

Engagement Policy Implementation Statement (“EPIS”)

The Motor Industry Pension Plan (the “Plan”) Plan Year End – 5 April 2025

The purpose of the EPIS is for us, the Trustee of the Motor Industry Pension Plan, to document what we have done during the year ending 5 April 2025 to achieve certain policies and objectives set out in the Statement of Investment Principles (“SIP”). It includes:

1. How our policies in the SIP about asset stewardship (including both voting and engagement activity) in relation to the Plan’s investments have been followed during the year; and
2. 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, and the ‘most significant’ votes cast over the reporting year.

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.

In our view, the Plan’s underlying investment managers chosen by Aon Investments Limited (“AIL”) were able to disclose good evidence of voting and engagement activity. We believe the engagement activities carried out over the year align with our stewardship priorities and that our voting policy has been implemented effectively.

How voting and engagement policies have been followed

The Plan is invested entirely in pooled funds, and so the responsibility for voting and engagement is delegated to the Plan's investment managers. With the help of our advisers, we reviewed the stewardship activity of the underlying investment managers carried out over the Plan year and in our view, most of the underlying investment managers were able to disclose good evidence of voting and engagement activity. More information on the stewardship activity carried out by the Plan's investment managers can be found in the following sections of this report.

Over the reporting year, we monitored the performance of the Plan's investments on a quarterly basis and received updates on important issues from our investment adviser, Aon Investments Limited ("Aon"). We received quarterly Environmental Social Governance ("ESG") ratings from Aon for the funds the Plan is invested in where available.

During the year, we were presented with Aon's annual stewardship report which includes some of the key stewardship activity carried out by Aon over the year.

Each year, with the help of our advisers, we review the voting and engagement policies of the Plan's underlying investment managers to ensure they align with our own policies for the Plan and help us to achieve them.

The Plan's stewardship policy can be found in the SIP:
<https://pensioninformation.aon.com/mipp/documents.aspx>

Our Engagement Action Plan

Based on the work we have done for the EPIS, we have decided to take the following steps over the next 12 months, in relation to the Plan's underlying investment managers:

Whilst Legal and General Asset Management ("L&G") provided a complete list of engagements for the invested funds, which we find encouraging, they did not provide detailed engagement examples specific to the funds in which we are invested, as per the Investment Consultants Sustainability Working Group ("ICSWG") industry standard engagement reporting template. Aon will continue to engage with L&G to encourage improvements in its engagement reporting.

We will continue to undertake an annual review of the Aon's Stewardship Report and evaluate how the underlying investment managers' Responsible Investment policies align with those of our own.

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 Environmental Social Governance ("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 manager's engagement activity

We delegate the management of the Plan's defined benefit assets to AIL, who manage the Plan's assets in a range of funds which can include multi-asset, multi-manager and liability matching funds. AIL selects the underlying investment managers on our behalf.

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 investment 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.

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

AIL has a net zero commitment to deliver UK delegated investment portfolios and default strategies which have a net zero carbon emissions profile by 2050.

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

Our 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 stewardship is in the members' best interests to promote best practice and encourage 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 Plan's investments is an important factor in deciding whether a manager remains the right choice for the Plan.

Voting rights are attached to listed equity shares, including equities held in multi-asset funds. We expect the Plan's equity-owning investment managers to responsibly exercise their voting rights.

Voting statistics

The table below shows the voting statistics for each of the Plan's material funds with voting rights for the year to 31 March 2025. Managers collate voting information on a quarterly basis. The voting information provided is for the year to 31 March 2025 which broadly matches the Plan's accounting year.

Funds	Number of resolutions eligible to vote on	% of resolutions voted	% of votes against management	% of votes abstained from
L&G - Multi-Factor Equity Fund	11,446	99.8%	20.8%	0.4%
UBS - Global Equity Climate Transition Fund	12,234	93.0%	8.1%	0.1%

Source: Managers.

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.

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 Plan's material managers use proxy voting advisers.

Managers	Description of use of proxy voting advisers
L&G	L&G's Investment Stewardship team uses Institutional Shareholder Services' ("ISS's") 'ProxyExchange' electronic voting platform to electronically vote. All voting decisions are made by L&G and L&G does not outsource any part of the strategic decisions. To ensure L&G's proxy provider votes in accordance with L&G's position on ESG, L&G have put in place a custom voting policy with specific voting instructions.
UBS	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.

Source: Managers

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.

Source: UN PRI

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.

Significant voting examples

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

Our managers' engagement activity

Engagement is when an investor communicates with current (or potential) investee companies (or issuers) 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.

The table below shows some of the engagement activity carried out by the Plan's underlying investment managers. 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	104	1,868	Environment - Climate; Other Environment Related Social - Human Right & Stakeholder Governance - Corporate Governance; Corporate Behaviour
Aegon Asset Management ("Aegon") – European Asset Backed Securities (ABS) Fund	115	422	Environment - Climate Change Social - Human and Labour Rights Governance - Leadership - Chair/CEO; Remuneration Other - General Disclosure
L&G - Multi-Factor Equity Fund	682	4,399	Environment - Climate Impact Pledge Social - Human Rights Governance - Capital Management; Remuneration Other - Corporate Strategy
Robeco - Credit Income Fund	12	324	Environment - Climate Change Social - Human and Labour Rights Governance - Shareholder Rights; Board effectiveness - Other
UBS - Global Equity Climate Transition Fund	174	425	Environment - Climate Change Social - Human and labour rights Governance - Remuneration; Board effectiveness – Other; Leadership - Chair/CEO Strategy, Financial & Reporting - Capital Allocation

Source: Managers.

Data limitations

At the time of writing, L&G did provide fund-level engagement information but these were not in the Investments Consultants Sustainability Working Group industry standard template.

This report does not include commentary on certain asset classes such as gilts or cash because of the limited materiality of stewardship associated with these asset classes. In addition, this report does not include the additional voluntary contributions ("AVCs") due to the relatively small proportion of the Plan's assets that are held as AVCs.

Trustee Director : Amanda Asante

Date: 29 August 2025

Appendix – Significant Voting Examples

In the table below are some significant vote examples provided by the Plan's underlying material investment managers. 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 of which are outlined in the examples below:

L&G – Multi-Factor Equity Fund	Company name	Wells Fargo & Company
	Date of vote	30 April 2024
	Approximate size of fund's or mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	0.5%
	Summary of the resolution	Resolution 7: Commission Third Party Assessment on Company's Commitment to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining Rights
	How the manager voted?	Votes supporting resolution
	Where the manager voted against management, did the manager communicate their voting intentions 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. It is our policy not to engage with our investee companies in the three weeks prior to an AGM as our engagement is not limited to shareholder meeting topics.
	Rationale for the voting decision	Shareholder Resolution - Labour rights: A vote in favour is applied as L&G supports proposals that are set to improve human rights standards and employee policies because we consider this issue to be a material risk to companies.
	Outcome of the vote	Fail
	Implications of the outcome e.g. were there any lessons learned and what likely future steps will the manager take in response to 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 has the manager assessed this vote to be most significant?	High Profile meeting: This shareholder resolution is considered significant due to the relatively high level of support received.
UBS – Global Equity Climate Transition Fund	Company name	Bank of America Corporation
	Date of vote	24 April 2024
	Approximate size of fund's or 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 the manager voted?	Votes supporting resolution
	Where the manager voted against management, did the manager communicate their voting intentions to the company ahead of the vote?	No
	Rationale for the voting decision	We 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 e.g. were there any lessons learned and what likely future steps will the manager take in response to the outcome?	Given strong shareholder support, we shall monitor further developments.
	On which criteria has the manager assessed this vote to be most significant?	Aggregate percentage of votes in support of resolution exceeded 25% of votes cast.

Source: Managers.