Implementation Statement

Servier Laboratories Limited Pension Fund (the “Fund”)

Fund Year End – 31 March 2026

The purpose of the Implementation Statement (“IS”) is for us, the Trustees of the Servier Laboratories Limited Pension Fund (the “Trustees”), to explain what we have done during the year ending 31 March 2026 to implement our policies and achieve our objectives as set out in the Statement of Investment Principles (“SIP”).

It includes:

1. A summary of any review and changes made to the SIP over the year
2. How our policies in the SIP have been followed during the year; and
3. How we have exercised our voting rights or how these rights have been exercised on our behalf, including the use of any proxy voting advisory services.

This IS covers both the DB and DC Sections of the Fund.

Our conclusion

Based on the activity we have undertaken during the year, we believe that the policies set out in the SIP have been implemented effectively.

We delegate the management of the Fund’s DC assets to our fiduciary manager Aon Investments Limited (“AIL”). In respect of the DB assets, over the year the assets were initially invested in funds managed by AIL, however, we transitioned the DB assets to the Insight Investment Management. Based on the information we have been provided with, we are comfortable with the management and the monitoring of Environmental, Social and Governance (“ESG”) integration and stewardship of the underlying managers that has been carried out on our behalf, and that this aligns with our policies and expectations. We also believe that the material underlying investment managers appointed by AIL were able to disclose good evidence of voting and engagement activity and that our voting rights have been implemented effectively on our behalf.

Changes to the SIP over the year to 31 March 2026

The Trustees have a policy to review the SIP formally at least every three years, or after any significant change in investment policy or member demographics.

The SIP was updated during the year to reflect changes in the investment strategy and investment manager for the DB assets. We consulted with the sponsor when making these changes and obtained written advice from our investment adviser.

Post year end we made a further update to the SIP to reflect a change in the investment strategy and our decision to purchase a bulk annuity policy ("Annuity Policy") with Just Group (the "Insurer") to insure the DB liabilities of the Fund alongside the changes to DC Section's default investment strategy made by Aon Investments Limited, AIL, (the "Fiduciary Manager").

The Fund's latest SIP (effective 20 July 2026) can be found here: https://www.servier.co.uk/about-servier-uk/

How the policies in the SIP have been followed

The Trustees outline a number of key objectives and policies in their SIP. These are noted in *blue* below[1], together with an explanation of how these objectives and policies have been met and adhered to over the course of the year to 31 March 2026. All Section numbers follow those set out in the SIP in place as at 31 March 2026.

1. <u>Defined Contribution (DC) Section</u>

1.1 Objectives and policy for securing objectives

The Trustees' investment objective is to make available a range of pooled investment funds which serve to meet the varying investment needs and risk tolerance of the Fund's members. In particular, the Trustees aim to provide investment options that allow members:

- *To maximise the value of their assets at retirement;*
- *To maintain the purchasing power of their savings in real (i.e. post-inflation) terms; and*
- *To provide protection for accumulated assets in the years approaching retirement against:*
  - *Sudden (downward) volatility in the capital value*
  - *Fluctuations in the cost of securing an income and / or cash in retirement*

The Trustees have provided members with a range of investment choices over the course of the year. For members who do not wish to make an active investment decision, a default lifestyle arrangement is in place which gradually moves members from higher risk, growth seeking assets to lower risk capital preservation assets as they approach retirement. In addition, 12 self-select funds are available which members can choose from depending on their risk appetite and if they are comfortable making their own investment decisions.

The investment strategy of the default investment option is managed by the Trustees' fiduciary manager, AIL. This strategy invests members' assets in higher-risk growth assets up to 15 years before a member's retirement to help maximise the value of assets at retirement. The strategy then moves into inflation linked assets and lower risk assets to help reduce volatility and protect against fluctuations on the cost of securing an income in retirement.

The Trustees receive and review quarterly monitoring reports from their fiduciary manager. The reports provide both short and long-term fund performance on the default strategy and all other self-select funds. These reviews did not raise concern over the adequacy of the investment strategy to meet the Trustees' objectives stated above.

The Trustees are comfortable that they have met this objective over the year.

[1]Wording taken from the Fund's SIP may have been summarised or shortened for the purposes of this document. A link to the SIP is provided earlier in this document.

1.2 Investment Policy:

1.2.1 Strategic Management

The Trustees will regularly review the appropriateness of the three asset allocation strategies, taking into account any significant changes in the demographic profile of the relevant members, and may make changes to fund choice from time to time. Members will be advised accordingly of any changes.

The current asset allocation strategies were put into place in December 2017 following a review that started in 2015. A further review of the investment strategy was carried out in 2020, and then again in 2023. The Trustees met this objective by commissioning the review and decided that the asset allocation strategies remained appropriate and that no changes should be made at that time. Post year end, the Trustees have undertaken an investment strategy review in 2026. Additionally, the Trustees regularly review the self-select range of funds.

The Fiduciary Manager also reviews the funds on an ongoing basis and following the latest review of the Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds completed in December 2024, AIL de-risked those Funds approaching their target dates in line with the original plan over the first half of 2025. Further changes were made in July and August 2025 to introduce a 10% medium term tactical allocation to long-dated nominal gilts within the growth phase reflecting the relatively attractive yields available on long dated nominal gilts.

1.2.2 Day-to-day management

The Trustees invest the main assets of the Defined Contribution Section of the Fund in funds managed by the Fiduciary Manager. The Trustees are satisfied that the spread of underlying managers and assets classes selected by the Fiduciary Manager's provide adequate diversification of investments.

The Trustees have regard to the suitability of the investment funds described above through periodic strategy and performance review. The Trustees expect the Fiduciary Manager of the funds to have regard to the suitability of the investment contained within each fund in accordance with each fund's investment aims.

The Trustees consider that they have met this objective through review of quarterly monitoring reports, which includes details on fund allocations and performance, from the Fiduciary Manager, in addition to the most recent investment strategy review completed over 2023, and ongoing review of the underlying funds by the Fiduciary Manager. The Trustees have completed a further review of the investment strategy post year end.

1.3 The balance between difference kinds of investments

The Trustees recognise that the key source of financial risk in relation to meeting its objectives normally arises from the choice of funds offered to members and is mindful of the fact that holding all the Defined Contribution assets in a traditional balanced fund could involve too high a level of investment risk for members approaching retirement. As a result, the Trustees implement a "lifestyle" default strategy for the Defined Contribution Section. Members are, however, able to choose a different strategy if they so wish. The Trustees retain responsibility for choosing the funds available and take advice as required from its professional advisers.

The Trustees consider that they have met this objective through review of the quarterly monitoring reports from the Fiduciary Manager, in addition to the most recent investment strategy review completed over 2023 and ongoing review of the underlying funds by the Fiduciary Manager. The Trustees have completed a further review of the investment strategy post year end.

1.4 Investment risk measurement and management

The Trustees recognise that members take the investment risk and the Trustees manage this risk through the selection and monitoring of investment performance and the choice of funds offered to members. The Trustees also monitor the continued appropriateness of the default strategy for the membership.

The Trustees consider that they have met this objective through review of the quarterly monitoring reports and regular review of the self-select range. The Fiduciary Manager also reviews the funds on an ongoing basis and following the latest review of the Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds completed in December 2024, AIL de-risked those Funds approaching their target dates in line with the original plan over the first half of 2025. Further changes were made in July and August 2025 by the Fiduciary Manager to introduce a 10% medium term tactical allocation to long-dated nominal gilts within the growth phase to increase the return for members, with a similar or slightly lower level of risk.

1.5 Illiquid Investment Policy

The Trustees hold illiquid investments on behalf of the Scheme's DC members who are invested in the Default Option. Whilst the Trustees recognise that illiquid investments may be associated with higher costs and liquidity risks, they nevertheless believe that access to an illiquidity premium should benefit members long-term. Any decision by the Fiduciary Manager to increase the allocation to illiquid investments, including unlisted equity, would only be made if it was expected to improve the expected risk and return profile for members, net of all charges. This is an area that the Trustees keep under regular review and would form part of any future investment strategy review.

The Trustees are comfortable that they have met this objective over the year.

2. Defined Benefit (DB) Section

2.1 Investment objectives

The Trustees recognise that the key objective is to maximise the probability that the Fund is able to provide all of the benefits due to members. They recognise that the investment strategy should take account of the principal employer's interests in respect of the size and incidence of contributions required to meet these liabilities, whilst considering the Fund's liabilities, the strength of the sponsoring employer covenant and the risk capacity and appetite of the Trustees and sponsoring employer. In particular, the agreed overall objective is set to an investment strategy that minimises the volatility on a solvency basis.

Over the year, the Trustee transitioned from their previous investment manager, AIL, to a newly appointed investment manager, Insight Investment Management Limited ("Insight"), in order to adopt an investment strategy with the overall objective of minimising the volatility on a solvency basis.

Following the Fund's year end, the Trustees agreed to purchase an Annuity Policy from the Insurer for the DB Section, which insures the liabilities of the DB Section.

2.2 Investment Strategy

The key principles of the asset allocation strategy to meet the Fund's objective are as follows:

• Hedging 95% of the interest rate risk of the Fund's estimated solvency liabilities. Practically this is achieved by investing in a portfolio of matching assets e.g. UK Gilts.

• Appropriate allocation to investment grade credit based on market conditions.

The Trustees reviewed the allocation regularly at the Trustees' meetings and believe that the strategy has helped to protect the DB section's Solvency funding level. Following year end, the Trustees agreed to purchase an Annuity Policy from the Insurer and now receives an amount equal to the pension payments for the members covered by the policy. This insurance contract is an asset of the DB Section of the Fund, and the corresponding pension liability remains within the DB Section of the Fund.

2.3 Choosing investments

The types of investments held and the balance between them is deemed appropriate given the liability profile of the Fund, its cashflow requirements, the funding level of the Fund and the Trustees' objectives.

Assets held to cover the liabilities of the Fund are invested in a manner appropriate to the nature and duration of the expected future retirement benefits payable under the Fund.

The Trustees monitor the level of self-investment by the Fund on a periodic basis and are satisfied that at the current time there is negligible self-investment.

The Trustees reviewed the investment strategy over the year, transitioning to a strategy expected to broadly match the Solvency liabilities of the DB section, in July 2025.

Over the year the investment strategy has provided the Fund with a portfolio that has met the objectives and has a sufficient level of diversification to meet the Fund's requirements.

The Trustees also monitor the level of self-investment annually through the reporting requirements of the Trustees' Report and Accounts. The Trustees therefore consider that they have met this objective over the year.

Following year end, the Trustees agreed to purchase an Annuity Policy with the Insurer.

2.4 The balance between different kinds of investments

The Trustees recognise that the key source of financial risk in relation to meeting its objectives arises from asset allocation. The Trustees retain responsibility for setting the Fund's overall asset allocation and takes advice as required from its adviser.

The Trustees review their investment strategy in conjunction with each formal actuarial valuation of the Fund, or more frequently should the circumstances of the Fund change in a material way.

The Trustees consider they have met this objective over the year. The Fund's investment strategy was reviewed over the year with the Trustees deciding to further reduce risk within the investment strategy and implement a strategy that closely matched the Solvency liabilities.

Following year end, the Trustees agreed to purchase an Annuity Policy with the Insurer

2.5 Investment risk measurement and management

The key investment risks are recognised as arising from investment strategy, employer failure and investment managers.

Following initial results of the 31 March 2025 actuarial valuation of the fund, the Trustees worked with their investment adviser to reduce risk in the investment strategy, lowering the target investment objective from gilts+1.2% p.a. initially to gilts+1.0% p.a. and then a strategy that is designed to match the Fund's Solvency liabilities.

During the year, the Trustees monitored employer covenant risk through regular updates from the Company and were not notified of any events that would have affected the employer's creditworthiness or required a review of the Fund's investment strategy.

The Trustees also monitor the performance of the Insight funds versus the Fund's investment objective and against their individual benchmarks/targets on a regular basis.

Therefore, the Trustees consider they have met this objective over the year.

2.6 Expected returns on assets

Over the long term the Trustees' expectations are:

- *for the "matching" assets (i.e. the LDI funds) to achieve a rate of return which is broadly in line with changes in the valuation of the Fund's liabilities due to changes in interest rates*
- *for the "credit" assets (i.e. the synthetic credit fund) to further reduce the volatility in the Fund's solvency deficit; and*
- *for the assets as a whole to provide projected returns in line with the Fund's estimated solvency liabilities.*

The Trustees are comfortable that the returns on assets were as expected over the year.

3. <u>Both Sections</u>

3.1 Realisation of investments/liquidity

The Trustees recognise that there is a risk in holding assets that cannot be easily realised should the need arise. Units in the funds in which the Fund invests may normally be bought and sold on a daily basis and hence the Trustees are satisfied with the liquidity of the Fund's investments.

A working balance of cash is held for imminent payment of benefits, expenses, etc. Under normal circumstances, it is not the Trustees' intention to hold a significant cash balance and this is monitored by the Fund's administrator. Additionally, the assets invested in within the DB section are liquid and daily dealing, with the underlying investments sufficiently liquid from the Trustees' perspective.

3.2 Environmental, Social and Governance considerations

In setting the Fund's DB and DC investment strategies, the Trustees' primary concern is to act in the best financial interests of the Fund's beneficiaries, seeking the best return that is consistent with a prudent and appropriate level of risk. This includes the risk that environmental, social and governance factors including climate change negatively impact the value of investments held if not understood and evaluated properly.

For the DB strategy, the Trustees consider this risk by taking advice from their investment adviser when setting the Fund's asset allocation, when selecting managers and when monitoring their performance.

For the DC Section, the Trustees have appointed the Fiduciary Manager to manage the Fund's DC assets and the Fiduciary Manager invests in a range of underlying investment vehicles. References in this policy to 'underlying investment managers' refers to those investment managers which the Fiduciary Manager in turn appoints to manage investments on behalf of the Trustees.

As part of the Fiduciary Manager's management of the Fund's DC assets, the Trustees expect the Fiduciary Manager to:

- *Where relevant, assess the integration of ESG factors in the investment process of underlying managers;*
- *Use its influence to engage with underlying managers to ensure the Fund's assets are not exposed to undue risk; and*
- *Report to the Trustees on its ESG activities as required.*

Within the DC default investment strategy, c.99% of the equities/real assets held up until 15 years before retirement are invested in funds with a climate / ESG focus, for example through the UBS Global Equity Climate Transition Fund, LGIM Multi Factor Equity Fund and the Aon Managed Global Impact Fund. This provides a c.75% reduction in carbon footprint (scope 1 & 2) from 2019 to 2024.

Aon, the investment adviser, provides each underlying fund with an ESG rating, either limited, integrated and advanced. The majority of passive funds are currently rated integrated, as the passive nature means that the ability to add an ESG tilt is severely limited through stock selection, so it is reliant on the investment managers using tools such as voting rights to influence corporate behaviour. The underlying funds within the Aon Managed Global Impact fund all have a rating of advanced (the highest rating), meaning the fund management team demonstrates awareness of potential ESG risks in the investment strategy and can demonstrate advanced processes to identify evaluate and potentially mitigate these risks across the entire portfolio. Additionally, the UBS Global Equity and LGIM Multi Factor Equity Funds also have a rating of advanced.

Over the year the DB strategy was invested in the Fruition range, and then LDI, cash and synthetic credit funds with Insight. The Fruition funds have a growth component with a strong focus on ESG. In particular, the respective growth components of the funds have a c.60% allocation to managers with an ESG rating of advanced. Given the nature of the LDI, cash and synthetic credit funds with Insight, ESG is less applicable to these asset classes.

The Trustees are comfortable that they have met this policy.

3.3 Stewardship – Voting and Engagement

The Trustees recognise the importance of their role as a steward of capital and the need to ensure high standards of governance and promotion of corporate responsibility in the underlying companies and assets in which the Fund invests, as this ultimately this creates long-term financial value for the Fund and its beneficiaries.

The Trustees review the stewardship activity of the investment manager of the DB assets and the Fiduciary Manager of the DC assets on an annual basis to ensure the Fund's stewardship policy is being appropriately implemented in practice. The Trustees receive annual reports on stewardship activity carried out by their Fiduciary Manager, these reports include detailed voting and engagement information from underlying asset managers.

The Trustees were able to meet this objective. Further detail is explained in the Voting and Engagement section below.

3.4 Members' Views and Non-Financial Factors

In setting and implementing the Fund's investment strategy (for both DB and DC) the Trustees do not explicitly take into account the views of Fund members and beneficiaries in relation to ethical considerations, social and environmental impact, or present and future quality of life matters (defined as "non-financial factors").

For DC members, the Trustees have made the Ethical and Islamic funds available to members who would like to invest in funds with these specific considerations. The underlying funds that make up the default fund and other self-select funds should not apply personal ethical or moral judgements as the sole basis for an investment decision.

The Trustees are comfortable that this policy has been met over the year.

3.5 Arrangements with Investment Managers

The Trustees have appointed AIL as their Fiduciary Manager, who they consider to be their investment manager. References in this Statement to 'underlying investment managers' refer to those investment managers which AIL in turn appoints to manage investments on behalf of the Trustees. The Trustees recognise that the arrangements with their Fiduciary Manager, and correspondingly the underlying investment managers, are important to ensure that interests are aligned. In particular, the Trustees seek to ensure that the Fiduciary Manager is incentivised to operate in a manner that generates the best long-term results for the Fund and its beneficiaries.

The Trustees receive regular reports from the Fiduciary Manager on various items including the investment strategy, performance, and longer-term positioning of the portfolio. The Trustees focus on longer-term performance when considering the ongoing suitability of the investment strategy in relation to the Fund objectives, and assess the Fiduciary Manager over 3-year periods.

The Trustees also receive annual stewardship reports on the monitoring and engagement activities carried out by their Fiduciary Manager, which supports the Trustees in determining the extent to which the Fund's engagement policy has been followed throughout the year.

The Trustees share the policies, as set out in this Statement, with the Fund's Fiduciary Manager and request that they review and confirm whether their approach is in alignment with the Trustees' policies.

The Trustees delegate the ongoing monitoring of underlying investment managers to the Fiduciary Manager. The Fiduciary Manager monitors the Fund's investments to consider the extent to which the investment strategy and decisions of the underlying investment managers are aligned with the investment objectives of the Fund.

For the DB Section, the Trustees regularly monitor the Fund's investments to consider the extent to which the investment strategy and decisions of the investment manager are aligned with the Trustees' policies, including those on non-financial matters.

Aon's investment manager research team meets the underlying managers on a regular basis to assess changes in investment staff, process, risk management and other evaluation factors to ascertain whether the overall rating assigned to the fund remains appropriate and the manager remains suitable to manage the assets. Awareness of potential ESG risks in the investment strategy is also considered as part of monitoring and assigning the overall rating to the fund. Specifically, and as noted above, AIL meets with each of the underlying managers on a six-monthly basis to carry out a session focused on ESG.

The Trustees receive quarterly monitoring reports from AIL summarising the investment strategy, performance and longer-term positioning of the portfolio. The investment adviser provides a summary of these reports at Trustees' meetings.

The Trustees also receive annual stewardship reports from AIL. These provide a summary of AIL's engagement activity as well as voting and engagement statistics for the underlying managers.

For the DB Section, the Trustees receive reports and verbal updates from the investment adviser and investment manager on various items including the investment strategy and performance.

The Trustees are comfortable that these policies have been met over the year.

3.6 Monitoring of Investment Manager Costs

For the DC Section, the Trustees collect information on member-borne costs and charges on an annual basis, where available, and sets these out in the Plan's Annual Chair's Statement regarding DC Governance (the "Annual Chair's Statement"), which is made available to members in a publicly accessible location.

For the DB Section, the Trustees evaluated the performance of their investment managers on a net of fees basis.

3.7 Effective Decision Making

The Trustees recognise that decisions should be taken only by persons or organisations with the skills, information and resources necessary to take them effectively. They also recognise that where they take investment decisions, they must have sufficient expertise and appropriate training to be able to evaluate critically any advice received.

The Trustees are aware of the importance of considering diversity and inclusion in investment decisions.

As at 31 March 2026, the Trustee board was made up of three Trustees with varying skill sets. With the exception of one Trustee, all Trustees are also members of the Fund.

The Trustees have a formal training policy in place that was updated over the Scheme year. Under this policy all Trustees are required to complete the Pensions Regulator's online training and must attend formal or informal training totalling a minimum of 15 hours each year. When a Trustee has not been appointed for the full Scheme year, the minimum number of hours is reduced to reflect this. Each Trustee is required to maintain a training log detailing attendance of both internal and external training courses. The training log is for the period 1 April to 31 March. Training logs are submitted to the Chair of Trustees who checks that the required level of training has been met. The Chair of Trustees is happy to report that all Trustees had exceeded the required level of training during the period 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026.

As part of the annual assessment (completed July 2025), the Chair concluded the Trustee Board is well diversified, with a good range of experience and skills and all Trustees are given equal opportunity to raise their views during meetings. Member Nominated Trustee communication has been updated to make it clear that the Board will take into account any changes that need to be made to the running of Trustees' meetings to ensure that this is not a barrier to interested individuals joining the Board. For example, the ability to be able to attend meetings virtually or around the timings of meetings.

Post year end, as part of the annual assessment (completed May 2026), the Chair of Trustees has identified further training areas given current ongoing focus and objectives for the year ahead.

The Trustees have engaged with their professional advisers regularly throughout the year to ensure that they exercise their functions properly and take professional advice where needed. In exercising their functions this has required knowledge of key scheme documents such as the Trust Deed & Rules, Trustee Report & Accounts and Member Booklet.

The Trustees are comfortable that this policy has been met over the year.

3.8 Additional Voluntary Contributions (“AVCs”) Arrangements

Some members obtain further benefits by paying Additional Voluntary Contributions (AVCs) to the Fund. The majority of members AVC assets are invested in the same funds that are utilised for the main Fund. Some assets are also invested with Scottish Widows Fund and Life Assurance Society.

From time-to-time the Trustees review the choice of investments available to members to ensure that they remain appropriate to the members' needs.

The Trustees are comfortable that this policy has been met over the year.

Our Engagement Action Plan

DC Section

1. Continue to engage with AIL as our Fiduciary manager for the DC Section. This will focus on:

   - **Transparency and Reporting:** provision of detailed reporting on AIL's engagement activities including how it has engaged on its stewardship priorities.
   - **Integration of ESG Factors:** consideration of how ESG factors are integrated into AIL's stewardship activities.
   - **Active Engagement:** we look for a continual increase in active engagement with companies. This includes proactively reaching out to company management, discussing concerns, suggesting improvements and holding companies accountable.
   - **Active collaboration:** by joining forces, investors can collectively address systemic issues and encourage positive change across industries.

2. We will invite AIL to a Trustee meeting to hear about their progress on engagement.

The implementation of our stewardship policy, including the exercise of our voting rights

Management of the Fund’s DC assets has been delegated to its fiduciary manager, AIL. For the Fund’s DB assets, these were invested in funds managed by the investment manager, AIL, until July 2025, until assets were transferred to Insight across LDI, Synthetic Credit and cash.

We have reported on the stewardship policy, including the exercise of voting rights and engagement in relation to the underlying components of the DB arrangements with AIL, on materiality grounds, as these assets were invested for more than one quarter of the year. No stewardship information is available for the investments held via Insight due to the limited applicability of stewardship to the underlying assets.

For the DC Section, AIL makes a range of investment options available for DC members to invest in including the default strategy and a wider range of self-select funds. AIL selects underlying investment managers and strategies to achieve the objective of each investment option available to members on behalf of the Trustees.

We have reviewed the stewardship activity carried out over the year by the material underlying investment managers selected by AIL and, in our view, all were able to disclose good evidence of voting and engagement activity. Based on the information provided, we are comfortable that our stewardship policy (including voting and engagement activity) has been implemented effectively over the year to 31 March 2026.

The rest of this section sets out the stewardship activities, including the exercise of our voting rights, carried out on our behalf over the year to 31 March 2026 by both AIL and the appointed underlying investment managers.

What is stewardship?

Stewardship is investors using their influence over current or potential investees/issuers, policy makers, service providers and other stakeholders to create long-term value for clients and beneficiaries leading to sustainable benefits for the economy, the environment and society.

This includes prioritising which ESG issues to focus on, **engaging** with investees/issuers, and **exercising voting rights**.

Differing ownership structures means stewardship practices often differ between asset classes.

Source: UN PRI

Our fiduciary manager's/investment manager's engagement activity

Engagement is when an investor communicates with current (or potential) investee companies or asset managers (as owners of companies) to improve their ESG practices, sustainability outcomes or public disclosure. Good engagement identifies relevant ESG issues, sets objectives, tracks results, maps escalation strategies and incorporates findings into investment decision-making.

As previously noted, management of the Fund's assets has been delegated to AIL. This includes management of the entirety of the DC Section assets, which continue to be invested through AIL's fiduciary "fund of funds" arrangements, where Aon selects the underlying investment managers on our behalf. In addition to management of the DB Section assets which invested by the investment manager AIL in a "fund of funds" arrangement. In July 2025, the DB Section assets were disinvested from the AIL funds and transitioned to Insight. However, the stewardship information relating to the underlying investment managers within the DB, AIL funds remains applicable for this statement, on materiality grounds, as assets were invested in those arrangements for over a quarter of the year

We delegate monitoring of ESG integration and stewardship of the underlying managers to AIL. We have reviewed AIL's latest annual Stewardship Report and we believe it shows that AIL is using its resources to effectively influence positive outcomes in the funds in which it invests.

Over the year, AIL held several engagement meetings with many of the underlying managers in its strategies. AIL discussed ESG integration, stewardship, climate, biodiversity and modern slavery with the investment managers. AIL provided feedback to the managers after these meetings with the aim of improving the standard of ESG integration across its portfolios.

To support these engagements, AIL maintains a set of stewardship priorities which align with their responsible investing beliefs. These priorities focus on investment stewardship, climate change transition and nature loss, combatting modern slavery and Artificial Intelligence. A summary of these priorities is provided in appendix 2.

Over the year, AIL engaged with the industry through white papers, working groups, webinars and network events, as well as responding to multiple consultations.

In 2021, AIL committed to achieve net zero emissions by 2050, with a 50% reduction by 2030 for its fully delegated clients' portfolios and defined contribution default strategies (relative to baseline year of 2019). During the year, AIL published its first report for the Taskforce on Climate Related Financial Disclosures. This showed that AIL has achieved a meaningful reduction in carbon footprint across its default strategies over the period from 2019 to 2025.

AIL also successfully renewed its signatory status to the 2020 UK Stewardship Code ("the Code"), which is a voluntary code established by the Financial Reporting Council ("FRC") that sets high standards on stewardship for asset owners, investment managers and service providers.

AIL has developed an Impact Research platform, focused on integrating ESG risk factors into the manager research process. The Impact research platform aims to help evolve AIL's view of "impact" to encompass both ethics/values-driven investing and ESG integration.

What is fiduciary management?

Fiduciary management is the delegation of some, or all, of the day-to-day investment decisions and implementation to a fiduciary manager. But the trustees still retain responsibility for setting the high-level investment strategy.

In fiduciary management arrangements, the trustees will often delegate monitoring ESG integration and asset stewardship to its fiduciary manager.

Furthermore, AIL is developing internal capabilities to integrate ESG data from multiple vendors and platforms through a "Quantamental" dashboard that provides in-depth ESG analytics for over 8,000 liquid strategies. AIL intends to expand this analysis in future to include advanced metrics for implied temperature rise, Sustainable Financial Disclosure Regulation's (SFDR's) Principal Adverse Indicators (PAIs) and Diversity Equity and Inclusion factors.

DC Section

Underlying managers' voting activity

Good asset stewardship means being aware and active on voting issues, corporate actions and other responsibilities tied to owning a company's stock.

We believe that good asset stewardship is in members' best interests by promoting best practice and encouraging investee companies to access opportunities, manage risk appropriately and protect shareholders' interests.

Understanding and monitoring the stewardship that investment managers practice in relation to the Fund's investments is an important factor in deciding whether a manager remains the right choice for the arrangement.

Voting rights are attached to listed equity shares, including equities held in multi-asset funds. We expect the Fund's equity-owning investment managers to responsibly exercise their voting rights. Over the year, the material equity, real asset and multi-asset investments held by the Fund within the default strategies and wider self-select fund range were as set out below and on the following pages:

Why is voting important?

Voting is an essential tool for listed equity investors to communicate their views to a company and input into key business decisions. Resolutions proposed by shareholders increasingly relate to social and environmental issues

Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds (default strategy)

Aon Managed Fund	Underlying managers (equity-owning only)
Aon Managed Global Impact Fund	Baillie Gifford, Lyrical, Mirova, Nordea
Aon Managed Initial Growth Phase Fund	Equities: L&G, UBS Listed real assets: BlackRock, L&G
Aon Managed Diversified Asset Fund	L&G, UBS

Source: Aon Investments Limited

Self-select fund range

Aon Managed Fund	Underlying managers (equity-owning only)
Aon Managed Global Equity Fund	L&G, UBS
Aon Managed Active Global Equity Fund	Baillie Gifford, BNY Mellon, BlackRock, Harris, GQG, Dodge & Cox
Aon Managed Global Impact Fund	Baillie Gifford, Lyrical, Mirova, Nordea
Aon Managed Property and Infrastructure	BlackRock, L&G (listed real assets)
HSBC Islamic Equity Index Fund	HSBC
L&G FTSE4Good Developed Equity Index Fund	L&G

Source: Aon Investments Limited

Voting statistics: Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds

The table below shows the voting statistics for each of the material funds held within the default strategy, the Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds, for the year to 31 March 2026. We also provide a combined view for a member 30 years from retirement and at retirement, invested in the Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds.

Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds

Aon Managed Funds	% Proposals Voted	% votes cast against management	% votes abstained
Aon Managed Initial Growth Phase Fund[1,2]	95.7%	13.9%	0.3%
Aon Managed Global Impact Fund	100.0%	19.7%	0.7%
Aon Managed Diversified Asset Fund[1]	96.3%	16.3%	0.4%
Aon Managed Retirement Pathway Funds			
Member 30 years from retirement[1]	96.1%	14.5%	0.4%
Member at retirement[1]	96.2%	15.4%	0.4%

Source: Aon Investments Limited, Underlying investment managers: BlackRock, L&G, UBS, Baillie Gifford, Mirova, Nordea.
[1]Please note figures shown only reflect the proportion of the portfolio with equity-voting rights.
[2]Invests 90% in the Aon Managed Global Equity Fund and 10% in property and infrastructure.

Voting statistics: self-select funds

The table below shows the voting statistics for each of the material funds offered within the wider self-select fund range available for the year to 31 March 2026.

Self-select fund range

Aon Managed Funds	% Proposals Voted	% votes cast against management	% votes abstained
Aon Managed Global Equity Fund	95.4%	14.6%	0.4%
Aon Managed Active Global Equity Fund	97.9%	3.4%	0.9%
Aon Managed Global Impact Fund	100.0%	19.7%	0.7%
Aon Managed Property and Infrastructure Fund[1]	98.3%	7.4%	0.2%
HSBC Islamic Global Equity Index Fund	95.6%	14.9%	0.5%
L&G FTSE4Good Developed Equity Index Fund	100.0%	17.2%	0.4%

Source: Aon Investments Limited, underlying investment managers (BlackRock, L&G, UBS, Nordea, Mirova, Baillie Gifford, Lyrical, BNY Mellon, Harris, GQG, Dodge & Cox, HSBC).
[1]Please note figures shown only reflect the proportion of the portfolio with equity-voting rights.

Underlying managers’ engagement activity

We have reviewed information on the engagement carried out by the material underlying managers appointed by AIL for the DC Section of the Fund. All material managers engaged on all of the themes listed below:

- Environment - Climate Risk Management
- Environment - Biodiversity
- Governance - Remuneration
- Governance - Board Effectiveness
- Governance - Corporate Strategy
- Social - Human Capital
- Social Risks & Opportunities

Note: The managers have provided information for the most recent calendar year available. Some of the information provided is at a firm level i.e., is not necessarily specific to the underlying fund.

We would expect all managers to have engaged on all themes, as all underlying managers meet AIL’s required standards for consideration of ESG factors / risks.

DB Section

Voting statistics

The table below shows the voting statistics for each of the Fund's material funds with voting rights for the year to 31 March 2026.

Funds	Number of resolutions eligible to vote on	% of resolutions voted	% of votes against management	% of votes abstained from
Legal and General Asset Management ("L&G") Multi-Factor Equity Fund[1]	12,245	100.0%	21.8%	0.4%
UBS Global Asset Management ("UBS") Global Emerging Markets Equity Climate Transition Fund[1]	8,965	84.0%*	13.3%	1.7%
UBS Global Equity Climate Transition Fund[1]	11,902	94.0%	9.7%	0.1%

Source: Investment Managers. (1) Underlying fund within AIL's Managed Growth Strategy. Please note that the 'abstain' votes noted above are a specific category of vote that has been cast and are distinct from a non-vote.
**Our investment adviser engaged with UBS to understand why the % of resolutions voted was lower than we would expect of equity managers. UBS confirmed that there are markets, including emerging markets, where it does not exercise voting rights due to the local market restrictions.*

Underlying managers' engagement activity

The table below shows some of the engagement activity carried out by the Fund's material investment managers for the underlying managers in the DB Section of the Fund, held over Q2 2025 before the transition to Insight. The managers have provided information for the most recent calendar year available.

Funds	Number of engagements		Themes engaged on at a fund level
	Fund level	Firm level	
Aberdeen - Climate Transition Bond Fund	117	1,698	Environment - Climate; Other Environment Related Social - Human Rights & Stakeholders; Labour Management Governance - Corporate Governance; Corporate Behaviour
Aegon - European Asset Backed Securities ("ABS") Fund	100	383	Environment - Climate Change Social - Conduct, Culture and Ethics Governance - Strategy, Financial & Reporting Other - General Disclosure
L&G Multi-Factor Equity Fund	515	3,762	Environment - Climate Change; Natural Resource Use/Impact Social - Inequality; Human and Labour Rights Governance - Strategy, Financial and Reporting; Remuneration; Board Effectiveness - Other Other - Multiple ESG Topics
Robeco Credit Income Fund	8	304	Environment - Climate Change Governance - Shareholder Rights
UBS Global Emerging Markets Equity Climate Transition Fund	35	341	Environment - Climate Change; Natural Resource Use/Impact Social - Human and Labour Rights; Human Capital Management Governance - Strategy, Financial and Reporting; Remuneration; Shareholder Rights; Board Effectiveness - Diversity
UBS Global Equity Climate Transition Fund	191	341	Environment - Climate Change; Natural Resource Use/Impact Social - Human Capital Management; Human and Labour Rights; Public Health Governance - Remuneration; Board Effectiveness - Other; Strategy, Financial & Reporting; Shareholder Rights

Source: Investment Managers.

DB and DC Sections

Use of proxy voting advisers

Many investment managers use proxy voting advisers to help them fulfil their stewardship duties. Proxy voting advisers provide recommendations to institutional investors on how to vote at shareholder meetings on issues such as climate change, executive pay and board composition. They can also provide voting execution, research, record keeping and other services.

Responsible investors will dedicate time and resources towards making their own informed decisions, rather than solely relying on their adviser's recommendations.

The table below describes how the Fund's DB and DC managers proxy voting advisers.

Why use a proxy voting adviser?

Outsourcing voting activities to proxy advisers enables managers that invest in thousands of companies to participate in many more votes than they would without their support.

Managers	Section	Description of use of proxy voting advisers *(in the managers' own words)*
L&G	DB & DC	Votes are cast according to our instructions, guided by our voting policies and effected through an electronic voting platform called 'ProxyExchange', which is managed by Institutional Shareholder Services ("ISS"). We have developed a granular custom voting policy with specific voting instructions driven by our expectations. In parallel to applying our custom voting policy, we use the voting information services of ISS and receive research reports for all companies in our equity portfolios. We undertake quarterly performance management reviews with ISS in which we discuss issues such as timeliness, the quality of their research and the application of our voting policy. During these meetings, we receive delivery statistics and discuss changes to team resources. We deliberate on specific instances where our expectations have not been met and review possible solutions to avoid future repetition. We escalate issues to senior individuals at ISS where necessary. We also have regular meetings with ISS to discuss the implementation and evolution of our policies, as part of our process to ensure that our voting decisions remain aligned to market best practices and evolving regulations.
UBS	DB & DC	UBS retains the services of ISS for the physical exercise of voting rights and for supporting voting research. UBS retains full discretion when determining how to vote at shareholder meetings.
Baillie Gifford	DC	Whilst Baillie Gifford is cognisant of proxy advisers' voting recommendations (ISS and Glass Lewis), it does not delegate or outsource any of its stewardship activities or follow or rely upon ISS's recommendations when deciding how to vote on its clients' shares. All client voting decisions are made in-house. Baillie Gifford votes in line with its in-house policy and not with the proxy voting providers' policies. Baillie Gifford also has specialist proxy advisors in the Chinese and Indian markets to provide it with more nuanced market specific information.
BlackRock	DC	Proxy research firms provide research and recommendations on proxy votes as well as voting infrastructure. BlackRock Investment Stewardship leverages ISS as an external proxy services vendor. ISS' electronic voting platform allows BlackRock Investment Stewardship to monitor voting activity, execute proxy vote instructions, record keep, and generate client and regulatory voting reports. BlackRock Investment Stewardship also uses Glass Lewis' services to support research and analysis. In addition to the global research provided by ISS and Glass Lewis, BlackRock Investment Stewardship subscribes to market-specific research providers including Institutional Voting Information Service in the UK, Ownership Matters in Australia, Stakeholder Empowerment Services in India, and ZD Proxy in China. Although proxy research firms provide important data and analysis, BlackRock Investment Stewardship does not follow any proxy research firm's voting recommendations.
BNY Mellon	DC	Walter Scott receives third party research from ISS for information purposes. However, the recommendations from any intermediary have no bearing on how Walter Scott votes.
Harris	DC	Harris utilises the services of ISS's proxy voting services. ISS implements a bespoke proxy voting policy for Harris and ISS's services are otherwise used for information only. Harris state that it will follow its own Proxy Voting Policy, except where the analyst covering a stock recommends voting otherwise. In these cases, the final decision rests with Harris' Proxy Voting Committee.

HSBC	DC	To enable efficient proxy voting operations, HSBC work with their proxy service provider (Institutional Shareholder Services), which provides research, a voting platform and disclosure services. Their Global Voting Guidelines, together with own research, inform more granular voting policy instructions, which form the basis for custom voting recommendations for each shareholder meeting.
Lyrical	DC	Lyrical has hired Broadridge Financial Solutions Inc. to help implement their proxy voting policies and procedures. Broadridge's default is to follow the recommendations of Glass Lewis, though Lyrical can override any such recommendation.
Mirova	DC	Mirova uses ISS as a voting platform for related services such as ballot collecting, vote processing and record keeping. Mirova subscribes to the ISS research, however its recommendation is not prescriptive or determinative to Mirova's voting decisions. All voting decisions are made by Mirova in accordance with its Voting Policy.
Nordea	DC	Nordea uses two external proxy advisors - ISS and Glass Lewis. ISS is used for proxy voting, execution as well as research, while Glass Lewis is mainly used for research. Nordea evaluate their proxy advisors regularly on operational integrity, quality of research and the implementation of the custom voting policy.
GQG	DC	As part of their research process and continuous monitoring of portfolio companies, GQG's analysts regularly communicate with certain companies' management. These communications can inform the proxy voting decisions. If GQG believe a board action would negatively affect clients, they would vote against the board. Proxy vote decisions may be reviewed by GQG's analysts and a vote can be changed in accordance with their Proxy Voting Policy. To augment their independent research, GQG uses ISS as an additional source of information to guide voting. While GQG votes with ISS on the majority of issues, they do not blindly follow their lead and will vote against their recommendations when they deem it necessary.
Dodge And Cox	DC	Dodge & Cox does not delegate voting decisions, but the operational aspects of voting are delegated to a third-party service provider. Dodge & Cox retains an outside vendor (ISS) to provide notification and research related to proxies. This vendor also administers proxy voting (i.e., implements the proxy voting decisions made by Dodge & Cox). The firm's Proxy Officer or delegate reviews proxy research received from the outside proxy research firms prior to voting each proxy according to the Dodge & Cox Proxy Voting Policy. Proxy vote recommendations are then ratified by a securities analyst when deemed appropriate. A delegate may include a third-party vendor hired to implement the Dodge & Cox Proxy Voting Policy. Exceptions, including potential conflicts of interest that arise when an issue is not clearly covered by these guidelines, and when deemed appropriate by the Proxy Officer or delegate, the proposal may be referred to one or more members of the Proxy Policy Committee for review. Dodge & Cox may also utilise proxy research provided by Glass Lewis to assist in the decision-making process. Their proxy voting administrator is reviewed and evaluated periodically. Onsite due diligence of their proxy voting administrator is also performed on a periodic basis

Source: Managers; Aon Investments Limited. Underlying managers

Significant voting examples

To illustrate the voting activity being carried out on our behalf, we asked AIL to provide a selection of what they and the underlying investment managers consider to be the most significant votes in relation to the Fund's funds. A sample of these significant votes can be found in Appendix 1.

Data limitations

This report does not include commentary on certain asset classes such as liability driven investments, gilts, synthetic credit or cash because of the limited materiality of stewardship to these asset classes.

Appendix 1 – Significant Voting Examples

In the table below are some significant vote examples provided by the Fund’s managers and underlying investment managers appointed by AIL. We consider a significant vote to be one which the manager considers significant. Managers use a wide variety of criteria to determine what they consider a significant vote, some examples include:

DB Section

L&G Multi-Factor Equity Fund	**Company name**	Mastercard Incorporated
	Date of vote	24 June 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	0.6%
	Summary of the resolution	Resolution 7: Oversee and Report on a Racial Equity Audit
	How you voted?	Votes supporting resolution
	Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	L&G’s Asset Management business publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an Annual General Meeting (“AGM”) as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.
	Rationale for the voting decision	Shareholder Resolution Diversity: A vote in favour is applied as we support such information and risk management approach to Diversity.
	Outcome of the vote	Fail
	Implications of the outcome e.g. were there any lessons learned and what likely future steps will you take in response to the outcome?	L&G’s Asset Management business will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.
	On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be most significant?	Thematic - Diversity: L&G’s Asset Management business views diversity as a financially material issue for our clients, with implications for the assets we manage on their behalf.
UBS Global Emerging Markets Equity Climate Transition Fund	**Company name**	Sasol Ltd.
	Date of vote	14 November 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	*Not provided*
	Summary of the resolution	Approve Climate Change Report
	How you voted?	Votes against resolution
	Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No
	Rationale for the voting decision	Say-on-climate proposal is not aligned with our expectations.
	Outcome of the vote	Pass
	Implications of the outcome e.g. were there any lessons learned and what likely future steps will you take in response to the outcome?	Given the high levels of dissent, we shall monitor for further developments.
	On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be most significant?	Over 14% of shareholders voted against the resolution.
UBS Global Equity Climate Transition Fund	**Company name**	The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.
	Date of vote	23 April 2025

	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	*Not provided*
	Summary of the resolution	Report on Clean Energy Supply Financing Ratio
	How you voted?	Votes supporting resolution
	Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No
	Rationale for the voting Decision	The proposal for banks to disclose their Energy Supply Ratio ("ESR") has received strong investor support in previous years and continues to be an area of focus for a prominent US asset owner. There is also a clear investor use case for the ratio, as highlighted by Bloomberg's integration of the metric into its offerings, for which additional company disclosure would improve granularity and transparency for investors.
	Outcome of the vote	Fail
	Implications of the outcome e.g. were there any lessons learned and what likely future steps will you take in response to the outcome?	Given notable shareholder support, we shall monitor for further developments.
	On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be most significant?	15.18% of shareholders supported this proposal.

Source: Investment Managers

<u>DC Section</u>

L&G	**Company name**	Dyno Nobel Ltd
	Date of vote	December 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	0.1%
	Summary of the resolution	Resolution 7: Approve progress on climate change transition
	How the manager voted	Against management
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	L&G publicly communicates its vote instructions on its website with the rationale for all votes against management. The policy states not to engage with investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as their engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.
	Rationale for the voting decision	L&G recognise the progress that the company has made in its transition plan, including improved disclosure of its operational GHG transition pathway and the introduction of scope 3 targets. However, L&G requires short-, medium- and long-term targets aligned to a 1.5C trajectory and covering all scopes of emissions. Dyno Nobel does not currently meet this criteria. Nor does it disclose capex linked to its climate transition plan. As a result, L&G voted against this resolution.
	Outcome of the vote	Pass
	Implications of the outcome	L&G will continue to engage with our investee companies, publicly advocate our position on this issue and monitor company and market-level progress.

	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	L&G Consider votes relating to alignment with the Paris Agreement to be significant.
BlackRock	**Company name**	Tyson Foods, Inc.
	Date of vote	February 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	Not provided
	Summary of the resolution	Elect Director David J. Bronczek
	How the manager voted	Against management
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	BlackRock endeavours to communicate to companies when it intends to vote against management, either before or just after casting votes in advance of the shareholder meeting.
	Rationale for the voting decision	BlackRock voted against the election of this director due to insufficient progress with respect to sustainability-related reporting.
	Outcome of the vote	The resolution passed
	Implications of the outcome	Where BlackRock has concerns which are raised either through voting or during engagement, BlackRock monitors developments and assesses whether the company has addressed its concerns.
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	BlackRock voted against company management.
UBS	**Company name**	Amazon.com Inc
	Date of vote	May 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	Not disclosed
	Summary of the resolution	Report on Impact of data centres on climate commitments
	How the manager voted	Against management
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No
	Rationale for the voting decision	UBS will support proposals that seek to promote greater disclosure and transparency in corporate environmental policies as long as: a) the issues are not already effectively dealt with through legislation or regulation; b) the company has not already responded in a sufficient manner; and c) the proposal is not unduly burdensome or overly prescriptive.
	Outcome of the vote	Fail
	Implications of the outcome	Given notable shareholder support, UBS will monitor for further developments. They will continue to engage with the company.
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	Large proportion of shareholders supported the resolution.
Nordea	**Company name**	NexEra Energy, Inc
	Date of vote	May 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	1.4%
	Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Amy B. Lane, incumbent chair of the committee responsible for climate risk oversight.
	How the manager voted	Against management.
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No
	Rationale for the voting decision	Nordea believe that retaining the incumbent chair of the committee responsible for climate risk oversight is warranted because the NexEra

		Energy is not aligned with investor expectations on achieving net zero by 2050.
	Outcome of the vote	Fail
	Implications of the outcome	Nordea will continue to vote against proposals that are not in line with their expectations on climate.
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	Significant votes are those that are severely against Nordea's principles and where Nordea feels it needs to enact change in the company.
Mirova	**Company name**	Microsoft Corporation
	Date of vote	December 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	5.8%
	Summary of the resolution	Shareholders request that the company publish a report assessing the effectiveness of its human rights due diligence processes addressing the misuse of its artificial intelligence and cloud products and services.
	How the manager voted	For the proposal (i.e. against management)
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes
	Rationale for the voting decision	Mirova has concerns over Microsoft's human rights due diligence process following the misuse of one of its products by the Israeli military
	Outcome of the vote	Fail
	Implications of the outcome	Mirova will focus on ensuring Microsoft explicitly connects its responsible AI principles to international human rights frameworks and develops clear implementation metrics.
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	This resolution concerns a topic that is core for the company and its business model and also aligns with Aon's stewardship priorities.
Baillie Gifford	**Company name**	Soitec SA
	Date of vote	July 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	0.5%
	Summary of the resolution	Two resolutions on executive remuneration.
	How the manager voted	Against management
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes
	Rationale for the voting decision	Baillie Gifford opposed the resolutions due to concerns about the weighting and materiality of some non-financial metrics.
	Outcome of the vote	Pass
	Implications of the outcome	The company has committed to engaging with Baillie Gifford more proactively on executive pay going forward.
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	This resolution is significant because they opposed executive remuneration.
HSBC	**Company name**	Tesla Inc.
	Date of vote	November 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	3.5%
	Summary of the resolution	Report on the use of child labour in connection with electric vehicles
	How the manager voted	For the resolution (i.e. against management)
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No

	Rationale for the voting decision	HSBC believed the proposal would contribute to the better management of human rights issues and be in the interest of shareholders.
	Outcome of the vote	The resolution failed
	Implications of the outcome	HSBC will likely vote for a similar proposal.
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	The company has a significant weight in the portfolio and HSBC voted against management.
BNY Mellon	**Company name**	Microsoft Corporation
	Date of vote	December 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	4.1%
	Summary of the resolution	Report on risks of operating in countries with significant human rights concerns
	How the manager voted	Against management
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes
	Rationale for the voting decision	Additional disclosures would be in the long-term best financial interest of shareholders
	Outcome of the vote	Fail
	Implications of the outcome	All significant votes are reviewed and approved by BNY's Proxy Voting and Engagement Group. Any potential learnings are then taken into account for periodic reviews of their Proxy Voting Policy.
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	It was a vote against management for a significant underlying holding.
Harris	**Company name**	Kering SA
	Date of vote	April 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	2.2%
	Summary of the resolution	Re-elect Financière Pinault as Director
	How the manager voted	Against management
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No
	Rationale for the voting decision	Harris voted against the re-election of Héloïse Temple-Boyer, representative of Financière Pinault, the controlling entity of Artemis group, a shareholder that owns 42.34% of Kering's equity and 59.34%of its voting rights. This is because Financière Pinault benefits from Kering's distortive voting rights structure, and in Harris' view does not merit support.
	Outcome of the vote	Pass
	Implications of the outcome	Not provided
	On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	Harris voted against their proxy policy and against management
Lyrical	**Company name**	HCA Healthcare, Inc.
	Date of vote	April 2025
	Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	4.9%
	Summary of the resolution	Shareholders resolution – Severance Policy (update to the policy covering severance payments to senior managers)
	How the manager voted	Against management
	Did the manager communicate its intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No
	Rationale for the voting decision	This shareholder proposal requests that the board seek shareholder approval of any senior

	manager’s new or renewed pay package that provides for severance or termination payments with an estimated value exceeding 2.99x the sum of the executive’s base salary plus target short-term bonus. Glass Lewis and Lyrical typically support such requests if they are less than 2.99x the sum of the executive’s base salary plus target short-term bonus. Above this threshold, based on the executive’s average annual compensation over the most recent five years, the company can no longer deduct severance payments as an expense, depriving shareholders of a valuable benefit without an offsetting incentive for the executive. Lyrical believes that shareholders should be consulted before relinquishing such a right, and that implementing such policies would still leave the company with sufficient flexibility to enter appropriate severance arrangements. Lyrical therefore voted "For" this proposal.
Outcome of the vote	Fail
Implications of the outcome	The implication of this outcome is to ensure that the underlying portfolio companies are implementing ESG best practices. Lyrical’s Director of Sustainability continues to monitor the situation.
On which criteria have the vote is considered significant?	Shareholders should be consulted before companies enters into severance agreements that provide benefits exceeding 2.99x salary and bonus.

Source: Aon Investments Limited, Underlying Managers (L&G, BlackRock, UBS, Baillie Gifford, Mirova, Nordea, HSBC, Harris, Lyrical).

Appendix 2 – AIL Stewardship priorities

Our investment manager has set stewardship priorities that align with its beliefs in relation to responsible investment.

These stewardship priorities focus on climate change and nature loss, modern slavery and artificial intelligence, as well as ensuring strong governance. These priorities have been identified as financially material risks that have the potential to impact the value of members' investments.

To support these priorities, the AIL has an Engagement Programme through which it engages identifies and analyses key areas for focus and engages with the underlying managers in turn. In turn, AIL also has a set of expectations for its underlying investment managers.

A summary of these priorities is set out below:

Strong governance

Strong governance is fundamental to protecting and growing long-term value for investors. Companies with clear accountability at board and executive level, transparent reporting, effective risk management, and rigorous oversight of issues such as strategy, capital allocation, climate and broader ESG risks are typically better positioned to navigate volatility and deliver sustainable performance. AIL looks for governance structures that support ethical conduct, robust internal controls, strong cyber security and data privacy, and alignment of management incentives with long-term shareholder interests. By engaging on and prioritising strong governance at investee companies, we seek to reduce operational, legal and reputational risks, improve decision-making quality, and support more stable, long-term returns for our members.

Climate transition and nature loss

Climate change and the progress towards net zero is a key area of focus for the Trustee and its investment manager, recognising the impact of climate-related risks on the value of members' savings over the long term. AIL looks for alignment between an investment manager's climate risk policy (or stated ambitions) and its responsible investment approach including engagement activities and voting decisions around climate. AIL engages with its underlying investment managers to monitor progress in the underlying investee companies towards setting targets and ensuring meaningful action as a result.

AIL also believes that biodiversity risk, including nature loss, is intrinsically linked to climate-change and hence the value of members' savings over the long term. AIL collaborated with the Cambridge Institute of Sustainability Leadership to create a framework for assessing nature-related risks including a due diligence questionnaire to measure progress on goals. AIL engages with its underlying investment managers to understand the risks in this area and ensure appropriate action is taken as a result.

Combatting modern slavery

AIL is a signatory of the 'Find It, Fix It, Prevent It' initiative which aims to combat modern slavery through engagement with investee companies, participation in shaping public policy and in developing better modern slavery data. Through this initiative AIL aims to raise awareness of the role investors can play in addressing modern slavery in supply chains. AIL engages with its investment managers to understand where any potential exposure exists and ensure appropriate action is taken as a result.

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

AI is a rapidly developing industry and its real world applications are yet to be fully explored. AIL has made AI an important topic for its engagement programme and endeavours to be at the forefront of this fast-developing area. AIL believes in the responsible use of AI. To effect this, AIL will promote transparency, explainability and appropriate guards against bias. Where AI is adopted, AIL will endeavour to engage with its investment managers to ensure this is done in a way that incorporates responsible design and that the energy and resource intensive nature of AI balances appropriately with Net Zero commitments.