

# Pension Board



**Monday, 22 November 2021 at 10.00 a.m.**

**Committee Room One - Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove  
Crescent, London, E14 2BG**

## Agenda

**Chair: Mr John Jones**

### Members

Vice-Chair: David Stephen Thompson

John Gray, Nneka Oroge, Councillor Abdal Ullah, Roger Jones and Annette McKenna

### Substitutes:

Michael Alderson

[A meeting is only quorate when at least one person of each member and employer representatives are present including an independent chair Or 50% of both member and employer representatives are present.]

### Further Information

Reports for consideration, meeting contact details, public participation and more information is available on the following pages.



## Public Information

### Viewing or Participating in Committee Meetings

The meeting will be broadcast live on the Council's website. A link to the website is detailed below. The press and public are encouraged to watch this meeting on-line. Please note: Whilst the meeting is open to the public, the public seating in the meeting room for observers will be extremely limited due to the Covid19 pandemic restrictions. You must contact the Democratic Services Officer to reserve a place, this will be allocated on a first come first served basis. No one will be admitted unless they have registered in advance.

### Meeting Webcast

The meeting is being webcast for viewing through the Council's webcast system.

<http://towerhamlets.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

### Contact for further enquiries:

Democratic Services,

1st Floor, Town Hall, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London, E14 2BG

Tel: 020 7364 0842

E-mail: [committee.services@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:committee.services@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

Web:<http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee>

### Electronic agendas reports and minutes.

Copies of agendas, reports and minutes for council meetings can also be found on our website from day of publication.

To access this, click [www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee](http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee) and search for the relevant committee and meeting date.

Agendas are available on the Modern.Gov, Windows, iPad and Android apps.

Scan this code for an electronic agenda:



## Pension Board

Monday, 22 November 2021

10.00 a.m.

	<b>PAGE NUMBER(S)</b>
<b>1. APOLOGIES</b>	
<b>2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS</b>	5 - 6
<b>3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES</b>	7 - 18
<p>To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Pensions Board held on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2021.</p>	
<b>4. SUBMISSIONS FROM FUND MEMBERS</b>	
<p>To consider any written submissions from Fund Members/Stakeholders.</p> <p>(Submissions must be received by the Clerk to the meeting no later than 5.00p.m. on the day before the meeting.)</p>	
<b>5. SUBMISSIONS / RESPONSES FROM PENSION COMMITTEE</b>	
<b>6. REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION</b>	
<b>6 .1 Governance Review Update (verbal)</b>	
<b>6 .2 Member Training - Renewable Energy Infrastructure Training - Quinbrook Infrastructure Partners</b>	
<b>6 .3 Member Training - Update on Hymans Academy (verbal)</b>	
<b>6 .4 Update on Pension Fund Accounts and Audit Plan (verbal)</b>	
<b>6 .5 Review of Risk Management Policy and Risk Register</b>	19 - 22
<b>6 .6 Quarterly ESG, Voting, Engagement and Stewardship Update</b>	23 - 62
<b>6 .7 Pensions Board Work Plan 2021-22</b>	63 - 66

**7. PENSIONS COMMITTEE AGENDA FOR THE FORTHCOMING MEETING**

**8. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

In view of the contents of the remaining items on the agenda the Committee is recommended to adopt the following motion: "That, under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting for the consideration of the Section Two business on the grounds that it contains information defined as Exempt in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972."

**EXEMPT SECTION (Pink Papers)**

The exempt committee papers in the agenda will contain information, which is commercially, legally or personally sensitive and should not be divulged to third parties. If you do not wish to retain these papers after the meeting, please post them to the Democratic Service Office, 1st Floor, Mulberry Place London E14 3BG or hold onto the papers until such time you can return to the Town Hall and dispose of the papers in the confidential bins.

**8.1 RESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S) 67 - 78**

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the restricted minutes of the meeting of the Pensions Board held on 6th September 2021

**8.2 Administration and LGPS Quarterly Update 79 - 88**

**8.3 London Collective Investment Vehicle Changes 89 - 182**

**Next Meeting of the Committee:**

Monday, 7 March 2022 at 10.00 a.m. to be held in the Committee Room One - Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London, E14 2BG

# Agenda Item 2

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AT MEETINGS– NOTE FROM THE MONITORING OFFICER**

This note is for guidance only. For further details please consult the Code of Conduct for Members at Part C, Section 31 of the Council's Constitution

### **(i) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI)**

You have a DPI in any item of business on the agenda where it relates to the categories listed in **Appendix A** to this guidance. Please note that a DPI includes: (i) Your own relevant interests; (ii) Those of your spouse or civil partner; (iii) A person with whom the Member is living as husband/wife/civil partners. Other individuals, e.g. Children, siblings and flatmates do not need to be considered. Failure to disclose or register a DPI (within 28 days) is a criminal offence.

Members with a DPI, (unless granted a dispensation) must not seek to improperly influence the decision, must declare the nature of the interest and leave the meeting room (including the public gallery) during the consideration and decision on the item – unless exercising their right to address the Committee.

**DPI Dispensations and Sensitive Interests.** In certain circumstances, Members may make a request to the Monitoring Officer for a dispensation or for an interest to be treated as sensitive.

### **(ii) Non - DPI Interests that the Council has decided should be registered – (Non - DPIs)**

You will have 'Non DPI Interest' in any item on the agenda, where it relates to (i) the offer of gifts or hospitality, (with an estimated value of at least £25) (ii) Council Appointments or nominations to bodies (iii) Membership of any body exercising a function of a public nature, a charitable purpose or aimed at influencing public opinion.

Members must declare the nature of the interest, but may stay in the meeting room and participate in the consideration of the matter and vote on it **unless:**

- A reasonable person would think that your interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair your judgement of the public interest. **If so, you must withdraw and take no part in the consideration or discussion of the matter.**

### **(iii) Declarations of Interests not included in the Register of Members' Interest.**

Occasions may arise where a matter under consideration would, or would be likely to, **affect the wellbeing of you, your family, or close associate(s) more than it would anyone else living in the local area** but which is not required to be included in the Register of Members' Interests. In such matters, Members must consider the information set out in paragraph (ii) above regarding Non DPI - interests and apply the test, set out in this paragraph.

### **Guidance on Predetermination and Bias**

Member's attention is drawn to the guidance on predetermination and bias, particularly the need to consider the merits of the case with an open mind, as set out in the Planning and Licensing Codes of Conduct, (Part C, Section 34 and 35 of the Constitution). For further advice on the possibility of bias or predetermination, you are advised to seek advice prior to the meeting.

### **Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992 - Declarations which restrict Members in Council Tax arrears, for at least a two months from voting**

In such circumstances the member may not vote on any reports and motions with respect to the matter.

**Further Advice** contact: Janet Fasan, Director of Legal and Monitoring Officer, Tel: 0207 364 4800.

## **APPENDIX A: Definition of a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest**

(Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, Reg 2 and Schedule)

Subject	Prescribed description
Employment, office, trade, profession or vacation	Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
Sponsorship	Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the relevant authority) made or provided within the relevant period in respect of any expenses incurred by the Member in carrying out duties as a member, or towards the election expenses of the Member. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.
Contracts	Any contract which is made between the relevant person (or a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest) and the relevant authority— (a) under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and (b) which has not been fully discharged.
Land	Any beneficial interest in land which is within the area of the relevant authority.
Licences	Any licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
Corporate tenancies	Any tenancy where (to the Member's knowledge)— (a) the landlord is the relevant authority; and (b) the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
Securities	Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where— (a) that body (to the Member's knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of the relevant authority; and (b) either—  (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or  (ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

## LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

### MINUTES OF THE PENSION BOARD

HELD AT 10.00 A.M. ON MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2021

ROOM C1, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE  
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG

#### Members Present:

John Jones (Chair)	(Independent Chair)		
John Gray (Member)	(Representing Active Admitted/Statutory Bodies Pension Fund Members)		
David Stephen Thompson (Vice-Chair)	(Representing Retired/Deferred Pension Fund Members)		
Councillor Abdal Ullah (Member)	(Representing Employers)	Pensions	Fund
Annette McKenna*	(Representing Employers)	Admitted	Bodies
Roger Jones*	(Representing Employers)	Pensions	Fund

#### Officers Present:

Ngozi Adedeji*	– (Principal Lawyer Civil Litigation, Governance)
Hitesh Jolapara*	– (Interim Divisional Director, Finance, Procurement & Audit)
Miriam Adams	– (Interim Head of Pensions & Treasury)
Farhana Zia	– (Democratic Services Officer, Committees, Governance)

\*Attended online -virtually.

#### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Nneka Oroge (Active Fund Member's Representative).

#### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of pecuniary interests made by members of the Board.

#### 2.1 PRESENTATION FROM LEGAL & GENERAL

Mr James Sparshott and Mr Iancu Daramus from Legal and General gave a presentation on the ESG (Economic, Social & Governance) investments relating to the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund.

Mr Sparshott stated Legal and General had been working with the Pension Fund since 2010 and had experience in managing funds for over 25 years. He said approximately £460m of assets were looked after by them. He said Legal and General were the largest pension fund manager in the UK managing over £1.3tn. he said they took their responsibility of investment stewardship seriously and said it was key in ensuring responsible investment and better outcome for their clients.

Mr Iancu Daramus, Senior Sustainability Analyst, then provided Board members with the ESG update. He said LGIM were working on several fronts to address ESG issues, such as net zero emission by 2050, getting companies to sign up to the Climate Impact Pledge to ensuring responsible investment and investment stewardship. He said key risks and opportunities were assessed when engaging with clients and working through these such as demography, technology, energy and markets. Statistical data was shared showing a board range of topics they covered. From climate change, healthcare, gender pay gap and ethnic diversity. Mr Daramus explained the initiatives LGIM has and said they would vote against a company if they did not comply with their expectations.

In response to questions from Members of the Board the following was noted:

- Mr Thompson referred to the LCIV and their targets to net zero emission by 2050. He said it was big on aspiration but short on milestones as to how companies would achieve this. He asked if companies managed by LGIM had milestones to achieve? Mr Daramus said the target was in line with the UK government policy. He said data was readily available with shorter milestones for lowering the carbon-footprint which had a target to reduce that by 50% by 2030. He said the Climate Impact Pledge was their flagship programme with over 1000 companies who had signed up for this. He said LGIM was working to ensure the assets managed by them met their client expectations on ESG.
- In response to how LGIM measured their success in ensuring companies complied with the Climate Impact Pledge, other than voting against the Chair, Mr Daramus stated they could not fully compare year on year as they had strengthened their own policies on governance structures. However, voting out the CEO or Board member was a powerful tool as were sanctions against companies that did not comply.
- Mr Gray thanked LGIM for the ESG update but was concerned the presentation concentrated on the “E” and not the “S” and the “G” factors of the policy. He said under “Social” factors, he was surprised there was no mention of social, economic class diversity at Company Board Level which was equally important as gender and ethnic diversity.
- Mr Daramus said there had been progress regarding board diversity with minimum standards improving particularly with ‘all male’ boards. He said LGIM had seen this change in the UK and have tried to replicate this globally.

- **ACTION:** LGIM to send their report and data on Board Diversity and ethnic diversity to Miriam Adams for circulation to Board Members.

The Chair thanked Mr Sparshott and Mr Daramus for their presentation.

### **3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

The Board agreed the unrestricted minutes from the 7<sup>th</sup> June 2021 meetings as an accurate record of the meeting, save for one typo on page 13 of the agenda where the minute referred to Mr Stephen-Thompson. Mr Thompson pointed out his surname was not hyphenated and should refer to him as Mr Thompson.

The Board also noted the draft Pension Committee minutes of 5<sup>th</sup> July and had no comments to make regarding the minutes.

### **4. SUBMISSIONS FROM FUND MEMBERS**

There were no submissions made by fund members.

### **5. SUBMISSIONS / RESPONSES FROM PENSION COMMITTEE**

There were no submissions and/or reports from the Pensions Committee.

Ms Miriam Adams provided a summary of the submission made on behalf of the Chair at the 5th July 2021 Pension Committee meeting. She said the Boards report had been well received by the Committee with the Chair of the Pensions Committee, Councillor Kyrsten Perry expressing her thanks to the Board for hosting and questioning the London CIV as well as building the relationship with the CIV.

Mr John Gray suggested that in the event the Board Chair cannot attend a Pensions Committee meeting, the vice-chair Mr Thompson ought to attend.

- **ACTION:** In the event the Board Chair Mr John Jones is unable to attend a Pensions Committee meeting, the vice-chair Mr Thompson will be asked to attend.

### **6. REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **6.1 Pensions Administration and LGPS Quarterly Update – June 2021**

Ms Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury stated the report provided members with information relating to the administration and performance of the Fund over the last quarter as well as updates on key LGPS issues and initiatives which impact the Fund.

Ms Adams said the Pensions Committee also received the report on a quarterly basis together with comments of the Board. She asked Board

members to note the admissions to the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund listed in the recommendations to the Committee and said the Cyril Jackson Academy was being represented by the University School Trust (a Multi Academy Trust - MAT).

Ms Adams explained the Clara Grant Primary School was moving to the Boleyn Trust (MAT) Newham and the Stepney Green Mathematics and Computing College to Mulberry Academy Trust (MAT) Tower Hamlets. She said although the management of Clara Grant Primary School was moving to the Boleyn Trust Newham, the MAT had requested to remain part of the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund. Ms Adams said the actuary had been consulted who agreed to the arrange as the school wasn't moving physical from its location.

Ms Adams referred Board Members to page 28 of the agenda and said there had been a small increase in membership numbers, from 7,263 at the last quarter to 7,283 for this quarter. Ms Adams referred to the table and the percentage changes for active, deferred, pensioner categories.

In reference to table 3.2 Ms Adams said this showed the number of tasks completed and outstanding as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Ms Adams said this excluded the queries received via the Pensions Administration inbox and calls received from Fund members. She said there had been an increase in the number of calls received with an average of 40 to 50 calls a day. She stated that Covid-19 appeared to have increased awareness with Fund members wanting to find out about their pensions.

Ms Adams said they had made progress with workflows with thirty workflows having been set up on the system and this had helped with consistency. A further six workflows needed to be added with the help of the Pensions software provider. She referred members to the table at paragraph 3.7 and said this set out the performance against CIPFA suggested timelines. Ms Adams explained that some of the missed targets were due to information being awaited from members. For example, deferred members who are close to retirement would be written to with an estimate of their pension. However further action cannot be taken until the estimate is acknowledged and the form is returned. Therefore, there is a time lag in achieving the target. Ms Adams said there were ten cases which required action before June.

Referring to the Annual Benefit Statement, Ms Adams said they missed the deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> August to dispatch the statements however statements had been sent out by 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2021. She said several active members would not receive their statements due to ongoing payroll data issues which the Pensions Team are assisting the Council's Payroll team to resolve.

Ms Adams referred to the table at paragraph 3.9 which showed the active members of the Fund as of 30<sup>th</sup> June before referring to paragraph 3.10. Ms Adams said the Pensions auditors as well as the Internal Audit report recommended that the breach be reported to the Pensions Regulator. Ms Adams stated that she will take questions in relation to this in the closed session.

Referring to the LGPS updates, Ms Adams referred to paragraph 3.13 and said the Pensions Team had project planned for the impact of the McCloud judgement and said that due to a delay in the regulation being issued, some of the tasks were shown as amber on the project plan as the true impact would not be known until the regulations had been published.

Ms Adams said paragraph 3.16 dealt with TCFD disclosures and the MHCLG were consulting on making TCFD a compulsory part of LGPS funds. She said Tower Hamlets were ahead of the curve, with the Pensions Committee agreeing to receive TCFD reporting in November 2020. Ms Adams said the Committee would be receiving an update at its next meeting.

On the staffing update Ms Adams stated three vacancies had been filled, two of which were existing agency staff. Ms Adams said there were seven more posts to fill, and she was hopeful of advertise a further three vacancies this week, with the remaining four being advertised in October/November 2021.

In response to questions from members the following was noted:

- The Chair stated the number of tasks outstanding, were the lowest figures he had seen. Ms Adams explained with was partly due her holding direct meetings with all the officers within the Pensions Team. She said she met with them weekly and/or fortnightly to go through the task list in detail. In cases where they are not getting responses, she was able to directly input and resolve queries.
- In reference to table 3.7, and the workflow for transfers, Mr Thompson said this area required focus in terms of performance. Ms Adams responded stating that transfers were a difficult area to manage as much depended on the 'starter' completing forms and returning this to the Pensions Team. She said some transfers were club transfer whereas other were non-club transfers.
- The Chair and Board Members agreed that looking at tables 3.2 and 3.7 together, the improvements made was significant. The Chair on behalf of the Board members expressed his thanks to Ms Adams and the Pensions Team for the work they had undertaken which had resulted in the improvement.
- Ms Adams explained the Pensions team were 100% funded by the Pensions Fund and they had no recourse to the Council's General Fund. Ms Adams said when the actuary made their triennial valuation a 0.6% adjustment for costs included in employer contribution rates. If day to day operational cash was required there was an approved process agreed by the Pensions Committee which was followed.
- Ms Adams confirmed 2021 would be the last year for sending out paper statements to Fund Members. Referring to paragraph 3.16 and the roll out of the Member Self-Service portal, Fund Members could view their pension information on the portal. However, if a Fund Member had requested a paper copy, they were legally required to provide one.
- Regarding the recruitment of staff, Ms Adams confirmed the timetable to fill vacancies had slipped slightly however the remedial action plan

was a two, three-year plan. Ms Adams said she remained hopeful that the remaining vacancies would also be filled.

- In respect to the frozen category referred to on page 28, Ms Adams said a former employee recently interviewed is being recruited to focus on this membership category.

The Pension Board **RESOLVED** to:

Note the recommendations being made to the Pensions Committee who were to consider this report at their meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2021.

The Pensions Committee is recommended to:

1. Note and comment on the contents of this report and appendix
2. Note the following admissions to the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund:
  - Age UK East London
  - Juniper Ventures Limited
  - Olive Dinning Limited
  - Cyril Jackson Academy, Boleyn Trust Academy and Age UK Limited.
3. Note admission of University School Trust (Multi Academy Trust MAT) is in respect of Cyril Jackson School.
4. Note the exit of Tower Trust Multi Academy Trust and move of Schools managed by the Trust - The Clara Grant Primary School to Boleyn MAT Newham and Stepney Green Mathematics and Computing College to Mulberry Academy Trust (MAT) Tower Hamlets.
5. Note that Clara Grant Primary School although moving under the management of Boleyn Trust Newham have requested to remain in the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund.

## 6.2 Quarterly Review of Risk Register

Ms Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury introduced the report saying three new risks had been added during the quarter to the register in line with the recently issued Cyber Score Card by the Scheme Advisory Board and draft code of Practice by the Pensions Regulator.

She referred Board members to paragraph 3.2 of the report which listed the new risks and said these risks had been part of boarder risks previously. They had been separated due to their recent importance plus the Scheme Advisory Board's raised profile on risk management and cyber risks. She said the LGA have been working with AON which had provided a checklist for schemes to use. Ms Adams said whilst this was not mandatory, it was part of good practice for the scheme and fund to take it upon itself to complete the checklist.

Ms Adams provided a detailed update of the risks identified in Appendix 1.

In response to questions from Members the following was noted:

- The Chair said there were five red rated risks. He asked if the risks relating to pension administration would reduce when staff had been recruited to the vacant posts. Ms Adams responded saying not all risks could be eliminated however they would manage the risks and once the work had been completed to satisfaction the risk would be moved to amber.
- Referring to paragraph 3.4, Mr Thompson stated he was not convinced the rating for G5 should be moved from amber to green. He pointed out that in the appendix this had been referred to as AG5. He said this was a very high hurdle to determine, as the statement referred to members understanding and appreciating the benefits plus being able to make informed decisions. Mr Thompson said the internal controls identified such things as a new website, surgeries, communications strategy etc but these were inputs, they did not measure the outputs. In other words, did fund members understand and appreciate the benefits and felt they could make informed decisions.
- The Chair stated the point made by Mr Thompson was a valid one and said clarity was needed as to what the risk was measuring. Following discussion, the Board agreed an action to take forward.
  - **ACTION:** The Pensions Team to undertake a survey in 18 months' time to see how the internal controls mentioned, such as the website, surgeries etc have impacted on the fund members understanding and appreciation of their benefits and if they feel confident in their decision-making.

The Pensions Board **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note and comment on the report and detailed risk register as set out in Appendix 1
2. Note the amendments to existing risks listed in section 3 of this report; and
3. Note the London Collective Investment Vehicle (LCIV) Climate Change Policy Report Appendix 2.

### 6.3 Communication Strategy and Policy Statement

Ms Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury said the terms of reference for the Pensions Board included consideration of having an effective communication strategy as part of the Pensions Board's functions.

She said the communication plan appended at appendix A outlined the Fund's planned communication activities and how the communication referred to within the Communication Policy Statement would be delivered in practice.

In response to questions from members the following was noted:

- The Chair stated the strategy was comprehensive and asked if an annual report ought to be part of the strategy, reporting on the progress made.

- Mr Gray suggested there be a campaign section in the Strategy, where for example deferred members are encouraged to be active again and join the scheme. He said many Members had out of date death beneficiary details for their pensions and therefore a campaign to promote awareness would be welcome. Ms Adams explained this was a task for the Employers and Trade Unions to undertake. However, she would raise this with the Employers' Forum.
- **ACTION:** Ms Adams to raise with the Employers' Forum, the need to encourage staff to join the pensions scheme. Plus consider putting information on the Pension's Website to remind fund members to keep their nomination forms up to date once launched.
- In reference to page 96 of the agenda, Mr Thompson asked the wording in relation to Staff Feedback be stronger when referring to feedback given by stakeholders. Ms Adams said regular opportunity was provided to staff to feedback especially as dealing with someone who had lost a loved one, can also affect the staff member dealing with the claim.

The Pensions Board **RESOVLED** to:

1. Note the Communication Strategy and Policy Statement (Appendix 1); and
2. The Board feedback on the Communication Strategy presented at the meeting.

#### **6.4 Pensions and Cyber Risk**

Ms Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury said the report reported on the impact of cyber risk on the Pension Administration Service. She said Pension Schemes hold a large amount of personal data and assets which can be targeted by criminals. Therefore, The Pensions Regulator (TPR) considers cyber risk to be an area of high priority for the scheme trustees and has recommended that this is included on the risk register and is reviewed regularly as part of best practice.

Members of the Board did not have any questions for Ms Adams.

The Pensions Board **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the content of the report.

#### **6.5 The Pensions Regulator (TPR) Single Code Consultation Update**

Ms Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury stated The Pensions Regulator (TPR) had drafted a single code of practice (COP) for all UK pensions scheme. Ms Adams explained the purpose of the single code was to merge the ten existing COPs into one single document, so that it would be easier to navigate, understand and keep up to date.

In response to questions from members the following was noted.

- Referring to paragraph 3.13, Members asked if there was a timetable for the review. Ms Adams responded saying the providers had started work on this, this week.

The Pensions Board **RESOVLED** to:

1. To note the report; and
2. Note that a review of the Fund against the TPR draft Code of Practice and LGPS Good Governance 3 Guidance had been commissioned.

#### **6.6 Review Draft Account, Fund Annual Report and Audit Plan - verbal update**

Ms Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury said the draft Pension fund accounts for 2020/21 are available however as the main accounts for 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 still required sign off, efforts to resolve queries relating to these sets of accounts had been focussed on. Ms Adams said auditors query regarding membership numbers for 2018/19 had been resolved and as such there were no outstanding queries relating to the Pensions Fund for the years mentioned above. Ms Adams said she hoped to bring the audit plan for 2021/22 to the Board however she was still awaiting this from the external auditors.

Members of the Board had no questions for Ms Adams.

The Pension Board **RESOVLED** to:

1. Note the verbal update provided.

#### **6.7 Member Training - verbal update**

Ms Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury informed Board Members the registration forms for the online learning academy had been set out to all members of the Board and she encouraged members to join and complete the sessions. Ms Adams said a monthly report would be sent to her by the providers showing the progress made by members. Ms Adams said the online academy was in addition to regular training provided to the Board and Committee.

In response to questions from Members the following was noted:

- The duration of the online courses were 30 minutes. Both the Pension Board and Pension Committee members were expected to complete the learning, at their own pace.
- The Chair of the Pensions Board, Mr John Jones requested Board members to complete the training.

#### **7. PENSIONS COMMITTEE AGENDA FOR THE FORTHCOMING MEETING**

The Chair, Mr John Jones noted that the Pension Committee agenda had not been published for the meeting scheduled for the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2021. However, several reports discussed by the Board will also be presented to the committee at its next meeting.

## **8. PENSIONS BOARD WORK PLAN**

Members of the Board were asked to note the Pension Board's work plan for 2021/22.

Members of the Board had no questions for Ms Adams.

The Pensions Board **RESOVLED** to:

1. Note the workplan for 2021/22.

## **9. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC - RESTRICTED**

The Chair **MOVED** and it was

### **RESOLVED**

“That under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting for the consideration of the Section Two business on the grounds that it contains information defined as Exempt in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act,1972.”

## **10. EXEMPT / RESTRICTED MINUTES**

The members noted the restricted minutes of the Pensions Committee meeting of 5<sup>th</sup> July and had no comment to make in relation to the exempt items.

## **11. EXEMPT / RESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **11.1 ESG, Voting and Engagement Quarterly Update - June 21**

The minute for this item is restricted.

## **12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business was discussed by the Board Members, save for Mr Thompson raising the London CIV and its policy on climate change – Item 6.1. He asked that dates and targets be provided in relation to its implementation.

The meeting ended at 12.15 p.m.

Chair, John Jones  
Pension Board

This page is intentionally left blank

Non-Executive Report of the:  <b>Pensions Committee</b>  Thursday, 25 November 2021	 <b>TOWER HAMLETS</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Kevin Bartle, Interim Corporate Director Resources	<b>Classification:</b> Open (Unrestricted)
<b>Risk Management Policy and Quarterly Review of Risk Register</b>	

<b>Originating Officer(s)</b>	Miriam Adams
<b>Wards affected</b>	(All Wards)

The following report was not available for publication by the statutory publication deadline because additional information was required. It is presented for consideration at this meeting as it is not possible to defer until the next meeting. It should also be noted that the report title was made available as part of the original meeting agenda

### **Executive Summary**

This report updates the Board and Committee on changes to the Fund’s Risk Register and Risk Management Policy. Risk Management is the practice of identifying, analysing and controlling in the most effective manner all threats to the achievement of the strategic objectives and operational activities of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Pension Fund (“the Fund”). A certain level of risk is inevitable in achieving the Fund objectives, but it must be controlled.

### **Recommendations:**

The Committee is recommended to:

1. Approve the Risk Management Policy (Appendix 1)
2. Note and comment on the detailed Risk Register (Appendix 2)

### **1. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS**

1.1 The terms of reference of the Pensions Committee sets out its responsibilities with regard to risk management, namely:

- *To review the risks inherent in the management of the Pension Fund.*

- 1.2 The Board is established by Public Sector Pensions Act 2013 and the first core function of the Board is to assist the Administering Authority in securing compliance with the Regulations, any other legislation relating to the governance and administration of the Scheme, and requirements imposed by the Pensions Regulator (TPR) in relation to the Scheme.
- 1.3 The consideration of the risks associated with administering the Pension Fund properly fall within the terms of reference of the Committee. Setting out of a policy recognises the importance that is placed in this area in accordance with the CIPFA guidance and recognise the increased role of the Pensions Regulator following the Public Service pensions Act 2013.
- 1.4 The risk register is presented in Appendix 2 for the Board to review and assist to demonstrate compliance with both regulations and guidance provided by CIPFA and TPR.
- 1.5 Not all risks can be eliminated, however with proper management and monitoring the impact to the Fund will be minimised. An example of this is economic downturn which the Fund has mitigated to an extent by having Equity protection in place to cover some of its equity investments from severe falls in the market.

## **2. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 2.1 Not reviewing the Risk Register for the Pension Fund potentially exposes the Fund and Council to action by the Pensions Regulator.

## **3. DETAILS OF THE REPORT**

- 3.1 The Pensions Regulator's Code of Practice recommends that a Pension Fund has a Risk Management Policy in place and that this is reviewed periodically. The risk management policy covers key areas such as:
  - The Fund's attitudes to, and appetite for risk;
  - Aims;
  - Risk measurement and management; and
  - Responsibility

The updated Risk Management Policy for Tower Hamlets Pension Fund is attached for approval at Appendix 1.

The Pensions Board undertakes quarterly detailed review of the identified risks and the process for maintaining the Risk Register and report back to the Pensions Committee on any areas of concern. The Pensions Committee carries out an annual review of the high level and emerging risks identified from the Fund's Risk Register. The Risk Register brings together all the Fund's risks in a single document. It continues to be based on the 4 key areas of activity within the Fund: Governance, Funding, Administration and Investment.

- 3.2 No new risks were identified during the quarter.
- 3.3 All existing risks have been reviewed and no change identified during the quarter. Updates to individual risks will be reported in March 2022 following the conclusion of the ongoing Governance review.

#### **4. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 There are no direct equalities implication arising from this report.

#### **5. OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 This section of the report is used to highlight further specific statutory implications that are either not covered in the main body of the report or are required to be highlighted to ensure decision makers give them proper consideration. Examples of other implications may be:
- Best Value Implications,
  - Consultations,
  - Environmental (including air quality),
  - Risk Management,
  - Crime Reduction,
  - Safeguarding.
  - Data Protection / Privacy Impact Assessment.

#### **Risk Management**

- 5.2 Section 249A of the Pensions Act 2004 requires the administering authority to manage risk by establishing and operating internal controls which are adequate for the purpose of securing that the scheme is administered and managed:
- (a) in accordance with the scheme rules
- (b) in accordance with the requirements of the law

The Risk Register, Risk Management Policy which is the subject of this report is designed to ensure compliance with the Council's statutory duties regarding managing risk related to the administration and management of the Pension Fund.

#### **6. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising as a result of this report, other than that by implementing a new Risk Register, the Fund is trying to minimise the chance of financial and reputational loss occurring.
- 6.2 There are clearly some risks which would be difficult to transfer or manage, such as the impact that increased longevity will have on the liabilities of the

Pension Fund, but the understanding of such risks could well impact on the other aspects of the decision making process to lower risks elsewhere.

## **7. COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES**

- 7.1 Section 249A of the Pensions Act 2004 requires the administering authority to manage risk by establishing and operating internal controls which are adequate for the purpose of securing that the scheme is administered and managed: -
- (a) in accordance with the scheme rules
  - (b) in accordance with the requirements of the law
- 7.2 The Risk Register, Risk Management Policy which is the subject of this report is designed to ensure compliance with the Council's statutory duties regarding managing risk related to the administration and management of the Pension Fund.
- 

## **Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents**

### **Linked Report**

- NONE

### **Appendices**

- Risk Management Policy (Appendix 1)
- Risk Register (Appendix 2)

### **Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)**

#### **List of "Background Papers" used in the preparation of this report**

List any background documents not already in the public domain including officer contact information.

- These must be sent to Democratic Services with the report
- State NONE if none.

#### **Officer contact details for documents:**

Miriam Adams, Interim Head of Pensions and Treasury Ext 4248

Email: [miriam.adams@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:miriam.adams@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

Non-Executive Report of the:  <b>Pensions Committee</b>  Thursday, 25 November 2021	 <b>TOWER HAMLETS</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Kevin Bartle, Interim Corporate Director, Resources	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted
<b>ESG, Voting, Engagement and Stewardship Update</b>	

<b>Originating Officer(s)</b>	Miriam Adams
<b>Wards affected</b>	(All Wards);

Exempt Report and Appendices – the report and two appendices are listed as exempt in accordance with paragraph 3 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972 in that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information in relation to the financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

### Executive Summary

This report provides the Committee with an overview of the stewardship activity carried out by Tower Hamlets Pension Fund’s investment managers and on its behalf by Local Authority Pension Forum (LAPFF) in the quarter ending September 2021.

### Recommendations:

The Pensions Committee is recommended to:

1. Note content of this report and appendices.

#### 1. **REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS**

- 1.1 The exercise of voting rights and engagement with investee companies are a key path of the Fund’s role as a long-term steward of assets. Ensuring good corporate governance and the adoption of sustainable business models at the companies in which the Fund invests should over the longer term ensure that they are able to deliver superior returns to the Fund.

#### 2. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 2.1 There is no alternative approach. The Fund invests mainly in pooled structures. By nature of these structures, voting is exercised by the investment manager rather than directly by the Fund. The Fund would remain

a member of Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF) to ensure the Fund's Responsible Investment (RI) approach is exercised via engagement.

### **3. DETAILS OF THE REPORT**

3.1 The move to a pooled structure continues to impact this arrangement as voting rights are exercised at pool or underlying manager level rather than Fund level. The Fund works with London Collective Investment Vehicle (LCIV) to ensure its views through the exercise of voting rights through the investments it manages on its behalf.

3.2 This report includes four appendices 3 of which is set out below to ensure that the Pensions Committee and Pensions Board are aware of the engagement activity being carried out by Legal & General Investment Management (LGIM), London CIV (the Fund's pooling company) via underlying managers and engagement activities of Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF)

- LAPFF Q3 2021 report (Appendix 2)
- LAPFF Voting Alerts Addendum Q3 (Appendix 3)
- LAPFF, TCI letter to FTSE All-share (Appendix 4)
- LGIM ESG Impact report (Appendix 5)

#### **LAPFF Engagement Summary**

3.3 LAPFF engagement takes place in the form of sending correspondences, issuing alerts, meetings, press releases, attending company, site visitations and community engagement. LAPFF engaged with 82 companies during the quarter on a range of topics including:

- Climate Change
- Human Rights
- Governance
- Social Risk
- Board Composition

3.4 Appendix 2 to this report details the Forum's activity during the quarter, Climate emergency related issues was one of the main engagement themes. The Forum continues to engage with Shell to work toward a truly Paris-aligned climate and business plan for the company.

3.5 Other engagement activities included collaborative engagements, collaborative investor and community meetings.

#### **Voting Activities**

3.6 Voting takes place during company meetings such as Annual General meeting (AGM), Special General meeting or Extra Ordinary General Meeting. Meetings are initiated by either management or shareholders as the case may be.

3.7 London CIV (BG) Global Alpha Growth Paris Aligned fund– Voting activity and company engagement over the quarter. A total of 124 resolutions in 7 countries across 8 companies was cast. The manager cast votes in all 124 resolutions with 123 votes cast For, 1 against.

3.8 LCIV (Ruffer) Absolute Return fund – Votes were cast in 86 companies and one pooled fund across 17 countries. The manager cast votes in 1,250 of 1,272 resolutions, 82 votes Against, 1,162 For, 6 votes withheld and 22 Abstained votes. Meetings ranged from AGM's, Annual Special, Extraordinary and Special.

The investment manager withheld votes in one company – Wheaton Precious Metal Corporation in relation to director matters.

3.9 LCIV (RBC) Sustainable Equity fund – The manager participated in 54 resolutions across 2 companies in 2 countries. 48 Votes cast For, 2 cast Against, and 3 No voting details. Majority of resolutions related to director election.

3.10 LCIV (BG) Diversified Growth fund – Stewardship voting activities during the quarter involved 21 companies across 7 countries. A total of 301 resolutions were voted on. 145 were voted For and 5 were voted Against. 4 votes Withheld, and no votes cast for 147 resolutions. Majority of voting involved resolutions for allocation of income, amendment of share capital, appoint/pay auditors, discharge of Board, incentive policy, remuneration policy and share repurchase. The table below shows reasons for no votes being cast in the 4 companies.

Company	Country	Meeting Type	Resolutions	Reason for No Vote
China Longyuan Power Group 'H'	China	Class	92	We did not vote the meeting due to an error with the electronic processing of votes. We intended to vote in favour of all resolutions. The outcome of the meeting was not impacted by the absence of our votes.
Wizz Air Holdings Plc	UK	AGM	26	We no voted this meeting as the company has restricted the voting rights of non-EU holders of Ordinary shares post-Brexit.
Ryanair	Ireland	AGM	17	We no voted this meeting as the company has restricted the voting rights of non-EU holders of Ordinary shares and ADRs post-Brexit.
HSBC Global Asset Backed High Yield Bond Fund	Luxembourg	AGM	12	We did not vote due to the practice known as "blocking" - the rules in some markets which restrict us from selling your shares during the period between the votes being cast and the date of the meeting.

3.11 LGIM Low Carbon funds – Stewardship voting activities during the quarter involved 99 companies across 19 countries. A total of 1,299 resolutions were voted on across a combination of annual, extraordinary, ordinary, special and other meetings. Resolutions covered a very wide range of categories

including capitalisation, Health and safety, climate change Human rights, reorganisations and mergers, director related, corporate governance and social proposals. The manager cast 199 votes against the resolution, 1.026 For, One year 2, 46 Withheld resolutions and 25 no decisions. LGIM ESG Impact report for the quarter is attached as appendix 5 to this report.

### **Voting Alert Variances**

3.12 There was no voting alert variance during the quarter.

### **LAPFF Voting Alerts**

3.13 During the quarter, the Forum issued 3 voting alerts – Appendix 1 to this report includes the breakdown of votes cast.

## **4. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 There are no direct equalities implications from this report.

## **5. OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 This section of the report is used to highlight further specific statutory implications that are either not covered in the main body of the report or are required to be highlighted to ensure decision makers give them proper consideration. Examples of other implications may be:

- Best Value Implications,
- Consultations,
- Environmental (including air quality),
- Risk Management,
- Crime Reduction,
- Safeguarding.
- Data Protection / Privacy Impact Assessment.

5.2 Risk Management Implications

The rigorous robust management of London Borough of Tower Hamlets Pension Fund results in better quicker and more effective decision making which can lead to better Fund performance and reduction in the contribution required from the Council towards the Fund.

Ensuring good governance and the adoption of sustainable business models at the companies in which the Fund invests should over the longer term ensure that they are able to deliver superior returns to the Fund.

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

6.1 This is a noting report and there are no direct financial implications as a result of the contents of this report.

- 6.2 The exercise of voting rights and engagement with investee companies are a key part of the Fund's role as a long-term steward of assets. Ensuring good corporate governance and the adoption of sustainable business models at the companies in which the Fund invests should over the longer term ensure that they are able to deliver superior returns to the Fund.
- 6.3 Poor corporate governance and unsustainable business practices can impact on share prices and increases in the risk that the Fund experience a loss of value in its investments in the future.

## **7. COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES**

- 7.1 [The Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulation 2016 Regulation 7 requires Administering Authorities to publish and maintain an Investment Strategy Statement which includes, amongst other items, details of:
- The authority's policy on how social, environmental and corporate governance considerations are considered in the selection, non-selection, retention and realisation of investments.
  - The authority's policy on the exercise of the rights (including voting rights) attaching to investments.
- 7.2 This report provides information demonstrating that investment activity is occurring in line with the Investment Strategy
- 7.3 In addition, Government guidance on the preparation and maintenance of the Investment Strategy Statement states that Administering Authorities should explain their policy on stewardship with reference to the Stewardship Code, the seven principles of which apply on a 'comply or explain' basis.
- 7.4 When carrying out its functions, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who don't (the public sector duty).

---

## **Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents**

### **Linked Report**

- List any linked reports  
**None**

### **Appendices**

- LAPFF Q3 voting alerts (Appendix 1)

- LAPFF Q3 2021 report (Appendix 2)
- LAPFF Voting Alerts Addendum Q3 (Appendix 3)
- LAPFF, TCI letter to FTSE All-share (Appendix 4)
- LGIM ESG Impact report (Appendix 5)

**Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)**

**List of “Background Papers” used in the preparation of this report**

- NONE.

**Officer contact details for documents:**

Miriam Adams

Interim Head of Pensions & Treasury

Email: [miriam.adams@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:miriam.adams@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1

### LAPFF Voting Alerts Quarter Ending September 21

Company	LCIV DGF	LCIV Ruffer	LCIV Paris	LCIV RBC	LGIM
National Grid PLC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution 20 – Approve ‘net zero’ commitment and associated targets - <b>FOR</b></li> <li>• Resolution 25 – Approve new articles of association - <b>FOR</b></li> </ul>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	FOR  FOR
Frasers Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve the Directors’ Remuneration Policy - <b>Oppose</b></li> <li>• Re-elect David Daly - <b>Oppose</b></li> <li>• Re-elect David Bryshaw – <b>Oppose</b></li> <li>• Approve the Executive Share Scheme – <b>Oppose</b></li> </ul>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
BHP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution 20 – Approval of the Climate Transition Action Plan - <b>Oppose</b></li> <li>• Amendment to the BHP Constitution - <b>FOR</b></li> <li>• Climate-related Lobbying - <b>FOR</b></li> <li>• Capital Protection - <b>FOR</b></li> </ul>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

This page is intentionally left blank



**Quarterly  
Engagement  
Report**

July-September  
2021



**Shell, Rio Tinto,  
ArcelorMittal,  
National Grid,  
SSE, Anglo  
American**

## CLIMATE EMERGENCY



# LAPFF Chair Visits Tailings Dam in Devon

**Objective:** Although LAPFF's plans to visit Brazilian communities affected by tailings dams have been postponed due to Covid, LAPFF's work with the communities has continued apace over the last year and a half. As part of building an understanding of how tailings dams function, LAPFF Chair, Cllr Doug McMurdo, visited a mine in Devon that has a tailings dam (pictured above and on cover).

**Achieved:** Cllr McMurdo visited the tungsten mine at the beginning of July. He was shown round the various mining functions by the mine's CEO and other staff, and part of this tour included the tailings dam. The Devon tailings dam was of a downstream construction. When asked about the construction type, the mine staff explained that they would not use an upstream dam because this type of construction is too dangerous. One of

the big problems faced by communities affected by tailings dams globally is that they are potentially in the path of run off from upstream dams.

**In Progress:** LAPFF is continuing to engage with companies, communities, and other stakeholders, as well as undertaking research to prepare for its visit to Brazil, whenever that might be.

---

### Shell

**Objective:** LAPFF had some serious concerns about the out-going Shell Chair's statement that oil and gas would be needed as part of the company's portfolio for the foreseeable future. Various conversations and interactions with the CEO had also raised concerns about the company's trajectory, both from a carbon perspective and from a business perspective.

Consequently, LAPFF was keen to meet the new Shell Chair, Andrew Mackenzie, formerly CEO of BHP and no relation to current BHP Chair, Ken MacKenzie.

**Achieved:** The meeting took place in early September, with the conversation focused primarily on Shell's financial performance and how the company's approach to fossil fuels would impact on that performance. LAPFF Chair, Cllr Doug McMurdo, noted that compared to BHP's total shareholder returns over the last ten years, Shell had performed poorly and that net zero objectives would not enable the company to achieve Paris-aligned climate targets. While LAPFF was grateful to Sir Andrew for his engagement and welcomed his willingness to take suggestions, significant inconsistencies in Shell's business strategy, business model, and climate strategy appear to persist.

# CLIMATE EMERGENCY

**In Progress:** LAPFF will continue to engage with Shell to work toward a truly Paris-aligned climate and business plan for the company.

## Rio Tinto

**Objective:** This year, LAPFF attended Rio Tinto's AGM to push the company on recognising the financial impacts of its social challenges. Therefore, Cllr McMurdo was pleased to meet Rio Tinto's Chief Financial Officer, Peter Cunningham, to discuss this issue further. Mr. Cunningham took over as interim CFO when Jakob Stausholm became CEO but has been made permanent recently.

**Achieved:** It appears that Mr Cunningham understands and agrees with the proposition that social impacts affect financial materiality at companies. However, everyone LAPFF has spoken to at Rio Tinto acknowledges that despite progress since Juukan Gorge, the company has some way to go to regain investor and affected community trust in its operations.

One area where Rio Tinto has improved substantially is in its willingness to engage with LAPFF. After the destruction of the Juukan Gorge rock shelters, LAPFF tried in vain to obtain meetings with the Chair to discuss what had happened but did not manage to do so for over six months after the shelters were destroyed. This year, LAPFF has met not only with Peter Cunningham but also with Mr. Stausholm and Chair Simon Thompson. The company continues to offer meetings with various specialist staff and affected community members with which the company engages.

LAPFF recognises that engagement is not progress. It also recognises that the staff and community members put forward by Rio Tinto probably have a particular bias or perspective on Rio Tinto's activities, especially since LAPFF continues to hear contradictory information from affected community representatives. However, engagement with all affected parties is useful for LAPFF to understand what questions to ask the various parties involved.

**In Progress:** Therefore, LAPFF is continuing to liaise with other interested investors, Rio Tinto, and affected communities and their representatives in Australia, the

US, Papua New Guinea, and elsewhere. This triangulated communication helps to paint a more complete picture for LAPFF of Rio Tinto's progress from an environmental, social, and financial perspective.

As a follow-up, the LAPFF Chair also met with Rio Tinto staff to discuss the forthcoming 'say on climate' vote at the 2022 AGM. The challenge as ever is addressing Scope 3 emissions, which comprise 95% of total emissions. In doing so, the pace of roll-out of zero-carbon technologies by the company's steel customers was noted.

## Anglo American

**Objective:** LAPFF has been concerned that Anglo American's board and management have not been sufficiently engaged with community members affected by the company's operations. However, LAPFF learned at the Anglo American AGM that the company's CEO, Mark Cutifani, had visited the company's controversial Colombian joint venture with Glencore and BHP, Cerrejon. Therefore, Cllr McMurdo met with Mr. Cutifani to hear about the CEO's experience of visiting the project.

**Achieved:** LAPFF appreciated Mr. Cutifani's openness in discussing the political, cultural, and environmental challenges surrounding Cerrejon. The project is a thermal coal mine, and just days after speaking to both Mr. Cutifani and BHP Chair, Ken MacKenzie, LAPFF received news that both Anglo American and BHP were pulling out of the joint venture to leave Glencore as the sole mining giant involved with the project. Subsequently, LAPFF representatives also met with Anglo American to discuss the company's next 'say on climate' resolution.

Anglo American has developed a detailed community engagement approach as part of its Social Way programme. However, the fact remains that all three companies have been investors in Cerrejon during a time when there have been allegations of severe human rights and environmental violations. All three companies have been named in a complaint filed with a number of OECD National Contact Points on these grounds.

**In Progress:** LAPFF will continue to engage with Anglo American on its community engagement approach and its climate approach.

## BHP Voting Alert

LAPFF issued a voting alert to oppose BHP's climate plan. While LAPFF commended BHP for putting its plan to a vote, the plan is not aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement. BHP has undoubtedly made progress on climate, but given the pressing nature of the climate crisis, LAPFF expects all climate plans to be Paris-aligned at this stage. As the alert stated, climate change is not a negotiation.

## BHP

**Objective:** There is a debate raging in Western Australia about a proposed cultural heritage law to increase protections for Indigenous communities in the area. LAPFF had spoken to Rio Tinto about the law, and the company had not seen the final draft. However, affected communities are apparently not pleased with either the process or the content of the law. As BHP is another company affected by the law, LAPFF had a meeting with the company's Indigenous Affairs representative to find out more about the law. LAPFF is also seeking a meeting with the affected Indigenous communities.

**Achieved:** LAPFF was able to understand from the discussion with BHP that the main point of contention appears to be the level of say affected communities have over whether projects move forward, a so-called 'right of veto'. While there are apparently improvements from the last piece of legislation, the question is whether sufficient positive change will be made to the new legislation to protect affected communities from another Juukan Gorge.

**In Progress:** LAPFF will continue to engage with BHP, Rio Tinto, and affected community members to see if there is a role for LAPFF to play in promoting a positive outcome to this debate and the eventual legislation.

# COMPANY ENGAGEMENT

## ArcelorMittal

**Objective:** After the long-awaited issuing of the company's second Group Climate Action report, a meeting was held with company representatives and other CA100+ investors to discuss company progress.

**Achieved:** ArcelorMittal now has a group-wide emission intensity reduction target for 2030 of 25%, and 35% for Europe. The LAPFF Vice-Chair, Cllr Chapman commended the strengthening of targets and announcements of zero carbon steel plants in Spain and Canada. On request, the report also included a mapping of the company progress against the CA100+ benchmark. This mapping will be used by many investors to inform AGM voting. Also raised were Paris-aligned accounts, climate considerations in remuneration, consulting shareholders on a transition plan vote at the 2022 AGM and requesting that the company run the 2022 AGM as openly as it did the 2021 AGM when the meeting was run on a virtual platform.

**In Progress:** Given the strengthened decarbonization targets and 'real world' impact of the new zero carbon steel plants, this engagement was considered to have shown substantial progress.

## National Grid

**Objective:** LAPFF has had long-term ongoing engagement with National Grid, most recently as joint-lead investor in the Climate Action 100+ (CA100+) engagement. This engagement culminated in the board putting a 'say on climate' resolution to the AGM, which asked shareholders, from 2022, to approve annual reporting on the company's net zero strategy, 2030 action plan, and progress against emission reduction targets. Cllr Rob Chapman, the LAPFF Vice-Chair, met with the new chair, Paul Rasput Reynolds, and attended the AGM to encourage robust decarbonization plans.

**Achieved:** A voting alert recommended that members support the board's accountability for annual approval of a transition plan as well as article amendments supporting provisions for holding 'hybrid' annual meetings. The latter provides greater opportunities for shareowners to participate and ask

questions of board members. At the meeting with the chair, LAPFF questions focused on seeking more ambition due to the new International Energy Agency Net Zero pathway, on phasing out gas, on setting short term targets up to 2025, and on looking for changes in planned capex to allow for a larger take up of electrification for heating. At the AGM the following week, LAPFF posed questions; the questions and responses from the board can be viewed [here](#). Ms. Reynolds noted there would be a board meeting following the AGM to consider how the UK and US transition plans are implemented and remain fit for purpose.

**In Progress:** It was considered the outcome of the meeting was 'change in progress'.

## SSE

**Objective:** Cllr Rob Chapman also met with SSE to discuss the company's 'say on climate' resolution ahead of SSE's AGM in July. LAPFF and SSE have a long-standing dialogue on environmental, social, and governance issues, including a just transition. The Forum is keen to continue this dialogue as SSE has been particularly constructive in its discussions with LAPFF over the years and has undertaken some innovative work in both the social and the environmental areas, not least a just transition to a zero-carbon economy.

**Achieved:** Acknowledging that SSE is ahead of the game on much of its transition planning, LAPFF raised some concerns in particular around Scope 3 emissions measurement and targets. A number of just transition challenges for the company were also discussed, along with a further discussion on the relevance of and uses for carbon capture and storage (CCS).

After the engagement meeting, Cllr Chapman also attended SSE's AGM by virtual means to ask questions around CCS and grid structure in relation to SSE's climate goals.

**In Progress:** LAPFF and SSE have agreed to continue dialogue and speak as necessary, but in particular prior to SSE's next 'say on climate' resolution.

## HSBC

**Objectives:** The LAPFF chair met with HSBC representatives to ascertain how HSBC will be assisting its clients to set and implement coal phase-out plans in line with the bank's own commitment and timeline. Clarity was also sought on how the company is progressing on pulling out of coal-intensive industries.

**Achieved:** Representatives noted that the International Energy Agency scenario 'net zero by 2050' will be used to benchmark progress. The company has undertaken new analysis, with more data to be considered. The company joined the net zero banking alliance in April to help understand the transition journeys clients are on, and how the bank can have impact. On retreating from coal-intensive industries, it was noted that coal exposure represents 0.2% of wholesale loans and advances as measured under the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosure metrics in 2020. However, it was recognised this still represents investments of £1.2 billion, but as existing, not new, commitments.

**In Progress:** Representatives noted that they are developing the methodology for a transition risk questionnaire for clients and that commitments would be made in 2021. A further request was made to disclose fossil fuel investments in the annual report. This disclosure is done at 'top level' but would not separate out renewables investments made by such companies. At this stage, the outcome was considered 'change in progress'.

## Standard Chartered

**Objectives:** The LAPFF chair met with the Standard Chartered chair, José Viñals, to ascertain how the company is progressing working with clients on climate change to reduce emissions and align with the bank's net zero by 2050 policy.

**Achieved:** Of concern has been the bank's funding of Adaro, a major coal supplier which Standard Chartered's own analysis shows to be aligned with an increase of 5-6°C in global warming. Standard Chartered will be issuing a roadmap setting out its route to net zero in October 2021, and the board is putting a 'say on climate' resolution to the 2022 AGM.

# COMPANY ENGAGEMENT

**In Progress:** It appears that an NGO is considering filing a resolution to the Standard Chartered AGM asking for commitments not yet evident in the company’s current transition plans. LAPFF met with this NGO to hear more of its concerns.

## Mitsubishi Financial

**Objective:** Cllr Glyn Caron, of the LAPFF Executive, joined a collaborative investor call organised by Asia Research and Engagement with Mitsubishi UFJ Financial (MUFJ). The meeting sought to cover constituent details of a plan which would align financing to the goals of the Paris agreement and the setting of a net zero financed emissions target. This call followed LAPFF correspondence with the company on the issuing of a voting alert for the company’s June AGM supporting the company issuing a plan to align financing with the Paris Agreement. The engagement was followed by media coverage on concerns over the bank’s provision of finance to fossil fuel expansion and deforestation.

**Achieved:** In May, MUFJ made a net zero declaration, and as part of this commitment joined the Net Zero Banking Alliance. The company is committed to developing a plan but has only just started addressing policy formulation and implementation. This initial activity has been through setting up working groups to see if improvement can be made on the current investment threshold of 50% coal, which is 50% of ‘total capacity’. The company representative noted this standard would be revised and a goal set, which will be shown in due course. On physical risk, currently only flooding impact is mapped.

**In Progress:** It was agreed further correspondence would follow, including sharing examples of good practice from other financial institutions and benchmarking of these companies on coal policies. It was noted further physical risks could be considered going forward. Overall, the outcome from the meeting illustrated there was a ‘change in process’.



## Sainsbury

**Objective:** LAPFF attended Sainsbury’s ‘Plan for Better’ event and posed questions, both at this event and at the AGM, on the company’s packaging practices, electric vehicles, supply chains, climate change and ‘say on climate’.

**Achieved:** Sainsbury’s ‘Plan for Better’ ESG event covered a broad range of ESG topics, noting targets and progress against them. In 2020, Sainsbury announced its climate target to be net zero by 2040 and has this year announced Scope 3 emissions target, which followed with a key theme of this year’s ESG event being that the company was engraining ESG at the core of its business strategy. It is taking a number of steps in stores to tackle plastic packaging, opting for loose veg as opposed to prepacked. These steps have led Sainsbury to be recognised by Greenpeace as the retailer with the second highest proportion of loose fruit and vegetables in the market.

A large part of Sainsbury’s strategy with plastic packaging is attempting to enable a circular economy, having launched an initiative in June, offering customers the opportunity to bring back any flexible plastic packaging to front of store collection points in 520 supermarkets for recycling. LAPFF has also co-led an engagement with Sainsbury in a coalition led by First Sentier Investors, pushing for suppliers and distributors of domestic and commercial washing machines to fit, as a standard procedure, filters to their products to prevent plastic microfibrils entering the world’s ecosystems. Sainsbury responded that they had engaged with white goods suppliers and were looking at viable options.

**In Progress:** LAPFF will be meeting with Sainsbury for a more in-depth conversation on the company’s approach to a zero-carbon transition and will be querying the company further on a ‘say on climate’ vote.

## COMPANY ENGAGEMENT



### Persimmon

**Objective:** LAPFF has been engaging with Persimmon over a number of years following serious concerns about excessive executive pay, customer care and build quality. The Forum has also identified housebuilders as an important sector for climate change engagements, given the level of emissions from residential property. The Forum therefore sought to meet with the Chair of Persimmon, Roger Devlin, to discuss improvements in customer care and executive pay alongside how it was seeking to move to a net zero business model.

**Achieved:** It was noted how the company had made changes to its approach to

customer care following a review by Stephanie Barwise QC. The meeting covered inspections of properties following historic build quality concerns and the company's improved customer ratings. The issue of executive pay was covered, including resolving issues that led to the high pay award of the former chief executive.

On climate change, Persimmon's targets to reach net zero were discussed. Persimmon has made a commitment that all new homes will be net-zero by 2030 and for the company, including its operations, to be net zero by 2040. Gas boilers are being banned in new homes from 2025 and the discussion focused on how Persimmon was seeking to get ready for this change.

**In progress:** The company has made improvements to customer care but there is scope for further improvements. While emission targets have been set it will be important to monitor their progress towards net zero.

### OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORIES (OPT) ENGAGEMENTS

**Objective:** There are short-term and long-term objectives with this engagement. The short-term objective is to have the LAPFF target companies operating in this area engage meaningfully with LAPFF on their human rights practices in the OPT. The long-term objective is to have these companies produce credible, robust, independent human rights impact assessments of their practices in the OPT so that LAPFF members can assess whether the companies' human rights practices meet international human rights and humanitarian law standards.

**Achieved:** In line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, LAPFF has been working for some months with a business and human rights expert to help with this engagement. This expert has joined LAPFF engagements with Altice and Booking Holdings this quarter, providing invaluable contributions to the engagements and ideas for how to proceed with the engagement. Both companies provided insights into their human rights due diligence processes and Booking Holdings has publicly announced that it is in the process of drafting its Human Rights Statement.

**In Progress:** LAPFF sent a follow up meeting request to the target companies and was able to schedule a few more meetings this time round. It will continue to approach companies for engagement and to request meaningful responses to information requests. Specifically, LAPFF is not content with the explanation that companies are abiding by the relevant law in the way they conduct business in the OPT. In all of LAPFF's work globally, this response is a red flag to LAPFF that companies are treading a thin line between legality and illegality in their conduct. This margin is not acceptable to LAPFF.

# COMPANY ENGAGEMENT

## PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANY ENGAGEMENTS

**Objective:** Some of LAPFF's largest holdings are in pharmaceutical companies. Many of these companies have been contributing to the development of Covid vaccines and have faced significant challenges over the last couple of years. LAPFF is interested in finding out how the Covid pandemic has affected these companies.

**Achieved:** LAPFF has written to five of the companies in which members hold a large number of shares in aggregate to find out whether the Covid pandemic has had an impact on their business strategies or business models. The companies of interest are AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, Novartis, Roche Holding, and Sanofi.

**In Progress:** LAPFF is in the process of arranging meetings with these companies, most of whom have responded that they are willing to meet and discuss this issue.

## COLLABORATIVE ENGAGEMENTS

**Chair's Quote:** "The speed with which the 'say on climate' initiative has taken root is indicative of its importance. I am heartened to see the number of companies putting their climate plans to a vote. However, the number of plans that fail to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement is alarming. I have always shared the view that Covid is a dress rehearsal for climate change; we must learn and take meaningful action much more quickly on both fronts."

The Institutional Investor Group on Climate Change has published a guide on Investor Expectations of Companies on Physical Climate Risks and Opportunities. LAPFF has co-signed letters to 50 companies in sectors highly exposed to physical climate risk asking them to adopt the expectations set out in the guide. These expectations very broadly are to establish a climate governance framework,

to undertake physical climate risk and opportunity assessment, to develop and implement a strategy for building climate resilience, and to identify and report against metrics to demonstrate progress over time.

## COLLABORATIVE INVESTOR MEETINGS

LAPFF continued to engage with other investors in the 30% Club, the Investors for Opioid and Pharmaceutical Accountability (IOPA) and the 'Financing a Just Transition Alliance'. It is also continuing to work with CA100+ on carbon reduction at widely held companies, and with Sarasin on Paris-aligned auditing of accounts. LAPFF continues to participate in investor collaborations to combat modern slavery too and is considering how best to expand engagement on this topic.

## COLLABORATIVE COMMUNITY MEETINGS

LAPFF was pleased to learn that JGP Credito, a Brazilian investor with which LAPFF has been liaising in relation to the Samarco and Brumadinho tailings dam collapses in Brazil, visited communities affected by those disasters at the end of August. One of the main asks from the communities was that LAPFF get Brazilian investors involved to help highlight the communities' struggles in the wake of the dam collapses. JGP has been an excellent partner in this regard, but it has been a struggle for LAPFF to engage other Brazilian investors. In any case, LAPFF is planning to continue its quarterly meetings with affected community members to monitor their experiences and to see what LAPFF can do to help meet their needs.

## POLICY ENGAGEMENT

Further to the setting up of the UK Accounting Standards Endorsement Board, which has taken over from the EU Commission in endorsing international accounting standards for use in the UK, the Chair of LAPFF has written to the Chair of the Board, Pauline Wallace. The letter requests production of the guidance used by the UKEB in endorsing standards in respect of 'true and fair view'. This

request comes after the former CEO of the FRC told Parliament that government lawyers had "concluded that they agreed" with "legal advice from Martin Moore QC who [had] concluded almost exactly the opposite of what [George Bompas, QC for the Local Authorities Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF)] had concluded." However, a Freedom of Information request revealed the government position: "We have never said that the views [of the LAPFF] are incorrect and may be disregarded. ... Ultimately, whether the views of the LAPFF are incorrect would be a matter for the courts".

In September, LAPFF – as part of a 587 investors strong group representing over USD \$46 trillion in assets – participated in sending the 2021 Global Investor Statement to Governments on the Climate Crisis. Considered the 'strongest ever call by global investors for governments to raise their climate ambition and implement meaningful policies to support investment in solutions to the climate crisis' the statement calls on all governments to undertake five priority actions in 2021. For further information on this statement, please access [here](#).

## CONSULTATION RESPONSES

There has been a series of consultations by the government relating to the UK's commitments on carbon reductions, including the interim goal of reducing emissions by 78% by 2035 over 1990 levels.

Transport, is the sector with the fastest growing source of carbon emissions and LAPFF has provided three related responses to relevant government consultations. In its response to the Department of Transport's 'Jet Zero' consultation on the strategy for net zero aviation, LAPFF considers that the government should take the opportunity to support the development of UK leadership in electric flight. In the response to the DWP consultation on ending the sale of new non-zero emission heavy goods vehicles, LAPFF supports a clearly identified legislative framework for carbon reductions, so companies can make the necessary decisions and financial commitments to provide the crucial short and long-term solutions to decarbonising the economy. Responding to the Department for Transport Consultation on a new CO<sub>2</sub>

# ENGAGEMENT

emissions regulatory framework, LAPFF supports deploying the zero-emission vehicle mandate. To maximise zero emission capability, the government should ensure there is a focus on electric drive-train technology for all road vehicles. For cars or vans, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy has already recognised that this approach is the lowest cost route to zero emissions. All responses can be viewed [here](#).

## MEDIA COVERAGE

**Investors with \$4 trln assets aim to tackle Asian firms on climate change goals** <https://www.reuters.com/article/marketsNews/idUSL8N2QU68V?il=0>  
<https://finance.yahoo.com/news/investors-4-trln-assets-aim-013000164.html>  
<https://www.dealstreetasia.com/stories/investors-asian-firms-climate-change-262764/>  
<https://www.straitstimes.com/business/economy/investors-handling-54-trillion-throw-weight-behind-new-platform-pushing-for-green>

**LGPS – Making Net Zero Add up To Something Real** <https://www.room151.co.uk/blogs/lgps-making-net-zero-add-up-to-something-real/>


**Legal Experts Warn on Issues with ICAEW Dividends guidance** <https://www.ipe.com/news/legal-experts-warn-on-issues-with-icaew-dividends-guidance/10055010.article>

**Phil Triggs: LGPS needs fine judgement on climate change and pooling** <https://www.lgcplus.com/investment/phil-triggs-lgps-needs-fine-judgement-on-climate-change-and-pooling-08-09-2021/>


**Sharp drop in LGPS fund and Pool signatories of stewardship code** <https://www.lgcplus.com/investment/sharp-drop-in-lgps-fund-and-pool-signatories-of-stewardship-code-06-09-2021/>

# ENGAGEMENT DATA


## ENGAGEMENT TOPICS




## ACTIVITY




## MEETING ENGAGEMENT OUTCOMES



## POSITION ENGAGED



## COMPANY DOMICILES



# COMPANY PROGRESS REPORT

82 Companies engaged over the quarter

\*The table below is a consolidated representation of engagements so reflects the number of companies engaged, not the number of engagements

Company/Index	Activity	Topic	Outcome
A G BARR PLC	Meeting	Other	Small Improvement
ABOITIZ EQUITY VENTURES INC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
AIR LIQUIDE SA	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
AJINOMOTO CO INC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
ALLERGAN PLC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
ALSTOM SA	Meeting	Human Rights	Small Improvement
AMS AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
ANGLO AMERICAN PLC	Meeting	Climate Change	Change in Process
ARCELORMITTAL SA	Meeting	Climate Change	Substantial Improvement
ARKEMA	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
ASTRAZENECA PLC	Sent Correspondence	Governance (General)	Dialogue
BANK LEUMI LE-ISRAEL BM	Sent Correspondence	Human Rights	Awaiting Response
BHP GROUP LIMITED (AUS)	Alert Issued	Climate Change	Dialogue
BOOKING HOLDINGS INC.	Meeting	Human Rights	Small Improvement
CAMPBELL SOUP COMPANY	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
CENTRICA PLC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
COCA COLA BEVERAGES PLC	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
CONAGRA BRANDS INC.	Meeting	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
COVESTRO AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
CSX CORPORATION	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
DANONE	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Dialogue
DELTA AIR LINES INC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
DIALOG SEMICONDUCTOR PLC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
DOMINION ENERGY INC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
ENDO INTERNATIONAL PLC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
FIRSTGROUP PLC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
FORMOSA PLASTICS CORP	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
GALP ENERGIA SGPS SA	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
GENERAL MILLS INC	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
GLAXOSMITHKLINE PLC	Sent Correspondence	Governance (General)	Dialogue
GRIFOLS SA	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
HSBC HOLDINGS PLC	Meeting	Climate Change	Change in Process
INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
JABIL CIRCUIT INC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
KELLOGG COMPANY	Meeting	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
KERRY GROUP PLC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
KEURIG DR PEPPER	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
LANXESS AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
LITEON TECHNOLOGY CORP	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
LOGITECH INTERNATIONAL S.A.	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
LONZA GROUP AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
LYONDELLBASELL INDUSTRIES N.V.	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
MARVELL TECHNOLOGY GROUP LTD	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
MEDTRONIC PLC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
MEIJI HOLDINGS CO LTD	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
MISC BERHAD	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
MITSUBISHI UFJ FINANCIAL GRP	Meeting	Climate Change	Change in Process
MONDELEZ INTERNATIONAL INC	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
NAN YA PLASTICS CORP	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
NATIONAL GRID PLC	AGM	Climate Change	Change in Process
NESTLE SA	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
NEXTERA ENERGY INC	Received Correspondence	Climate Change	Substantial Improvement
NIPPON EXPRESS CO LTD	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
NISSIN FOOD HLDGS CO LTD	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
NOKIA OYJ	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue

# COMPANY PROGRESS REPORT

82 Companies engaged over the quarter

\*The table below is a consolidated representation of engagements so reflects the number of companies engaged, not the number of engagements

NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
NOVARTIS AG	Sent Correspondence	Governance (General)	Dialogue
PANALPINA WELTTRANSPORT AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
PEPSICO INC.	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
PERSIMMON PLC	Meeting	Climate Change	Moderate Improvement
PUBLIC SERVICE ENTERPRISE GROUP INC	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
RENASAS ELECTRONICS CORP	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
RIO TINTO GROUP (AUS)	Meeting	Governance (General)	Dialogue
RIO TINTO PLC	Meeting	Climate Change	Change in Process
ROCHE HOLDING AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
ROHM CO LTD	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
ROYAL DUTCH SHELL PLC	Meeting	Governance (General)	Dialogue
SAINSBURY (J) PLC	AGM	Environmental Risk	Dialogue
SANOFI	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
SANWA HOLDINGS CORP	Sent Correspondence	Board Composition	Dialogue
SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY PUBLIC LIMITED COMPANY	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
SOLVAY SA	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
SSE PLC	Meeting	Climate Change	Change in Process
STANDARD CHARTERED PLC	Meeting	Climate Change	Dialogue
STMICROELECTRONICS NV	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
SUMITOMO MITSUI FINANCIAL GROUP	Meeting	Board Composition	Moderate Improvement
SUNTORY BEVERAGE & FOOD LTD	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
SWATCH GROUP AG	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
THE CLOROX COMPANY	Sent Correspondence	Climate Change	Dialogue
THE KRAFT HEINZ COMPANY	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
UNILEVER PLC	Sent Correspondence	Social Risk	Awaiting Response
VALE SA	Meeting	Human Rights	Dialogue

## LOCAL AUTHORITY PENSION FUND FORUM MEMBERS

Avon Pension Fund	Enfield Pension Fund	London Pension Fund Authority	Teesside Pension Fund
Barking and Dagenham Pension Fund	Environment Agency Pension Fund	Lothian Pension Fund	Tower Hamlets Pension Fund
Barnet Pension Fund	Essex Pension Fund	Merseyside Pension Fund	Tyne and Wear Pension Fund
Bedfordshire Pension Fund	Falkirk Pension Fund	Merton Pension Fund	Waltham Forest Pension Fund
Berkshire Pension Fund	Gloucestershire Pension Fund	Newham Pension Fund	Wandsworth Borough Council Pension Fund
Bexley (London Borough of)	Greater Gwent Pension Fund	Norfolk Pension Fund	Warwickshire Pension Fund
Bromley Pension Fund	Greater Manchester Pension Fund	North East Scotland Pension Fund	West Midlands ITA Pension Fund
Cambridgeshire Pension Fund	Greenwich Pension Fund	North Yorkshire Pension Fund	West Midlands Pension Fund
Camden Pension Fund	Gwynedd Pension Fund	Northamptonshire Pension Fund	West Yorkshire Pension Fund
Cardiff & Glamorgan Pension Fund	Hackney Pension Fund	Nottinghamshire Pension Fund	Westminster Pension Fund
Cheshire Pension Fund	Hammersmith and Fulham Pension Fund	Oxfordshire Pension Fund	Wiltshire Pension Fund
City of London Corporation Pension Fund	Haringey Pension Fund	Powys Pension Fund	Worcestershire Pension Fund
Clywd Pension Fund (Flintshire CC)	Harrow Pension Fund	Redbridge Pension Fund	
Cornwall Pension Fund	Havering Pension Fund	Rhondda Cynon Taf Pension Fund	
Croydon Pension Fund	Hertfordshire Pension Fund	Shropshire Pension Fund	
Cumbria Pension Fund	Hounslow Pension Fund	Somerset Pension Fund	<b>Pool Company Members</b>
Derbyshire Pension Fund	Islington Pension Fund	South Yorkshire Pension Authority	Border to Coast Pensions Partnership
Devon Pension Fund	Kingston upon Thames Pension Fund	Southwark Pension Fund	Brunel Pensions Partnership
Dorset Pension Fund	Kensington and Chelsea (Royal Borough of)	Staffordshire Pension Fund	LGPS Central
Durham Pension Fund	Lambeth Pension Fund	Strathclyde Pension Fund	Local Pensions Partnership
Dyfed Pension Fund	Lancashire County Pension Fund	Suffolk Pension Fund	London CIV
Ealing Pension Fund	Leicestershire Pension Fund	Surrey Pension Fund	Northern LGPS
East Riding Pension Fund	Lewisham Pension Fund	Sutton Pension Fund	Wales Pension Partnership
East Sussex Pension Fund	Lincolnshire Pension Fund	Swansea Pension Fund	



## **LAPFF, TCI Fund Management and Sarasin & Partners write to the FTSE All-share calling for a Say On Climate resolution at every 2022 AGM**

With COP 26 rapidly advancing and its goal to secure global net zero and keep 1.5°C within reach, the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF), Sarasin & Partners and TCI Fund Management have written to all UK listed companies<sup>1</sup> urging them to submit a Climate Transition Action Plan to each AGM for shareholder approval.

Cllr Doug McMurdo, Chair of Local Authority Pension Fund Forum, said: “The speed with which the ‘Say on Climate’ initiative has taken root is indicative of its importance. I am heartened to see a number of companies putting their climate plans to a vote.

However, the number of plans that fail to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement is alarming. I have always shared the view that Covid is a dress rehearsal for climate change; we must learn and take meaningful action much more quickly on both fronts.”

Natasha Landell-Mills of Sarasin & Partners, also an early joiner to the Say on Climate initiative, called on companies to ensure their capital deployment lines up with their net-zero strategies, saying “we consider it vital that companies provide accounting disclosures aligned with a 2050 net-zero emissions pathway”.

Sir Chris Hohn of TCI Fund Management, who also chairs the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation which launched the Say on Climate Initiative, has stressed the importance of companies outlining plans for the next five years and for long-term executive compensation to be clearly and substantially aligned with meeting critical climate goals.

It is clear that filing resolutions at a limited number of companies of high carbon impact is no longer enough. All listed companies need to present a clear

---

<sup>1</sup> Excluding investment trusts



strategy for reducing their entire emissions footprint and make provision for their shareowners to review this annually by means of a resolution at the AGM.

**ENDS>**

**7 October 2021**

**For further information:**

Tessa Younger, Head of Engagement  
PIRC Ltd (research and engagement partner to LAPFF)  
Tel: 07507 844561 Email: Tessa.younger@pirc.co.uk

**About the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum:** The Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF) is a voluntary association of 84 public sector pension funds and seven pool companies based in the UK with combined assets of over £300 billion. It exists to 'promote the long-term investment interests of local authority pension funds, and to maximise their influence as shareholders to promote corporate responsibility and high standards of corporate governance amongst the companies in which they invest.' PIRC is the Research and Engagement partner to the Forum @lapfforum <https://lapfforum.org/>.

Further information on the Say on Climate Initiative can be found here: <https://www.sayonclimate.org/>



Q2 2021

# ESG Impact Report

Global engagement to  
deliver positive change

# Our mission

To use our influence to ensure:



1. Companies integrate environmental, social and governance (ESG) factors into their culture and everyday thinking



2. Markets and regulators create an environment in which good management of ESG factors is valued and supported

In doing so, we seek to fulfil LGIM's purpose: to create a better future through responsible investing.

# Our focus

## Holding boards to account

To be successful, companies need to have people at the helm who are well-equipped to create resilient long-term growth. By voting and engaging directly with companies, we encourage management to control risks while seeking to benefit from emerging opportunities. We aim to safeguard and enhance our clients' assets by engaging with companies and holding management to account for their decisions. Voting is an important tool in this process, and one which we use extensively.

## Creating sustainable value

We believe it is in the interest of all stakeholders for companies to build sustainable business models that are also beneficial to society. We work to ensure companies are well-positioned for sustainable growth, and to prevent market behaviour that destroys long-term value. Our investment process includes an assessment of how well companies incorporate relevant ESG factors into their everyday thinking. We engage directly and collaboratively with companies to highlight key challenges and opportunities, and support strategies that can deliver long-term success.

## Promoting market resilience

As a long-term investor for our clients, it is essential that markets are able to generate sustainable value. In doing so, we believe companies should become more resilient to change and therefore seek to benefit the whole market. We use our influence and scale to ensure that issues impacting the value of our clients' investments are recognised and appropriately managed. This includes working with key policymakers, such as governments and regulators, and collaborating with asset owners to bring about positive change.



## Action and impact

In the second quarter of 2021, we engaged with companies on a wide range of topics, from climate change to executive remuneration. You will find in this report details on our key activity during the period, including engagement campaigns, key votes and work with policymakers.



## Environmental | Social | Governance

# ESG: Environment

## The latest results of our strengthened Climate Impact Pledge

In 2020, we expanded our Climate Impact Pledge engagement programme to focus on around 1,000 global companies in 15 climate-critical sectors. We were pleased to see progress across most sectors. Notably, food retailer **Kroger\***, previously excluded as a sanction, has now been reinstated across select LGIM funds, following progress.

However, much remains to be done, which is why:

- Four new companies will be added to our exclusion list, taking the total number to 13.
- 130 companies have also been subject to voting sanctions for not meeting our minimum, data-driven standards.

## Sustainability summit

On 15 June 2021, LGIM hosted its inaugural Sustainability Summit, during which we announced the pledge's results. The virtual global event focused on every aspect of ESG, illustrating its core role at LGIM, while showcasing our brand, purpose, capabilities and leadership as a responsible investor. More than 350 clients attended the event, along with 22 members of the press and 10 external speakers. Speakers included Nigel Topping, the UK Government's expert and leader on climate change, internationally renowned environmentalist Dr. Jane Goodall, as well as CEOs of the large multinationals **Unilever\*** and **BHP\***.



\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## Supporting clients with their climate reporting

With the UK government rolling out new climate reporting requirements for pension schemes, we have developed a five-step checklist to help clients better understand how we can support them in meeting their regulatory obligations.

Our [article](#) contains more information about the checklist, including details of the carbon and climate metrics on which we intend to report.



## Asking questions at the LyondellBasell\* AGM

On 28 April 2021 we joined investor colleagues under the IIGCC/CA100+ umbrella to directly engage with the Chair and the Directors of the Board around the chemical company's management of climate-related risks. Under this collaborative initiative we had asked for the board to add two discussion items to the AGM agenda: 'Climate Change and Commitment Strategy' and 'Advisory Vote on Climate Change'. The company agreed to this and, alongside seven other investors, we asked multiple questions regarding LyondellBasell's net-zero targets, science-based targets, lobbying, Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) reporting, and Paris-aligned activities. We also discussed director accountability and annual votes on the company's transition plan. We had a dialogue with the Board directors and will continue to engage with the company.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## Finance for biodiversity pledge

In April 2021 we signed the Finance for Biodiversity pledge at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), alongside more than 50 financial institutions representing over €9 trillion in assets under management and custody. The pledge calls on global leaders to agree on timely and effective measures to reverse nature loss to ensure ecosystem resilience.

As a signatory, by 2024 at the latest we commit to: collaborating and knowledge sharing; engaging with companies; assessing impact; setting targets; and reporting publicly. We will help develop policies and differentiated expectations across industries, with the aim that companies reduce their negative/increase their positive impacts on biodiversity.





**One of the proposals we supported requested the company to amend its articles to stop building new coal plants and to take measures to reduce emissions from coal generation.**

**Shareholder proposals**

Page 47

LGIM voted in favour of shareholder proposals for oil majors **Chevron\*** and **ConocoPhillips\*** to set targets for emissions associated with the use of their products, and against the ‘say-on-climate’ proposals put forward by **Shell\*** and **Total\*** (now TotalEnergies\*) for an advisory vote from shareholders. We have provided further comment on the significance on these votes in our [blog](#).

Today, Japan is only second to the US in terms of the number of activist campaigns.<sup>1</sup> Proposals in Japan have focused mainly on unlocking the value trapped within large balance sheets by returning cash to shareholders. Common proposals call for the unwinding of cross shareholdings and increased dividends but these are rarely successful.

One emerging theme in shareholder proposals is climate change. Last year, **Mizuho Financial Group\*** was the first Japanese company to receive a [climate-related proposal](#). This year, environmental groups filed similar proposals calling for **Sumitomo Corporation\*** and **Mitsubishi UFJ Financial Group\*** to adopt and disclose plans to align their businesses with the goals of the Paris Agreement. While both companies have shown progress, including a commitment to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050, we chose to vote in favour of both proposals to signal our concerns around the pathway to successfully deliver on the long-term commitments. Neither passed, but they received 20% and 23% shareholder support, respectively.

At **Kansai Electric Power’s\*** AGM, 24 proposals predominantly related to governance and environmental issues were filed by **33 shareholders** including the municipal governments of Osaka City and Kyoto City. One of the proposals we supported requested the company to amend its articles to stop building new coal plants and to take measures to reduce emissions from coal generation.

**Toyo Seikan Group Holdings\*** received a proposal from an activist fund to amend its articles to disclose a plan outlining the business strategy, taking into account the TCFD framework.

While none of these shareholder resolutions passed in Japan, we hope our support for the resolutions has helped signal the importance and urgency for companies to act.

1. Source: CLSA based on Bloomberg data (as of 30 June 2021).  
\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

**Significant votes**

<b>Company name:</b> ExxonMobil Corporation*					
<b>ISIN:</b> US30231G1022	<b>Market cap:</b> \$236.9bn <sup>2</sup>				
<b>Sector:</b> Oil and gas					
<b>Issue identified:</b>	Due to persistent concerns around governance, climate and capital allocation, the company was removed from select LGIM strategies in 2019, with sanctions applied under LGIM’s Climate Impact Pledge.  In 2020, we announced that we would be opposing the re-election of the company’s chair/CEO as we believe the separation of roles provides a better balance of authority and responsibility.  In 2021, we escalated our engagement by supporting an activist investor who proposed an alternative slate of directors, as the experience and skills of the proposed four candidates would, in our view, make a positive contribution to board effectiveness and oversight. We announced our voting stance ahead of the AGM, with our position being widely covered in major news outlets and referenced in the voting recommendations from proxy adviser ISS.				
<b>Summary of the resolution:</b>	Proxy content at the AGM, 26 May 2021				
<b>How LGIM voted:</b>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>LGIM voted FOR:</td> <td>LGIM voted AGAINST:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The four activist-proposed director nominees</li> <li>A number of ESG shareholder proposals</li> </ul> </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The re-election of the chair/CEO</li> <li>The reappointment of auditors</li> <li>The remuneration report</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </table>	LGIM voted FOR:	LGIM voted AGAINST:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The four activist-proposed director nominees</li> <li>A number of ESG shareholder proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The re-election of the chair/CEO</li> <li>The reappointment of auditors</li> <li>The remuneration report</li> </ul>
LGIM voted FOR:	LGIM voted AGAINST:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The four activist-proposed director nominees</li> <li>A number of ESG shareholder proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The re-election of the chair/CEO</li> <li>The reappointment of auditors</li> <li>The remuneration report</li> </ul>				
<b>Rationale for the decision:</b>	We have had multiple engagements with the company but remain dissatisfied with the strength of the company’s climate targets and strategy, along with the levels of transparency around sustainability and lobbying, and with the levels of board oversight (in particular the combined chair/CEO roles).				
<b>Outcome:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three of the four proposed new directors have been appointed.</li> <li>The chair of the remuneration committee, against whom LGIM voted last year, was not reappointed to the board.</li> <li>A majority of shareholders voted for a report on climate-related lobbying.</li> </ul>				
<b>Why is this vote significant?</b>	This is most high-profile example to date of a climate-related proxy contest; a recently formed hedge fund with a minority stake managed to galvanise sufficient support to replace a third of the board at a company that less than a decade ago was the world’s largest by market capitalisation.  For LGIM, the escalation is in keeping with our approach of holding individual directors accountable for their companies’ climate performance. We have commented on the significance on the vote repeatedly in the media and in our blog				

2. The source for all market cap data in this document is Refinitiv, as at 21 July 2021  
\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

<b>Company name:</b> HSBC Holdings plc*	
<b>ISIN:</b> GB0005405286	<b>Market cap:</b> £80.6bn
<b>Sector:</b> Banks	
<b>Issue identified:</b>	<p>The bank has repeatedly been identified as a substantial climate change financier, continuing to finance new fossil fuel projects not in line with the Paris Agreement goals.</p> <p>To work towards a net-zero future aligned with Paris Agreement goals, ShareAction initially proposed a resolution to strengthen HSBC's climate change policies and disclosure.</p> <p>As a result of further discussions between the company, the proponents and shareholders, ShareAction was sufficiently comfortable with management's counter proposal to withdraw its own resolution.</p>
<b>Summary of the resolution:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGM: 28 May 2021</li> <li>Resolution 15 – to set, disclose and implement short- and medium-term targets, to publish and implement a phase-out policy and to report on progress.</li> </ul>
<b>How LGIM voted:</b>	LGIM voted FOR the management-proposed climate change resolution (in line with management's recommendation).
<b>Rationale for the decision:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LGIM has engaged with HSBC on its climate change policies and disclosures for a number of years, and we joined a collaborative engagement around the shareholder proposal ahead of the 2021 AGM.</li> <li>We encouraged the Board to reach a compromise with the proponents to require only a single resolution, and so were happy to support management's climate change proposal at the AGM.</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement between company, proponent and institutional shareholders led to the preferred outcome of a single resolution supported by management and proxy advisers.</li> <li>Resolution 15 received overwhelming support with 99.71% of votes cast FOR.</li> <li>We will continue to monitor the strength of HSBC's climate change policies and progress towards improved disclosure of targets and emissions across the portfolio.</li> </ul>
<b>Why is this vote significant?</b>	<p>The topic of the proposal was in line with LGIM's climate change policy stance and our campaign to push for a net-zero economy globally.</p> <p>Ahead of the AGM and while engagement between the parties continued, we had many client and press queries regarding our views and likely vote on the proposals.</p>

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.



# Environmental | Social | Governance

# ESG: Social

## Medical oxygen roundtables

The Investment Stewardship team was invited to participate in the first (of three) Access to Medical Oxygen roundtables, organised by the Access to Medicine Foundation and Every Breath Counts Coalition. The aim was to explore opportunities to increase access to medical oxygen in low-and middle-income countries (LMICs) in the context of COVID-19. The roundtable brought together companies and industry associations, investors, donor governments and foundations as well as global health agencies, such as the World Bank, World Health Organisation (WHO), and the Clinton Health Access Initiative.

Globally, to date, there have been approximately 180 million reported cases of COVID-19 and almost 4 million deaths.<sup>3</sup> Medical oxygen therapy is a core part of the treatment of patients with severe COVID-19. Of those admitted to hospital with COVID-19, 41% need supplemental oxygen.<sup>4</sup> With slower-than-expected vaccine rollout in many of the LMICs, access to oxygen and other medicines have been described during the

Access to Medical Oxygen roundtables as “exceedingly important” in reducing COVID-19 deaths in the short-term. Sir Jeremy Farrar, Director of the Wellcome Trust, an independent charitable foundation dedicated to combatting the most urgent global health challenges, has noted that medical oxygen will save more lives in 2021 than vaccines will, but supplies to many countries are precariously low.<sup>5</sup>

Medical oxygen is included under the Therapeutics Pillar of the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator (ACT-A)—a global partnership led by WHO to accelerate development, production, and equitable access to COVID-19 tests, treatments, and vaccines. Under the umbrella of ACT-A, the ‘Oxygen Emergency Taskforce’ was established in February 2021 to help LMICs respond to the rapidly rising need for medical oxygen to treat COVID-19 patients.

The third roundtable was held on 9 June 2021 with the objective of engaging the oxygen industry more directly to prevent a repeat of the oxygen crises that have occurred in many LMICs, most recently in India and Nepal. The roundtable was opened by Carl Bildt, WHO Special Envoy for the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator (ACT-A) and former Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary of Sweden. In conversations with participants and, in particular, some companies in which we invest, LGIM stated our clear support for those companies who were taking steps to increase access to medical oxygen and encouraged others to follow suit. We were delighted to hear, less than a week later, that two of the world’s largest medical oxygen suppliers **Air Liquide\*** and **Linde plc\*** – which have participated in the roundtables – had agreed to collaborate with the COVID-19 ‘Oxygen Emergency Taskforce’ to increase access to medical oxygen in LMICs.<sup>6</sup> We will continue to participate in the roundtables and encourage other investee holdings to support the efforts of the ‘Oxygen Emergency Taskforce’.

3. John Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center, last accessed 22 June 2021: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>

4. Jane Feinmann, BMJ 2021;373:n1166, last accessed 22 June 2021: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n1166>

5. Interview with Jeremy Farrar by Mun-Keat Looi, BMJ, International Features Editors, last accessed 22 June 2021: <https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n459>

6. [Unprecedented cooperation with global oxygen suppliers paves way to increase access for low- and middle-income countries to address COVID-19 crisis - Unitaid](#)

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

We are working to enhance global and political coordination, accountability and governance by strengthening future pandemic preparation and addressing challenges to tackle antimicrobial resistance.



## Support of UN high level dialogue on AMR

On 23 January 2020 at the World Economic Forum annual meeting in Davos, the Access to Medicine Foundation, **FAIRR, PRI** and the UK Government launched a new initiative – Investor Action on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) – focused on tackling the global threat of drug-resistant infections. Since September 2020, LGIM has been a member of Investor Action on AMR. At the end of April 2021, under this umbrella and upon the request of the President of the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, we joined with other high profile organisations and supported the UN’s General Assembly’s Call to Action on AMR. The aim is to enhance global and political coordination, accountability and governance by strengthening future pandemic preparation and addressing challenges to tackle antimicrobial resistance. Collective dialogue and the influence of investors such as LGIM, will play a vital role in tackling AMR<sup>7</sup> and again, this underscores, and confirms, the need of a ‘One Health’ approach to AMR, of which LGIM is a firm believer.<sup>8</sup>

7. [\\*2021\\_06 PGA-letter-Summary-of-High-Level-Interactive-Dialogue-on-Antimicrobial-Resistance-AMR.pdf](#)

8. The World Health Organization (WHO) has declared that AMR is one of the top 10 global public health threats facing humanity. Due to the complexity of AMR the WHO promotes a ‘One Health’ approach which brings together various stakeholders working in multiple fields such as human and animal health, food production, environment etc to work together in the designing and implementing research programmes, policies and legislation to attain better public health outcomes. A ‘One Health’ approach is essential in combating AMR as it affects all facets of society.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## Tax transparency

LGIM has long believed that tax is an ESG issue. Not only is it important that individual company earnings are of a high quality and not over-reliant on specific tax structures, but if over the longer term societies are insufficiently funded, this could lead to greater societal inequalities and begin to impact companies' ability to operate sustainably. This quarter our desire to see greater transparency on tax and a fairer tax system has been bolstered by significant developments. In June, the G7 committed to set a global minimum corporate tax rate of at least 15%, and to take it forward with the G20. We have also lent our support, alongside other investors, to proposed legislation in [Europe](#), and the [US](#), which would mandate country by country tax reporting for multinational companies.



Page 50

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## Significant votes

Company name: McDonald's Corporation*	
ISIN: US5801351017	Market cap: \$174.8bn
Sector: Hotels, restaurants & leisure	
<b>Issue identified:</b>	AMR is a key focus of the engagement strategy of LGIM's Investment Stewardship team. We believe that, without coordinated action today, AMR could prompt the next global health crisis, with a potentially dramatic impact on the planet, its people, and global GDP.
<b>Summary of the resolution:</b>	Resolution 5 - Report on Antibiotics and Public Health Costs at the company's AGM held on 20 May 2021.
<b>How LGIM voted:</b>	LGIM voted FOR the shareholder resolution (against management).
<b>Rationale for the decision:</b>	<p>LGIM voted in favour as we believe the proposed study will inform shareholders and other stakeholders of the negative ramifications of sustained use of antibiotics in the company's supply chain and its impact on global health, with a particular focus on the systemic implications.</p> <p>While LGIM applauds the company's efforts over the past few years in reducing the use of antibiotics in its supply chain for chicken, beef and pork, we believe AMR is a financially material issue for the company and other stakeholders, and we wanted to signal the importance of this topic to the company's board of directors.</p>
<b>Outcome:</b>	11.3% of shareholders supported the resolution. LGIM will continue to engage with the company and monitor progress.
<b>Why is this vote significant?</b>	We consider this vote to be significant as LGIM took the rare step of publicly pre-declaring it before the shareholder meeting.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

<b>Company name:</b> Rio Tinto plc*	
<b>ISIN:</b> GB0007188757	<b>Market cap:</b> £98bn
<b>Sector:</b> Mining	
<b>Issue identified:</b>	Community rights and social license to operate.
<b>Summary of the resolution:</b>	Resolution 3 and 4 – Approve remuneration report for UK and Australian law purposes.
<b>How LGIM voted:</b>	LGIM voted AGAINST the remuneration reports, at both AGMs of the dual-listed mining giant.
<b>Rationale for the decision:</b>	LGIM believed that further reductions in the exit package awarded to the outgoing CEO would have been appropriate given the destruction of the heritage site at Juukan Gorge, the associated reputational damage and the strain it has put on community relations, which are essential to maintaining the social license to operate for the industry.
<b>Outcome:</b>	A majority of shareholders opposed the pay package at the UK AGM
<b>Why is this vote significant?</b>	The destruction of a 46,000-year old heritage site in Western Australia during a 2020 mine site expansion prompted a backlash from local communities, the Australian government, the media and investors, culminating in the departure of four directors, including the chairman and the CEO. This vote represents the latest development in LGIM's efforts to press the company for accountability since the beginning of the scandal.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.



# Environmental | Social | Governance

# ESG: Governance

## Summary of pre-declarations

This is the first year in which LGIM has centralised the reporting of our vote intentions in advance of a company's AGM. LGIM's voting intentions for 2021, in [our blog post](#), highlights the companies and resolutions we believe require additional scrutiny from the market. Publicly pre-declaring our vote intention is an important tool for our engagement activities. We decide to pre-declare for a number of reasons, including as part of our escalation strategy, where we consider the vote to be contentious, or as part of a specific engagement programme.

The pre-declarations covered a number of different ESG topics, too. For example, our post on Informa\* highlighted our intention to vote against a number of resolutions, including one pertaining to its remuneration policy, to reflect our concerns over the media company's pay practices.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.



This is the first year in which LGIM has centralised the reporting of our vote intentions in advance of a company's AGM.

## Co-filed significant shareholder resolutions

During the autumn of 2020 we co-filed, together with members of Investors for Opioid and Pharmaceutical Accountability (IOPA), two shareholder resolutions at **Eli Lilly\*** and **Gilead Sciences\*** seeking the appointment of an independent chair. LGIM has a longstanding policy advocating for the separation of the roles of CEO and board chair. These two roles are substantially different, requiring distinct skills and experiences. Since 2015 we have supported shareholder proposals seeking the appointment of independent board chairs, and since 2020 we have voted against all combined board chair/CEO roles. Furthermore, we have published a guide for boards on the separation of the roles of chair and CEO, and we have reinforced our position on leadership structures across our stewardship activities – e.g. via individual corporate engagements and director conferences.

In our advocacy process, the obvious next step was to start filing shareholder resolutions on this subject. At the Eli Lilly\* AGM the shareholder proposal received support from 42% (excl. insider shares) of the independent shareholders and at Gilead Sciences\* the same proposal received 35% support from shareholders. For Gilead Sciences\*, we also took the rare step of publicly pre-declaring our vote intentions before the shareholder meeting.

9. Source: Sumitomo Mitsui Trust Bank (as of 1 July 2021). Note that in a hybrid AGMs, a "participating" shareholder can view the meeting online but cannot vote during the meeting, while an "attending" shareholder can not only view but also vote during the meeting. Only a small number of companies have given shareholders the option to "attend" virtually.


10. In Japan, a new [law](#) has come into effect, allowing companies to hold virtual-only meetings without the need to amend the articles for two years from 16 June 2021.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## COVID-19 and virtual AGMs

In June, more than 300 Japanese companies held 'hybrid AGMs', allowing shareholders the option to either physically turn up for the meeting, or alternatively 'participate' or 'attend' online.<sup>9</sup>

Additionally, we note that 10 Japanese companies proposed to amend their articles of incorporation to allow virtual-only AGMs.<sup>10</sup> We chose to support proposals by companies that specified the situations - such as during a pandemic or major natural disaster - in which a virtual-only AGM would be allowed without shareholder approval (e.g. **Takeda Pharmaceutical Company\***). However, we voted against proposals that did not limit the conditions (e.g. **Sumitomo Mitsui Financial Group\***), as we believe that authorising companies to hold virtual-only meetings permanently could undermine the quality of exchange between shareholders and companies. This is particularly important to retail investors who do not have the same access to companies that institutional investors have outside the AGM.



## Board composition

In 2021, we strengthened our board diversity policy to vote against companies in the TOPIX 500 in instances where there are no women on the board. This resulted in 51 votes against the chairman or most senior member of the board during the second quarter.<sup>11</sup> This is compared to six in the same period in 2020, the first year in which we implemented a voting policy in Japan to vote against any company in the TOPIX 100 with an all-male board. We are pleased to note that three of those six companies have appointed women directors to the board this year.



**In 2021, we strengthened our board diversity policy to vote against companies in the TOPIX 500 in instances where there are no women on the board.**

Further information and views on diversity in Japan can be found in the LGIM blog:

- [Why gender diversity in Japan’s boardrooms should matter to investors](#) (10 May 2021)
- [Hi-seiki, high stakes: how we engage on gender diversity in Japan](#) (17 May 2021)

Moreover, we have continued to vote against Japanese companies when independent directors account for less than one third of the board. During the latest quarter, we voted against 141 companies, down from 191 during the same period in 2020, due to board independence concerns.<sup>12</sup>

11. Votes represent voting instructions for our main FTSE pooled index funds which include approximately 500 Japanese holdings.

12. Ibid.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## Significant votes

Company name: AT&T*	
ISIN: US00206R1023	Market cap: \$199.3bn
Sector: Telecommunications	
<b>Issue identified:</b>	LGIM identified serious issues with the structure and quantum of AT&T’s executive remuneration. In particular, the US\$48 million sign-on equity award to the incoming CEO of its Warner Media division and a US\$9 million retention grant to the General Counsel.
<b>Summary of the resolution:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 3 - Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation</li> <li>• AGM – 30 April 2021</li> </ul>
<b>How LGIM voted:</b>	AGAINST
<b>Rationale for the decision:</b>	The awards and payments made by AT&T did not meet LGIM’s expectations of fair and balanced remuneration both in respect to their magnitude and the lack of performance criteria.
<b>Outcome:</b>	A majority of investors (51.7%) voted against the advisory resolution, sending a strong signal to management that its remuneration policy revision.
<b>Why is this vote significant?</b>	This was a high-profile vote.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

<b>Company name:</b> General Electric*	
<b>ISIN:</b> US00206R1023, US3696041033	<b>Market cap:</b> \$111.5bn
<b>Sector:</b> Industrials	
<b>Issue identified:</b>	<p>LGIM believes that the roles of chair and CEO should be separated. The concentration of power in the hands of a single individual can be seen as an advantage for a company. For example, having a single person is thought by many to facilitate quick decision-making. However, LGIM believes that, on balance, the perceived advantages do not outweigh the risks of such a structure. Instead, a separate chair and CEO provides a balance of authority and responsibility that is in both the company's and investors' best interests. At the company's 2021 AGM, a shareholder resolution was proposed to require an independent chair, which would in effect result in a separation of the chair and CEO roles.</p> <p>LGIM is committed to addressing the issue of climate change. We believe that climate change and the transition to low-carbon presents both risks and opportunities for our investee companies. At the company's 2021 AGM, a shareholder resolution was filed by requesting that the company report on its progress towards achieving a target of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.</p>
<b>Summary of the resolution:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 6 – Require Independent Board Chair</li> <li>Item 7 – Report on Meeting the Criteria of the Net Zero Indicator</li> <li>AGM – 4 May 2021</li> </ul>
<b>How LGIM voted:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FOR – Item 6</li> <li>FOR – Item 7</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for the decision:</b>	LGIM voted to support both resolutions in an effort to improve the company's governance structure and to spur meaningful action by the company to address gaps in its climate related disclosure and strategy.
<b>Outcome:</b>	<p>The resolution requiring an independent board chair received 29.8% votes in favour and failed to pass. LGIM will continue to engage with the company on this important governance structure best practice.</p> <p>The board and an overwhelming majority of 97.96% of investors supported the shareholder resolution. General Electric* and the board issued a statement reiterating their recognition that climate change is an urgent priority and that the company will disclose a Scope 3 emissions target and says that it plans on publishing a sustainability report in 2021 that will include whether the company intends to set a net-zero target and the rationale behind it.</p>
<b>Why is this vote significant?</b>	This was a high-profile vote.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

# Public policy update

## United Kingdom

Over the past quarter, the UK government has been very active with regards to strengthening ESG-related policy and regulation. There have been announcements ranging from the UK audit reform, UK taxonomy, sustainability labelling, the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), social factors in pensions schemes, green bond issuance, to sustainability disclosures requirements.

In May, LGIM and L&G Group submitted a joint response to the UK's 'Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy' (BEIS) consultation on "mandatory climate-related financial disclosures by publicly quoted companies, large private companies and Limited Liability Partnerships (LLPs)". LGIM has for many years been encouraging the significant strengthening climate-related reporting across the UK economy and beyond, and this consultation was very welcome. We again highlighted the importance that such regulations must be aligned across the investment chain to ensure the required data is disclosed by corporates, thus enabling disclosures further up the chain. This is critical if we are to get accurate, comparable and consistent disclosures for end investors. We were, however, disappointed to see that the ambition from BEIS was below what we feel is necessary i.e. reporting at a TCFD 4 pillar level as opposed to the full 11 recommendations. In collaboration with other investors, LGIM wrote to the government to highlight this as a serious area of concern.

LGIM has also been: i) engaging with the FCA on the next steps to the Lord Hill review (e.g. use of special purpose acquisition companies or 'SPACs'); ii) preparing responses to the BEIS Audit Reform consultation; iii) joined the **Aldersgate Group** and UK Green Building Council **collaboration** of businesses and investors that wrote to the prime minister to call for the UK Planning Bill to deliver net zero and protect nature (**picked up** in the FT); and iv) reviewing the forthcoming FCA TCFD consultations for asset managers and standard listed issuers.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## United States

In June, we submitted a comment letter to Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as part of its **public input solicitation** for the climate change disclosure rules under consideration. Within the letter, among other points, we highlighted the importance of consistent global disclosure requirements across all asset classes on climate-related risks as well as the need for broader ESG disclosures. LGIM also met with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in June to discuss the importance of federal methane policies, given the potency of substance and its incompatibility with a net zero future. In May, as part of the **Human Capital Management Coalition**, we met with SEC Chairman Gary Gensler to discuss human capital disclosure recommendations: number of workers, cost of work force, turnover and diversity.

**We met to discuss human capital disclosure recommendations: number of workers, cost of work force, turnover and diversity.**





## European Union

As ever, the European Union (EU) continues to lead the way on developing a comprehensive policy and regulatory framework in sustainable finance, as well as driving progress on the transition to a low-carbon economy (and meet the Paris Agreement targets) across each sector. An area of focus for the EU at this time is improving ESG transparency right across the investment chain. In May, following last year's consultation on reviewing the Non-Financial Reporting Directive, the EU released its proposal for the **'Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive'**. While this is just the first step, and a lot will depend on how close the EU aligns with the new IFRS Sustainability Standards Board (which is key), we welcome the proposal. We have summarised the key changes in [our blog](#). We will be continuing to engage with the EU and advocate for robust sustainable finance policies, including an area that the EU may have overlooked, integrating strong 'stewardship' activities. It is also worth mentioning we [joined a collaboration](#) through The Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC) on reiterating the requirements and the importance of a strong EU methane policy, with our stance covered by major news agency [Reuters](#).



## Japan

In June, the Tokyo Stock Exchange (TSE) **announced** the second revision of Japan's Corporate Governance Code, which was first compiled in 2015 and revised in 2018. This was accompanied by the Japan Financial Services Agency's (FSA) revised Guidelines for Investor and Company Engagement (Engagement Guidelines) **announced** the same day. LGIM engaged with the public consultation both directly and alongside our partners in the Asian Corporate Governance Association (ACGA), and also worked with the International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN) to provide input into the *"Council of Experts Concerning the Follow-up of Japan's Stewardship Code and Japan's Corporate Governance Code"* (set up by the TSE and the FSA).

LGIM welcomes the Code's enhancements to: i) board independence; ii) references to climate change (including TCFD-aligned reporting) and human rights issues among others as aspects of sustainability for the board to embrace; iii) strengthened wording regarding nomination and remuneration committees; and iv) increased emphasis on diversity at the board and management level.

All are issues that LGIM has advocated on for many years. In our view, however, the latest board independence requirements still leave room for further enhancement. Moreover, we believe the revised Code does not sufficiently add to the sections on the management and timing of [shareholder meetings](#), and cross-shareholdings (we note, however, that there have been some additions to the Engagement Guidelines). Additionally, in future revisions, we would like to see a number of important items – including English disclosures, TCFD-aligned reporting, and independent board committees – become applicable to companies beyond just those listed on the prime market. We have also recommended that the TSE and FSA consider ways to monitor and enforce compliance against the Code, as adherence should not be a tick-box exercise and any non-compliance should be explained with compelling reasons. A sound corporate governance framework is in the long-term interests of all participants in the Japanese market, and we will continue to engage on this topic going forward.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

In April, and in the context of delivering on Paris Agreement, LGIM engaged on pushing the Japanese government to encourage setting an appropriate 2030 greenhouse gas emission reduction target to be included in their National Determined Contribution (NDC – which was being negotiated ahead of COP26 later this year). LGIM's position was to encourage a strengthening of the reduction target to 50% below 2013 levels (which had previously been set at just 26%), however, the government eventually decided on a less ambitious 46% reduction target along with an unofficial goal to aim to reduce emissions by 50%. It is encouraging to see that the government has now codified into law its commitment for the economy to be carbon-neutral (net zero) by 2050. We are also pleased to announce that LGIM is now part of the **'Japan Climate Leaders' Partnership'** (JCLP), and look forward to collaborating with the group on Japanese climate related policy.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

## ACGA Japan Working Group

LGIM has been a member of the Asian Corporate Governance Association (ACGA), an independent research and advocacy non-profit membership organisation based in Hong Kong, since 2012. This year, Aina Fukuda, who leads LGIM's stewardship efforts in Japan, was appointed deputy chair of the ACGA Japan Working Group (JWG). The JWG is a sub-group of ACGA investor members comprised of professionals committed to advancing corporate governance and stewardship in Japan on behalf of their organisations. The JWG comprises 29 ACGA member organisations with global assets under management of more than US\$20tn (as of December 2020).

During her two-year term, Aina will represent LGIM and work with ACGA and the JWG chair to advance JWG's engagement with regulators, listed companies and other key stakeholders in Japan. Since her appointment, JWG members have identified corporate engagements on board independence, diversity, and capital management (e.g. cross-shareholdings) as a key priority for the group. Other JWG meetings during this quarter involved knowledge sharing as well as constructive dialogue between JWG members and Japanese companies, proxy advisers, and NGOs.





## Australia

LGIM responded to a [Treasury consultation](#) that is reviewing the regulatory regime for proxy advice and looking to introduce reforms that reportedly encourage greater transparency in the system. This consultation was similar to that of the SEC in the US in 2019, a proposal to which LGIM strongly opposed. In the US, the SEC has announced the ruling will be revisited. We encouraged the Treasury in Australia not to proceed with the proposal highlighting: i) that proxy advisers are agents of investors, not issuers; ii) research must be independent; iii) investors take the final decision on voting; and iv) that investors already publicly publish voting reports, engagements, and voting policies on their websites. We will closely follow this proposal going forward.




## Global

### G7

In June, world leaders gathered at the G7 meeting in Cornwall, UK. While there was a lot on the agenda, we felt there were some very positive signals for the 'ESG space', specifically: i) the political ambition and alignment on climate change and biodiversity (ahead of both COPs later this year); ii) ESG disclosures; iii) corporate tax standards; iv) anti-microbial resistance; and v) financing the transition to low carbon economies in emerging markets. Please see our [blog](#) for further details.

**There were some very positive signals for the 'ESG space' at the G7 meeting in June 2021.**



\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

\*References to any security are for illustrative purposes only.

### Tax

This quarter has seen some big moves in our desires to see greater transparency on tax and a fairer tax system. As mentioned above, in June the G7 committed to set a global minimum corporate tax rate of at least 15%, and to take it forward with the G20. We have also lent our support, alongside other investors, to proposed legislation in [Europe](#) and [the US](#) which would mandate country by country tax reporting for multinational companies.

### Climate change

In June, LGIM joined the 2021 [Global Investor Statement](#) to governments on the climate crisis. The statement was coordinated by The Investor Agenda and represents 457 investors with more than US\$41tn in assets under management and custody. The statement sets out five actions that governments need to urgently take steps on: i) strengthening National Determined Contributions (NDC) for 2030 and in-line with limiting warming to 1.5 degrees centigrade; ii) commit to mid-century net zero targets with decarbonisation roadmaps; iii) strengthen pre-2030 policy actions e.g. phase out fossil-fuel subsidies; iv) ensure COVID-19 recovery plans support the transition to net zero; and v) mandate climate risk disclosures e.g. TCFD. LGIM is also: i) preparing a response to the FSB's consultation on establishing cross-sectorial TCFD metrics; and ii) working with a collaborative group of investors to push for a greater focus and action on micro-fibre pollution.

### Agriculture

Continuing our focus on ensuring that policymakers strengthen their focus and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) emitted by the agriculture sector – see our previous engagement on [EU Common Agricultural Policy](#) when we met with the Commission to discuss and spoke about during closing remarks [of this event](#) – we have joined a collaborative with the [FAIRR Initiative](#) titled 'Where is the Beef'. The [investor statement](#) is urging all G20 nation to enact ambitious policies and to publicly disclose effective targets for GHG reductions in the agriculture sector within or alongside their NDCs commitments at COP26. If well managed, the sector can actually serve as a 'carbon sink'. The statement has received strong support from the former secretary-general of the UNs, Ban Ki-Moon, and was [picked up](#) in the media.


# Regional updates

## UK - Q2 2021 voting summary

Page 57

Proposal category	Total for	Total against	Total abstentions
Anti-takeover related	215	0	0
Capitalisation	1077	53	0
Directors related	2150	176	0
Non-Salary compensation	332	157	0
Reorganisation and mergers	26	6	0
Routine/Business	1312	19	0
Shareholder Proposal - Compensation	1	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Corporate governance	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Directors related	2	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - General economic issues	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Health/Environment	2	1	0
Shareholder Proposal - Other/Miscellaneous	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Routine/Business	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social/Human rights	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social	0	0	0
Total	5117	412	0
Total resolutions		5529	
No. AGMs		295	
No. EGMs		42	
No. of companies voted on		314	
No. of companies where voted against management/abstained on at least one resolution		173	
% of companies where at least one vote against management (includes abstentions)		55%	

### Votes against management



### Number of companies voted for/against management



■ No. of companies where we supported management  
■ No. of companies where we voted against management


**LGIM voted against at least one resolution at 55% of UK companies over the quarter.**



## Europe - Q2 2021 voting summary

Proposal category	Total for	Total against	Total abstentions
Anti-takeover related	4	8	0
Capitalisation	684	89	0
Directors related	2118	502	12
Non-Salary compensation	689	409	2
Reorganisation and mergers	57	3	0
Routine/Business	1692	128	3
Shareholder Proposal - Compensation	2	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Corporate governance	4	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Directors related	19	23	0
Shareholder Proposal - General economic issues	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Health/Environment	1	2	0
Shareholder Proposal - Other/Miscellaneous	1	1	0
Shareholder Proposal - Routine/Business	6	1	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social/Human rights	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social	0	0	0
Total	5277	1166	17
Total resolutions		6460	
No. AGMs		322	
No. EGMs		11	
No. of companies voted on		325	
No. of companies where voted against management/abstained on at least one resolution		281	
% of companies where at least one vote against management (includes abstentions)		86%	

### Votes against management



### Number of companies voted for/against management



■ No. of companies where we supported management  
■ No. of companies where we voted against management


**LGIM voted against at least one resolution at 86% of European companies over the quarter.**



## North America - Q2 2021 voting summary

Proposal category	Total for	Total against	Total abstentions
Anti-takeover related	59	1	0
Capitalisation	53	7	0
Directors related	3813	1187	5
Non-Salary compensation	423	245	0
Reorganisation and mergers	12	1	0
Routine/Business	310	263	0
Shareholder Proposal - Compensation	4	16	0
Shareholder Proposal - Corporate governance	16	14	0
Shareholder Proposal - Directors related	62	70	0
Shareholder Proposal - General economic issues	0	1	0
Shareholder Proposal - Health/Environment	6	34	0
Shareholder Proposal - Other/Miscellaneous	5	61	0
Shareholder Proposal - Routine/Business	2	27	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social/Human rights	0	6	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social	13	5	0
Total	4778	1938	5
Total resolutions	6721		
No. AGMs	520		
No. EGMs	10		
No. of companies voted on	526		
No. of companies where voted against management/abstained on at least one resolution	508		
% of companies where at least one vote against management (includes abstentions)	97%		

### Votes against management



### Number of companies voted for/against management




**LGIM voted against at least one resolution at 97% of North American companies over the quarter.**




## Japan - Q2 2021 voting summary

Proposal category	Total for	Total against	Total abstentions
Anti-takeover related	0	6	0
Capitalisation	1	0	0
Directors related	3614	606	0
Non-Salary compensation	209	22	0
Reorganisation and mergers	77	21	0
Routine/Business	267	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Compensation	1	8	0
Shareholder Proposal - Corporate governance	1	1	0
Shareholder Proposal - Directors related	23	2	0
Shareholder Proposal - General economic issues	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Health/Environment	38	6	0
Shareholder Proposal - Other/Miscellaneous	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Routine/Business	17	4	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social/Human rights	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social	0	0	0
Total	4248	676	0
Total resolutions	4924		
No. AGMs	396		
No. EGMs	3		
No. of companies voted on	399		
No. of companies where voted against management/abstained on at least one resolution	307		
% of companies where at least one vote against management (includes abstentions)	77%		

### Votes against management



### Number of companies voted for/against management



**LGIM voted against at least one resolution at 77% of Japanese companies over the quarter.**




## Asia Pacific - Q2 2021 voting summary


Page 59

Proposal category	Total for	Total against	Total abstentions
Anti-takeover related	4	0	0
Capitalisation	137	107	0
Directors related	371	149	5
Non-Salary compensation	25	53	0
Reorganisation and mergers	41	1	0
Routine/Business	259	30	0
Shareholder Proposal - Compensation	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Corporate governance	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Directors related	0	16	0
Shareholder Proposal - General economic issues	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Health/Environment	1	5	0
Shareholder Proposal - Other/Miscellaneous	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Routine/Business	0	3	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social/Human rights	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social	0	0	0
Total	838	364	5
Total resolutions		1207	
No. AGMs		117	
No. EGMs		25	
No. of companies voted on		131	
No. of companies where voted against management/abstained on at least one resolution		104	
% of companies where at least one vote against management (includes abstentions)		79%	

### Votes against management



### Number of companies voted for/against management




**LGIM voted against at least one resolution at 79% of Asia Pacific companies over the quarter.**




## Emerging markets - Q2 2021 voting summary

Proposal category	Total for	Total against	Total abstentions
Anti-takeover related	1	0	0
Capitalisation	1954	371	0
Directors related	4080	1239	356
Non-Salary compensation	133	368	0
Reorganisation and mergers	1761	475	0
Routine/Business	6506	457	0
Shareholder Proposal - Compensation	8	20	0
Shareholder Proposal - Corporate governance	19	82	0
Shareholder Proposal - Directors related	86	570	15
Shareholder Proposal - General economic issues	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Health/Environment	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Other/Miscellaneous	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Routine/Business	20	129	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social/Human rights	0	0	0
Shareholder Proposal - Social	0	0	0
Total	14568	3711	371
Total resolutions		18650	
No. AGMs		1110	
No. EGMs		323	
No. of companies voted on		1142	
No. of companies where voted against management/abstained on at least one resolution		826	
% of companies where at least one vote against management (includes abstentions)		72%	

### Votes against management



### Number of companies voted for/against management



**LGIM voted against at least one resolution at 72% of emerging market companies over the quarter.**




### Global - Q2 2021 voting summary

Proposal category	Total for	Total against	Total abstentions	Total
Anti-takeover related	283	15	0	298
Capitalisation	3906	627	0	4533
Directors related	16146	3859	378	20383
Non-Salary compensation	1811	1254	2	3067
Reorganisation and mergers	1974	507	0	2481
Routine/Business	10346	897	3	11246
Shareholder Proposal - Compensation	16	44	0	60
Shareholder Proposal - Corporate governance	40	97	0	137
Shareholder Proposal - Directors related	192	681	15	888
Shareholder Proposal - General economic issues	0	1	0	1
Shareholder Proposal - Health/Environment	48	48	0	96
Shareholder Proposal - Other/Miscellaneous	6	62	0	68
Shareholder Proposal - Routine/Business	45	164	0	209
Shareholder Proposal - Social/Human rights	0	6	0	6
Shareholder Proposal - Social	13	5	0	18
Total resolutions	34826	8267	398	43491
No. AGMs				2760
No. EGMs				414
No. of companies voted on				2837
No. of companies where voted against management/abstained on at least one resolution				2199
% of companies where at least one vote against management (includes abstentions)				78%

Page 60

% of companies with at least one vote against (includes abstentions)



Number of companies voted for/against management



# Global engagement summary



In Q2 2021, the Investment Stewardship team held

112



engagements

with

91



companies

(vs. 234 engagements with 216 companies last quarter)


## Breaking down the engagement numbers

### Breakdown of engagement by themes




Page 61

### Top five engagement topics\*




\*Note: an engagement can cover more than a single topic

### Regional breakdown of engagements



### Engagement type



## Contact us

For further information about LGIM, please visit [lgim.com](http://lgim.com) or contact your usual LGIM representative



### Important information

Views expressed are of Legal & General Investment Management Limited as at June 2021.

The information contained in this document (the 'Information') has been prepared by LGIM Managers Europe Limited ('LGIM Europe'), or by its affiliates ('Legal & General', 'we' or 'us'). Such Information is the property and/or confidential information of Legal & General and may not be disclosed by you to any other person without the prior written consent of Legal & General.

No party shall have any right of action against Legal & General in relation to the accuracy or completeness of the Information, or any other written or oral information made available in connection with this publication. Any investment advice that we provide to you is based solely on the limited initial information which you have provided to us. No part of this or any other document or presentation provided by us shall be deemed to constitute 'proper advice' for the purposes of the Investment Intermediaries Act 1995 (as amended). Any limited initial advice given relating to professional services will be further discussed and negotiated in order to agree formal investment guidelines which will form part of written contractual terms between the parties.

Past performance is no guarantee of future results. The value of an investment and any income taken from it is not guaranteed and can go down as well as up; you may not get back the amount you originally invested.

The Information has been produced for use by a professional investor and their advisors only. It should not be distributed without our permission.

The risks associated with each fund or investment strategy are set out in this publication, its KIID, the relevant prospectus or investment management agreement (as applicable) and these should be read and understood before making any investment decisions. A copy of the relevant documentation can be obtained from your Client Relationship Manager.

### Confidentiality and limitations:

Unless otherwise agreed by Legal & General in writing, the Information in this document (a) is for information purposes only and we are not soliciting any action based on it, and (b) is not a recommendation to buy or sell securities or pursue a particular investment strategy; and (c) is not investment, legal, regulatory or tax advice. Any trading or investment decisions taken by you should be based on your own analysis and judgment (and/or that of your professional advisors) and not in reliance on us or the Information. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we exclude all representations, warranties, conditions, undertakings and all other terms of any kind, implied by statute or common law, with respect to the Information including (without limitation) any representations as to the quality, suitability, accuracy or completeness of the Information.

Any projections, estimates or forecasts included in the Information (a) shall not constitute a guarantee of future events, (b) may not consider or reflect all possible future events or conditions relevant to you (for example, market disruption events); and (c) may be based on assumptions or simplifications that may not be relevant to you.

The Information is provided 'as is' and 'as available'. To the fullest extent permitted by law, Legal & General accepts no liability to you or any other recipient of the Information for any loss, damage or cost arising from, or in connection with, any use or reliance on the Information. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Legal & General does not accept any liability for any indirect, special or consequential loss howsoever caused and, on any theory, or liability, whether in contract or tort (including negligence) or otherwise, even if Legal & General has been advised of the possibility of such loss.

### Third party data:

Where this document contains third party data ('Third Party Data'), we cannot guarantee the accuracy, completeness or reliability of such Third-Party Data and accept no responsibility or liability whatsoever in respect of such Third-Party Data.

### Publication, amendments and updates:

We are under no obligation to update or amend the Information or correct any errors in the Information following the date it was delivered to you. Legal & General reserves the right to update this document and/or the Information at any time and without notice.

Although the Information contained in this document is believed to be correct as at the time of printing or publication, no assurance can be given to you that this document is complete or accurate in the light of information that may become available after its publication. The Information may not take into account any relevant events, facts or conditions that have occurred after the publication or printing of this document.

### Telephone recording:

As required under applicable laws Legal & General will record all telephone and electronic communications and conversations with you that result or may result in the undertaking of transactions in financial instruments on your behalf. Such records will be kept for a period of five years (or up to seven years upon request from the Central Bank of Ireland (or such successor from time to time)) and will be provided to you upon request.

In the United Kingdom and outside the European Economic Area, it is issued by Legal & General Investment Management Limited, authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, No. 119272. Registered in England and Wales No. 02091894 with registered office at One Coleman Street, London, EC2R 5AA.

In the European Economic Area, it is issued by LGIM Managers (Europe) Limited, authorised by the Central Bank of Ireland as a UCITS management company (pursuant to European Communities (Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities) Regulations, 2011 (S.I. No. 352 of 2011), as amended) and as an alternative investment fund manager with "top up" permissions which enable the firm to carry out certain additional MiFID investment services (pursuant to the European Union (Alternative Investment Fund Managers) Regulations 2013 (S.I. No. 257 of 2013), as amended). Registered in Ireland with the Companies Registration Office (No. 609677). Registered Office: 33/34 Sir John Rogerson's Quay, Dublin, 2, Ireland. Regulated by the Central Bank of Ireland (No. C173733).

LGIM Managers (Europe) Limited operates a branch network in the European Economic Area, which is subject to supervision by the Central Bank of Ireland. In Italy, the branch office of LGIM Managers (Europe) Limited is subject to limited supervision by the Commissione Nazionale per le società e la Borsa ("CONSOB") and is registered with Banca d'Italia (no. 23978.0) with registered office at Via Uberto Visconti di Modrone, 15, 20122 Milan, (Companies' Register no. MI - 2557936). In Germany, the branch office of LGIM Managers (Europe) Limited is subject to limited supervision by the German Federal Financial Supervisory Authority ("BaFin"). In the Netherlands, the branch office of LGIM Managers (Europe) Limited is subject to limited supervision by the Dutch Authority for the Financial Markets ("AFM") and it is included in the register held by the AFM and registered with the trade register of the Chamber of Commerce under number 74481231. Details about the full extent of our relevant authorisations and permissions are available from us upon request. For further information on our products (including the product prospectuses), please visit our website.

© 2021 Legal & General Investment Management Limited. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying and recording, without the written permission of the publishers.

D001604

This page is intentionally left blank

# **PENSIONS BOARD**

**Work Plan 2021/22**

**September 21**

Date of Meeting	Title of Report	In-line with PB Terms of Reference (no.)
November 2021		
	Member Training – Update on Hymans Academy	55j
	Member Training – Renewable Energy Infrastructure Training – Quinbrook Infrastructure Partners	55j
	Receive Pensions Committee agenda and meeting minutes	55a
	Governance Review Update (verbal)	55a
	Administration and LGPS Quarterly Update	55c & 56b
	Review of Risk Management Policy and Risk Register	55b, 5656f
	Quarterly Voting and Engagement Update	56j
	Update on Pension Fund Accounts and Audit Plan (verbal)	55l, 55m & 56e
	London CIV Changes	
March 2022		
	Member Training – triennial valuation	55j
	Receive Pensions Committee agenda and meeting minutes	55a
	Receive Pensions Committee meeting papers	55a
	Administration and LGPS Quarterly Update	55c
	Review of Risk Management Policy and Risk Register	55b, 56f
	Quarterly Voting and Engagement Update	56j
	Review Draft Audit Plan	56e & 55i
	Review of Pension Fund Customer Services Survey	56a
	Pension Fund Work Plan 2022/23	55i & 55j
	Cost Management Report	55o
June 2022		
	Member Training	55j

	Manager Invite – to be agreed	
	Receive Pensions Committee agenda and meeting minutes	55a
	Receive Pensions Committee meeting papers	55a
	Administration and LGPS Quarterly Update	55c & 56b
	Review of Risk Management Policy and Risk Register	56f
	Quarterly Voting and Engagement Update	56j
	Receive and review The Pensions Regulator Code of Practice – TPR Checklist	55a-55e
	Review Draft Account, Fund Annual Report and Audit Plan	55l, 55m & 56e
	Governance Compliance Review	55d
	Pension Fund Work Plan 2021/22	55i & 55j
	Annual report of breaches	55e, 55g
September 2022		
	Member Training	55j
	Receive Pensions Committee agenda and meeting minutes	55a
	Receive Pensions Committee meeting papers	55a
	Administration and LGPS Quarterly Update	55c & 56b
	Review of Risk Management Policy and Risk Register	56f
	Quarterly Voting and Engagement Update	56j
	Communications Strategy and Policy Statement	55e, 55i
	Pensions and Cyber Risk	56f, 56g, 55b
	The Pensions Regulator (TPR) Single Code Consultation Update	55i
	Review Draft Account, Fund Annual Report and Audit Plan	55l, 55m & 56e
	Board work plan	55i, 55j

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 8.2

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 8.3

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank