

Port of Tyne Authority Superannuation Pension Scheme Implementation Statement for the year ended 31 December 2020

Purpose

This Implementation Statement provides information on how, and the extent to which, the Trustees of the Port of Tyne Authority Superannuation 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 December 2020 ("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 documented in the updated Statement of Investment Principles dated September 2019.

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 and Company views on ESG (including climate change) and stewardship.

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 through from the diversified growth funds in which the Scheme invests. Therefore, a summary of the voting behaviour and most significant votes cast by each of the relevant investment manager organisations is shown below.

LGIM – Dynamic Diversified Fund

Voting Information
Legal and General Investment Management Dynamic Diversified Fund
<p>The manager voted on 99.86% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 81093 eligible votes.</p>
Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote
<p>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.</p>
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 consultation (PLSA). 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 will provide information on significant votes in the format of detailed case studies in our quarterly ESG impact report and annual active ownership publications.

If you have any additional questions on specific votes, please note that we publicly disclose our votes for the major markets on our website. The reports are published in a timely manner, at the end of each month and can be used by clients for their external reporting requirements. The voting disclosures can be found by selecting 'Voting Report' on the following page:

http://documentlibrary.lgim.com/litlibrary/lglibrary_463150.html?req=internal

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 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.
LGIM will continue to monitor this company.			
International Consolidated Airlines Group	Resolution 8: Approve Remuneration Report' was proposed at the company's annual shareholder meeting held on 7 September 2020.	We voted against the resolution.	28.4% of shareholders opposed the remuneration report.
LGIM will continue to engage closely with the renewed board.			
Lagardere	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 Lagardere, as well as to remove all the incumbent directors (apart from two 2019 appointments).	LGIM voted in favour of five of the Amber-proposed candidates (resolutions H,J,K,L,M) and voted off five of the incumbent Lagardere SB directors (resolutions B,C,E,F,G).	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)
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.			
Pearson	'Resolution 1: Amend remuneration policy' was proposed at the company's special shareholder meeting, held on 18 September 2020.	We voted against the amendment to the remuneration policy.	At the EGM, 33% of shareholders voted against the co-investment plan and therefore, by default, the appointment of the new CEO.
Such significant dissent clearly demonstrates the scale of investor concern with the company's approach. It is important that the company has a new CEO, a crucial step in the journey to recover value; but key governance questions remain which will now need to be addressed through continuous engagement.			

BlackRock – Dynamic Diversified Fund

Voting Information
BlackRock Dynamic Diversified Growth Fund
The manager voted on 96.82% of resolutions of which they were eligible out of 12609 eligible votes.

Investment Manager Client Consultation Policy on Voting

Our voting guidelines are intended to help clients and companies understand our thinking on key governance matters. They are the benchmark against which we assess a company's approach to corporate governance and the items on the agenda to be voted on at the shareholder meeting. We apply our guidelines pragmatically, taking into account a company's unique circumstances where relevant. We inform our vote decisions through research and engage as necessary. If a client wants to implement their own voting policy, they will need to be in a segregated account. BlackRock's Investment Stewardship team would not implement the policy ourselves, but the client would engage a third-party voting execution platform to cast the votes.

Investment Manager Process to determine how to Vote

The team and its voting and engagement work continuously evolves in response to changing governance related developments and expectations. Our voting guidelines are market-specific to ensure we take into account a company's unique circumstances by market, where relevant. We inform our vote decisions through research and engage as necessary. Our engagement priorities are global in nature and are informed by BlackRock's observations of governance related and market developments, as well as through dialogue with multiple stakeholders, including clients. We may also update our regional engagement priorities based on issues that we believe could impact the long-term sustainable financial performance of companies in those markets. We welcome discussions with our clients on engagement and voting topics and priorities to get their perspective and better understand which issues are important to them. As outlined in our Global Corporate Governance and Engagement Principles, BlackRock determines which companies to engage directly based on our assessment of the materiality of the issue for sustainable long-term financial returns and the likelihood of our engagement being productive. Our voting guidelines are intended to help clients and companies understand our thinking on key governance matters. They are the benchmark against which we assess a company's approach to corporate governance and the items on the agenda to be voted on at the shareholder meeting. We apply our guidelines pragmatically, taking into account a company's unique circumstances where relevant. We inform our vote decisions through research and engage as necessary. If a client wants to implement their own voting policy, they will need to be in a segregated account. BlackRock's Investment Stewardship team would not implement the policy ourselves, but the client would engage a third-party voting execution platform to cast the votes.

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

During the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, BlackRock Investment Stewardship periodically published detailed explanations of specific key votes in "vote bulletins". These bulletins are intended to explain our vote decision, including the analysis underpinning it and relevant engagement history when applicable, on certain high-profile proposals at company shareholder meetings. We make this information public shortly after the shareholder meeting, so clients and others can be aware of our vote determination when it is most relevant to them. We consider these vote bulletins to contain explanations of the most significant votes for the purpose of the Shareholder Rights Directive II.

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

BlackRock's proxy voting process is led by the BlackRock Investment Stewardship team (BIS), which consists of three regional teams – Americas ("AMRS"), Asia-Pacific ("APAC"), and Europe, Middle East and Africa ("EMEA") - located in seven offices around the world. The analysts with each team will generally determine how to vote at the meetings of the companies they cover. Voting decisions are made by members of the BlackRock Investment Stewardship team with input from investment colleagues as required, in each case, in accordance with BlackRock's Global Corporate Governance and Engagement Principles and custom market-specific voting guidelines.

Top 5 Significant Votes during the Period

Company	Voting Subject	How did the Investment Manager Vote?	Result
EXXON MOBIL CORP	Item 1.2: Elect Director Angela F. Braly Item 1.4: Elect Director Kenneth C. Frazier Item 4: Require Independent Board Chair https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/literature/press-release/blk-vote-bulletin-exxon-may-2020.pdf	Against, Against, For	N/A
As we have discussed during our most recent conversations with Exxon Mobil Corporation (Exxon), we continue to see a gap in the company's disclosure and action with regard to several components of its climate risk management. We see this as a corporate governance issue that has the potential to undermine the company's long-term financial sustainability. Our approach to investment stewardship is grounded in an expectation that the board will oversee and advise management, influencing management's approach to key business issues. When effective corporate governance is lacking, we believe that voting against the re-election of the responsible directors is often the most impactful action a shareholder can take. The directors in the boardroom, the independence of their voices, and the value of their collective experience are meaningful determinants of their ability to provide direction and leadership to management and to oversee and drive management's performance.			
ROYAL DUTCH SHELL PLC CLASS B	Item 21: Request Shell to Set and Publish Targets for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/literature/press-release/blk-vote-bulletin-shell-may-2020.pdf	Against	N/A
We will continue to engage with the company on its governance practices, reporting on material factors including the alignment with the SASB guidelines, and on the development of its plans to achieve its ambitious climate commitments.			
CHEVRON CORP	Item 6: Report on Climate Lobbying Aligned with Paris Agreement Goals https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/literature/press-release/blk-vote-bulletin-chevron-may-2020.pdf	FOR	N/A
0			

WOODSIDE PETROLEUM LTD	Item 4a: Special Resolution to Amend the company Constitution Item 4b (1-3): Ordinary Resolution on Paris Goals and Targets Item 4c: Ordinary Resolution on Climate-Related Lobbying Item 4d: Ordinary Resolution on Reputation Advertising Activities https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/literature/press-release/blk-vote-bulletin-woodside-may-2020.pdf	Against, Against, Against, Against	N/A
We will continue to engage with the board and management of Woodside on a range of governance and material sustainability issues, including its long-term ambition for carbon neutrality. We will also monitor and provide feedback on the relevant disclosures and targets once published			
BARCLAYS PLC	Resolution 29: Approve Barclays' Commitment to Tackling Climate Change Resolution 30: Approve ShareAction Requisitioned Resolution https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/literature/press-release/blk-vote-bulletin-barclays-may-2020.pdf	For, Against	N/A

Signed: _____, Chair of Trustees

Date: _____