



Options Workplace Mastertrust Implementation Statement



PART OF



GROUP PLC

Introduction

This document is designed to be used in conjunction with the Statement of Investment Principles and:

- sets out how, and the extent to which, in the opinion of the Trustee, the policies in the SIP have been followed during the year
- describes any reviews of the SIP undertaken during the period and any other review of how the SIP has been met, as well as explaining any changes made to the SIP during the period and the reasons for those changes
- describes the voting behaviour performed on behalf of the Trustee (including the most significant votes cast by Trustee or on their behalf) during the period and states any use of the services of a proxy voter during that year
- Confirms that the Trustees are comfortable that the SIP has been effectively followed throughout the period (subject to some minor points) as described in more detail below.

This document covers the scheme year period from 1st April 2022 – 31st March 2023. The SIP was updated once during this period in June 2022. It has since been most recently updated in September 2023. The latest version can be found [here](#).

Changes to investments available over the last year

The following changes were made to the range of investments made available.

Following engagement by the Trustees and their Investment Adviser adjustments were made to the Quilter investment benchmark in order to move away from a UK focus to a more globalised portfolio. In addition, the decision was made to consolidate the funds into a single range to help achieve better economies of scale. This move happened gradually over the year and was fully completed after the end of the scheme year end in May 2023.

With the launch of the Wahed strategy the previous Islamic Lifestyle became redundant, and assets were gradually consolidated into the new strategy. The legacy Islamic Lifestyle was closed in April 2022.

The Trustees, assisted by their Investment Adviser, regularly monitor the full range of investments and consider the ongoing appropriateness of the range on an at least quarterly basis. The Trustees are able to make changes as they see fit at any time and will do so if deemed necessary. The Trustees have a number of projects in progress to improve the range for the membership. This includes the introduction of a streamlined self-select range, including the Options “Your Tomorrow” fund which will provide an investment Options for members who want their pension savings to create a greater positive ESG impact. The Trustees have also approved the consolidation of the Blackrock Lifepath funds into the Primary Default AB Target Date funds and the introduction of lifestyling elements into the TAM default. The Trustees are continuously exploring further consolidation of the range.

Changes to the SIP over the last year

The SIP was updated once during the Scheme year in June 2022 and contained the following key changes:

- Addition of a Climate beliefs statement to reflect lessons learned from TCFD reporting and the Trustees’ commitment to both recognising the importance of Climate Change and taking relevant action.
- The removal of the legacy Islamic Lifestyle following the transfer of assets to the Wahed section.
- The Quilter section was updated to reflect the planned consolidation and adjustments to the range which have now been completed. The new Lifestyle, which has a reduced UK focus and derisks later, was fully implemented in May 2023.

Subsequent to the Scheme year-end, the SIP was updated again on 15 May 2023 with the following changes:

- The long-term investment objective was updated to remove reference to DB schemes as this was felt to be confusing.
- Confirmation of the planned consolidation of the Blackrock Funds into the AB TDFs was added.
- Areas where commentary was repeated for different scheme sections such as those surrounding risks were consolidated into a single section to reduce length.

Actions that were to be completed this year

Each year the Trustees ensure they review the performance and continued appropriateness of the investment range. The Trustees achieved this by receiving at least quarterly updates from the investment advisor in order to review the appropriateness and performance of the default funds. A more in-depth annual review of the Scheme and its investments was also conducted on 29 November 2022. The Trustees are continuing to work to improve the range offered to the membership and have several projects in progress to achieve this. While the impact of Covid-19 has meant that meetings continued to be held virtually throughout this period, the Trustees are satisfied that there has been no member detriment as a result of this.

The Trustees aim to engage directly with their managers both to assess their performance and to better understand their practices and policies in terms of their stewardship and investment beliefs. Where performance has been a cause for concern, the Trustees believe in engaging with managers and working with them to find a solution to minimise the risk of crystallising any poor performance by selling at the lowest point.

The Trustees, as part of their commitment to taking action on climate change, produced a further TCFD report to monitor progress towards their climate goals, and assess the climate risks and opportunities present in the Scheme's investments. The Trustees were satisfied that their managers demonstrated sufficient commitment towards achieving net zero.

The Trustees have the responsibility to review the fees paid to their Scheme investment managers and custodians to ensure they are consistent with industry norms for the services they provide. To satisfy this they drew on the knowledge of their investment advisor to confirm the fees being paid are not out of line with what they experience more generally in the market. The Trustees were satisfied that the fee levels being paid were not unreasonable for the level of service and products offered.

A review of the membership was completed and presented to the Trustees on 3rd October 2022. It was identified that average pot size was relatively small, with the average age of members being 40. The Scheme had undergone significant growth over the previous 12 months, but the Trustees do not believe that this is a reason to make changes to the investment range. Retirements and transfers out were minimal and there was no evidence for inappropriate withdrawals. The Trustees are satisfied that they are able to provide an appropriate service to their membership.

The Trustees

Two new members were added to the Trustee board during the year in order to increase the Trustee boards capacity and capabilities:

- **Align Pensions**, represented by Bhavna Kumar was appointed on 1 June 2022. Bhavna now chairs the investment committee for the master trust.
- **Gwyneth Lloyd** was appointed on 22 August 2022. Gwyneth now chairs the communications committee.

The Trustees have continued enhancing their skills and training. As part of their role with Options, they have received training from their Investment Advisers on TCFD and climate change. The Trustees have also individually pursued training in a variety of areas.

Monitoring

The Investment Subcommittee has met either in person or by teleconference seven times over the period. The Trustees have received monitoring updates on all investments from their investment advisors on at least a quarterly basis. The latest update confirmed that, despite 2022 being one of the worst years in history for investment performance across asset classes, the default funds continued to perform as expected when compared against their peers.

The Trustees have reviewed the range of defaults available with the assistance of their investment advisor, who has considered the risk and return characteristics of each. The Trustees identified that in the case of Quilter and TAM that the risk benchmarks used may not be optimal for the membership. As a result of the engagement with TAM, progress is underway to implement a lifestyle in the TAM section of the Scheme to provide more appropriate risk levels to members who are either very far from or close to retirement. As a result of the engagement with Quilter the fund ranges have now been unified and the strategy has moved to be less heavily weighted towards the UK in recognition of changing global markets. The Trustees see these actions as an effective implementation of their monitoring policy. The Trustees have also made the decision to consolidate the Lifepath range into the AB TDFs which they believe will give members better risk control and help allow economies of scale.

As part of the investment advisor's assessment of suitability of the investment range, the advisor has considered, amongst other factors, the risks associated with the investments, particularly with a view on those with inadequate liquidity, poor diversification, underperformance, country/political and organisational risk.

Known Departures from SIP & Issues

There were no known significant departures/issues regarding the SIP. The Trustees have identified one minor issue: although the previous Islamic Lifestyle was fully closed in April 2022, it was not removed from the SIP until June 2022. We do not believe there has been any material member detriment as members were unable to invest in these funds during this period.

ESG, Stewardship & Material Non-Financial Considerations

The Trustees have previously made clear their beliefs on ESG issues and material non-financial considerations. In order to ensure that their views are accurately reflected in their investments, the Trustees have shared their views with the default investment managers, and in turn considered their ESG beliefs. The Trustees consider the stewardship capabilities of investment managers, as well as their ESG and Climate Change integration policies, as part of the hiring and retention process.

Holding Managers to account

When the Trustees identify potential causes for concern with their investment managers, they prefer, where possible, to invite them to present directly and address concerns.

One such example during the period was the Investment Consultants visiting TAM for a meeting to discuss how the presentation of climate metrics could be improved and how we could move towards implementing lifestyling. On both of these, significant progress is being made, with TAM able to produce much more comprehensive Climate metrics this year than last year and this is reflected in the TCFD report.

The Trustees also, as part of their climate reporting, recognised that their property holdings could be exposed to significant climate related risks. By engaging with their managers, they identified that their property exposure is largely passive and predominantly invested in indices without explicit climate change awareness targets. Exposure to the US is significant and is where transition risk is highest. The only direct property within a default fund, Segro PLC which is held within Quilter, is a UK industrial and logistics landlord deemed to have low ESG risk by Sustainalytics. The Trustees agreed to monitor the situation and ensure managers were aware of these risks.

In the process of creating this report the Trustees identified a number of votes made by Blackrock within the Lifepath funds which they felt were at odds with their beliefs. These included a number of votes made against climate related proposals for Equinor ASA as well as a vote against "Request Shell to Set and Publish Targets for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions", against Chevron to "Adopt Medium and Long-Term GHG Emissions Reduction Targets" and against Sumitomo Mitsui Financial Group, Inc. to "Amend Articles to Disclose Plan Outlining Company's Business Strategy to Align Investments with Goals of Paris Agreement". The Trustees challenged Blackrock on these. We summarise their response for each below though Blackrock provide full rationale for their voting decisions as part of their vote bulletins available on their website.

- **Equinor ASA:** Blackrock is supportive of managements climate strategy, and believes they are making good progress. They felt the shareholder proposals were largely unnecessary, with significant overlap with the current plans, and that as an Oil and Gas company they did not have full control over shorter term emissions due to uncertain demand therefore could not effectively set targets.
- **Shell:** Blackrock voted for the management proposal for an Energy Transition Progress update and against a shareholder proposal for GHG targets. Blackrock felt that as an Oil and Gas company they did not have full control over shorter term emissions due to uncertain demand therefore could not effectively set targets. Blackrock did not believe the shareholder proposal was additive.
- **Chevron:** Blackrock did not support this proposal as the company has already set scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG reduction targets, and particularly note the difficulty for oil and gas companies to set scope 3 targets. Blackrock believe Chevron has made reasonable progress and updates on their emissions reduction targets.
- **Sumitomo Mitsui Financial Group:** Blackrock felt that the company had already demonstrated sufficient commitment to address climate related risks by making disclosure already, and that the proposed changes would be legally binding and overly prescriptive which was not in the shareholders' interests.

The Trustees accept that energy security concerns mean gas and oil demand is currently unknown and that these organisations do have transition plans in place, but still believe that setting shorter term targets is important even if these are not set as binding targets. The Trustee will continue to challenge on this issue and once more information is known determine a suitable course of action. As a point of mitigation the decision to remove this range of funds has already been made.

ESG, Stewardship & Material Non-Financial Considerations (continued)

Voting Rights

The Trustees recognise the importance of voting and engagement as an essential part of good governance. However, the Trustees also recognise that it is impractical and often impossible to have direct involvement in the day-to-day voting activities of their managers, and thus delegate this responsibility. The Trustees have asked their managers to provide details of voting made within each fund holding equities, including whether a proxy was used. The responses were varied, as many of the managers further deferred these voting rights to underlying managers. The manager responses are covered below with significant votes in the appendix.

AB (Target Date Funds)

Mobius have provided us with a document covering the funds holding equity in the Target Date Funds, this document is attached as the final appendix to this document.

AB engages with issuers which they invest in directly, both during research and while invested. The majority of funds within the TDF are accessed through other managers. Where they use other managers within the TDFs, they prefer those that actively engage, believing it is an important part of investment management.

Furthermore, AB, and their underlying managers, often engage issuers before votes in order to align interests ahead of time. However they are willing to vote against issuers promoting poor ESG practices. AB have informed us they are active users of their voting rights and use them to encourage sustainability and promote ESG issues. In 2018 Ceres rated them as one of the Top Four companies globally voting for climate-related proposals.

Amundi Index MSCI World Climate Transition Fund

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	9,386
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	100,558
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	94%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	91%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	8%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	1%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	35%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	We use Institutional Shareholder Services' (ISS) electronic platform to execute our vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting. In certain markets, we work with proxy research firms who apply our proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform our voting decision.
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	0%

ESG, Stewardship & Material Non-Financial Considerations (continued)

Aegon Blackrock Lifepath Funds

An overview of the voting activity that took place within the Lifepath Target Date funds is provided below. Significant vote information is provided in the appendix. As discussed in the Holding Managers to Account section, a number of votes made appeared to be in contrast to the Trustees' beliefs and we are awaiting a further response.

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	9,386
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	100,558
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	94%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	91%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	8%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	1%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	35%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	We use Institutional Shareholder Services' (ISS) electronic platform to execute our vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting. In certain markets, we work with proxy research firms who apply our proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform our voting decision.
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	0%

Quilter Fund Range

An overview of the voting activity that took place within the Quilter funds is provided below.

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	96
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	1649
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	100%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	96%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	4%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	0%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	26%

ESG, Stewardship & Material Non-Financial Considerations (continued)

Quilter Fund Range (continued)

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	We use the ISS proxy voting service in order to inform our decision making, however we will not automatically implement its recommendations. When we meet a company to discuss governance issues the research analyst does so alongside the responsible investment team as we are committed to ensuring that responsible investment operates within our investment process rather than apart from it.
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	3%

TAM Balanced Fund

TAM do not have direct access to the voting rights but were able to collect information from two of their underlying funds, Nomura Global Sustainable Equity Fund and the SSGA SPDR MSCI World Climate Paris Aligned UCITS. They have collated these below:

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	627
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	9,237
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	89%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	90.86%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	8.95%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	0.36%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	48%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	ISS
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	7.14%

TAM were unable to provide data for the following equity funds:

- Firststate Stewart Investors - Worldwide sustainability Fund
- Liontrust Sustainable Future UK Growth
- Wellington Management US Dynamic.
- iShares II MSCI USA Islamic UCITS ETF
- iShares II MSCI World Islamic UCITS ETF

The Trustees' investment advisor is in regular engagement with TAM and will put pressure on them to provide more comprehensive voting data, stressing that it is a requirement of the Trustees. The Trustees will consider the ability to provide voting information when reviewing and deciding whether to retain their managers.

Shard Balanced Fund

Shard have only one underlying fund with the ability to access voting rights, the HSBC MSCI World Climate Paris Aligned UCITS ETF. The information is copied out below.

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	6,686
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	84,256
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	96.09%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	83.18%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	15.91%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	0.91%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	89%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	n/a
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	n/a

Wahed Fund Range

Wahed provided two completed PLSA Templates for the scheme, one covering the HSBC Islamic Global Equity fund and one covering both the iShares MSCI World Islamic UCITS ETF and the iShares MSCI EM Islamic UCITS ETF. These engagements will have been performed by Blackrock on behalf of Wahed. The results of these have been collated below with significant vote information attached to this report as an appendix.

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	20,970
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	195,498
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	98,03%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	86.77%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	11.26%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	1.97%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	44%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	BlackRock Investment Stewardship/ ISS
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	n/a

Amber self-select range**Tatton Oak Funds – Blended Aggressive Fund, Cautious Growth Fund and Capital Growth Fund**

Tatton Oak have stated that they did not take part in any votes on these funds during the period. While the impact is mitigated by these funds being self-select funds, the Trustees still believe engagement is a vital part of fund management and expect to see evidence of this in all strategies. The Trustees will consider these factors, amongst others, when determining any future self-select range.

Aegon Ethical Cautious Managed

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	62
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	1,136
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	100%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	98.50%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	0.88%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	0.62%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	9.70%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	"ISS, IVIS. We only use their research as a reference when making voting decisions"
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	4.78%

The significant vote information for the fund is attached as an appendix to this report. The manager has only reported two significant votes over the period, we would expect that as over 9,000 votes took place that the manager would be able to identify more than two significant votes. While the impact is mitigated by these funds being self-select funds, the Trustees still believe engagement is a vital part of fund management and expect to see evidence of this in all strategies. The Trustees will consider these factors, amongst others, when determining any future self-select range.

Newton Global Income

Voting Statistic (Applicable to the Scheme's reporting period)	Response
How many meetings were you eligible to vote at?	53
How many resolutions were you eligible to vote on?	897
What % of resolutions did you vote on for which you were eligible?	100%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote with management?	92.2%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote against management?	7.8%
Of the resolutions on which you voted, what % did you vote to abstain?	0%
In what % of meetings, for which you did vote, did you vote at least once against management?	57%
Which proxy advisory services does your firm use, and do you use their standard voting policy or created your own bespoke policy which they then implemented on your behalf?	Newton utilises an independent voting service provider for the purposes of managing upcoming meetings and instructing voting decisions via its electronic platform, and for providing research. Its voting recommendations of are not routinely followed; it is only in the event that we recognise a potential material conflict of interest as described above that the recommendation of our external voting service provider will be applied.
What % of resolutions, on which you did vote, did you vote contrary to the recommendation of your proxy adviser? (if applicable)	6.0%

The significant vote information for the fund is attached as an appendix to this report. The manager has only reported nine significant votes rather than ten. While the impact is mitigated by these funds being self-select funds, the Trustees still believe engagement is a vital part of fund management and expect to see evidence of this in all strategies. The Trustees will consider these factors, amongst others, when determining any future self-select range.

LF (Woodford) Equity Income

The LF (Woodford) Equity Income Fund is in the process of being wound up and the manager has been unable to provide information on engagement. The closing of this fund by the scheme, however, mitigates this as the only significant remaining assets are those that may be paid out as a result of FCA action.

Trustees' Comments

Where investment managers have provided full responses the Trustees have found that their managers are taking their responsibilities seriously and voting in a way consistent with the Trustees' beliefs. The Trustees are pleased to see a number of votes in favour of better ESG and Climate disclosures as the Trustees believe that transparency around these issues is highly important, particularly when it comes to tackling Climate Change.

Coverage of stewardship information has improved since last year, though the Trustees are disappointed that there are still some gaps in data, and some voting rights not being used effectively. The Trustees will continue to work with their managers to improve disclosure and encourage active stewardship.

The Trustees were disappointed to see votes within the Lifepath funds that appeared to be at odds with their own beliefs. They are hoping to receive a satisfying response as to why these occurred.

Appendix

Quilter

	Company name	Date of vote	Summary of the resolution	How you voted	Rationale for the voting decision
Vote 1	Honeywell International	25/04/2022	Reduce Ownership Threshold for Shareholders to Call Special Meeting	Against	ISS recommends eliminating the 20-shareholder aggregation limit as it is thought to improve the company's existing proxy access right for shareholders. The board states that it formulated the various terms concerning its proxy access right based on investor views, its own institutional shareholder profile, its current governance practices and other company proxy access provisions. After discussing internally, it has been highlighted that the existing threshold is not out of sync with other US listed corporations. Therefore, we will be voting in line with management on this resolution.
Vote 2	Pfizer	28/04/2022	Amend Proxy Access Right	Against	ISS recommends eliminating the 20-shareholder aggregation limit as it is thought to improve the company's existing proxy access right for shareholders. The board states that it formulated the various terms concerning its proxy access right based on investor views, its own institutional shareholder profile, its current governance practices and other company proxy access provisions. After discussing internally, it has been highlighted that the existing threshold is not out of sync with other US listed corporations. Therefore, we will be voting in line with management on this resolution.
Vote 3	JPMorgan Chase	17/05/2022	Reduce Ownership Threshold for Shareholders to Call Special Meeting	Against	ISS recommends voting in favour of reducing the ownership threshold for shareholder to call a special meeting and removal of the holding period requirement would provide for a more useful special meeting right for shareholders. After discussing internally, it has been highlighted that the existing threshold is not out of sync with other US listed corporations. Additionally, a lower threshold is not necessarily aligned with long-term shareholder interests as under the 10 percent threshold, a single shareholder would be able to reach the proposed threshold which could lead to increased expenditure of company costs and resources. Therefore, we will be voting in line with management on this resolution.
Vote 4	Amazon.com	25/05/2022	Adopt a Policy to Include Non-Management Employees as Prospective Director Candidates	Against	The company already has in place engagement programmes, and independent directors are well represented on the board (9 out of 11), therefore, we have decided to vote in line with management on this item.
Vote 5	Chevron	25/05/2022	Issue Audited Net-Zero Scenario Analysis Report	Against	There is no current framework to audit a net zero transition plan for oil companies as there isn't one yet through SBTi. While we would support such a resolution if it focused on shorter term steps, we have decided to vote in line with management on this item.
Vote 6	Tesla	02/06/2022	Report on Corporate Climate Lobbying in line with Paris Agreement	Against	Most of the information can be found in existing disclosures, therefore we will be voting in line with management.

Quilter (continued)

	Company name	Date of vote	Summary of the resolution	How you voted	Rationale for the voting decision
Vote 7	Microsoft	13/12/2022	Report on Government Use of Microsoft Technology	Against	The company provides adequate information on its human rights principles, due diligence, and oversight related to government use of its technology.
Vote 8	Visa	24/01/2023	Require Independent Board Chair	Against	The proponent believes that having one individual hold both the roles of CEO and chair diminishes the unique responsibilities inherent to each role, which are critical to the health of a successful corporation. However, the board has a lead independent director with clearly delineated and robust duties, the company has established governance guidelines and there are no concerns regarding board and committee independence or the company's performance or governance practices. In addition, the proposal appears to contemplate an immediate separation of the roles rather than a separation at the next CEO transition.
Vote 9	Apple	10/03/2023	Report on Civil Rights and Non-Discrimination Audit	Against	The company has adequate disclosures related to its DEI initiatives and commitments, and it has already committed to conducting a civil rights audit.
Vote 10	Nordea Bank	23/03/2023	Amend Articles Re: General Meeting Participation; General Meeting	Against	The item is in line with the updated Finnish Companies Act, and the company explains that shareholders can exercise their full decision-making powers, including the right to speak, make counterproposals and vote, in real-time, using a telecommunication connection and technical means. The company also highlights that virtual meetings enable all shareholders to engage with the management regardless of the shareholders' geographical location. Considering a hybrid meetings model, which many companies already partake in, also allow shareholders to participate irrespective of location, we don't consider this a compelling rationale. Additionally, open, and direct communication (facilitated by in person meetings) with the board is important.

Blackrock Lifepath Funds

Company name	Summary of the resolution	How you voted	Rationale for the voting decision	Outcome of the vote
Royal Dutch Shell Plc	Request Shell to Set and Publish Targets for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions	Against	[RU-S0000-001] Proposal is not in shareholders' best interests.	Fail
Equinor ASA	Introduce a Climate Target Agenda and Emission Reduction Plan	Against	[RU-S0000-001] Proposal is not in shareholders' best interests.	Fail
Chevron	Adopt Medium and Long-Term GHG Emissions Reduction Targets	Against	[RU-S0000-001] Proposal is not in shareholders' best interests. [SF-S0000-022] The company already provides sufficient disclosure and/or reporting regarding this issue.	Fail

Blackrock Lifepath Funds (continued)

Company name	Summary of the resolution	How you voted	Rationale for the voting decision	Outcome of the vote
Sumitomo Mitsui Financial Group, Inc	Amend Articles to Disclose Plan Outlining Company's Business Strategy to Align Investments with Goals of Paris Agreement	Against	[RJ-S0742-888] AGAINST shareholder proposal as the proposal will not serve shareholder's interest.	Fail
HCA Healthcare, Inc.	Report on Lobbying Payments and Policy	Against	[SF-S0000-021] The company already has policies in place to address the request being made by the proposal, or is already enhancing its relevant policies.	Fail
Ocado Group Plc	Amend Value Creation Plan	Against	[LN-M0550-001] Remuneration arrangements are poorly structured.	Pass
Equinor ASA	Instruct Board to Present a Strategy for Real Business Transformation to Sustainable Energy Production	Against	[RU-S0000-001] Proposal is not in shareholders' best interests.	Fail
Meta Platforms, Inc.	Report on Community Standards Enforcement	For	[SF-S0000-002] We believe it is in the best interests of shareholders to have access to greater disclosure on this issue.	Fail
McDonald's Corporation	Issue Transparency Report on Global Public Policy and Political Influence	Against	[SF-S0000-022] The company already provides sufficient disclosure and/or reporting regarding this issue, or is already enhancing its relevant disclosures.	Fail
Netflix, Inc.	Elect Director Ann Mather	Withhold	[SF-M0201-019] Nominee serves on an excessive number of public company boards, which we believe raises substantial concerns about the director's ability to exercise sufficient oversight on this board.	Pass
New World Development Company Limited	Elect Lee Luen-Wai, John as Director	For	[HK-M0201-006] Director responsible for failing to ensure sufficient board independence [SF-M0201-045] Vote AGAINST director due to insufficient independence after reclassification[HK-M0201-013] Remuneration Committee without majority independence[SF-M0201-025] The nomination committee is not majority independent.[HK-M0201-007] Chair of Audit Committee not independent [HK-M0201-012] Chair of Remuneration Committee not independent	Pass
Banco de Chile SA	Elect Andronico Luksic Craig as Director	Against	[SF-M0201-019] Nominee serves on an excessive number of public company boards, which we believe raises substantial concerns about the director's ability to exercise sufficient oversight on this board.	Pass
Banco de Chile SA	Elect Francisco Perez Mackenna as Director	Against	[SF-M0201-019] Nominee serves on an excessive number of public company boards, which we believe raises substantial concerns about the director's ability to exercise sufficient oversight on this board.	Pass

Shard

HSBC MSCI World Climate Paris Aligned UCITS

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Company name	NVIDIA Corporation	Amazon.com, Inc.	Alphabet Inc.	Tesla, Inc.	Apple Inc.
Date of vote	02-Jun-22	25-May-22	01-Jun-22	04-Aug-22	10-Mar-23
Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	1.48%	1.73%	2.37%	0.94%	5.40%
Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Harvey C. Jones	Report on Efforts to Reduce Plastic Use	Report on Physical Risks of Climate Change	Report on Efforts to Prevent Harassment and Discrimination in the Workplace	Report on Median Gender/Racial Pay Gap
How you voted	Against	For	For	For	For
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rationale for the voting decision	"Against the election of the incumbent Chair of a formally established nomination committee if the following thresholds for women on the board are not met: mega (50bn+) 40 percent."	"We vote FOR this proposal, as shareholders would benefit from additional information on how the company is managing risks related to the creation of plastic waste"	"We vote FOR this proposal. Shareholders would benefit from increased disclosure regarding how the company is assessing and managing climate change risks."	"We vote FOR this resolution, as the company has faced recent attention for allegations of harassment and discrimination in the workplace, and increased transparency would help shareholders assess how the company is managing associated risks."	"We believe that the proposal would contribute to improving gender inequality."
Outcome of the vote	For	Against	Against	Against	Against
Implications of the outcome e.g., were there any lessons learned and what likely future steps will you take in response to the outcome?	Nothing required.	Nothing required.	Nothing required.	Nothing required.	Nothing required.
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.

Shard (continued)

	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10
Company name	Microsoft Corporation	Meta Platforms, Inc.	ABB Ltd.	Amazon.com, Inc.	Alphabet Inc.
Date of vote	13-Dec-22	25-May-22	05-May-22	25-May-22	01-Jun-22
Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	4.42%	1.11%	0.97%	1.73%	2.37%
Summary of the resolution	Report on Tax Transparency	Report on Child Sexual Exploitation Online	Re-elect Peter Voser as Director and Board Chair	"	Report on Median Gender/Racial Pay Gap
How you voted	For	For	Against	For	For
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rationale for the voting decision		"We vote FOR this proposal, as additional information on risks related to potential sexual exploitation of children through the company's platforms would give shareholders more information on how well the company is managing related risks."	"We have concerns about the company's management of nature-related risks. We have concerns about insufficient diversity of the board."	"We vote FOR this proposal, as shareholders would benefit from additional information allowing them to better measure the progress of the company's diversity and inclusion initiatives and its management of related risks."	"We vote FOR this proposal. Shareholders would benefit from increased disclosure regarding how the company is managing human rights-related risks in high-risk countries."
Outcome of the vote	Against	Against	For	Against	Against
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.	Following principles as opposed to Management recommendations.

TAM

(Nomura Global Sustainable Equity Fund and SSGA SPDR MSCI World Climate Paris Aligned)

Company name	Date of vote	Summary of the resolution	How you voted	Rationale for the voting decision
Meta Platforms, Inc.	31-May-23	Report on Executive Pay Calibration to Externalized Costs	Against	SSGA is abstaining from this item as drivers of the executive compensation plans are relevant to the business but could be enhanced.
Public Storage	02-May-23	Report on GHG Emissions Reduction Targets Aligned with the Paris Agreement Goal	For	SSGA is abstaining on the proposal as the company's disclosures related to GHG emissions are mostly aligned with SSGA's guidance, but could be enhanced.
Microsoft Corporation	13-Dec-22	Assess and Report on the Company's Retirement Funds' Management of Systemic Climate Risk	Against	This proposal does not merit support as the company's disclosure and/or practices related to climate change are reasonable.
BlackRock, Inc.	24-May-23	Report on Ability to Engineer Decarbonization in the Real Economy	Against	SSGA is abstaining on the proposal as the company's disclosures related to climate change are mostly aligned with SSGA's guidance, but could be enhanced.
Mowi ASA	01-Jun-23	Approve Remuneration Statement	Against	In the absence of significant concerns, this proposal merits support.
Netflix, Inc.	01-Jun-23	Report on Climate Risk in Retirement Plan Options	Against	SSGA is abstaining on the proposal as the company's disclosures related to climate change are mostly aligned with SSGA's guidance, but could be enhanced.
adidas AG	11-May-23	Approve Remuneration Report	Against	In the absence of significant concerns, this proposal merits support.
Amazon.com, Inc.	24-May-23	Commission a Third-Party Audit on Working Conditions	For	SSGA is abstaining on the proposal as the company's disclosures related to facility safety are broadly in line with market standard but could be enhanced.
QBE Insurance Group Limited	12-May-23	Approve Remuneration Report	Abstain	In the absence of significant concerns, this proposal merits support.
Berkshire Hathaway Inc.	Berkshire Hathaway Inc.	Berkshire Hathaway Inc.	Berkshire Hathaway Inc.	Berkshire Hathaway Inc.

Wahed

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Company name	Apple Inc.	Visa Inc.	Accenture	ABB Ltd.	Applied Materials, Inc.
Date of vote	03/10/2023	01/24/2023	02/01/2023	03/23/2023	03/09/2023
Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	7%	2%	1%	0.29%	0.50%
Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Sue Wagner	Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation	Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation	Re-elect Peter Voser as Director and Board Chair	Elect Director Judy Bruner
How you voted	Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)	Inclusive Growth and Shared Prosperity	Inclusive Growth and Shared Prosperity	Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)	Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)
Rationale for the voting decision	We communicated our thinking on the shareholder proposals ahead of the AGM.	No	No	No	No
Outcome of the vote	We have concerns about insufficient diversity of the board.	AGAINST grant of shares or options to executives within the LTIP that are not majority (+51%) linked to performance criteria. AGAINST grant of shares or options to executives within the LTIP if the vesting period is less than 3 years.	We consider the quantum of the total pay excessive. We also have concerns about the grant of shares or options to executives within the LTIP if the vesting period is less than 3 years.	We have concerns about insufficient diversity of the board.	We have concerns about insufficient diversity of the board.
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	We will continue to engage on the issue along with other issues of concern and will likely vote against a similar proposal should we see insufficient improvements.	We will likely vote against a similar proposal should we see insufficient improvements.	We plan to raise our concern at the company and will likely vote against such a proposal should there be no improvements.	We will likely vote against a similar proposal should we see insufficient improvements.	We will likely vote against a similar proposal should we see insufficient improvements.

Wahed (continued)

	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10
Company name	Novartis AG	Novo Nordisk A/S	QUALCOMM Incorporated	Roche Holding AG	Starbucks Corporation
Date of vote	03/07/2023	03/23/2023	03/08/2023	03/14/2023	03/23/2023
Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	1.04%	1.09%	0.77%	1.06%	0.65%
Summary of the resolution	Re-elect Patrice Bula as Director	Approve Remuneration Report (Advisory Vote)	Elect Director Ann M. Livermore	Approve Remuneration Report	Shareholder proposal to Report on Plant-Based Milk Pricing
How you voted	Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)	Inclusive Growth and Shared Prosperity	Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)	Inclusive Growth and Shared Prosperity	Climate change and Nature/biodiversity
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	Against (Vote Against Mgmt.)	For (Vote Against Mgmt.)
Rationale for the voting decision	No	No	No	No	No
Outcome of the vote	We have concerns about insufficient diversity of the board.	We consider the quantum of the total pay excessive. We consider the performance measurement period for the LTIP too short.	We have concerns about insufficient diversity of the board.	We consider the quantum of the total pay excessive. The LTIP is not linked to performance criteria. The NED board chair participates in performance-based incentive schemes. The STI and LTIP grants are assessed on a discretionary basis. There is insufficient ex-post disclosure to explain the evolution of variable payouts versus company performance.	We believe that the proposal would enhance accountability in relation to the pricing of plant-based milk.
Outcome of vote	The resolution passed.	The resolution passed.	The resolution passed.	The resolution passed.	The resolution passed.
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	The company has a significant weight in the portfolio, and we voted against management.	The company has a significant weight in the portfolio, and we voted against management.	The company has a significant weight in the portfolio, and we voted against management.	The company has a significant weight in the portfolio, and we voted against management.	The company has a significant weight in the portfolio, and we voted against management.

Aegon Ethical Cautious

	Vote 1	Vote 2
Company name	Kin & Carta	AVEVA Group plc
Date of vote	21st September 22	20th July 2022
Approximate size of fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	0.70%	1.48%
Summary of the resolution	Amend Articles of Association	Against remuneration report
How you voted	In favour	Against
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	We were party to the consultations	Yes, wrote ahead of the AGM
Rationale for the voting decision	<p>This is the first UK Listed company to change its articles of association to become a B Corp i.e. a company that elevates consideration of the impact on society and the environment in the context of decision making, seeks to ensure that the Company has an overall material positive impact in these areas, such that those matters and stakeholder interests are considered in the same manner as shareholders' interests.</p>	<p>We abstained on the remuneration report last year since we did not consider the EPS range applied to the PSP was sufficiently challenging. Upon review this year, we note that the weighting attached to the EPS had been further reduced. Whilst the company does not provide detail of targets going forward, it should be noted that the same metric (ARR) is used within the annual bonus plan - thereby there is a risk of being rewarded twice for the same performance. The share price fell considerably during 2021/2 and significantly underperformed both its sector and the wider market. Given this performance we would have expected PSP awards levels to have been scaled back. Whilst the company did consider this, it determined that grants would be made at the maximum level but would consider the vesting outcome when appropriate to ensure that windfall gains do not exist. Whilst this may provide a degree of comfort, we prefer grants to be scaled back at the outset rather than taking a reflective view. The Company has failed to address concerns we raised last year regarding the challenge of EPS targets attached to the PSP. Our concerns this year are exacerbated given the remuneration committee's decision not to reduce the grant size given the significantly lower share price. Given the potential for a pay versus performance disconnect, we voted against the remuneration report.</p>
Outcome of the vote	99.9% support	97.14% in favour
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	The first of its kind in the UK	Ongoing rem issues and engagement

Newton Global Income

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Company name	CME Group Inc.	CME Group Inc.	CME Group Inc.
Date of vote	04-May-23	04-May-23	04-May-23
Approximate size of fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	2.32	2.32	2.32
Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Timothy S. Bitsberger	Elect Director Charles P. Carey	Elect Director Daniel R. Glickman
How you voted	Against management	Against management	Against management
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No	No	No
Rationale for the voting decision	We voted against the re-election of the members of the compensation committee in line with our voting recommendation on executive remuneration arrangements. Further, in our opinion, the company did not exhibit adequate responsiveness to last year's significant shareholder dissent on executive pay.	We voted against the re-election of the members of the compensation committee in line with our voting recommendation on executive remuneration arrangements. Further, in our opinion, the company did not exhibit adequate responsiveness to last year's significant shareholder dissent on executive pay.	We voted against the re-election of the members of the compensation committee in line with our voting recommendation on executive remuneration arrangements. Further, in our opinion, the company did not exhibit adequate responsiveness to last year's significant shareholder dissent on executive pay.
Outcome of the vote	30.3% AGAINST	45.4% AGAINST	38.0% AGAINST
Outcome Of Vote	This is the second consecutive year when the underlying say-on-pay proposal has not been approved by shareholders, which is a clear indication of consistent shareholder dissatisfaction with the pay practices at the company. We expect the company to reach out now to shareholders to seek input for improvements, otherwise we expect shareholders to put further pressure on director accountability through adverse recommendations at director elections. There has been an increasing dissent on compensation committee member elections this year.	This is the second consecutive year when the underlying say-on-pay proposal has not been approved by shareholders, which is a clear indication of consistent shareholder dissatisfaction with the pay practices at the company. We expect the company to reach out now to shareholders to seek input for improvements, otherwise we expect shareholders to put further pressure on director accountability through adverse recommendations at director elections. There has been an increasing dissent on compensation committee member elections this year.	This is the second consecutive year when the underlying say-on-pay proposal has not been approved by shareholders, which is a clear indication of consistent shareholder dissatisfaction with the pay practices at the company. We expect the company to reach out now to shareholders to seek input for improvements, otherwise we expect shareholders to put further pressure on director accountability through adverse recommendations at director elections. There has been an increasing dissent on compensation committee member elections this year.
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	The level of shareholder dissent against the compensation committee director but also the underlying say-on-pay proposal merits this vote as significant.	The level of shareholder dissent against the compensation committee director but also the underlying say-on-pay proposal merits this vote as significant.	The level of shareholder dissent against the compensation committee director but also the underlying say-on-pay proposal merits this vote as significant.

Newton Global Income (continued)

	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
Company name	CME Group Inc.	Bayer	Sysco Corporation
Date of vote	04-May-23	28-Apr-23	18-Nov-22
Approximate size of fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	2.32	2.73	1.45
Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Terry L. Savage	Approve Remuneration Report	Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation
How you voted	Against management	Against management	Against management
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No	No	No
Rationale for the voting decision	We voted against the re-election of the members of the compensation committee in line with our voting recommendation on executive remuneration arrangements. Further, in our opinion, the company did not exhibit adequate responsiveness to last year's significant shareholder dissent on executive pay.	We voted against executive pay arrangements as, in our opinion, the company did not exhibit adequate responsiveness to last year's significant shareholder dissent on executive pay. Further, we voted against executive remuneration arrangements due to a misalignment between pay and performance.	We voted against executive remuneration arrangements due to a misalignment between pay and performance.
Outcome of the vote	36.3% AGAINST	52% votes FOR	36% AGAINST
Outcome Of Vote	This is the second consecutive year when the underlying say-on-pay proposal has not been approved by shareholders, which is a clear indication of consistent shareholder dissatisfaction with the pay practices at the company. We expect the company to reach out now to shareholders to seek input for improvements, otherwise we expect shareholders to put further pressure on director accountability through adverse recommendations at director elections. There has been an increasing dissent on compensation committee member elections this year.	The significant shareholder dissent will push the company to reform its practices and increase its engagement on the topic to improve disclosure and practices.	The vote outcome highlights the dissatisfaction of shareholders with the pay arrangements at the company.
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	The level of shareholder dissent against the compensation committee director but also the underlying say-on-pay proposal merits this vote as significant.	This is a significant vote as, given Bayer's history of controversies, a conservative approach to pay should be taken.	We considered it significant that the vote outcome on pay related matters surpassed the dissent level of 20%.

Newton Global Income (continued)

	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9
Company name	Shell Plc	Sysco Corporation	Sysco Corporation
Date of vote	23-May-23	18-Nov-22	18-Nov-22
Approximate size of fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	1.90	1.45	1.45
Summary of the resolution	Request Shell to Align its Existing 2030 Reduction Target Covering the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions of the Use of its Energy Products (Scope 3) with the Goal of the Paris Climate Agreement	Report on Third-Party Civil Rights Audit	Commission Third Party Report Assessing Company's Supply Chain Risks
How you voted	Against management	Against management	Against management
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes	No	No
Rationale for the voting decision	We abstained on the proposal requesting an alignment of the 2030 Scope 3 reduction target to the Paris agreement. While the argument is acknowledged, voting in favour of this resolution can be considered as overstepping on management's prerogatives in strategy setting. However, we have abstained in line with our views that the current transition plan merits more robust 2030 goals in order to gain credibility.	We voted against a shareholder proposal asking the company to report on a third-party civil rights audit of the company's policies and practices. In our view, the company is taking positive steps and has sufficient disclosures on its policies and practices about the civil rights of its stakeholders. We believe it is preferable to encourage the company to undertake the EEO-1 report (equal employment opportunity) through engagement and it is unclear how the scope of the proposed audit will mitigate the specific concerns highlighted by the proponent.	We voted against a shareholder proposal asking the company to expand its third-party assessments of supply chain risks. In our view, the company provides sufficient information to the shareholders to be able to effectively assess any related risks, there appears to be no controversies related to this and the company's practices regarding auditing of suppliers in its supply chains are not inconsistent with its peers.
Outcome of the vote	80% FOR	NA- Proposal Withdrawn	82% AGAINST
Outcome Of Vote	The significant dissent on the proposal shows concern from the shareholder base around Shell's transition plan.	Proposal was withdrawn after Sysco published its 2022 Sustainability report and the company's first DE&I report.	The vote outcome suggests that majority shareholders share our views that the company provides sufficient information to the shareholders to be able to effectively assess any related risks related to supply chain management. We will monitor the company's progress and disclosure and vote accordingly in future AGMs.
On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "most significant"?	As a significant GHG emitter, it is critical for Shell to have a credible transition plan. Abstaining on this resolution would convey to the company, in addition to our engagement, the need to add credibility to its transition planning.	This is significant as the company made efforts towards enhancing human capital management for investors to be able to seek comfort and prevent further escalation.	The vote outcome confirms our initial read that the issue is not deemed significant at this stage for the company and validates our case-by-case analysis for social issues while voting.

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Climate Transition Fund		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	207
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	139	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	32
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?	2	How many engagements were made regarding financials?	36
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	643	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	
Please discuss some of the key engagements and outcomes from the last 12 months.	<p>1st Company Name: CATERPILLAR INC</p> <p>Topic Addressed: Transition Towards a Low Carbon Economy - CDP Climate</p> <p>Milestone Achieved: Raise issue with Company</p> <p>2nd Company Name: DEXCOM INC</p> <p>Topic Addressed: Product, Client, Societal Responsibility - Cyber Security / Cyber Crime</p> <p>Milestone Achieved: Raise issue with Company</p>		
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.
Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments	<p>The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. Analysis from ISS, Glass Lewis, and Proxinvest is available to more efficiently identify problematic resolutions, while retaining complete autonomy from their recommendations. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.</p>		How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund? 2111
How many times did you vote in favour of management?	1647	How many times did you vote against management?	464

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Climate Transition Fund		
How many votes did you abstain from?	0	Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote • How did you vote? • Rationale of the voting decision • Outcome of the vote • Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Yes <p>Apple Inc.</p> <p>2023-03-10</p> <p>Report on Civil Rights and Non-Discrimination Audit</p> <p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p> <p>3.89</p> <p>Against</p> <p>We do not see that the proponent has demonstrated a deficiency in the Company's current level of disclosure on the matter, and therefore we consider that the proposal is not in shareholders' interest.</p> <p>Not Given</p> <p>Yes</p>
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:	Yes
• Company name	Johnson & Johnson	• Company name	LVMH Moet Hennessy Louis Vuitton SE
• Date of the Vote	2023-04-27	• Date of the Vote	2023-04-20
• Summary of the resolution	Report on Impact of Extended Patent Exclusivities on Product Access	• Summary of the resolution	Re-elect Marie-Laure Sauty de Chalou as Director

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Climate Transition Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.55
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	A vote FOR this proposal is warranted because shareholders would benefit from more robust disclosure of the company's processes and oversight mechanisms for managing risks related to anticompetitive practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	International Business Machines Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Coca-Cola Company
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Lobbying Payments and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Issue Transparency Report on Global Public Policy and Political Influence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Climate Transition Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.49
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	The company does indeed have strong direct contributions disclosures, but not indirect ones (which is where membership in trade associations raises questions). Therefore, increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's lobbying activities, assess if spending is in line with stated objectives and how the Board monitors them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's Contributions and Expenditures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Pfizer Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Nestle SA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Feasibility of Intellectual Property Transfer to Boost Covid-19 Vaccine Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Discharge of Board and Senior Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'sixth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'seventh most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	Given that the Company has been involved in controversies related to vaccine inequity, the proposed report would shed more light on the subject and be beneficial to shareholders to understand how the company is managing related risks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters.

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Climate Transition Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Yes
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the ninth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name 	The Walt Disney Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name 	Abbott Laboratories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of the Vote 	2023-04-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of the Vote 	2023-04-28
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the resolution 	Report on Charitable Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the resolution 	Report on Lobbying Payments and Policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'eighth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'ninth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.38
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale of the voting decision 	We do not see that the proponent has demonstrated a deficiency in the Company's current level of disclosure on the matter, and therefore we consider that the proposal is not in shareholders' interest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale of the voting decision 	Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's Contributions and Expenditures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the tenth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name 	Bank of America Corporation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of the Vote 	2023-04-25		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the resolution 	Disclose 2030 Absolute GHG Reduction Targets Associated with Lending and Underwriting		

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Climate Transition Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'tenth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.36		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	We consider the commitment requested by the proposal as useful for shareholders to assess progress towards Paris Agreement targets.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No		
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	-0.43

Activity	Amundi MSCI Emerging Ex China ESG Leaders		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	17
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	12	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	1
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?		How many engagements were made regarding financials?	4
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	42	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi MSCI Emerging Ex China ESG Leaders		
<p>Please discuss some of the key engagements and outcomes from the last 12 months.</p>	<p>1st Company Name: CHINA MENGNIU DAIRY CO</p> <p>Topic Addressed: Water management and carbon footprints</p> <p>Milestone Achieved: In our first engagement with the company on these two important issues - carbon and water- we learnt that the company is struggling with limiting its carbon footprint. Currently there are two main targets in place; a carbon peak by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2050. The company is aware that these need to be strengthened, and that we would hope to see submission to the SBTi soon. The company has now established a working group to look deeper into the issue, and reports now working closely with one of their raw milk suppliers that has just submitted to the SBTi too. On water, the company has one company wide target in place to reduce water consumption (per product) by 6% by 2025 (vs 2020 levels). We have communicated with the company that we would hope to see more ambitious targets than this and the company seemed receptive to this, including suggesting partnerships and collaborations with NGOs and other third party stakeholders to help them achieve future water goals. It was positive to learn that the company has achieved AWS certification at two factories.</p>		
<p>Do you engage in voting for this fund?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Do you conduct your own votes?</p>	<p>The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.</p>
<p>Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments</p>	<p>The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. Analysis from ISS, Glass Lewis, and Proxinvest is available to more efficiently identify problematic resolutions, while retaining complete autonomy from their recommendations. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.</p>	<p>How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?</p>	<p>878</p>
<p>How many times did you vote in favour of management?</p>	<p>702</p>	<p>How many times did you vote against management?</p>	<p>176</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi MSCI Emerging Ex China ESG Leaders		
How many votes did you abstain from?	0	Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:	Yes
		• Company name	America Movil SAB de CV
		• Date of the Vote	2023-04-14
		• Summary of the resolution	Approve Discharge of Board and CEO
		• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
		• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	1.48
		• How did you vote?	Against
		• Rationale of the voting decision	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters.
		• Outcome of the vote	N/A
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No		
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:	Yes
• Company name	Grupo Bimbo SAB de CV	• Company name	Equatorial Energia SA
• Date of the Vote	2023-04-26	• Date of the Vote	2023-04-28
• Summary of the resolution	Elect or Ratify CEO, Directors, Secretary (Non-member) and Deputy Secretary (Non-Member);	• Summary of the resolution	Elect Directors

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi MSCI Emerging Ex China ESG Leaders		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 	Approve their Remuneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.29
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters. The roles of CEO and Chairperson are combined and there is no lead independent Director as per Amundi's independence criteria. The board is not sufficiently independent as per our voting policy. Arturo Manuel Fernandez Perez holds an excessive number of board mandates (six in total, including three as an Executive) and is therefore considered overboarded. Javier de Pedro Espinola, Luis Jorba Servitje, Jose Ignacio Perez Lizaur are non-independent member of the Nomination Committee which is composed of less than 50% independent directors. Javier de Pedro Espinola, Luis Jorba Servitje, Jose Ignacio Perez Lizaur are non-independent member of the Remuneration Committee which is composed of less than 50% independent directors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters. The nominee Carlos Augusto Leone Piani holds an excessive number of board mandates (4 in total, including 1 as chair) and is therefore considered overboarded.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	SM Investments Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Gruma SAB de CV
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-21

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi MSCI Emerging Ex China ESG Leaders		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Ratify All Acts and Resolutions of the Board of Directors, Board Committees and Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Elect and/or Ratify Directors, Secretary, and Alternates, Verify Independence Classification of Directors and Approve Their Remuneration; Approve Remuneration of Audit and Corporate Practices Committees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "fourth most significant"? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be "fifth most significant"? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	The roles of CEO and Chairperson are combined and there is no lead independent Director as per Amundi's independence criteria. There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters. Everardo Elizondo Almaguer holds an excessive number of board mandates (four in total, including one as a Chair of audit committee) and is therefore considered overboarded. Carlos Hank Gonzalez holds an excessive number of board mandates (four in total, including one as an Executive and one as a Chair) and is therefore considered overboarded.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Ayala Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Komerčni banka as
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Ratify Acts of the Board of Directors and Officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Financial Statements

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi MSCI Emerging Ex China ESG Leaders		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'sixth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'seventh most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?	No, Only seven votes deemed significant enough to give details on	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?	Yes
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	0

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Fund		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes,	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	57
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	33	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	8
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?	1	How many engagements were made regarding financials?	6
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	193	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Fund		
Please discuss some of the key engagements and outcomes from the last 12 months.	1st Company Name: NVIDIA CORP Topic Addressed: Strong Governance for Sustainable Development - Diversity Milestone Achieved: Milestone 1: Raise issue with Company 2nd Company Name: NUTRIEN LTD Topic Addressed: Natural Capital Preservation - Biodiversity (general) Milestone Achieved: Milestone 2C: Strategy/Response developed to issue raised		
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes,	Do you conduct your own votes?	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.
Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. Analysis from ISS, Glass Lewis, and Proxinvest is available to more efficiently identify problematic resolutions, while retaining complete autonomy from their recommendations. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.	How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?	500
How many times did you vote in favour of management?	395	How many times did you vote against management?	105
How many votes did you abstain from?	0	Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?: • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution	Yes The Coca-Cola Company 2023-04-25 Issue Transparency Report on Global Public Policy and Political Influence

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Fund		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	2.18
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's Contributions and Expenditures.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Walt Disney Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Adobe Inc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Charitable Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Hiring of Persons with Arrest or Incarceration Records
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	1.42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	1.36

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Fund		
• How did you vote?	Against	• How did you vote?	For
• Rationale of the voting decision	We do not see that the proponent has demonstrated a deficiency in the Company's current level of disclosure on the matter, and therefore we consider that the proposal is not in shareholders' interest.	• Rationale of the voting decision	Additional disclosure would be useful to shareholders' understanding of how this subject is managed by the Company.
• Outcome of the vote	Not Given	• Outcome of the vote	Not Given
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No	• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
• Company name	Texas Instruments Incorporated	• Company name	The Toronto-Dominion Bank
• Date of the Vote	2023-04-27	• Date of the Vote	2023-04-20
• Summary of the resolution	Report on Due Diligence Efforts to Trace End-User Misuse of Company Products	• Summary of the resolution	SP 3: Advisory Vote on Environmental Policies
• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	1.23	• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	0.93
• How did you vote?	For	• How did you vote?	For
• Rationale of the voting decision	Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess how the company managed the risks of end-user misuse of their products, in particular in case of violations of international law.	• Rationale of the voting decision	While we are aware of the positive steps taken by the company (net-zero ambition, CDP improvement score, alignment with TCFD), we nevertheless consider that the proposal has merit insofar it reiterates the importance for shareholders of monitoring this subject. Amundi is in favour of and would encourage companies to submit Say on Climate votes, we believe it is important for investors to be able to express their view on a company's climate strategy.
• Outcome of the vote	Not Given	• Outcome of the vote	Not Given

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Cigna Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Bank of Nova Scotia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-04
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Congruency of Political Spending with Company Values and Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	SP 1: Advisory Vote on Environmental Policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'sixth most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'seventh most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.52
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's lobbying activities, assess if spending is in line with stated objectives and how the Board monitors them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	Amundi is in favour of and would encourage companies to submit Say on Climate votes, we believe it is important for investors to be able to express their view on a company's climate strategy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the ninth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	HCA Healthcare, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Exelon Corporation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Political Contributions and Expenditures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Elect Director Anthony Anderson

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'eighth most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'ninth most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	<p>Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's lobbying activities, assess if spending is in line with stated objectives and how the Board monitors them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	<p>There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
<p>Do you have a vote you consider the tenth most significant for this fund?:</p>	Yes	<p>Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?</p>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	National Bank of Canada		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-21		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	SP 1: Advisory Vote on Environmental Policies		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'tenth most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>		

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index MSCI World Fund		
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	0.25		
• How did you vote?	For		
• Rationale of the voting decision	N/A		
• Outcome of the vote	Not Given		
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No		
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	-0.08

Activity	Amundi Global Multi-Factor Equity Fund		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes,	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	139
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	61	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	21
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?	1	How many engagements were made regarding financials?	17
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	320	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	
Please discuss some of the key engagements and outcomes from the last 12 months.	<p>1st Company Name: TESLA INC Topic Addressed: Product, Client, Societal Responsibility - Ethics Milestone Achieved: Raise issue with Company</p> <p>2nd Company Name: DEXCOM INC Topic Addressed: Product, Client, Societal Responsibility - Cyber Security / Cyber Crime Milestone Achieved: Raise issue with Company</p>		
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Global Multi-Factor Equity Fund		
<p>Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments</p>	<p>The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. Analysis from ISS, Glass Lewis, and Proxinvest is available to more efficiently identify problematic resolutions, while retaining complete autonomy from their recommendations. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.</p>	<p>How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?</p>	<p>1449</p>
<p>How many times did you vote in favour of management?</p>	<p>1159</p>	<p>How many times did you vote against management?</p>	<p>290</p>
<p>How many votes did you abstain from?</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote • How did you vote? • Rationale of the voting decision • Outcome of the vote • Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Apple Inc.</p> <p>2023-03-10</p> <p>Report on Civil Rights and Non-Discrimination Audit</p> <p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p> <p>1.19</p> <p>Against</p> <p>We do not see that the proponent has demonstrated a deficiency in the Company's current level of disclosure on the matter, and therefore we consider that the proposal is not in shareholders' interest.</p> <p>Not Given</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Pfizer Inc.</p>	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name 	<p>Yes</p> <p>The Coca-Cola Company</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Global Multi-Factor Equity Fund		
• Date of the Vote	2023-04-27	• Date of the Vote	2023-04-25
• Summary of the resolution	Report on Feasibility of Intellectual Property Transfer to Boost Covid-19 Vaccine Production	• Summary of the resolution	Issue Transparency Report on Global Public Policy and Political Influence
• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'?		• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	1.08	• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	0.64
• How did you vote?	For	• How did you vote?	For
• Rationale of the voting decision	Given that the Company has been involved in controversies related to vaccine inequity, the proposed report would shed more light on the subject and be beneficial to shareholders to understand how the company is managing related risks.	• Rationale of the voting decision	Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's Contributions and Expenditures.
• Outcome of the vote	Not Given	• Outcome of the vote	Not Given
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No	• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
• Company name	The Cigna Group	• Company name	Johnson & Johnson
• Date of the Vote	2023-04-26	• Date of the Vote	2023-04-27
• Summary of the resolution	Report on Congruency of Political Spending with Company Values and Priorities	• Summary of the resolution	Report on Impact of Extended Patent Exclusivities on Product Access

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Global Multi-Factor Equity Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.58
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	<p>Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess risks presented by the Company's lobbying activities, assess if spending is in line with stated objectives and how the Board monitors them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	<p>A vote FOR this proposal is warranted because shareholders would benefit from more robust disclosure of the company's processes and oversight mechanisms for managing risks related to anticompetitive practices</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
<p>Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:</p>	Yes	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:</p>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Citigroup Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Nestle SA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2023-04-20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Respecting Indigenous Peoples' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Discharge of Board and Senior Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'sixth most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'seventh most significant'? 	<p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Global Multi-Factor Equity Fund		
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote		• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	0.54
• How did you vote?	For	• How did you vote?	Against
• Rationale of the voting decision	N/A	• Rationale of the voting decision	There are concerns regarding how the Board is overseeing ESG matters.
• Outcome of the vote	Not Given	• Outcome of the vote	Not Given
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No	• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Yes
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the ninth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
• Company name	Stellantis NV	• Company name	UniCredit SpA
• Date of the Vote	2023-04-13	• Date of the Vote	2023-03-31
• Summary of the resolution	Approve Remuneration Report Excluding Pre-Merger Legacy Matters	• Summary of the resolution	Accept Financial Statements and Statutory Reports
• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'eighth most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).	• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'ninth most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	0.4	• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	0.37
• How did you vote?	Do Not Vote	• How did you vote?	For
• Rationale of the voting decision	Compensation is considered excessive compared to peers. The structure of the LTIP is considered inadequate. The company has not provided sufficient disclosure for shareholders to assess the adequacy of executive remuneration.	• Rationale of the voting decision	N/A
• Outcome of the vote	Not Given	• Outcome of the vote	Not Given
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No	• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Global Multi-Factor Equity Fund		
Do you have a vote you consider the tenth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?	No
• Company name	Texas Instruments Incorporated		
• Date of the Vote	2023-04-27		
• Summary of the resolution	Report on Due Diligence Efforts to Trace End-User Misuse of Company Products		
• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'tenth most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).		
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	0.32		
• How did you vote?	For		
• Rationale of the voting decision	Increased disclosure would allow shareholders to more fully assess how the company managed the risks of end-user misuse of their products, in particular in case of violations of international law.		
• Outcome of the vote	Not Given		
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No		
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	-0.01

Activity	Amundi Index FTSE EPRA NAREIT GLOBAL FUND		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	2
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	14	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	1
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?		How many engagements were made regarding financials?	

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index FTSE EPRA NAREIT GLOBAL FUND		
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	31	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.
Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. Analysis from ISS, Glass Lewis, and Proxinvest is available to more efficiently identify problematic resolutions, while retaining complete autonomy from their recommendations. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.	How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?	504
How many times did you vote in favour of management?	413	How many times did you vote against management?	91
How many votes did you abstain from?	0	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote • How did you vote? • Rationale of the voting decision 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Gecina SA</p> <p>2023-04-20</p> <p>Approve Financial Statements and Statutory Reports</p> <p>As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).</p> <p>0.36</p> <p>For</p> <p>N/A</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index FTSE EPRA NAREIT GLOBAL FUND		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of the vote 	Not Given
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name 	Covivio SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name 	Icade SA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of the Vote 	2023-04-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of the Vote 	2023-04-21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the resolution 	Approve Company's Climate Transition Plan (Advisory) Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the resolution 	Approve Company's Climate and Biodiversity Transition Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	0.09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale of the voting decision 	As we were unable to find dedicated documentation for this SOC (CSR publication page is OOO), certain questions remains unanswered but the main topics are covered. Covivio has set targets on its decarbonisation pathway, validated by SBTi in 2022. The company has detailed some levers to reach its targets and also listed interim quantified targets to 2025. (+) Science based and validated targets aligned with a net zero trajectory(+) Significant Capex plan to finance the decarbonisation(+) Compensation is linked to CSR criteria (-) No mention of offsets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale of the voting decision 	We voted for the SOC last year and are still endorsing their strategy. Icade has a net zero trajectory which has been validated by SBTi in 2022 and aligned on 1.5°. All the divisions of the group are covered by the strategy as well as all the 3 scopes. Icade clearly details the objectives by division, and within each division, the different stages that will enable to reach the first stage in 2030. (+) One of the most comprehensive pathway in the sector(+) Annual review and vote on achievements(+) In addition to the decarbonisation strategy, the group has developed a comprehensive biodiversity strategy(=) Carbon intensity has decreased in all business lines but global carbon footprint has increased in 2022 due to growth of the activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of the vote 	Not Given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of the vote 	Not Given

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi Index FTSE EPRA NAREIT GLOBAL FUND		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	No
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	No, Only three votes deemed significant enough to give details on	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?	No
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	-0.08

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	1581
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	1083	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	155
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?	87	How many engagements were made regarding financials?	645
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	4381	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund		
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	<p>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 Principles and custom market-specific voting guidelines.</p> <p>While we subscribe to research from the proxy advisory firms Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS) and Glass Lewis, it is just one among many inputs into our vote analysis process, and we do not blindly follow their recommendations on how to vote. We primarily use proxy research firms to synthesise corporate governance information and analysis into a concise, easily reviewable format so that our investment stewardship analysts can readily identify and prioritise those companies where our own additional research and engagement would be beneficial. Other sources of information we use include the company's own reporting (such as the proxy statement and the website), our engagement and voting history with the company, and the views of our active investors, public information and ESG research.</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund	
		<p>In summary, proxy research firms help us deploy our resources to greatest effect in meeting client expectations. BlackRock sees its investment stewardship program, including proxy voting, as part of its fiduciary duty to and enhance the value of clients' assets, using our voice as a shareholder on their behalf to ensure that companies are well led and well managed.</p> <p>We use proxy research firms in our voting process, primarily to synthesise information and analysis into a concise, easily reviewable format so that our analysts can readily identify and prioritise those companies where our own additional research and engagement would be beneficial.</p> <p>We do not follow any single proxy research firm's voting recommendations and in most markets, we subscribe to two research providers and use several other inputs, including a company's own disclosures, in our voting and engagement analysis.</p> <p>We also work with proxy research firms, which apply our proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform our voting decision.</p> <p>The proxy voting operating environment is complex and we work with proxy research firms to execute vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting.</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund		
<p>Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf?</p> <p>If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments</p>	<p>We use Institutional Shareholder Services' (ISS) electronic platform to execute our vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting. In certain markets, we work with proxy research firms who apply our proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform our voting decision.</p> <p>The BlackRock Stewardship team publishes statements on our analysis, engagements and votes in relation to certain high-profile proposals at company shareholder meetings. We publish these bulletins to highlight several of our key voting rationales as informed by our global voting guidelines, including when we vote against directors due to: insufficient progress on climate-related disclosures (particularly with regard to TCFD/SASB-aligned reporting); concerns about remuneration and/or overboarding; concerns about board oversight; and risk management in high profile situations, among others. We do not disclose our vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings as we do not see it as our role to influence other investors. Our role is to send a signal to the company about how well we believe the board and management has done in delivering long-term shareholder value. Our vote bulletins can be found here:</p> <p>https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/about-us/investment-stewardship#engagement-and-voting-history</p>	<p>How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?</p>	<p>20296</p>
<p>How many times did you vote in favour of management?</p>	<p>18006</p>	<p>How many times did you vote against management?</p>	<p>995</p>
<p>How many votes did you abstain from?</p>	<p>87</p>	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Rio Tinto Plc</p> <p>2022-04-08</p> <p>Approve Climate Action Plan Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? 	<p>We endeavour to communicate to companies when we intend to vote against management, either before or just after casting votes in advance of the shareholder meeting. We publish our voting guidelines to help clients and companies understand our thinking on key governance matters that are commonly put to a shareholder vote. 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. Our voting decisions reflect our analysis of company disclosures, third party research and, where relevant, insights from recent and past company engagement and our active investment colleagues.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Bank of Montreal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	HCA Healthcare, Inc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	SP 4: Adopt a Policy to Ensure the Bank's Financing is Consistent with IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Political Contributions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 	Scenario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-020] The request is either not clearly defined, too prescriptive, not in the purview of shareholders, or unduly constraining on the company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-021] The company already has policies in place to address the request being made by the proposal, or is already enhancing its relevant policies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Marathon Petroleum Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Santos Limited
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-03
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Climate Strategy Consistent with ILO's "Just Transition Guidelines" Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Decommissioning Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'? 	[SF-S0000-022] The company already provides sufficient disclosure and/or reporting regarding this issue, or is already enhancing its relevant disclosures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	[SF-S0000-020] The request is either not clearly defined, too prescriptive, not in the purview of shareholders, or unduly constraining on the company
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Withdrawn
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Ocado Group Plc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Barclays Plc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-04
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Decommissioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Barclays' Climate Strategy, Targets and Progress 2022
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[LN-M0550-001] Remuneration arrangements are poorly structured.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the ninth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Rio Tinto Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Equinor ASA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Climate Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Action Plan For Quality Assurance and Anti-Corruption
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'eighth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'ninth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[HK-S0000-001] We consider this to be in the best interests of shareholders.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the tenth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Intel Corporation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-12		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'tenth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-M0500-010] Pay is not aligned with performance and peers.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail		

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.		
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	30.87

Activity	iShares MSCI World SRI UCITS ETF -Hedged		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	414
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	298	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	47
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?	24	How many engagements were made regarding financials?	177
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	8	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund "Do you conduct your own votes?"

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	iShares MSCI World SRI UCITS ETF -Hedged		
<p>Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments</p>	<p>We use Institutional Shareholder Services' (ISS) electronic platform to execute our vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting. In certain markets, we work with proxy research firms who apply our proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform our voting decision.</p> <p>The BlackRock Stewardship team publishes statements on our analysis, engagements and votes in relation to certain high-profile proposals at company shareholder meetings. We publish these bulletins to highlight several of our key voting rationales as informed by our global voting guidelines, including when we vote against directors due to: insufficient progress on climate-related disclosures (particularly with regard to TCFD/SASB-aligned reporting); concerns about remuneration and/or overboarding; concerns about board oversight; and risk management in high profile situations, among others. We do not disclose our vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings as we do not see it as our role to influence other investors. Our role is to send a signal to the company about how well we believe the board and management has done in delivering long-term shareholder value. Our vote bulletins can be found here: https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/about-us/investmentstewardship#engagement-and-voting-history</p>	<p>How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?</p>	<p>5406</p>
<p>How many times did you vote in favour of management?</p>	<p>4901</p>	<p>How many times did you vote against management?</p>	<p>209</p>
<p>How many votes did you abstain from?</p>	<p>33</p>	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	<p>Yes</p> <p>HCA Healthcare, Inc.</p> <p>2022-04-21</p> <p>Elect Director Charles O. Holliday, Jr.</p> <p>Significant Vote Proposal</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	iShares MSCI World SRI UCITS ETF -Hedged		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	HCA Healthcare, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	HCA Healthcare, Inc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Lobbying Payments and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Political Contributions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-021] The company already has policies in place to address the request being made by the proposal, or is already enhancing its relevant policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-021] The company already has policies in place to address the request being made by the proposal, or is already enhancing its relevant policies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail
Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Home Depot, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Home Depot, Inc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-19
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Elect Director Albert P. Carey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Oversee and Report a Racial Equity Audit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	iShares MSCI World SRI UCITS ETF -Hedged		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-M0201-019] Nominee serves on an excessive number of public company boards, which we believe raises substantial concerns about the director's ability to exercise sufficient oversight on this board.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-002] We believe it is in the best interests of shareholders to have access to greater disclosure on this issue.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Home Depot, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Home Depot, Inc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-19
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Efforts to Eliminate Deforestation in Supply Chain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Steps to Improve Gender and Racial Equity on the Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'sixth most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'seventh most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-014] The company does not meet our expectations for disclosure of natural capital policies and/or risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-022] The company already provides sufficient disclosure and/or reporting regarding this issue, or is already enhancing its relevant disclosures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the ninth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	The Home Depot, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	J Sainsbury Plc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-07-07
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Require Independent Board Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Shareholder Resolution on Living Wage Accreditation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'eighth most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'ninth most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	iShares MSCI World SRI UCITS ETF -Hedged		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0107-101] Company has a designated lead director who fulfils the requirements appropriate to such role.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[RU-S0000-001] Proposal is not in shareholders' best interests.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you have a vote you consider the tenth most significant for this fund?: 	No, Only 9 votes deemed as significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund? 	Yes

Activity	BLK AQC AB Global Equity Fund		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	1581
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	1083	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	155
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?	87	How many engagements were made regarding financials?	645
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	4381	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund "Do you conduct your own votes?"

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC AB Global Equity Fund		
<p>Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments</p>	<p>We use Institutional Shareholder Services' (ISS) electronic platform to execute our vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting. In certain markets, we work with proxy research firms who apply our proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform our voting decision guidelines</p> <p>The BlackRock Stewardship team publishes statements on our analysis, engagements and votes in relation to certain high-profile proposals at company shareholder meetings. We publish these bulletins to highlight several of our key voting rationales as informed by our global voting guidelines, including when we vote against directors due to: insufficient progress on climate-related disclosures (particularly with regard to TCFD/SASB-aligned reporting); concerns about remuneration and/or overboarding; concerns about board oversight; and risk management in high profile situations, among others. We do not disclose our vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings as we do not see it as our role to influence other investors. Our role is to send a signal to the company about how well we believe the board and management has done in delivering long-term shareholder value. Our vote bulletins can be found here: https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/about-us/investmentstewardship#engagement-and-voting-history</p>	<p>How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?</p>	<p>20296</p>
<p>How many times did you vote in favour of management?</p>	<p>18006</p>	<p>How many times did you vote against management?</p>	<p>995</p>
<p>How many votes did you abstain from?</p>	<p>87</p>	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? • Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Rio Tinto Plc</p> <p>2022-04-08</p> <p>Approve Climate Action Plan</p> <p>Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC AB Global Equity Fund		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Bank of Montreal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	HCA Healthcare, Inc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	SP 4: Adopt a Policy to Ensure the Bank's Financing is Consistent with IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Political Contributions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-020] The request is either not clearly defined, too prescriptive, not in the purview of shareholders, or unduly constraining on the company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-021] The company already has policies in place to address the request being made by the proposal, or is already enhancing its relevant policies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Marathon Petroleum Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Santos Limited
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-04-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-03
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Report on Climate Strategy Consistent with ILO's "Just Transition Guidelines"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Decommissioning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC AB Global Equity Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-022] The company already provides sufficient disclosure and/or reporting regarding this issue, or is already enhancing its relevant disclosures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-S0000-020] The request is either not clearly defined, too prescriptive, not in the purview of shareholders, or unduly constraining on the company
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Withdrawn
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Ocado Group Plc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Barclays Plc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-04
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Decommissioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Barclays' Climate Strategy, Targets and Progress 2022
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[LN-M0550-001] Remuneration arrangements are poorly structured.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the ninth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Rio Tinto Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Equinor ASA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Approve Climate Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Action Plan For Quality Assurance and Anti-Corruption
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'eighth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'ninth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[HK-S0000-001] We consider this to be in the best interests of shareholders.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK AQC AB Global Equity Fund		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the tenth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Intel Corporation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-12		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'tenth most significant'? 	Vote decision expected to be of particular interest to clients.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SF-M0500-010] Pay is not aligned with performance and peers.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Fail		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.		
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	19.83

Activity	BLK ACS World Small Cap ESG Screened Equity Tracker Fund		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	1138
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	525	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	111
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?	38	How many engagements were made regarding financials?	451
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	25	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund "Do you conduct your own votes?"

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK ACS World Small Cap ESG Screened Equity Tracker Fund		
<p>Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf?</p> <p>If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments</p>	<p>We use Institutional Shareholder Services' (ISS) electronic platform to execute our vote instructions, manage client accounts in relation to voting and facilitate client reporting on voting. In certain markets, we work with proxy research firms who apply our proxy voting guidelines to filter out routine or non-contentious proposals and refer to us any meetings where additional research and possibly engagement might be required to inform our voting decision.</p> <p>The BlackRock Stewardship team publishes statements on our analysis, engagements and votes in relation to certain high-profile proposals at company shareholder meetings. We publish these bulletins to highlight several of our key voting rationales as informed by our global voting guidelines, including when we vote against directors due to: insufficient progress on climate-related disclosures (particularly with regard to TCFD/SASB-aligned reporting); concerns about remuneration and/or overboarding; concerns about board oversight; and risk management in high profile situations, among others. We do not disclose our vote intentions in advance of shareholder meetings as we do not see it as our role to influence other investors. Our role is to send a signal to the company about how well we believe the board and management has done in delivering long-term shareholder value. Our vote bulletins can be found here: https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/about-us/investmentstewardship#engagement-and-voting-history</p>	<p>How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?</p>	<p>49206</p>
<p>How many times did you vote in favour of management?</p>	<p>41050</p>	<p>How many times did you vote against management?</p>	<p>3917</p>
<p>How many votes did you abstain from?</p>	<p>286</p>	<p>Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company name • Date of the Vote • Summary of the resolution • On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'? 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Warrior Met Coal, Inc.</p> <p>2022-04-26</p> <p>Advisory Vote to Ratify Named Executive Officers' Compensation</p> <p>Significant Vote Proposal</p>

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK ACS World Small Cap ESG Screened Equity Tracker Fund		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Against
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[LN-M0550-003] Poor use of remuneration committee discretion regarding increases. [SD-M0550-001] Disclosure does not provide sufficient understanding of the company's remuneration policies and the link between performance-based pay and company performance.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the third most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Consolidated Communications Holdings, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	NCR Corporation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-05-06
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Elect Director Robert J. Currey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Elect Director Mark W. Begor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'second most significant'? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'third most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	Withhold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you vote? 	For
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	[SD-M0201-005] Nominee is not independent and serves on a key committee.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale of the voting decision 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of the vote 	Pass
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote? 	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the fourth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the fifth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	Interdigital, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Company name 	TaskUs, Inc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-06-01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of the Vote 	2022-06-14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Elect Director Lawrence (Liren) Chen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the resolution 	Elect Director Bryce Maddock
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fourth most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'fifth most significant'? 	Significant Vote Proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote 	

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK ACS World Small Cap ESG Screened Equity Tracker Fund		
• How did you vote?	For	• How did you vote?	For
• Rationale of the voting decision		• Rationale of the voting decision	
• Outcome of the vote	Pass	• Outcome of the vote	Pass
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the sixth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the seventh most significant for this fund?:	Yes
• Company name	PagerDuty, Inc.	• Company name	Viasat, Inc.
• Date of the Vote	2022-06-15	• Date of the Vote	2022-06-21
• Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Elena Gomez	• Summary of the resolution	Issue Shares in Connection with Merger
• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'sixth most significant'?	Significant Vote Proposal	• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'seventh most significant'?	Significant Vote Proposal
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote		• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	
• How did you vote?	For	• How did you vote?	For
• Rationale of the voting decision		• Rationale of the voting decision	
• Outcome of the vote	Pass	• Outcome of the vote	Pass
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.
Do you have a vote you consider the eighth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you have a vote you consider the ninth most significant for this fund?:	Yes
• Company name	International Money Express, Inc.	• Company name	Uniper SE
• Date of the Vote	2022-06-24	• Date of the Vote	2022-12-19
• Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Bernardo Fernandez	• Summary of the resolution	Approve Creation of EUR 25 Billion Pool of Authorized Capital 2022 without Pre-emptive Rights
• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'eighth most significant'?	Significant Vote Proposal	• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'ninth most significant'?	Significant Vote Proposal
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote		• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	
• How did you vote?	For	• How did you vote?	For
• Rationale of the voting decision	Pass	• Rationale of the voting decision	Pass
• Outcome of the vote		• Outcome of the vote	
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.	• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	BLK ACS World Small Cap ESG Screened Equity Tracker Fund		
Do you have a vote you consider the tenth most significant for this fund?:	Yes	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?	Yes
• Company name	Helmerich & Payne, Inc.		
• Date of the Vote	2023-02-28		
• Summary of the resolution	Elect Director Delaney M. Bellinger		
• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'tenth most significant'?	Significant Vote Proposal		
• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote			
• How did you vote?	For		
• Rationale of the voting decision			
• Outcome of the vote	Pass		
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	Repeated answer: See BLK AQC Currency Hedged AB Global Equity Fund vote 1 answer.		

Activity	Amundi MSCI China ESG Leaders		
Do you undertake Engagements for this fund?	Yes	How many engagements have you had with companies in the past 12 months?	6
How many engagements were made regarding climate change?	1	How many engagements were made regarding board diversity?	
How many engagements were made regarding waste reduction?		How many engagements were made regarding financials?	
How many engagements were made regarding other issues?	2	Which form of engagement is most representative of the approach taken for this fund over the last 12 months:	
Do you engage in voting for this fund?	Yes	Do you conduct your own votes?	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.
Do you use a third party to vote on your behalf? If Yes, please provide the details of your provider and any comments	The team uses the ISS ProxyExchange platform to send its voting instructions. Analysis from ISS, Glass Lewis, and Proxinvest is available to more efficiently identify problematic resolutions, while retaining complete autonomy from their recommendations. ISS also provides customized voting recommendations based on Amundi's voting policy.	How many votes were proposed across the underlying companies in the fund?	381

Mobius (AB Target Date Funds) (continued)

Activity	Amundi MSCI China ESG Leaders		
How many times did you vote in favour of management?	324	How many times did you vote against management?	57
How many votes did you abstain from?	0	Do you have a vote you consider the most significant for this fund?:	Yes
		• Company name	Bank of China Limited
		• Date of the Vote	2023-04-21
		• Summary of the resolution	Approve Fixed Asset Investment Budget
		• On which criteria have you assessed this vote to be 'most significant'?	As determined at Amundi level, significant votes, are a selection of the most important environmental and social shareholder proposals. Emblematic votes, as encountered by the voting analysts from time to time (linked for example to controversies that have been highly mediatized), vote of all items for meetings of issuers that have been noted as a conflict of interest as per our voting policy as well as votes against board members of climate & social laggard companies (as defined in our voting policy).
		• Approximate size of the fund's/ mandate's holding as at the date of the vote	4.46
		• How did you vote?	For
		• Rationale of the voting decision	Not Given
		• Outcome of the vote	N/A
• Where you voted against management, did you communicate your intent to the company ahead of the vote?	No		
Do you have a vote you consider the second most significant for this fund?:	No, Only one vote deemed significant enough to give details on	Do you monitor the carbon emission levels or similar of the underlying companies in the fund?	Yes
What is the target turnover rate for the portfolio?		What was the actual turnover rate over the last 12 months?	0



PART OF



GROUP PLC

FOR MORE INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT
 OPTIONS CORPORATE PENSIONS UK LTD

1st Floor Lakeside House,
 Shirwell Crescent, Furzton Lake,
 Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire, MK4 1GA.

T: +44 (0) 330 124 1510

optionspensions.co.uk
 workplaceenquiries@optionspensions.co.uk