

Baillie Gifford Pacific Fund

Shareholder Rights Directive Annual Disclosure for the period 01 January 2024 to 31 December 2024



This disclosure is produced to meet our obligation to provide enhanced reporting under the Shareholder Rights Directive (SRD) requirements. It is not marketing material. This document is solely for the use of professional investors and should not be relied upon by any other person. It is not intended for use by retail clients.

Our Investment Strategy

We are long-term, active, growth investors focused on identifying those companies that can grow their earnings, in hard currency, faster than the market over the long-term. Stock prices are wildly unpredictable in the short-term, however, ultimately, share prices do reflect the earnings capability of a company over the long-term. So when we find a company that has the potential to grow its profits significantly over time, we must invest with the patience that allows a good decision to prove its worth. To this end, we ask clients to judge us over a 5 year plus time frame, over which period our aim is to outperform the MSCI AC Asia ex Japan Index, after fees.

How We Make Investment Decisions

All investment ideas, whether existing holdings or new ideas, are discussed by the Emerging Markets Equity Team, at the weekly stock meeting. This is the opportunity to challenge and explore the research, drawing on the collective experience of the team.

The decision as to whether to buy or sell a stock is taken by co-investment managers, who typically meet on a monthly basis to discuss portfolio construction. Stock weightings are determined by a combination of the conviction in the investment case, the scale and probability of the relative expected return and the context of the holding in relation to the rest of the portfolio.

Our sell discipline is triggered if a company no longer meets our growth hurdle, if the investment case no longer stands up to scrutiny, if the valuation no longer leaves sufficient upside or if there are significantly better ideas elsewhere.

Key Material Medium to Long Term Risks

Fundamental risk - the permanent loss of capital and the risk of missing out on companies which subsequently post strong returns. We therefore place significant emphasis in our investment management process on understanding the fundamentals of the companies in which we invest, including environmental, social and governance factors (ESG), which may impact the sustainability of future growth.

Portfolio risk - a failure to maintain an appropriate level of diversification at the strategy level. A series of investment guidelines are in place which are intended to ensure that there is a sufficient level of diversification.

Liquidity risk - a failure to maintain appropriate level of liquidity at the strategy level. We have a series of guidelines that ensure the strategy remains sufficiently liquid to enable positions to be exited or client cash flows to be managed with minimal impact.


Portfolio Composition

The Fund is positioned as a long-term Asian (ex Japan) growth fund. Our aim is to identify quality companies that will outperform over a 5 year (or longer) time horizon. We have a strong preference for growth. The Fund is relatively index and sector agnostic, as we primarily focus on finding the best long-term Asian (ex Japan) investments irrespective of their country or sector. The Fund benefits from Baillie Gifford's substantial global investment resources, helping to produce a portfolio that typically holds 50-100 stocks with low turnover.

Top Ten Holdings

Asset Name	% of Portfolio
TSMC	9.9
Tencent	6.5
CNOOC	3.5
Reliance Industries Ltd	3.3
Samsung Electronics	3.2
Accton Technology	2.9
Sea Ltd ADR	2.8
Meituan	2.8
Mediatek	2.5
SK Hynix Inc	2.4

Geographic Analysis of Total Assets



	%
1 China	33.8
2 India	20.2
3 Taiwan	16.9
4 South Korea	11.2
5 Vietnam	8.8
6 Singapore	2.9
7 Indonesia	2.8
8 Kazakhstan	2.0
9 Hong Kong	1.3
10 Thailand	0.3
11 Cash	-0.2

Source: Baillie Gifford & Co.
Please note that totals may not add due to rounding.

Turnover and Turnover (Transaction) Costs

	%
Rolling One Year Turnover	26

Rolling One Year Turnover is calculated as the lesser of the sum of all purchases and the sum of all sales in each month divided by the monthly average market value, summed over 12 months. Turnover is a measure of average investment horizon, the lower the turnover the longer the average investment horizon.

Transaction costs:	%
Explicit transaction costs	0.21
Implicit transaction costs	0.18

Explicit costs are directly observable and include broker commissions and transaction taxes and fees. Implicit costs are the indirect costs associated with buying and selling of securities. Specifically, implicit costs represent the differential between the actual transaction price (excluding taxes and commissions) and the mid-market price of the asset when the order to transact was transmitted to a third-party. Due to the methodology used, overall transaction costs may be 'negative' if individual securities are purchased below the prevailing mid-price or conversely sold above the mid-price. Current MiFID II guidance requires us to disclose these costs, even if they result in a negative figure (i.e. an implicit gain to the investor).

Our Governance and Sustainability Approach

We look beyond current financial performance, undertaking proprietary research to build up an in-depth knowledge of an individual company and a view on their long-term prospects, including material governance and sustainability factors which we believe will positively or negatively affect the financial returns of an investment. In keeping with our decentralised and autonomous culture, we are comfortable with our various investment strategies taking different approaches to reach the same goal of properly assessing and weighing up governance and sustainability considerations in the investment process. Further information regarding our approach is detailed in our Governance and Sustainability Principles and Guidelines available in the About Us section of our website.

Our Approach to Voting and Engagement

Thoughtful voting of our clients' holdings is an integral part of our commitment to stewardship. Our Governance and Sustainability team oversees our voting analysis and execution in conjunction with our investment managers. Unlike many of our peers, we do not outsource the responsibility of voting to third-party suppliers. We utilise research from proxy advisers for information only. Additionally, Baillie Gifford does not lend securities on behalf of our clients. Where a client chooses to lend securities, we may consider requesting that clients recall any securities on loan to enable us to vote if we deem a meeting to be significant or contentious.

We engage regularly with management and board members to identify and understand issues and to monitor performance. Analysts from the Governance and Sustainability team regularly join our investors for these meetings, in addition to meetings that they will arrange directly with company representatives to discuss specific issues. Further details of Baillie Gifford's approach to voting and engagement is outlined in our Governance and Sustainability Principles and Guidelines document available in the About Us section of our website.

Detailed below are the engagements and the most significant votes we have carried out.

Company Engagement

Engagement Type	Company
Environmental	Airtac International Group, Brilliance China Automotive Holdings Limited, CNOOC Limited, Coupang, Inc., PDD Holdings Inc., PT Bank Rakyat Indonesia (Persero) Tbk, Ping An Insurance (Group) Company of China, Ltd., Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Sea Limited, Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited, Tencent Holdings Limited, Zijin Mining Group Company Limited

Social	Accton Technology Corporation, CNOOC Limited, PDD Holdings Inc., PT Bank Rakyat Indonesia (Persero) Tbk, Ping An Insurance (Group) Company of China, Ltd., Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Sea Limited, Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited, Tencent Holdings Limited, Zijin Mining Group Company Limited
Governance	ASMPT Limited, Accton Technology Corporation, Airtac International Group, Brilliance China Automotive Holdings Limited, CNOOC Limited, DLF Limited, EO Technics Co., Ltd., Fabrinet, HDFC Bank Limited, Ho Chi Minh City Development Joint Stock Commercial Bank, Jadestone Energy plc, Kaspi.kz Joint Stock Company JSC, Koh Young Technology Inc., Li Ning Company Limited, MMG Limited, Midea Group Co., Ltd., Military Commercial Joint Stock Bank, PDD Holdings Inc., PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk, PT Bank Rakyat Indonesia (Persero) Tbk, Ping An Insurance (Group) Company of China, Ltd., SG Micro Corp, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Sea Limited, Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited, Techtronic Industries Company Limited, Yifeng Pharmacy Chain Co., Ltd., Zijin Mining Group Company Limited
Strategy	Brilliance China Automotive Holdings Limited, Kaspi.kz Joint Stock Company JSC, PDD Holdings Inc., PT Bank Rakyat Indonesia (Persero) Tbk, Ping An Insurance (Group) Company of China, Ltd., Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Sea Limited, Silergy Corp., Tencent Holdings Limited, Zijin Mining Group Company Limited

Voting Activity

Votes Cast in Favour	Votes Cast Against	Votes Abstained/Withheld
Companies	61 Companies	25 Companies
Resolutions	622 Resolutions	39 Resolutions

Significant Votes Cast in Favour

Company	Meeting Details	Voting Rationale
Bank Mandiri	AGM 07/03/24 Resolution(s): 7	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
Brilliance China Automotive	AGM 25/06/24 Resolution(s): 2B, 4A, 4C	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
Li Ning	AGM 13/06/24 Resolution(s): 3.IC	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
PB Fintech	AGM 27/09/24 Resolution(s): 3, 11	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
Phoenix Mills	AGM 13/09/24 Resolution(s): 6	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
Ping An Insurance	AGM 30/05/24 Resolution(s): 10	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
Silergy	AGM 30/05/24 Resolution(s): 3	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.

Company	Meeting Details	Voting Rationale
SK Hynix Inc	AGM 27/03/24 Resolution(s): 6	We voted in favour of routine proposals at the aforementioned meeting(s). This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.

Significant Votes Cast Against

Company	Meeting Details	Voting Rationale
Bank Mandiri	AGM 07/03/24 Resolution(s): 3	We opposed the remuneration for the board as independent directors receive incentive-based pay which we believe could compromise their objectivity. This resolution is significant because we opposed remuneration.
Bank Mandiri	AGM 07/03/24 Resolution(s): 8	We opposed the election of directors due to a lack of disclosure of the candidates ahead of the meeting. This resolution is significant because we opposed the election of a director.
Bank Rakyat Indonesia	AGM 01/03/24 Resolution(s): 3	We opposed the remuneration for the board as independent directors and commissioners receive incentive-based pay which we believe could compromise their objectivity. This resolution is significant because we opposed remuneration.
Bank Rakyat Indonesia	AGM 01/03/24 Resolution(s): 7	We opposed the changes to the composition of the company's management due to lack of disclosure of the changes. This resolution is significant because we opposed the election of a director.
China Oilfield Services Ltd 'H'	AGM 28/05/24 Resolution(s): 11	We opposed the resolution which sought authority to issue equity because the potential dilution levels are not in the interests of shareholders. This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
DLF Ltd	AGM 07/08/24 Resolution(s): 3	We opposed the election of a non-independent director due to concerns over their suitability and previous board experience. This resolution is significant because we opposed the election of a director.
Eo Technics Co Ltd	AGM 28/03/24 Resolution(s): 1	We opposed the financial statements as the annual report, including the auditor's opinion, was not disclosed ahead of the voting deadline. This resolution is significant because we opposed the company reports.
Guangzhou Kingmed 'A'	EGM 31/01/24 Resolution(s): 5.1	We opposed the election of one director because we have concerns over his suitability to serve on the board as he was criticised by Shanghai Stock Exchange. This resolution is significant because we opposed the election of a director.
Kaspi.kz ADR	Special 19/11/24 Resolution(s): 5	We opposed the resolution to approve directors' remuneration as non-executive directors receive stock options, which could impair objectivity of independent board members. We also have concerns over the lack of detail regarding the terms of the option component. This resolution is significant because we opposed remuneration.

Company	Meeting Details	Voting Rationale
Ping An Insurance	AGM 30/05/24 Resolution(s): 11	We opposed the amendments to the articles of association because one amendment would give the board full discretion to decide on the issuance of shares and convertible bonds. We would prefer that shareholders are able to assess the appropriateness of these issuances on a case-by-case basis. This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
Ping An Insurance	AGM 30/05/24 Resolution(s): 7.07	We opposed the re-election of a non-executive director as he is a shareholder representative and sits on the Audit Committee, which should be comprised entirely of independent directors. This resolution is significant because we opposed the election of a director.
SG Micro 'A'	EGM 19/09/24 Resolution(s): 2.1	We opposed the election of one director due to concerns they are not suitably qualified. This resolution is significant because we opposed the election of a director.
Techtronic Industries	AGM 10/05/24 Resolution(s): 4	We opposed the ratification of the auditor because of the length of tenure. We believe it is best practice for the auditor to be rotated regularly as this works to ensure independent oversight of the company's audit process and internal financial controls. This resolution is significant because we opposed the election of auditors.
Tencent	AGM 14/05/24 Resolution(s): 5	We opposed the resolution which sought authority to issue equity because of concerns with the level of discount. This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.
Zijin Mining Group Co Ltd 'H'	AGM 17/05/24 Resolution(s): 15	We opposed the resolution which sought authority to issue equity because the potential dilution levels are not in the interests of shareholders. This resolution is significant because it received greater than 20 per cent opposition.

Significant Abstentions

There were no significant abstentions

Conflicts of Interest

Baillie Gifford maintains a firm-wide Conflicts Matrix, which identifies conflicts and potential conflicts of interest that exist within the firm, and the procedures and controls that have been adopted to manage these conflicts. Baillie Gifford's firm wide conflict of interest disclosure is available in the Important Disclosures area of our website

We recognise the importance of managing potential conflicts of interest that may exist when we engage with or vote at a company with whom we have a material business or personal relationship and the Governance and Sustainability team is responsible for monitoring these possible material conflicts of interest.

The Governance and Sustainability team's approach to dealing with conflicts of interest in relation to voting and engagement can be found in our Investment Stewardship Activities report which is available in the Governance and Sustainability area of our website.

