

# Loganair 1997 Pension Scheme Implementation Statement for the year ended 31 March 2021

## Purpose

---

This Implementation Statement provides information on how, and the extent to which, the Trustees of the Loganair 1997 Pension Scheme (“the Scheme”) have followed their policy in relation to the exercising of rights (including voting rights) attached to the Scheme’s investments, and engagement activities during the year ended 31 March 2021 (“the reporting year”). In addition, the statement provides a summary of the voting behaviour and most significant votes cast during the reporting year.

## Background

---

In Q3 2019, the Trustees received training on Environmental, Social and Governance (“ESG”) issues from their Investment Adviser, XPS Investment (“XPS”) and discussed their beliefs around those issues. This enabled the Trustees to consider how to update their policy in relation to ESG and voting issues which, up until that point, had simply been a broad reflection of the investment managers’ own equivalent policies. The Trustees’ new policy was first documented in the updated Statement of Investment Principles dated March 2020, and remains in the updated Statement of Investment Principles dated August 2020.

## The Trustees’ updated policy

---

The Trustees believe that there can be financially material risks relating to ESG issues. The Trustees have delegated the ongoing monitoring and management of ESG risks and those related to climate change to the Scheme’s investment managers. The Trustees require the Scheme’s investment managers to take ESG and climate change risks into consideration within their decision-making, recognising that how they do this will be dependent on factors including the characteristics of the asset classes in which they invest.

The Trustees have delegated responsibility for the exercise of rights (including voting rights) attached to the Scheme’s investments to the investment managers and encourage them to engage with investee companies and vote whenever it is practical to do so on financially material matters including those deemed to include a material ESG and/or climate change risk in relation to those investments.

## Manager selection exercises

---

One of the main ways in which this updated policy is expressed is via manager selection exercises: the Trustees seek advice from XPS on the extent to which their views on ESG and climate change risks may be taken into account in any future investment manager selection exercises.

During the reporting year, there have been no such manager selection exercises.

## Ongoing governance

---

The Trustees, with the assistance of XPS, monitor the processes and operational behaviour of the investment managers from time to time, to ensure they remain appropriate and in line with the Trustees’ requirements as set out in this statement. Further, the Trustees have set XPS the objective of ensuring the selected managers reflect the trustees’ views on ESG (including climate change) and stewardship.

During the reporting year, the Trustees commissioned a report from XPS on the extent to which ESG considerations are incorporated into the investment processes of the investment manager organisations appointed to the Scheme. The Trustees recognise that the level of ESG integration within the investment processes is dependent on the asset class in question.

The report was discussed at the 28<sup>th</sup> April 2020 Trustee meeting. One of the areas considered by the report was stewardship, which relates to influencing a company in which the Scheme is ultimately invested via the funds held within the Scheme’s portfolio. Companies can be influenced through meaningful engagement and using voting rights to drive long term positive change in their policies and practices. The report rated each investment manager organisation in this area and on ESG matters overall. The Trustees concluded that the ESG capabilities of the investment managers were satisfactory for the Scheme overall, but noted that some practices were assessed as poor for some of the funds in which the Scheme invests. ESG issues will be kept under review as part of the quarterly monitoring process and the Trustees will communicate their concerns with the relevant investment manager organisations when, for example, they present at meetings.

Beyond the governance work currently undertaken, the Trustees believe that their approach to, and policy on, ESG matters will evolve over time based on developments within the industry and, at least partly, on a review of data relating to the voting and engagement activity conducted annually.

## Adherence to the Statement of Investment Principles

During the reporting year the Trustees are satisfied that they followed their policy on the exercise of rights (including voting rights) and engagement activities to an acceptable degree.

## Voting activity

The main asset class where the investment managers will have voting rights is equities. The Scheme has specific allocations to equities that form part of the strategy for the LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund in which the Scheme invests. Therefore, a summary of the voting behaviour and most significant votes cast by LGIM is shown below.

### LGIM Dynamic Diversified Fund

#### Voting Information

Legal and General Investment Management Dynamic Diversified Fund

The manager voted on 99.9% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 83262 eligible votes.

#### Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

LGIM’s voting and engagement activities are driven by ESG professionals and their assessment of the requirements in these areas seeks to achieve the best outcome for all our clients. Our voting policies are reviewed annually and take into account feedback from our clients.

Every year, LGIM holds a stakeholder roundtable event where clients and other stakeholders (civil society, academia, the private sector and fellow investors) are invited to express their views directly to the members of the Investment Stewardship team. The views expressed by attendees during this event form a key consideration as we continue to develop our voting and engagement policies and define strategic priorities in the years ahead. We also take into account client feedback received at regular meetings and/ or ad-hoc comments or enquiries.

### Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

All decisions are made by LGIM's Investment Stewardship team and in accordance with our relevant Corporate Governance & Responsible Investment and Conflicts of Interest policy documents which are reviewed annually. Each member of the team is allocated a specific sector globally so that the voting is undertaken by the same individuals who engage with the relevant company. This ensures our stewardship approach flows smoothly throughout the engagement and voting process and that engagement is fully integrated into the vote decision process, therefore sending consistent messaging to companies.

### How does this manager determine what constitutes a 'Significant' Vote?

As regulation on vote reporting has recently evolved with the introduction of the concept of 'significant vote' by the EU Shareholder Rights Directive II, LGIM wants to ensure we continue to help our clients in fulfilling their reporting obligations. We also believe public transparency of our vote activity is critical for our clients and interested parties to hold us to account.

For many years, LGIM has regularly produced case studies and/ or summaries of LGIM's vote positions to clients for what we deemed were 'material votes'. We are evolving our approach in line with the new regulation and are committed to provide our clients access to 'significant vote' information.

In determining significant votes, LGIM's Investment Stewardship team takes into account the criteria provided by the Pensions & Lifetime Savings Association (PLSA) guidance. This includes but is not limited to:

- High profile vote which has such a degree of controversy that there is high client and/ or public scrutiny;
- Significant client interest for a vote: directly communicated by clients to the Investment Stewardship team at LGIM's annual Stakeholder roundtable event, or where we note a significant increase in requests from clients on a particular vote;
- Sanction vote as a result of a direct or collaborative engagement;
- Vote linked to an LGIM engagement campaign, in line with LGIM Investment Stewardship's 5-year ESG priority engagement themes.

We provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

The vote information is updated on a daily basis and with a lag of one day after a shareholder meeting is held. We also provide the rationale for all votes cast against management, including votes of support to shareholder resolutions.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that LGIM publicly discloses its vote instructions on our website at: <https://vds.issgovernance.com/vds/#/MjU2NQ==/>

### Does the manager utilise a Proxy Voting System? If so, please detail

LGIM's Investment Stewardship team uses ISS's 'ProxyExchange' electronic voting platform to electronically vote clients' shares. All voting decisions are made by LGIM and we do not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. Our use of ISS recommendations is purely to augment our own research and proprietary ESG assessment tools. The Investment Stewardship team also uses the research reports of Institutional Voting Information Services (IVIS) to supplement the research reports that we receive from ISS for UK companies when making specific voting decisions

To ensure our proxy provider votes in accordance with our position on ESG, we have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions. These instructions apply to all markets globally and seek to uphold what we consider are minimum best practice standards which we believe all companies globally should observe, irrespective of local regulation or practice.

We retain the ability in all markets to override any vote decisions, which are based on our custom voting policy. This may happen where engagement with a specific company has provided additional information (for example from direct engagement, or explanation in the annual report) that allows us to apply a qualitative overlay to our voting judgement. We have strict monitoring controls to ensure our votes are fully and effectively executed in accordance with our voting policies by our service provider. This includes a regular manual check of the votes input into the platform, and an electronic alert service to inform us of rejected votes which require further action.

### Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
Qantas Airways Limited	Resolution 3 Approve participation of Alan Joyce in the Long-Term Incentive Plan Resolution 4 Approve Remuneration Report.	LGIM voted against resolution 3 and supported resolution 4.	About 90% of shareholders supported resolution 3 and 91% supported resolution 4. The meeting results highlight LGIM's stronger stance on the topic of executive remuneration, in our view.
We will continue our engagement with the company.			
Whitehaven Coal	Resolution 6 Approve capital protection. Shareholders are asking the company for a report on the potential wind-down of the company's coal operations, with the potential to return increasing amounts of capital to shareholders.	LGIM voted for the resolution.	The resolution did not pass, as a relatively small amount of shareholders (4%) voted in favour. However, the environmental profile of the company continues to remain in the spotlight: in late 2020 the company pleaded guilty to 19 charges for breaching

			<p>mining laws that resulted in 'significant environmental harm'. As the company is on LGIM's Future World Protection List of exclusions, many of our ESG-focused funds – and select exchange-traded funds – were not invested in the company.</p>
<p>LGIM will continue to monitor this company.</p>			
<p>International Consolidated Airlines Group</p>	<p>Resolution 8: Approve Remuneration Report' was proposed at the company's annual shareholder meeting held on 7 September 2020.</p>	<p>We voted against the resolution.</p>	<p>28.4% of shareholders opposed the remuneration report.</p>
<p>LGIM will continue to engage closely with the renewed board.</p>			
<p>Lagardère</p>	<p>Shareholder resolutions A to P. Activist Amber Capital, which owned 16% of the share capital at the time of engagement, proposed 8 new directors to the Supervisory Board (SB) of Lagardère, as well as to remove all the incumbent directors (apart from two 2019 appointments).</p>	<p>LGIM voted in favour of five of the Amber-proposed candidates (resolutions H,J,K,L,M) and voted off five of the incumbent Lagardère SB directors (resolutions B,C,E,F,G).</p>	<p>Even though shareholders did not give majority support to Amber's candidates, its proposed resolutions received approx. between 30-40% support, a clear indication that many shareholders have concerns with the board. (Source: ISS data)</p>
<p>LGIM will continue to engage with the company to understand its future strategy and how it will add value to shareholders over the long term, as well as to keep the structure of SB under review.</p>			
<p>Imperial Brands plc</p>	<p>Resolutions 2 and 3, respectively, Approve Remuneration Report and Approve Remuneration Policy.</p>	<p>LGIM voted against both resolutions.</p>	<p>Resolution 2 (Approve Remuneration Report) received 40.26% votes against, and 59.73% votes of support. Resolution 3 (Approve Remuneration Policy) received 4.71% of votes against, and 95.28% support.</p>

LGIM continues to engage with companies on remuneration both directly and via IVIS, the corporate governance research arm of The Investment Association. LGIM annually publishes remuneration guidelines for UK listed companies.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_, Chair of Trustees

Date: \_\_\_\_\_