

Edmund Nuttall Limited Staff Superannuation Fund (the “Fund”)

Implementation Statement
Year Ended 31 December 2022



Engagement Policy Implementation Statement for the Year Ended 31 December 2022

EDMUND NUTTALL LIMITED STAFF SUPERANNUATION FUND (“the Fund”)

1. INTRODUCTION

This Engagement Policy Implementation Statement (the Statement) sets out the Trustee’s assessment of how, and the extent to which, they have followed their engagement policy and their policy with regard to the exercise of rights (including voting rights) attaching to the Fund’s investments during the one-year period to 31 December 2022 (the “Fund Year”). The Trustee’s policies are set out in their Statement of Investment Principles (SIP) dated March 2023. A copy of the Trustee’s SIP is available [here](#).

This Statement has been produced in accordance with the *Occupational Pension Schemes (Investment and Disclosure) (Amendment and Modification) Regulations 2018* and the *Occupational Pension Schemes (Investment and Disclosure) (Amendment) Regulations 2019* along with guidance published by the Pensions Regulator.

The Trustee invest the assets of the Fund in a fiduciary arrangement with Mercer Limited (Mercer). Under this arrangement Mercer are appointed as a discretionary investment manager and day-to-day management of the Fund’s assets is by investment in a range of specialist pooled funds (the Mercer Funds). Management of the assets of each Mercer Fund is undertaken by a Mercer affiliate, Mercer Global Investments Europe Limited (MGIE) and Mercer Alternatives (Luxembourg) S.à r.l. (PIP IV).

MGIE are responsible for the appointment and monitoring of suitably diversified portfolio of specialist third party investment managers for each Mercer Fund’s assets.

The publicly available [Sustainability Policy](#) sets out how Mercer addresses sustainability risks and opportunities and considers Environmental, Social and Corporate Governance (ESG) factors in decision making across the investment process. The [Stewardship Policy](#) provides more detail on Mercer’s beliefs and implementation on stewardship specifically. Under these arrangements, the Trustee accept that they do not have the ability to directly determine the engagement or voting policies or arrangements of the managers of the Mercer Funds. However, the Trustee have reviewed these policies and note an awareness of engagement topics that are important to the Fund and integrating the Trustee views on specific themes, where possible, is an important part of Mercer’s Fiduciary duty. Mercer’s Client Engagement Survey aims to facilitate this by assessing the level of alignment between Mercer’s engagement priority areas and those of the Trustee, while highlighting additional areas of focus which are important to the Trustee. The Trustee review regular reports from Mercer with regard to the engagement and voting undertaken on their behalf in order to consider whether the policies are being properly implemented.

Section 2 of this Statement sets out the Trustee’s engagement policy and assesses the extent to which it has been followed over the Fund Year.

Section 3 sets out the Trustee’s policy with regard to the exercising of rights (including voting rights) attaching to the Fund’s investments and considers how, and the extent to which, this policy has been followed during the Fund Year. This Section also provides detail on voting activity undertaken by the Fund’s third party investment managers during the Fund Year.

Taking the analysis included in Sections 2 to 3 together, it is the Trustee’s belief that their policies with regard to engagement and the exercise of rights attaching to investments has been successfully followed during the Fund Year.

2. TRUSTEE’S POLICY ON ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, AND GOVERNANCE (ESG) ISSUES, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE

Policy Summary

Mercer and the Trustee believe stewardship plays an important role in managing sustainability risks and other ESG factors, and helps the realisation of long-term value by providing investors with an opportunity to enhance the value of companies and markets consistent with long-term investor timeframes. Consequently, an approach that integrates effective stewardship is in the best interests of the Fund. The Trustee also recognise that long-term sustainability issues, particularly climate change, present risks and opportunities, including non-financial performance that require the Trustee’s explicit consideration.

It is the Trustee’s policy that the third party investment managers appointed by Mercer, via Mercer Global Investments Europe (MGIE), report in line with established best practice such as the UK Stewardship Code 2021, to which Mercer is a signatory, including public disclosure of compliance via an external website, when managing the Fund’s assets. Further, in appointing the third party asset managers, the Trustee expect MGIE to select managers where it believes the managers will engage directly with issuers in order to improve their financial and non-financial performances over the medium to long term. To monitor the third party investment managers’ compliance with this expectation, the Trustee consider regular reports from Mercer that include an assessment of each third party manager’s engagement activity.

Should the Trustee consider that Mercer, MGIE or the third party asset managers, have failed to align their own engagement policies with those of the Trustee, the Trustee will notify Mercer and consider disinvesting some or all of the assets held in the Mercer Funds and/or seek to renegotiate commercial terms with Mercer.

How the Policy has been implemented over the Fund Year

The following work was undertaken during the year relating to the Trustee’s policy on ESG factors, stewardship and climate change.

Policy Updates	Climate Change Reporting and Carbon Foot-printing	ESG Rating Review
The Trustee consider how ESG, climate change and stewardship is integrated within Mercer’s, and MGIE’s, investment processes and those of the underlying asset managers in the monitoring	Mercer and the Trustee believe climate change poses a systemic risk and recognise that limiting global average temperature increases this century to “well below two degrees Celsius”, as per the 2015 Paris Agreement, is aligned with the	Where available, ESG ratings assigned by Mercer are included in the investment performance reports produced by Mercer on a quarterly basis and reviewed by the Trustee. ESG ratings are reviewed by MGIE during quarterly monitoring processes, with a more comprehensive review

process. Mercer, and MGIE, provide reporting to the **Trustee** on a regular basis.

The Mercer Sustainability Policy is reviewed regularly. In March 2021 there was an update in relation to the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) implementation. In August 2022 the policy update reflected enhancements to the approach to climate change modelling and transition modelling, additional detail on how the policy is implemented, monitored and governed and, as part of the commitment to promote diversity, finalising MGIE's signatory status to the UK chapter of the 30% Club.

In line with the requirements of the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, Mercer have implemented a standalone Stewardship Policy to specifically address the requirements of the directive. This Policy was also updated in August 2022 to reflect enhancements made to Mercer's stewardship approach including an introduction of Engagement Dashboards and Trackers, an enhanced UN Global Compact engagement and escalation process and a Client engagement survey.

UN Principles of Responsible Investing scores for 2021 (based on 2020 activity) were issued over Q3 2022. Mercer were awarded top marks for over-the-arching Investment and Stewardship Policy section, underpinned by strong individual asset class results.

best economic outcome for long-term diversified investors. Mercer supports this end goal and is committed to achieving net-zero absolute carbon emissions by 2050 for the multi-asset growth fund used by the Fund. To achieve this, Mercer plans to reduce portfolio relative carbon emissions by at least 45% from 2019 baseline levels by 2030. This decision was supported by insights gained from Mercer's Investing in a Time of Climate Change (2015 and 2019) reports, Mercer's Analytics for Climate Transition (ACT) tool and advice framework, and through undertaking climate scenario analysis and stress testing modelling.

Mercer's approach to managing climate change risks is consistent with the framework recommended by the Financial Stability Board's Task Force on Climate related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), with Mercer's inaugural Climate Change Management report, highlighting Mercer's approach to the TCFD framework in more detail, including example analysis on strategy and targets and metrics. As at 31 December 2021 Mercer are ahead of target year-on-year. There has been a notable 21% reduction since 2019 baseline levels, resulting in the absolute 45% reduction by 2030 being well within range.

performed annually - which seeks evidence of positive momentum on ESG integration and compares the Mercer funds overall ESG rating with the appropriate universe of strategies in Mercer's Global Investment Manager Database (GIMD). Engagements are prioritised with managers where their strategy's ESG rating is behind that of their peer universe.

As at 31 December 2021, in the Annual ESG review provided by Mercer, the Trustee noted that 89% of Mercer Funds have an ESG rating equal to or above their asset class universe and 64% have seen an improved ESG rating over the past 4 years. Due to the nature of certain strategies, they do not have an ESG rating (i.e. are N rated) and are therefore excluded from this review. Please see Mercer's Guide to ESG Ratings for more information <https://www.mercer.com/our-thinking/mercer-esg-ratings.html>

Approach to Exclusions

As an overarching principle, Mercer and MGIE prefer an approach of positive engagement rather than negative divestment. However Mercer and MGIE recognises that there are a number of cases in which investors deem it unacceptable to

Sustainability-themed investments

An allocation to Sustainable Equities and Sustainable Opportunities (private markets) is included within the Fund's portfolio of Growth assets, with the strategic allocation to Sustainable

Diversity

From 31 December 2020, gender diversity statistics have also been included in the quarterly reporting for the Mercer equity funds and this is being built into a broader Mercer Investment Solutions International policy on Diversity, Equity and

profit from certain areas and therefore exclusions will be appropriate.

Controversial weapons are excluded from active equity and fixed income funds, and passive equity funds. In addition tobacco companies (based on revenue) are excluded from active equity and fixed income funds. The Mercer sustainability-themed funds have additional exclusions, for example covering gambling, alcohol, adult entertainment and fossil fuels.

Mercer expanded exclusions to further promote environmental and social characteristics across the majority of the multi-client building block funds over the second half of 2022, in line with EU SFDR Article 8 classification, as well as aligning Mercer's existing active and passive exclusions across their fund range.

In addition, Mercer and MGIE monitors for high-severity breaches of the UN Global Compact (UNGC) Principles that relate to human rights, labour, environmental and corruption issues.

Equities now accounting for c.6.1% of the Growth Portfolio.

A detailed standalone report sustainability monitoring report is produced for the active/passive Sustainable Global Equity fund on a semi-annual basis, including a more granular breakdown of the fund against ESG metrics, for example the UN Sustainability Development Goals.

Inclusion, sitting alongside Mercer's established Diversity Charter.

Mercer consider broader forms of diversity in decision-making, but currently report on gender diversity. As at 30 September 2021 33% of the Key Decision Makers (KDM's) within Mercer IS team are non-male, and Mercer's long term target is 50%.

Within the Fixed Income universe the average fund has 8% non-male KDM's and within the EMEA Active Equity universe the average is 12%. Figures relating to Mercer Fixed Income and Active Equity Funds are currently slightly ahead at 9% and 13%.

In Q3 2022 MGIE was confirmed as a signatory of the UK Chapter of the 30% Club.

3. TRUSTEE'S POLICY ON EXERCISE OF RIGHTS (INCLUDING VOTING RIGHTS) ATTACHING TO FUND INVESTMENTS

Policy

The Trustee's policy is to delegate responsibility for the exercising of rights (including voting rights) attaching to the Fund's investments to the third party investment managers appointed by Mercer on the Trustee's behalf.

This is because any voting rights that do apply with respect to the underlying investments attached to the Mercer Funds are, ultimately, delegated to the third party investment managers appointed by MGIE. In delegating these rights, MGIE accepts that managers are typically best placed to exercise voting rights and prioritise particular engagement topics by security, given they are expected to have detailed knowledge of both the governance and the operations of the companies and issuers they invest in. However, Mercer has a pivotal role in monitoring their stewardship activities and promoting more effective stewardship practices, including ensuring attention is given to more strategic themes and topics. As such, proxy voting responsibility is given to listed equity investment managers with an expectation that all shares are to be voted in a timely manner and a manner deemed most likely to protect and

enhance long-term value. Mercer and MGIE carefully evaluates each sub-investment manager’s capability in ESG engagement and proxy voting, as part of the selection process to ensure it is representing Mercer’s commitment to good governance, integration of sustainability considerations . Managers are expected to take account of current best practice such as the UK Stewardship Code 2020, to which Mercer is a signatory. As such the Trustee do not use the direct services of a proxy voter.

Voting: As part of the monitoring of managers’ approaches to voting, MGIE assesses how managers are voting against management and seeks to obtain the rationale behind voting activities, particularly in cases where split votes may occur (where managers vote in different ways for the same proposal). MGIE portfolio managers will use these results to inform their engagements with managers on their voting activities.

Set out below is a summary of voting activity for the year to 31 December 2022 for a range of Mercer Funds that the Fund’s assets are invested in. This may include information in relation to funds that the Fund’s assets were no longer invested in at the year end. The statistics set out in the table below are drawn from the Glass Lewis voting system (via Mercer’s custodian). Typically, votes exercised against management can indicate a thoughtful and active approach. This is particularly visible where votes have been exercised to escalate engagement objectives. The expectation is for all shares to be voted.

Fund Name	Total Proposals		Vote Decision					For/Against Mgmt	
	Eligible Proposals	Proposals Voted On	For	Against	Abstain	No Action	Other	For	Against
Mercer Global Listed Infrastructure Fund	809	747	82%	11%	7%	0%	0%	85%	15%
Mercer Global Small Cap Equity Fund	6,657	6,506	91%	6%	1%	1%	0%	92%	8%
Mercer Low Volatility Equity Fund	8,384	8,231	91%	7%	0%	1%	0%	92%	8%
Mercer Multi-Asset Credit Fund ⁽¹⁾	9	9	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Mercer Passive Global REITS UCITS CCF	3,066	2,931	79%	16%	0%	4%	0%	80%	20%
Mercer Sustainable Global Equity Fund	6,755	6,608	87%	11%	1%	1%	0%	88%	12%
MGI Emerging Markets Equity Fund	8,622	8,346	82%	14%	3%	0%	0%	84%	16%
MGI Eurozone Equity Fund	4,706	4,592	85%	13%	2%	0%	0%	86%	14%
MGI UK Equity Fund	1,090	1,089	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	99%	1%

⁽¹⁾ Voting Activity figures for the Mercer Multi-Asset Credit fund relate to a small number of equity holdings within the fund’s underlying segregated mandates. Please note this does not include voting activity from any underlying pooled strategies within the fund over the period

- “Eligible Proposals” reflect all proposals of which managers were eligible to vote on over the period
- “Proposals Voted On” reflect the proposals managers have voted on over the period (including votes For and Against, and any frequency votes encompassed in the “Other” category)”
- “No Action” reflects instances where managers have not actioned a vote. MGIE may follow up with managers to understand the reasoning behind these decisions, and to assess the systems managers have in place to ensure voting rights are being used meaningfully
- “Other” refers to proposals in which the decision is frequency related (e.g. 1 year or 3 year votes regarding the frequency of future say-on-pay).

Significant Votes: Mercer has based its definition of significant votes on its [Beliefs, Materiality and Impact \(BMI\) Framework](#). In order to capture this in the monitoring and reporting of managers voting activities, significant votes focus on proposals covering priority areas identified by the BMI Framework.

The significant votes below were assessed on the following criteria

1. Proposal topic relates to an Engagement Priority (*climate change, human/labour rights, diversity, etc.*) classified in broader topics below; Environmental, Social, or Governance
2. Proposal proponent is Shareholder (*as opposed to Management*)
3. Size of holding (*e.g. top 10 holdings within the fund*)
4. Industry controversial / topical proposals

The topic and criteria used are included in the Shareholder Proposal column below.

We have not included an explanation for the rationale for the voting decision and, where against management, whether this was communicated to the company ahead of the vote because we do not currently have this information, but this is something which Mercer are looking to include in the future.

Most significant votes (1/3)

Fund	Topic: Shareholder Proposal (SHP), (Criteria)	Issuer	Date of the Vote	Vote Decision (For/Against Proposal)	Outcome of the Vote
Mercer Global Listed Infrastructure Fund	Environmental: Management Proposal Regarding Approval of Climate Action Plan, (Criteria 1,2,3)	Aena S.M.E. S.A.	2022-03-31	Against	94% For
	Governance: Management Proposal Regarding Remuneration Report, (Criteria 2,3)	Aena S.M.E. S.A.	2022-03-31	Against	96% For
Mercer Global Small Cap Equity Fund	Governance: Management Proposal Regarding the Election of Directors, (Criteria 2,3)	Dena Co Ltd	2022-06-26	Against	90% For
	Environmental: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Adoption of Targets to Achieve Net-zero Emissions by 2050, (Criteria 1,2)	US Foods Holding Corp	2022-05-18	For	68% For

Most significant votes (2/3)

Fund	Topic: Shareholder Proposal (SHP), (Criteria)	Issuer	Date of the Vote	Vote Decision (For/Against Proposal)	Outcome of the Vote
Mercer Low Volatility Equity Fund	Governance: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Report on Board Diversity, (Criteria 1,2,3)	Alphabet Inc.	2022-06-01	Against	5% For
	Environmental: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Climate Report, (Criteria 1,2,3)	Charter Communications Inc.	2022-04-26	For	37% For
	Environmental: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Managing Climate Risk in Employee Retirement Options (Criteria 1,2,3)	Microsoft Corporation	2022-12-13	Against	11% For
Mercer Passive Global REITS UCITS CCF	Governance: Management Proposal Regarding the Election of Executive Committee Members, (Criteria 1,2,3)	Prologis	2022-05-04	Against	85% For
	Governance: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Right to Call Special Meetings, (Criteria 2,3)	Equinix, Inc.	2022-05-25	For	39% For
	Governance: Management Proposal Regarding the Election of Directors, (Criteria 1,2,3)	VICI Properties Inc	2022-04-27	Against	99% For
Mercer Passive Global Small Cap Equity UCITS CCF	Environmental: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Report on GHG Targets and Alignment with Paris Agreement, (Criteria 1,2)	Skechers U S A, Inc.	2022-05-26	For	75% For
	Environmental: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Aligning Business Strategy to the Paris Agreement, (Criteria 1,2)	Electric Power Development	2022-06-28	For	26% For
	Governance: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Board Diversity Report, (Criteria 1,2)	Badger Meter Inc.	2022-04-29	For	25% For

Most significant votes (3/3)

Fund	Topic: Shareholder Proposal (SHP), (Criteria)	Issuer	Date of the Vote	Vote Decision (For/Against Proposal)	Outcome of the Vote
Mercer Sustainable Global Equity Fund	Governance: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Report on Board Diversity, (Criteria 1,2,3)	Alphabet Inc.	2022-06-01	Against	5% For
	Social: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Report on Untraceable Firearms, (Criteria 2,3)	Mastercard Incorporated	2022-06-21	For	10% For
	Environmental: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Managing Climate Risk in Employee Retirement Options, (Criteria 1,2,3)	Microsoft Corporation	2022-12-13	Mixed ⁽¹⁾	11% For
MGI Emerging Markets Equity Fund	Governance: Management Proposal Regarding Authority to Issue Repurchased Shares, (Criteria 2,3)	Tencent Holdings Ltd	2022-05-18	Against	70% For
MGI Eurozone Equity Fund	Environmental: Management Proposal Regarding Opinion on 2022 Sustainability and Climate Progress Report, (Criteria 1,3,4)	Total Energies SE	2022-05-25	For	89% For
	Governance: Management Proposal Regarding Appointment of Auditor (PricewaterhouseCoopers), (Criteria 2,3,4)	Air Liquide S.A	2022-05-04	For	96% For
	Governance: Management Proposal Regarding Amendments to Articles Regarding the CEO's Age Limit and Shareholder Notification, (Criteria 2,3)	Lvmh Moet Hennessy Vuitton SE	2022-04-21	Against	82% For
MGI UK Equity Fund	Environmental: Management Proposal Regarding Approval of Climate Action Plan, (Criteria 1,2,3)	Rio Tinto plc	2022-04-08	Against	82% For
	Environmental: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Fossil Fuel Financing, (Criteria 1,2,4)	Standard Chartered plc	2022-05-04	Against	12% For
	Environmental: Management Proposal Regarding Endorsement of Pathway to Net Zero, (Criteria 1,3,4)	Standard Chartered plc	2022-05-04	For	83% For

(1) "Mixed" refers to occasions where underlying managers have voted differently for the same proposal. Vote decisions of this nature are monitored and fed into the wider engagement process with managers. In this case, two managers voted "For" and two managers voted "Against" the proposal.