	96.9%	95.2%	98.7%
Proportion of votes for management	88.9%	95.0%	97.6%
Proportion of votes against management	8.0%	5.0%	2.4%
Proportion of resolutions abstained from voting on	1.8%	0.6%	0.0%

Note: Figures may not sum due to rounding. For BlackRock funds, figures may not total 100% due to a variety of reasons, such as lack of management recommendation, scenarios where an agenda has been split voted, multiple ballots for the same meeting were voted differing ways, or a vote of 'Abstain' is also considered a vote against management.

Voting behaviour			
	BlackRock Environment & Low Carbon Tilt Property Securities Fund	BlackRock MSCI World Index	LGIM World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund
Period	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026
Number of meetings eligible to vote at	380	1,394	4,660
Number of resolutions eligible to vote on	4,026	20,371	40,066
Proportion of votes cast	97.9%	93.6%	99.9%
Proportion of votes for management	95.8%	96.8%	77.0%
Proportion of votes against management	4.2%	3.2%	20.5%
Proportion of resolutions abstained from voting on	0.2%	0.4%	2.5%

*Note: Figures may not sum due to rounding. For BlackRock funds, figures may not total 100% due to a variety of reasons, such as lack of management recommendation, scenarios where an agenda has been split voted, multiple ballots for the same meeting were voted differing ways, or a vote of 'Abstain' is also considered a vote against management.
Please note that prior to May 2024 the name of the Fund was the Ethical Global Equity Index Fund.

Voting behaviour			
	LGIM FTSE4Good Developed Equity Index Fund*	LGIM FTSE Developed Core Infrastructure Index Fund	MFS Global Equity Fund
Period	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026	01/04/2025-31/03/2026
Number of meetings eligible to vote at	1,229	143	87
Number of resolutions eligible to vote on	17,338	1,865	1,448
Proportion of votes cast	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Proportion of votes for management	82.4 %	76.9%	95.4%
Proportion of votes against management	17.2%	22.8%	4.6%
Proportion of resolutions abstained from voting on	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%

Figures may not sum due to rounding.

Trustees' engagement

The Trustees have considered the environmental, social and governance rating for all of the investment managers, provided by the investment consultant, which includes consideration of voting and/or engagement activities.

The Trustees have reviewed the investment managers' policies relating to engagement and voting and how they have been implemented and have found them to be acceptable at the current time.

The Trustees recognise that engagement and voting policies, practices and reporting, will continue to evolve over time and are supportive of their investment managers being signatories to the United Nations' Principles for Responsible Investment and the Financial Reporting Council's UK Stewardship Code 2020

Appendix

Links to the engagement Policies for each of the investment managers can be found here:

Investment manager	Engagement policy
MFS Investment Management	https://www.mfs.com/content/dam/mfs-enterprise/mfscom/backlot/Directive%20II%20-%20InstiCli.pdf
Legal & General Investment Management	https://www.lgim.com/landg-assets/lgim/_document-library/capabilities/lgim-engagement-policy.pdf
BlackRock Investment Management	https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/about-us/investment-stewardship#guidelines

Information on the most significant votes for each of the funds containing public equities is shown below.

BlackRock 70/30 Global Equity Index	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Stellantis NV	The Cigna Group	HCA Healthcare, Inc.
Date of Vote	15/04/2025	23/04/2025	24/04/2025
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	Approve Remuneration Report Containing Remuneration Policy for Management Board Members	Amend Right to Call Special Meeting	Amend Patient Safety and Quality of Care Committee Charter
How the fund manager voted	Against	Against	Against

Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote	"No, BIS does not disclose its vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings."		
Rationale for the voting decision	"Remuneration arrangements are poorly structured. Poor use of remuneration committee discretion regarding the grant of a one-off award. Disclosure does not provide sufficient understanding of the company's remuneration policies and the link between performance-based pay and company performance."	"We do not believe the proposed amendment to the provision to call special meetings is sufficient to avoid waste of corporate resources."	"Company already has policies in place to address these issues."
Outcome of the vote	Pass	Fail	Fail
Implications of the outcome	"Generally, BlackRock Investment Stewardship supports the vote recommendations of the board of directors and management. When we determine it is in our clients' financial interests to convey concern to companies through voting, we may do so in two forms: we might not support the election of directors or other management proposals, or we might not support management's voting recommendation on a shareholder proposal. In some cases, companies may request an engagement after a shareholder meeting to provide additional clarity. We value the opportunity to listen to company leadership, which enhances our understanding of their business models, ensuring		

that our proxy voting decisions are based on a comprehensive view on company practices and priorities.

In these conversations, we do not direct companies on how they should manage their business. That responsibility lies with management, with input from the board."

Criteria on which the vote is assessed to be "most significant"

"The Investment Stewardship website is available here: <https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/insights/investment-stewardship>

For BlackRock Active Investment Stewardship (BAIS), the vast majority of proposals on which we vote are routine, and we will generally vote in line with management recommendations and our Global Engagement and Voting Guidelines. We may determine that a vote is significant based on the potential financial impact on clients, the level of anticipated interest across our clients in the vote, the complexity of the issue, or the context within which the vote is made, amongst other things. We vote on all proposals to advance our clients' financial interests, consistent with their investment objectives and our fiduciary duty as an asset manager.

BIS prioritizes its stewardship activities around themes on which the team most frequently engages companies, where these issues are relevant and represent a source of material business risk or opportunity.

These themes are: board quality and effectiveness; strategy, purpose, and financial resilience; incentives aligned with financial value creation; climate and natural capital; and company impacts on people.

BIS has identified a population of shareholder meeting proposals that align with these themes and are therefore considered significant."

BlackRock MSCI World Index	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Equinor ASA	Takeda Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.	Deere & Company
Date of Vote	14/05/2025	25/06/2025	25/02/2026
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	Withdrawal from All Offshore Wind Globally; Eliminate Management Bonuses	Approve Annual Bonus	Report on Expected Return on Investment of Company's Emissions Reduction Goals
How the fund manager voted	Against	Against	Against
Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote	"No, BIS does not disclose its vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings."		
Rationale for the voting decision	"The request is either not clearly defined, too prescriptive, not in the purview of shareholders, or unduly constraining on the company."	"AGAINST due to issues with compensation-related disclosure and governance."	"Proposal is not in shareholders' best financial interests."
Outcome of the vote	Fail	Pass	Fail

Implications of the outcome	"Generally, BlackRock Investment Stewardship supports the vote recommendations of the board of directors and management. When we determine it is in our clients' financial interests to convey concern to companies through voting, we may do so in two forms: we might not support the election of directors or other management proposals, or we might not support management's voting recommendation on a shareholder proposal. In some cases, companies may request an engagement after a shareholder meeting to provide additional clarity. We value the opportunity to listen to company leadership, which enhances our understanding of their business models, ensuring that our proxy voting decisions are based on a comprehensive view on company practices and priorities. In these conversations, we do not direct companies on how they should manage their business. That responsibility lies with management, with input from the board."
-----------------------------	---

Criteria on which the vote is assessed to be "most significant"	"The Investment Stewardship website is available here: https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/insights/investment-stewardship For BlackRock Active Investment Stewardship (BAIS), the vast majority of proposals on which we vote are routine, and we will generally vote in line with management recommendations and our Global Engagement and Voting Guidelines. We may determine that a vote is significant based on the potential financial impact on clients, the level of anticipated interest across our clients in the vote, the complexity of the issue, or the context within which the vote is made, amongst other things. We vote on all proposals to advance our clients' financial interests, consistent with their investment objectives and our fiduciary duty as an asset manager. BIS prioritizes its stewardship activities around themes on which the team most frequently engages companies, where these issues are relevant and represent a source of material business risk or opportunity. These themes are: board quality and effectiveness; strategy, purpose, and financial resilience; incentives aligned with financial value creation; climate and natural capital; and company impacts on people.
---	---

BIS has identified a population of shareholder meeting proposals that align with these themes and are therefore considered significant."

BlackRock Dynamic Diversified Growth Fund	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	CommScope Holding Company, Inc.	Emerald Resources NL	LG Chem Ltd.
Date of Vote	08/05/2025	28/11/2025	31/03/2026
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	Elect Director L. William (Bill) Krause	Elect Michael Bowen as Director	Amend Articles of Incorporation (Advisory Shareholder Resolutions) (Shareholder Proposal)
How the fund manager voted	Against	For	For
Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to	"No, BIS does not disclose its vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings."		

the company
ahead of the
vote

Rationale for the voting decision	“Vote against Nominating/Governance Committee member for failure to adequately account for diversity on the board.”	n/a	“Proposal considered to be in the best interests of shareholders.”
-----------------------------------	---	-----	--

Outcome of the vote	Pass	Pass	N/A
---------------------	------	------	-----

Implications of the outcome	“Generally, BlackRock Investment Stewardship supports the vote recommendations of the board of directors and management. When we determine it is in our clients’ financial interests to convey concern to companies through voting, we may do so in two forms: we might not support the election of directors or other management proposals, or we might not support management’s voting recommendation on a shareholder proposal. In some cases, companies may request an engagement after a shareholder meeting to provide additional clarity. BlackRock Investment Stewardship identifies and prioritizes companies for engagement based on several factors, including but not limited to, identified or potential material financial risks, aggregate client exposure, corporate developments, changes in regulation, or geopolitical or environmental-related developments that could impact a company’s operations. We determine engagement would be helpful to further understand a company’s situation after assessing its disclosures. We value the opportunity to listen to company leadership, which enhances our understanding of their business models, ensuring that our proxy voting decisions are based on a comprehensive view on company practices and priorities. In these conversations, we do not direct companies on how they should manage their business. That responsibility lies with management, with input from the board.”
-----------------------------	--

Criteria on which the vote is assessed to	“BlackRock Investment Stewardship publishes “vote bulletins” and “case studies” on key votes at shareholder meetings to provide insight into certain vote decisions the team expects will be of particular interest to clients. The vote bulletins are published on the “Vote Bulletin
---	--

be “most significant”

library” section of the BlackRock Investment Stewardship website. The case studies can be found in BlackRock Investment Stewardship’s flagship publications, also available on the website. These bulletins and case studies are intended to explain vote decisions relating to proposals addressing a range of corporate governance issues, including sustainability-related matters that may be material to a company’s business model, that are on the agenda for a shareholder general meeting. Other factors BlackRock Investment Stewardship may consider in deciding to publish a vote bulletin and/or a case study include the profile of the issue in question and the level of client interest we expect in the vote decision. The vote bulletins and case studies include relevant company-specific background, sector or local market context, and engagement history when applicable. Vote bulletins and case studies may also include observations on emerging corporate governance issues and market-level stewardship developments.

The Investment Stewardship website is available here:

<https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/insights/investment-stewardship>

For BlackRock Active Investment Stewardship (BAIS), the vast majority of proposals on which we vote are routine, and we will generally vote in line with management recommendations and our Global Engagement and Voting Guidelines. We may determine that a vote is significant based on the potential financial impact on clients, the level of anticipated interest across our clients in the vote, the complexity of the issue, or the context within which the vote is made, amongst other things. We vote on all proposals to advance our clients’ financial interests, consistent with their investment objectives and our fiduciary duty as an asset manager.

BIS prioritizes its stewardship activities around themes on which the team most frequently engages companies, where these issues are relevant and represent a source of material business risk or opportunity.

These themes are: board quality and effectiveness; strategy, purpose, and financial resilience; incentives aligned with financial value creation; climate and natural capital; and company impacts on people.

BIS has identified a population of shareholder meeting proposals that align with these themes and are therefore considered significant.”

Blackrock Aquila Life Global Minimum Volatility Fund	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Amazon.com, Inc.	Costco Wholesale Corporation	Nordea Bank Abp
Date of Vote	21/05/2025	15/01/2026	24/03/2026
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	Report on Impact of Data Centers on Climate Commitments	Assess and Report on Financial Risks and Costs of Climate Commitments	Approve Proposal Regarding Business Activities in the Arctic Region
How the fund manager voted	Against	Against	Against
Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote	"No, BIS does not disclose its vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings."		
Rationale for the voting decision	"The company already provides sufficient disclosure and/or reporting regarding this issue or is already enhancing its relevant disclosures."	"The company already provides sufficient disclosure and/or reporting regarding this issue or is already enhancing its relevant disclosures."	"Proposal is not in shareholders' best financial interests."

Outcome of the vote	Fail	Fail	N/A
Implications of the outcome	“Generally, BlackRock Investment Stewardship supports the vote recommendations of the board of directors and management. When we determine it is in our clients’ financial interests to convey concern to companies through voting, we may do so in two forms: we might not support the election of directors or other management proposals, or we might not support management’s voting recommendation on a shareholder proposal. In some cases, companies may request an engagement after a shareholder meeting to provide additional clarity. We value the opportunity to listen to company leadership, which enhances our understanding of their business models, ensuring that our proxy voting decisions are based on a comprehensive view on company practices and priorities. In these conversations, we do not direct companies on how they should manage their business. That responsibility lies with management, with input from the board.”		
Criteria on which the vote is assessed to be “most significant”	“BlackRock Investment Stewardship publishes “vote bulletins” and “case studies” on key votes at shareholder meetings to provide insight into certain vote decisions the team expects will be of particular interest to clients. The vote bulletins are published on the “Vote Bulletin library” section of the BlackRock Investment Stewardship website. The case studies can be found in BlackRock Investment Stewardship’s flagship publications, also available on the website. These bulletins and case studies are intended to explain vote decisions relating to proposals addressing a range of corporate governance issues, including sustainability-related matters that may be material to a company’s business model, that are on the agenda for a shareholder general meeting. Other factors BlackRock Investment Stewardship may consider in deciding to publish a vote bulletin and/or a case study include the profile of the issue in question and the level of client interest we expect in the vote decision. The vote bulletins and case studies include relevant company-specific background, sector or local market context, and engagement history when applicable. Vote bulletins and case studies may also include observations on emerging		

corporate governance issues and market-level stewardship developments.”

The Investment Stewardship website is available here:
<https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/insights/investment-stewardship>

For BlackRock Active Investment Stewardship (BAIS), the vast majority of proposals on which we vote are routine, and we will generally vote in line with management recommendations and our Global Engagement and Voting Guidelines. We may determine that a vote is significant based on the potential financial impact on clients, the level of anticipated interest across our clients in the vote, the complexity of the issue, or the context within which the vote is made, amongst other things. We vote on all proposals to advance our clients' financial interests, consistent with their investment objectives and our fiduciary duty as an asset manager. BIS prioritizes its stewardship activities around themes on which the team most frequently engages companies, where these issues are relevant and represent a source of material business risk or opportunity.

These themes are: board quality and effectiveness; strategy, purpose, and financial resilience; incentives aligned with financial value creation; climate and natural capital; and company impacts on people.

BIS has identified a population of shareholder meeting proposals that align with these themes and are therefore considered significant.”

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
LGIM FTSE4Good Developed Equity Index Fund*			
Company name	Microsoft Corporation	Alphabet Inc.	Eli Lilly and Company
Date of Vote	2025-12-05	2025-06-06	2025-05-05
Approximate size of fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	6.6	2.2	1.6
Summary of the resolution	Resolution 1f: Elect Director Satya Nadella	Resolution 1d: Elect Director John L. Hennessy	Resolution 1d: Elect Director Juan R. Luciano
How the fund manager voted	Against	Against	Against
Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote	“L&G publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.”		
Rationale for the voting decision	“Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects companies to separate the roles of Chair and CEO due to risk	“Board balance - Independence: A vote against is applied to the (re-)election of a non-independent director due to lack of independence on the board.	“Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects companies to separate the roles of Chair and CEO

management and oversight concerns.”	Independence: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects the Chair of the Nominations/Governance Committee to have served on the board for no more than 12 years in order to maintain independence and a balance of relevant skills, experience, tenure, and background. Average board tenure: 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. Diversity: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a company to have at least one-third of women on the board. Independence: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects the Chair of the Board to have served on the board for no more than 12 years and the board to be regularly refreshed in order to maintain an appropriate mix of independence, relevant skills, experience, tenure, and background. Independence - Board balance: A vote against is	due to risk management and oversight concerns. Average board tenure: 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. Classified Board: A vote against is applied as LGIM supports a declassified board as directors should stand for re-election on an annual basis.”
--	---	---

		applied because the board does not comprise of a majority of independent directors. Shareholder rights: A vote against is applied because LGIM supports the equitable structure of one-share-one-vote. We expect companies to move to a one-share-one-vote structure or provide shareholders a regular vote on the continuation of an unequal capital structure.”	
Outcome of the vote	Pass	Pass	Pass
Implications of the outcome	“L&G will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.”		
Criteria on which the vote is assessed to be “most significant”	“Thematic - Board Leadership: L&G considers this vote to be significant as it is in application of an escalation of our vote policy on the topic of the combination of the board chair and CEO.”	“Thematic - Diversity: L&G Asset Management business views gender diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf.”	“Thematic - Board Leadership: L&G Asset Management business considers this vote to be significant as it is in application of an escalation of our vote policy on the topic of the combination of the board chair and CEO.”

**Please note that prior to May 2024 the name of the Fund was the Ethical Global Equity Index Fund.*

LGIM World Emerging Markets Equity Index Fund	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	China Construction Bank Corporation	PDD Holdings Inc.	Pop Mart International Group Limited
Date of Vote	2025-06-27	2025-12-19	2025-05-27
Approximate size of fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	1.0	0.9	0.3
Summary of the resolution	Resolution 2: Elect Lei Jun as Director	Resolution 6: Elect Director George Yong-Boon Yeo	Resolution 3a: Elect Wang Ning as Director
How the fund manager voted	Against	Against	Against
Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote	“L&G Asset Management business publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.”		
Rationale for the voting decision	“Climate Impact Pledge: A vote against is applied as the company is deemed not to have made sufficient progress against our climate expectations and red lines, as set	“Remuneration: A vote against has been applied as L&G expects companies to obtain annual shareholder approval of executive directors pay and non-	“Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as L&G expects the roles of Board Chair and CEO to be separate. These two roles are substantially different and a

	out in our sector guides through LGIM's dial-mover engagement programme."	executive directors fees. Diversity: A vote against is applied as L&G expects a company to have at least one-third of women on the board."	division of responsibilities ensures there is a proper balance of authority and responsibility on the board. Remuneration Committee: A vote against has been applied due to insufficient independence on the Committee."
Outcome of the vote	Pass	Pass	Pass
Implications of the outcome	"L&G Asset Management business will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress."		
Criteria on which the vote is assessed to be "most significant"	"Thematic - Climate: L&G Asset Management business considers this vote to be significant as it is applied under the Climate Impact Pledge, our flagship engagement programme targeting companies in climate-critical sectors. More information on L&G Asset Management business' Climate Impact Pledge can be found here: https://am.landg.co	"Thematic - Diversity: L&G views gender diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf."	"Thematic - Board Leadership: L&G Asset Management business considers this vote to be significant as it is in application of an escalation of our vote policy on the topic of the combination of the board chair and CEO."

	m/en-uk/institutional/responsible-investing/climate-impact-pledge/”		
LGIM FTSE Developed Core Infrastructure Index Fund	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	NextEra Energy, Inc.	The Williams Companies, Inc.	Central Japan Railway Co.
Date of Vote	2025-05-22	2025-04-29	2025-06-25
Approximate size of fund’s holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	5.3	2.8	0.8
Summary of the resolution	Resolution 1f: Elect Director John W. Ketchum	Resolution 1.4: Elect Director Stacey H. Dore	Resolution 2.1: Elect Director Kaneko, Shin
How the fund manager voted	Against	Against	Against
Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote	“L&G Asset Management business publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.”		

Rationale for the voting decision	“Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as L&G expects companies to separate the roles of Chair and CEO due to risk management and oversight concerns. Board mandates: A vote against is applied because we have concerns regarding the time commitment required to manage all board positions and how this may impact their ability to remain informed and effectively contribute to board discussions.”	“Diversity: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects a company to have at least one-third of women on the board.”	“Diversity: A vote against is applied due to the lack of meaningful diversity on the board.”
Outcome of the vote	n/a	n/a	n/a
Implications of the outcome	“L&G Asset Management business will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.”		
Criteria on which the vote is assessed to be “most significant”	“Joint Chair/CEO: A vote against is applied as LGIM expects companies to separate the roles of Chair and CEO due to risk management and oversight concerns. Board mandates: A vote against is applied because we have concerns regarding the time commitment required to manage all	“Thematic - Diversity: L&G Asset Management business views gender diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf.”	“Thematic - Diversity: L&G Asset Management business views gender diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf.”

board positions and how this may impact their ability to remain informed and effectively contribute to board discussions.”

MFS Global Equity Fund	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	Canadian National Railway Co	Alphabet Inc Class A	Burberry Group Plc
Date of Vote	02/05/2025	06/06/2025	16/07/2025
Approximate size of fund's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	1.21%	2.20%	0.55%
Summary of the resolution	Management Advisory Vote on Climate Change	Publish a Human Rights Impact Assessment of AI Driven Targeted Advertising	Authorize UK Political Donations and Expenditures
How the fund manager voted	With Management	With Management	With Management
Where the fund manager voted against management, did they communicate their intent to the company ahead of the vote	“While MFS may engage with issuers ahead of our vote at a shareholder meeting, we may not disclose our final vote decisions that are considered on a case-by-case basis prior to the meeting.”		
Rationale for the voting decision	“MFS voted FOR this proposal, as the company's climate	“MFS voted FOR this proposal, as an independent human	“MFS voted FOR this proposal, as the company states it

	disclosures meet market standards, and the company's climate transition plan includes clear and approved science-based targets, specific actions, and governance framework."	rights impact assessment would strengthen the company's ability to address potential risks associated with its AI-driven advertising practices, particularly amid a recent data privacy settlement."	does not intend to make overtly political payments but is making this technical proposal in order to avoid inadvertent contravention of UK legislation."
Outcome of the vote	95.2%	14.3%	96.4%
Implications of the outcome	"As this is an advisory vote, the results are non-binding. However, the vote provides the board important feedback on the company's approach to climate change, including as it continues its ongoing efforts to refine its climate strategy."	"We will continue to monitor how the company considers its human rights risks, specifically through targeted AI advertising, and the steps it takes to mitigate any future concerns."	"Understanding the initiatives that the company supports through its political contribution efforts allows us as shareholders better gauge how the company views and manages the potential risks associated with its direct and indirect political contribution expenditures."
Criteria on which the vote is assessed to be "most significant"	"For the purpose of this questionnaire, "significant votes" may have the following characteristics, among others: vote is linked to the proxy voting policy and/or certain engagement priorities, vote considered engagement with the issuer, vote relates to certain thematic or industry trends, etc."		

Information on the most significant engagement case studies for BlackRock as a company for the funds containing public equities as at 31 December 2024 (latest available) is shown below:

BlackRock	Case Study 1	Case Study 2	Case Study 3
Name of entity engaged with	Hyundai Motor Co., Ltd. (Hyundai Motor)	PepsiCo, Inc. (PepsiCo)	Henkel AG & Co. KGaA (Henkel)
Topic	Company Impacts on People	Natural Capital	Board Composition
Rationale	n/a	n/a	n/a
What the investment manager has done	“Hyundai Motor is an automaker headquartered in Seoul, South Korea. The agenda for the company’s March 2024 AGM included the election of directors and the approval of the company’s compensation policies. In July and December 2022, multiple media outlets reported that Hyundai Motor’s suppliers based in the U.S. employed underage children. As noted in BIS’ approach to engagement on	“PepsiCo is a U.S.-based global consumer packaged goods company focused on beverages and convenient snacks. On the agenda of Pepsi’s May 2024 AGM was a shareholder proposal requesting that the company “complete a material biodiversity dependency and impact assessment and issue a corresponding public report to identify the extent to which the company’s supply chains and operations are vulnerable to risks	“Henkel is a large German consumer goods company. On the agenda of the April 2024 AGM were management proposals to re-elect directors to the supervisory board. In April 2024, BIS engaged with Henkel’s investor relations team to gain additional clarity on the company’s approach to board composition, corporate governance, and remuneration. At the time of Henkel’s April 2024 AGM, the level of gender diversity on the company’s management and

corporate human rights risks, poor working conditions, substandard wages, and use of forced labor or child labor—by a company or its key suppliers—can expose a company to supply chain stoppages, health and safety incidents, strikes, international trade disruption, reputational damage, and negative impact on a company’s ability to deliver long-term financial returns. Before the March 2023 AGM, the company published a shareholder letter addressing its view on the child labor controversy, as well as a summary report on its audit of the labor practices of the Tier 1 suppliers of Hyundai Motor America. In the letter, Hyundai Motor committed to ensuring that suppliers would comply with the company policies in the future. Additionally, it introduced new requirements for suppliers to fulfill third-party audits for	associated with biodiversity loss. At PepsiCo’s request, BIS engaged with members of the company’s management team in advance of the May 2024 AGM. In that engagement, we learned about PepsiCo’s Positive Agriculture agenda. PepsiCo’s business relies on a secure source of crops and ingredients to manufacture its products. The company’s Positive Agriculture agenda is designed to address risks such as freshwater scarcity and soil degradation. From engagement as well as the company’s disclosure, we also learned that PepsiCo is striving to mitigate natural capital-related risks across its value chain. PepsiCo is committed to expanding biodiversity-related disclosure and are assessing how they might incorporate the Taskforce on Nature-	supervisory boards fell below European market practice.”
---	--	---

purposes of greater transparency in reporting around its supply chain.

Hyundai Motor also confirmed that their suppliers have terminated relationships with the third-party staffing agencies who falsely certified that they had screened for underage workers.

related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) into future reporting as they seek to comply with other requirements, such as ISSB and the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD).”

In July 2023, Hyundai Motor published the results of supplier assessments in its annual Sustainability Report. BIS engaged with Hyundai Motor in 2022 and 2023, both before and after the March 2023 AGM to learn how the company was approaching these matters.

BIS engaged again with Hyundai Motor in March 2024 at the company’s request to provide additional clarity around its governance mechanisms, board oversight, and risk management

	surrounding its supply chain management.”		
Outcomes and next steps	“Given Hyundai Motor’s enhanced disclosures, proactive supplier assessments, and commitment to enhancing its labour practices, BIS supported management at the company’s March 2024 AGM. All management-proposed items received majority shareholder support at the March 2024 AGM. BIS also supported management across all items at the company’s March 2023 AGM.”	“BIS did not support the natural capital-related shareholder proposal at PepsiCo’s May 2024 AGM, which received ~18% shareholder support. In our assessment, PepsiCo’s existing disclosure on these issues is robust and the company has policies and practices in place to manage material natural capital-related risks and opportunities.”	“BIS did not support the election of three directors, who were also members of the Nomination Committee, to the supervisory board in alignment with BIS’ proxy voting guidelines for EMEA securities and reflecting our ongoing concerns with the overall composition of the board. BIS’ voting guidelines take into consideration market-level standards or initiatives at the board level in European markets, including Germany. All management proposed items, including the election of directors, received majority support from shareholders at the April 2024 AGM.”

Information on the most significant engagement case studies for L&G as a company for the funds containing public equities as at 31 December 2025 (latest available) is shown below:

L&G	Case Study 1	Case Study 2	Case Study 3
Name of entity engaged with	Rio Tinto Plc	Fortum OYJ	Anglo American Plc
Topic	Climate & Governance	Climate Impact Pledge	Climate; governance
Rationale	Rio Tinto is a global diversified mining and metals company. The mining and diversified metals sector produces minerals that are essential to the energy transition. As such, L&G believe that long-term, responsible investors, such as L&G, can support these companies as they decarbonise and realise the associated financial opportunities. In August 2024, L&G published their updated assessment framework for mining companies' climate transition plans, which sets out their expectations for the sector and has formed the framework for L&G's ongoing	In early 2022, the Nordic energy company Fortum committed to become carbon-neutral by 2050, and although the company had produced disclosures related to its plan to achieve this, L&G believed that it needed to go further in developing a resilient strategy that would support sustainable value creation. As a result, L&G became a co-lead investor of the Fortum engagement within the Climate Action 100+ initiative (CA100+). In March 2023, after a series of collaborative and constructive engagements, the company increased its	L&G's engagement with Anglo American has been in-depth and focussed on strategic opportunities that have the potential to strengthen the company's position as a leader in the climate transition. Anglo American is also included in L&G's engagement-led investing strategy - an approach that seeks to support companies in creating long-term shareholder value while reducing emissions and advancing the energy transition. This strategy complements L&G's existing stewardship activities.

engagements with mining companies. UN SDG 13: Climate Action	climate change ambitions by: - Bringing forward its carbon neutrality target (across scopes 1, 2 and 3), to 2030 - Committing to exit all coal generation by the end of 2027 - Committing to set a 1.5°C-aligned emission reduction target verified by the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)	Having previously been public about their views on the Company's proposed takeover by BHP Group, L&G have been equally transparent about their support for the proposed merger with Teck Resources, and the latter formed a substantial focus of L&G's engagement in 2025, along with related remuneration proposals. UN SDG 13: Climate Action
	These commitments were undeniably ambitious and incredibly welcome. However, L&G wanted to continue their engagement with Fortum to understand: • How it would meet its emission reduction targets • How it would facilitate its exit from coal • How it was advocating for a policy environment that would support its own	

		decarbonisation ambitions.	
		UN SDG 13: Climate Action	
What the investment manager has done	L&G engaged extensively with Rio Tinto on climate and governance matters, including meetings with the Chair, Senior Independent Director and management. Discussions focused on strengthening Scope 3 emissions targets, customer decarbonisation, and the company's response to a shareholder resolution regarding its dual-listed company structure and governance arrangements.	L&G engaged twice with Fortum during 2025, focusing on its climate strategy and policy advocacy. Fortum strengthened its climate credentials through SBTi-approved 1.5°C-aligned targets, a detailed transition plan, and enhanced climate lobbying disclosures, reflecting feedback provided by L&G over several years.	L&G held multiple meetings with Anglo American's senior leadership and board on strategy, governance, climate priorities and value creation. L&G supported the company's proposed merger with Teck Resources, having previously advocated strategic restructuring, but voted against amendments to executive incentive arrangements that were inconsistent with its remuneration expectations.
Outcomes and next steps	Climate: L&G considered Rio Tinto's enhanced climate strategy to be broadly aligned with its expectations, supported by improved value-chain decarbonisation disclosures and clear emissions reduction actions. As a result,	L&G viewed Fortum's enhanced climate lobbying disclosures, ambitious decarbonisation strategy and demonstrated progress as evidence of a successful engagement outcome. As a result, L&G stepped back from its engagement through	Following L&G's pre-declared vote and wider shareholder concerns, Anglo American withdrew the proposed remuneration resolution, while shareholders approved the Teck Resources merger. L&G continues to engage on

L&G supported the Climate Action Plan and will continue to monitor implementation and progress. Governance: Following engagement with both the company and the shareholder proponent, L&G concluded that the board had already undertaken a sufficiently robust review of the dual-listed structure. L&G therefore voted against the shareholder resolution, supporting management's recommendation.	CA100+ and the Climate Impact Pledge, while continuing to monitor progress and refocusing engagement efforts elsewhere. The decision reflects L&G's belief that meaningful progress should be recognised and rewarded.	remuneration, decarbonisation and low-carbon growth opportunities, and has also contributed to broader industry discussions on executive pay practices within the extractives sector.
---	---	--

Information on the most significant engagement case studies for MFS as a company for the funds containing public equities as at 31 March 2026 (latest available) is shown below:

MFS	Case Study 1	Case Study 2	Case Study 3
Name of entity engaged with	Air Liquide SA	Experian PLC	Glencore PLC
Topic	Environment - Climate change	Strategy, Financial and Reporting - Strategy/purpose	Environment - Climate change
Rationale	"We believe open communication with companies and issuers is an important aspect of our ownership responsibilities, which is why we take a constructive approach to engagement. Characterized as collaborative, materiality oriented and issuer-focused, we believe this approach gives us an analytical advantage and can act as a source of alpha generation. It is our view that the best outcomes are most likely achieved through strong relationships and regular, mutual dialogue with our portfolio companies. Our goal when engaging is to exchange views on ESG topics that represent material risks or opportunities for companies or issuers, and to effect positive change on such issues. We believe that long-term-oriented asset managers who engage companies on ESG topics can positively influence a multitude of better business practices, which will ultimately accrete value for our clients. Our engagement approach is driven by strong collaboration between all members of our investment platform, including our stewardship team. Our engagements take place consistently, and in a number of different forms, often through mutual dialogue with company management, formal letters, ESG-focused board meetings and more. We may also work with other industry participants. We believe that our approach to engagement can generate positive impacts for industries, individual companies and a wide range of stakeholders, including shareholders. We actively participate in industry initiatives, organizations and working groups that seek to improve and provide guidance on corporate and investor best practices, ESG integration and proxy voting issues. MFS is a member of or signatory to a variety of organizations and initiatives that promote ESG topics, including the Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI), the Workforce Disclosure Initiative (WDI), the CDP and Ceres. We are actively encouraging our portfolio companies to enhance disclosure and adopt		

	best practices across a variety of ESG topics such as setting science-based emissions reduction targets, addressing modern slavery and forced labor concerns and enhancing disclosure around employee management practices."		
What the investment manager has done	"While the engagement described below took place during the one year timeframe to end March 2026, engagement may have been ongoing for a number of years. At a firm level we have open dialogue with companies that are long-term in nature. MFS recently engaged with Air Liquide to discuss several sustainability topics. We discussed the planned updates to the company's long-term incentive (LTI) program, which include aligning vesting periods globally and increasing the ESG weighting, aiming to support the reduction of absolute CO2 emissions in line with Air Liquide's climate objectives.	"While the engagement described below took place during the one year timeframe to end March 2026, engagement may have been ongoing for a number of years. At a firm level we have open dialogue with companies that are long-term in nature. MFS held a recent engagement with this company to discuss their efforts in outlining their positive social impacts and enhancing the accuracy of their credit reporting. During the meeting, we reviewed the company's social impact framework, which relates to the ways clients can enhance their credit profiles and improve their credit scores. Despite the program's potential, we found that the actual credit score improvements it offers are quite minimal, often ranging only between 1-7 points. Our conversation also covered a recent controversy that the company was involved in and learned more about the company's processes for handling customer complaints and	"While the engagement described below took place during the one year timeframe to end March 2026, engagement may have been ongoing for a number of years. At a firm level MFS have open dialogue with companies that are long-term in nature. Meeting date: Multiple Led by: CSO, Stewardship team, portfolio managers, industry analyst. Members of our investment team engaged with the sustainability lead, carbon lead and company secretary of Glencore ahead of the upcoming AGM and vote on the progress report of the company's

The company is also addressing shareholder voting concerns raised by ISS to ensure better alignment and understanding among stakeholders on the company's management of climate risk and transition planning. Air Liquide reaffirmed its medium-term targets to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 35% and Scope 3 emissions by 60% by 2035, with a broader goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2050. The company provided confidence that although access to low-carbon electricity remains a critical factor in meeting these objectives, no significant technical barriers are anticipated. We discussed the company's approach to managing transition risks under emissions trading systems, including	ensuring the accuracy of credit reports. We believe that there may be some underlying issues with the company's operational transparency accuracy, and stakeholder communication. Overall, this engagement underscores the need for continued dialogue with the company to ensure they address these critical areas effectively, avoiding potential regulatory scrutiny and enhancing their overall service reliability."	climate transition plan. Our discussion provided additional color to the dynamics and factors shaping the decarbonization pathway for thermal coal and provided insight on both the progress and challenges in detailed public disclosure. Regarding product use emissions data, we encouraged Glencore to do more on customer engagement, including supporting the transfer of knowledge on carbon capture from Australia into Asia. We also identified areas where we would like to see enhanced disclosure in the future."
--	--	--

the anticipated cost implications of certificate shortfalls in the EU ETS. Air Liquide remains confident in its ability to pass through these costs to consumers and views rising carbon prices as an opportunity to accelerate customer demand for decarbonization solutions. Finally, we note that Air Liquide is collaborating with investors to develop a global framework for accounting avoided emissions, which could enhance the transparency and impact of its climate initiatives. We can investigate further this framework and its implications in future engagement.

We had an additional engagement in 2025 to discuss board composition, executive compensation, hydrogen strategy, and carbon pricing

risk. On governance, the Chair provided an overview of board effectiveness and recent changes, noting that five new directors have joined over the past two years, bringing valuable expertise in digitization and industry knowledge. The board also proposed an increase in long-term and climate-related incentives for the CEO. Overall, the company communicated their reaffirmed focus on efficiency, margin improvement, and long-term growth looking forward.

On carbon pricing, we believe that the company is overall well positioned to pass through costs to customers. The company's European hydrogen infrastructure network is expected to face increased cash requirements to cover EU Emissions Trading

Scheme obligations, but we believe the financial exposure will be mitigated by various means, including their investments in carbon capture technology and renewable hydrogen. We came away from the meeting with a positive view of the company's decarbonization strategy and preparedness for a changing regulatory landscape. " "While the engagement described below took place during the one year timeframe to end March 2026, engagement may have been ongoing for a number of years. At a firm level we have open dialogue with companies that are long-term in nature.

We held a recent engagement with this company to discuss their efforts in outlining their positive social impacts and

enhancing the accuracy of their credit reporting. During the meeting, we reviewed the company's social impact framework, which relates to the ways clients can enhance their credit profiles and improve their credit scores. Despite the program's potential, we found that the actual credit score improvements it offers are quite minimal, often ranging only between 1-7 points.

Our conversation also covered a recent controversy that the company was involved in and learned more about the company's processes for handling customer complaints and ensuring the accuracy of credit reports. We believe that there may be some underlying issues with the company's operational transparency accuracy, and

stakeholder communication. Overall, this engagement underscores the need for continued dialogue with the company to ensure they address these critical areas effectively, avoiding potential regulatory scrutiny and enhancing their overall service reliability." "While the engagement described below took place during the one year timeframe to end March 2026, engagement may have been ongoing for a number of years. At a firm level we have open dialogue with companies that are long-term in nature.

Meeting date:
Multiple

Led by: CSO,
Stewardship team,
portfolio managers,
industry analyst.

Members of our investment team engaged with the sustainability lead, carbon lead and company secretary of Glencore ahead of the upcoming AGM and vote on the progress report of the company's climate transition plan. Our discussion provided additional color to the dynamics and factors shaping the decarbonization pathway for thermal coal and provided insight on both the progress and challenges in detailed public disclosure. Regarding product use emissions data, we encouraged Glencore to do more on customer engagement, including supporting the transfer of knowledge on carbon capture from Australia into Asia. We also identified areas where we would like to see enhanced

	disclosure in the future."		
Outcomes and next steps	"We will continue to engage with the company as needed."	"We will continue to engage with the company as needed."	"Shortly after our engagement with Glencore, we followed up with written correspondence mentioning that we plan to support the vote approving the progress report, despite limited implementation progress, and outlining feedback on multiple related topics. We further identified areas where we would like to see enhanced reporting on thermal coal in order to provide continued support of future progress reports such as capital allocation, the company's future emissions pathway, action to reduce customer emissions and mine rehabilitation."