

FOR PROFESSIONAL CLIENTS AND QUALIFIED INVESTORS ONLY
NOT TO BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN APPROVAL

Article (65)6 / RTS 28: Annual Report 2020

Top 5 Venues Best Execution

April 2021



All venue reporting categories commentary

MiFID II requires investment firms who execute client orders, to summarise and make public on an annual basis for each class of financial instrument, the top five execution venues in terms of trading volumes where they executed client orders in the preceding year and information on the quality of execution obtained. Below please find our annual Article (65)6 and RTS28 Report for 2020.

The following commentary applies to all our trading for each venue reporting category unless otherwise noted in the specific venue reporting category commentary.

For cash equity and FX trades undertaken during 2020, we are reporting the counterparties we traded with and not the end venues where our counterparts will have executed our order.

Close links, conflicts of interest or common ownership with execution venues

Insight¹ is a separate asset manager within the BNY Mellon Asset Management (BNYM) boutique structure located in its own secure premises. The organisational structure, and hence the operational independence of each of the boutiques, is such that conflicts are unlikely to arise between the separate businesses. Effective Chinese Walls are in place between BNYM, the other investment management boutiques and Insight to manage potential conflicts should they arise. Insight operates procedures to ensure the prompt, fair and expeditious execution and allocation of client orders relative to other client orders. Insight does not trade for its own accounts, in 2020, we did not execute any client trades with BNYM.

Insight does not have any close links, common ownership or arrangements concerning rebates with respect to any execution venue used to execute orders. In addition, the inducement and research rules of the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA), prohibits investment firms which carry out portfolio management services from receiving inducements (other than acceptable minor non-monetary benefits) in relation to those services. Minor non-monetary benefits must be of a scale and nature that could not be judged to impair Insight's compliance with its duty to act honestly, fairly and professionally in the best interests of the client. Insight monitors non-monetary benefits through its Research Policy. Insight also monitors and requires pre-clearance of gifts and entertainment above certain thresholds to ensure that Insight is not induced to use one execution venue over another.

Client categorisation

Insights Order Execution Policy does not treat different categories of clients differently. We follow a consistent approach across our client base whilst ensuring we comply with any client specific regulation (for example ERISA and 1940 Act regulations). For derivative and repo products that trade under legal agreements such as IDSAs or GMRA and our trading is limited to counterparties with whom we have that documentation in place.

Execution monitoring processes

For best execution monitoring, we operate a two-tier process using a first and second line of defence model. The Head of Trading is responsible for first line of defence monitoring of best execution and delivering the best execution strategy. Additional second line of defence monitoring is undertaken by our Compliance Team.

First line of defence monitoring is achieved through exception monitoring of traded prices / spreads, counterparty hit ratio monitoring and various other analytics used to identify patterns and anomalies in our trading outcomes. Tolerances are used to identify trades which have been executed outside a specific range compared to a number of benchmarks some of which are asset class specific and tailored to fit the characteristics of the asset class in question. These benchmarks include, but are not limited to, the market price / benchmark price at point of execution, arrival price, market close, market

¹ Insight is the corporate brand for certain companies operated by Insight Investment Management Limited (IIML). Insight includes, among others, Insight Investment Management (Global) Limited (IIMG), Insight Investment International Limited (IIL), Insight Investment Management (Europe) Limited (IIMEL) and Insight North America LLC (INA), each of which provides asset management services.

price at time trade is completed, VWAP, TWAP, our TCA providers expected market impact benchmark data and Implementation shortfall. The price and basis point tolerance ranges are proposed by our Trading Analysts and or the trading head for each desk and are approved by the Head of Trading and the Trading Oversight Committee (TOC). Trades that fall outside the agreed tolerances are highlighted by our independent third-party transaction cost analysis (TCA) providers and are assessed by our traders and trading analysts. Our aim is to in as many instances as possible capture and record data along the lifecycle of a trade so that sufficient information is attached to the trade to help explain the circumstances of a trade. However, when an exception is generated, the trader or Head of Trading reviews the trade and the corresponding execution factors documented at point of trade with the trader adding or the Head of Trading requesting further explanation as required. For those trades not initially reviewed by the Head of Trading a final review, sign off and categorisation of each exception is undertaken by the Head of Trading or Trading Analysts.

Where a fair value price comparison is not available (e.g. through TCA), for example some of the less liquid products we trade, Compliance will review a sample of these trades to ensure that best execution can be demonstrated. The testing frequency and sample sizes are driven by a risk-based approach as well as taking into consideration if the instrument being reviewed was traded as part of a package trade. All testing undertaken is designed to consider the relevance of all best execution factors in determining the exact approach to be followed per asset class. Exception based monitoring in addition to TCA statistical data is used to analyse our execution quality and venue selection. Analysis is presented to the trading oversight committee (TOC) on a monthly basis where the committee reviews and can recommend changes to or approve execution strategies, processes and venue selection.

For products where algorithms may be used to execute our trades, separate quarterly meetings are held to review all of our algorithmic trading. Attendees at these algorithm review meetings are the Head of Trading, the Head of Front Office Compliance, Heads of Trading desks, our Trading Analysts and other Traders as required. The reviews comprise an assessment of execution quality versus expected outcome, signalling risk and performance as measured by our TCA providers. The findings of these reviews are presented to the TOC.

Periodically we undertake deep dives into trading outcomes in specific asset classes, from specific trading venues, trading styles or trades for a specific fund in a time period. The aim is to double check that our order execution policies are effective and to analyse if we can use the output from these deep dives to help refine or improve any aspects of our trading processes.

Assessment of execution quality obtained across all products

As buy-side traders, we are subject to factors we can influence and factors outside our control but that we can anticipate and respond to. Factors that we can influence include the trade presentation style we utilise, the speed of execution, venue and counterparty choice, how passively or aggressively we work our order, the quality of our trade management tools and the ability of our traders. Factors outside our control but which we can respond to can include market and product volatility, positioning and order flow in the marketplace from other participants in the same product we are trading. This means that the execution methodology, cost to trade and outcome achieved for identical trades that are undertaken at different times may differ because of the effect of those variables. For example, if we are selling a stock at a time where there is an excess of buyers over sellers present in the market then we can adjust our order presentation to take advantage of that favourable positioning. However, if we are selling at a time when everyone else is selling then we will again tailor our trading style to reflect that market circumstance, but our trading costs may be greater than if we were the only seller.

Post trade we use two external TCA providers, a range of internal monitoring processes, available execution venue trading analysis reports and any bespoke trading analysis reports that counterparties produced for Insight to help us assess the quality of our executions achieved. Trades that look potentially more expensive than we would have expected are highlighted and investigated and any lessons that can be learnt are fed back to trading teams and portfolio managers. Whilst it's always possible to improve on one's outcome, the evidence from our post trade analysis (which includes peer analysis where available) is that we are achieving consistently competitive trading outcomes for our clients. However, we remain vigilant and continue to constantly monitor our counterparts, venues, trading styles and outcomes to ensure we deliver consistently excellent outcomes to our clients.

RTS27 reports: We note that in March 2021 the FCA determined that execution venues need not produce RTS27 reports pending a consultation on the ongoing publication of RTS27 reports. Where available in 2020 we assessed counterparties RTS27 reports as part of our trade analysis. Our aim was to see if we could observe any statistically relevant data, patterns or outcomes that could be usefully incorporated into our pre trade decision making processes. In addition, some venues and counterparts provide us with more frequent Insight specific bespoke trading analysis and the output from these reports is analysed. In 2020, we attached greater importance to and used more extensively, these bespoke reports and trading analysis that venues provided to us in response to our specific requests. We found the counterpart RTS27 reports were of very limited benefit to our trading analysis and trading decision making processes because of the lack of context behind all trades being assessed and by the fact that counterparts reports are not always directly comparable or accessible. We therefore attached significantly more weight to our own internal analysis and our external TCA providers analysis when assessing venues and trading outcomes.

General disclosures

For some products we traded with more than one legal entity within a counterparty group. In these instances, we have consolidated our reporting at group level as there were some counterparties who would have fallen outside the top five at legal entity level but inside at group level. We feel reporting at group level facilitates more effective comparisons of total turnover across counterparties.

Passive and aggressive reporting: We have not reported passive and aggressive outcomes within our trading statistics because where we trade using low touch broker algorithms our broker is providing DEA (direct electronic access) and as member of the exchanges or venues and it is their routers that are deciding whether to sit passively on the exchange or take liquidity aggressively. Though these liquidity indicators are fed back to and consumed by us, it is not Insight who is directly accessing the venues and thus it is the brokers who should report the passive / aggressive statistics in their RTS27 reports.

Lettering of the venue top five reports: Readers will notice that we have skipped several letters of the alphabet when labelling the asset categories below. This is because we have followed the ESMA lettering for each asset class and have omitted those asset classes where we had no trading volumes in 2020.

Response to Covid 19

In March 2020 the UK moved into lockdown and Insight moved all of our traders to a work from home status. We had been planning for this event ensuring all traders had appropriate hardware and connectivity from home. Whilst our default was to have all traders working from home a small number of traders alternated working from home with time in the office, this arrangement was on a voluntary basis and was provided to suit their individual circumstances. As lockdown commenced, we observed increased market volatility and that meant that trading costs for most assets temporarily increased. This temporary increase to volatility also meant that if you were the right side of a trade, trading costs could actually be lower than average. We were able to execute all our book of business at appropriately competitive levels throughout lockdown. All our 1LOD, 2LOD and other trading oversight activities continued unchanged throughout 2020 and to ensure a competitive trading service could be continuously delivered we increased communication channels both within trading teams and with portfolio managers.

Contents

a) Equity: shares and depositary receipts	2
b) Debt instruments	5
c) Interest rate derivatives	8
d) Credit derivatives	10
e) Currency derivatives	11
f) Structured finance instruments	13
g) Equity derivatives	14
k) Exchange traded products (exchange traded funds, exchange traded notes, and exchange traded commodities)	16
m) Other instruments	17
Securities financing transactions	18
Appendix I List of financial instruments	19

a) Equity: shares and depositary receipts

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For equities, price and size were our most important execution factors, however the whole context of each order is always considered as there are occasions where speed and likelihood of execution are given increasing importance. In addition Fund Manager limits or instructions will form part of the execution strategy decision making process where specific parameters or requirements of a trade may influence our decision to trade high touch for example interacting with a brokers risk price or low touch for example executing via a brokers algorithm.

Quality of execution

Pre trade we used a number of tools to help determine positioning and availability of IOI's (indications of interest), this data is used by our traders to help determine their trade presentation strategies. Post trade we used Bloomberg BTCA to analyse our achieved executions which were measured against a number of benchmarks which included arrival price, executed price and expected market impact. Where available, we used trading venues peer comparison data to further benchmark our outcomes. In addition, we monitored counterparty turnover, venue performance, counterparty hit ratios and concentrations.

Separate and specific reviews are undertaken of all our trades executed via a broker provided algorithms and each algorithm's outcomes is reviewed against expected outcomes and peer providers outcomes.

Our analysis showed that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes for our trading activities in 2020.

Execution venues

In 2020 we added two new equity brokers and we removed three brokers following a merger and for lack of use.

Note that in some of our top five reports below UBS captured a large percentage of our total number of orders. This resulted from a number of programme trades where our strategy was to trade a basket of equities against their underlying index which often led to a high number of trades with a lower overall value being printed. Each of these programme trades was worked with a single broker (not always the same broker) with a zero-slippage limit. Additionally, these programme trades had the capacity to affect our trading statistics as we did not trade a large amount of outright physical equities in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Flow Traders (549300Z7LIC6NFIJL947)	33.18%	0.34%	0.00%
Jane Street Group LLC (5493002N1VX6KHGYO08)	11.36%	0.34%	0.00%
UBS Group AG (549300SZJ9VS8SGXAN81)	9.56%	67.88%	0.00%
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3JD5P30I6NJZ34)	6.67%	6.03%	0.00%
Jefferies LLC (58PU97L1C0WSRCWADL48)	5.85%	2.76%	0.00%

i) Tick size liquidity band 5 – 6

Tick size liquidity bands 5 and 6, from 2,000 trades per day.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
UBS Group AG (549300SZJ9VS8SGXAN81)	22.63%	78.96%	0.00%
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3JD5P30I6NJZ34)	17.80%	5.79%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	10.30%	1.69%	0.00%
Jefferies LLC (58PU97L1C0WSRCWADL48)	7.97%	1.02%	0.00%
Bank of America Corp (9DJT3UXIJZJI4WXO774)	7.16%	2.61%	0.00%

ii) Tick size liquidity band 3 – 4

Tick size liquidity bands 3 and 4, from 80 to 1,999 trades per day.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Jefferies LLC (58PU97L1C0WSRCWADL48)	21.79%	16.27%	0.00%
Royal Bank of Canada (ES7IP3U3RHIGC71XBU11)	14.48%	1.44%	0.00%
Liberum Capital Limited (213800U6KUF87S1KCC03)	13.96%	0.96%	0.00%
Numis Corp PLC (213800ARWWDZZCNBHD25)	9.48%	7.18%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	5.50%	5.74%	0.00%

iii) Tick size liquidity band 1 – 2

Tick size liquidity bands 1 and 2, from zero to 79 trades per day.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Winterflood Securities Ltd (8BRUP6V1DX3PIG2R0745)	39.40%	9.64%	0.00%
Numis Corp PLC (213800ARWWDZZCNBHD25)	29.60%	10.84%	0.00%
Jefferies LLC (58PU97L1C0WSRCWADL48)	16.60%	10.84%	0.00%
N+1 Singer (2138006PRPC7DIAIZV82)	5.04%	54.22%	0.00%
Liquidnet (213800ZIRB79BE5XQM68)	4.32%	4.82%	0.00%

iv) Tick size liquidity band other

Tick banding other: any instrument that does not have a current tick banding.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Susquehanna Financial Group LLLP (549300UHLZVQ1CWNT812)	18.20%	3.66%	0.00%
Bank of America Corp (9DJT3UXIJZJI4WXO774)	17.66%	15.85%	0.00%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	9.45%	8.54%	0.00%
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3J5P30I6NJZ34)	8.17%	6.10%	0.00%
JPMorgan Chase & Co (8I5DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	7.08%	6.71%	0.00%

Execution RTS 28

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
TradeWeb	1.40%	0.17%	0.00%

b) Debt instruments

i) Bonds

Relative importance given to the execution factors

Price and liquidity were our most important execution factors, however the whole context of each order is always considered as there are occasions where speed, likelihood of execution, likelihood of settlement and market positioning are given increasing importance. These additional factors generally assumed greater importance for less liquid bonds but their importance for all bonds varied in response to changing market and order characteristics.

Quality of execution

Pre trade we used a number of positioning tools such as Neptune and data from available electronic execution venues to help our traders determine their trade presentation strategies. Post trade we used BestX an external TCA provider to analyse our achieved executions which were measured against a number of benchmarks. Where available we used trading venues peer comparison data to further benchmark our outcomes. In addition, we monitored counterparty turnover, hit ratios and concentrations. Our internal and external analysis shows we achieved consistently competitive outcomes for our trading activities.

Execution venues

During the course of 2020 we added six fixed income counterparties and we removed four counterparties because of lack of use. The percentages attributed to the four execution venues mentioned below do not add up to 100% because a portion of our trading was executed and confirmed directly with counterparts and not via an execution venue. Note the Bloomberg and Tradeweb volumes below include process trades that were initially negotiated by phone but then affirmed electronically. The MarketAxes volumes were all trades that were fully quoted and traded via those electronic execution platforms.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3JD5P30I6NJZ34)	10.52%	10.60%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	9.37%	8.70%	0.00%
NatWest Markets Plc (RR3QWICWWIPCS8A4S074)	9.19%	4.59%	0.00%
JPMorgan Chase & Co (8I5DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	7.69%	6.81%	0.00%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	7.49%	9.08%	0.00%

Execution RTS 28

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
TradeWeb	36.72%	41.02%	0.00%
Bloomberg	32.60%	43.17%	0.00%
MarketAxcess	0.38%	5.57%	0.00%
LiquidNet	0.10%	0.30%	0.00%

ii) Money market instruments

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For money market transactions, which include Certificates of Deposit, Commercial Paper, Floating Rate Notes and Agency Paper, price, counterparty exposure and issuer credit ratings were our most important execution factors.

For listed securities, where they are available, quotes were obtained from competing counterparties and trades were concluded through the counterparties that provided the best price. For instruments that give an ongoing exposure to the issuer such as CDs, counterparty exposure is as least as important as price and often was our key execution factor as we look to ensure we sufficiently diversified our ongoing counterparty exposures. In addition, issuer credit ratings and our internal analysis of each credit were taken into account when making investment selection decisions.

Our execution policy does not treat different categories of clients differently. We trade both directly with counterparts and also via money market brokers/dealers.

It should be noted that the duration of the instrument purchased can affect our counterparty turnover numbers. For example if we purchased a six month CD and rolled it once in the year into another six month CD this would give the same next exposure to the issuer as having a three month CD of the same notional size and rolling it three times in the year yet the counterparty turnover will show as double for the three month instrument as we rolled it more frequently.

Quality of execution

For money market instruments an assessment of the outcome must consider the yield achieved in relation to the credit rating and our assessment of creditworthiness of the issuer and the duration of the instrument being traded. Most money market instruments are effectively new securities created at the point of execution and our external TCA providers do not cover these instruments, we therefore monitored our execution quality internally. Counterparty exposure, turnover and hit ratios were all monitored. In addition, we measure yields achieved against maturity and issuer rating and any outliers were challenged with our traders.

Our monitoring shows that we consistently achieved competitive outcomes for our clients.

Execution venues

We made no changes to our counterparty panel in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Bred Banque (NICH5Q04ADUV9SN3Q390)	20.67%	19.14%	0.00%
Tradition London Clearing (969500CWFF1XKRFXJ90)	7.96%	5.34%	0.00%
Tullett Prebon Securities Ltd (5493009UWRK48KKUD358)	7.11%	4.32%	0.00%
Cooperatieve Rabobank UA (DG3RU1DBUFHT4ZF9WN62)	5.49%	8.45%	0.00%
ICAP Securities (213800NMEZS3MD2IUP33)	4.95%	2.43%	0.00%

c) Interest rate derivatives

i) Futures and options admitted to trading on a trading venue

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For bond futures and options, price and liquidity were typically the most important execution factors. The best price in a market usually represents an opportunity to trade in a particular size, where we have orders larger than this size, size, speed and the need to manage information leakage increased in importance; however price was always the primary consideration. Secondary factors such as speed of execution, market positioning, ability to price block trades for larger orders and the likelihood of execution may also direct insight to use a particular execution strategy or counterparty.

Quality of execution

We used BestX an external TCA provider to review our futures and options trades. Exception and total cost-based monitoring was undertaken against a number of benchmarks. In addition, we monitored internally the cost and outcomes of our block trades that we executed on a principal basis with counterparties.

The monitoring undertaken confirmed that we consistently achieved competitive outcomes for our clients.

Execution venues

We made no changes to our counterparty panel in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Bank of America Corp (9DJT3UXIJZJI4WXO774)	22.67%	14.41%	0.00%
JPMorgan Chase & Co (8I5DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	18.75%	19.35%	22.85%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	18.59%	27.20%	8.58%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	18.16%	9.82%	0.00%
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3JD5P30I6NJZ34)	18.10%	21.09%	0.00%

ii) Swaps, forwards, and other interest rate derivatives

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For interest rate swaps, forwards and other interest rate derivatives, price and size were our most important execution factors. Where market reference pricing data was available, including but not limited to, interest rates, our traders analysed the available data and competing spreads from the universe of available counterparties to model a transaction and establish a mid-price position, this data is recorded within internal systems. Once the model price is established, client orders were executed with those counterparties which offered the best price taking into account other best execution factors such as liquidity, size of order, counterparty restrictions, the need to manage the risk of information leakage and other implicit costs of trading.

In addition, counterparties were selected based upon other factors such as the ISDA and swap agreements in place, which may limit the number of available counterparties, fund manager limits or any client instructions or limits and underlying market conditions.

Quality of execution

Our IRS monitoring was undertaken internally with trades being assessed against a number of price and cost-based benchmarks. In addition, counterparty exposure, turnover, hit ratios and counterparty performance across a range of different market conditions and positioning were actively assessed. Whilst the availability of external information to benchmark ourselves against was less than was available for certain other asset classes our analysis shows that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes in 2020.

Execution venues

We made no changes to our counterparty panel in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
NatWest Markets Plc (RR3QWICWWIPCS8A4S074)	20.20%	13.37%	0.00%
Barclays Plc (213800LBQA1Y9L22JB70)	11.98%	8.00%	0.00%
Lloyds Banking Group PLC (549300PPXHEU2JF0AM85)	10.67%	8.89%	0.00%
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3JD5P30I6NJZ34)	9.58%	8.36%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	8.59%	14.84%	0.00%

d) Credit derivatives

ii) Other credit derivatives

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For credit default swaps, price or spread and size of trade were our most important execution factors. Client orders were executed with those counterparties which offer the best price whilst also taking into account other best execution factors such as liquidity, counterparty restrictions and other implicit costs of trading.

Counterparties were also selected based upon additional factors such as the ISDA and swap agreements in place, which may limit the number of available counterparties, fund manager limits or any client instructions or limits and underlying market conditions.

Quality of execution

Our monitoring was undertaken internally with trades being assessed against a number of price and cost-based benchmarks. In addition, counterparty exposure, turnover and hit ratios were actively assessed. Our analysis demonstrated that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes for our trading activities in 2020.

Execution venues

We made no changes to our counterparty panel in 2020.

The percentages shown in the RTS28 table below do not add up to 100%, this is because the majority of our trading was undertaken directly with counterparts however a small portion of our total CDS trading was undertaken via Tradeweb the electronic execution venue.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	20.40%	14.07%	0.00%
JPMorgan Chase & Co (815DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	17.85%	16.55%	0.00%
BNP Paribas SA (R0MUWSFPU8MPRO8K5P83)	13.76%	9.73%	0.00%
Barclays Plc (213800LBQA1Y9L22JB70)	13.15%	11.22%	0.00%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	11.06%	15.87%	0.00%

Execution RTS 28

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
TradeWeb	35.54%	32.80%	0.00%

e) Currency derivatives

i) Futures and options admitted to trading on a trading venue

Relative importance given to the execution factors

Currency futures markets are both transparent and liquid. When executing these trades, we placed the highest importance on price and then any associated costs of trading. Currency futures were an infrequently traded asset class for Insight and represented less than 0.25% of Insight's total foreign exchange activity by volume in 2020.

Quality of execution

We used an independent TCA provider BestX to assess the quality of our currency futures and options executions. Trades were measured against a number of benchmarks and our analysis demonstrated that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes for our trading activities in 2020.

Execution venues

One venue was added, and no counterparts were added or removed in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
JPMorgan Chase & Co (815DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	51.66%	35.06%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	48.18%	64.14%	0.00%
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3JD5P30I6NJZ34)	0.16%	0.80%	0.00%

ii) Swaps, forwards, and other currency derivatives

Relative importance given to the execution factors

Currency markets are in the main, highly liquid making price the most important execution factor. Cost and Market impact were our next highest considerations. Where our orders were above a certain size and seeking a price may not be to the clients' advantage, we used execution algorithms to achieve the best outcome. In this scenario, size of trade, spreads and costs were our most important considerations although the latter are becoming increasingly standard as venues compete for business. Once the decision was made to fragment an order in this way, speed of execution became a factor as we aimed to optimise the time risk taken under this approach so as to minimise the risk of signalling our intentions to the market by trading too quickly and being too high a percentage of market volume.

We used a number of pre-trade execution tools to determine the best parameters and venues for each method of execution and validated this using post-trade analysis tools provided by our independent TCA provider BestX. These tools use our empirical data as well as the anonymised data of a number of our peers to identify which venues have performed best by currency pair, trade size and time of day.

Quality of execution

We used BestX an independent TCA provider to assess our currency trading outcomes. All aspects of execution performance were assessed, including price, costs, speed, likelihood of execution and settlement, size, nature of the order, as well as benchmark performance, market impact, post-trade revaluations, signalling risk, peer performance and implementation shortfall. This analysis demonstrated that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes for our trading activities in 2020.

Execution venues

We did not add or remove any execution venues or counterparts in 2020. Note the percentages shown in the RTS28 table below do not add up to 100% because not all our order flow was distributed via these platforms, the balance was voice traded.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
JPMorgan Chase & Co (8I5DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	11.79%	10.45%	0.00%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	11.43%	13.49%	0.00%
HSBC Holdings PLC (MLU0ZO3ML4LN2LL2TL39)	10.96%	12.66%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	10.24%	8.40%	0.00%
BNP Paribas SA (R0MUWSFPU8MPRO8K5P83)	7.79%	11.36%	0.00%

Execution RTS 28

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Fxall	80.34%	93.10%	0.00%

f) Structured finance instruments

Relative importance given to the execution factors

This section covers our ABS and MBS trading. For these instruments, price and liquidity were our primary execution factors. Factors such as size, likelihood of settlement, market positioning and market impact also played a part, particularly so in less liquid instruments as positioning determined on occasions whom could competitively quote to trade the security we wished to trade.

Quality of execution

We used an independent TCA provider BestX an external TCA provider to help analyse our ABS and MBS trading outcomes. Not all structured products are covered by our external TCA providers, so we supplemented our TCA checks for this asset class with some internal manual trade cost checks. Additionally, we monitored internally our counterparty hit ratios and concentrations. Our analysis shows consistently competitive outcomes in 2020.

Execution venues

We did not add or remove any counterparties in 2020. The percentages shown in the RTS28 report below do not add up to 100% because not all our ABS and MBS trades were executed via an execution platform. Some larger, more difficult or less liquid securities were negotiated and traded directly with counterparties.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Bank of America Corp (9DJT3UXIJIZJI4WXO774)	24.34%	9.37%	0.00%
Barclays Plc (213800LBQA1Y9L22JB70)	8.91%	5.85%	0.00%
BNP Paribas SA (R0MUWSFPU8MPRO8K5P83)	7.92%	7.13%	0.00%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	7.64%	8.55%	0.00%
Wells Fargo & Co (PBLD0EJDB5FWOLXP3B76)	5.95%	7.04%	0.00%

Execution RTS 28

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Bloomberg	62.24%	81.48%	0.00%
TradeWeb	25.53%	7.47%	0.00%

g) Equity derivatives

i) Options and futures admitted to trading on a trading venue

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For equity options and futures transactions price and size were our most important execution factors. The equity futures contracts that we traded are generally very liquid and that meant that most trades were communicated to a counterparty who then traded in accordance with our instructions on the relevant exchange. For larger orders, speed, likelihood of execution and information leakage become more important and for some larger trades we traded as principal with a single counterparty asking them to quote a risk price.

For equity options, orders were traded on an RFQ (request for quote) basis except where our size risked information leakage in which case we on occasion asked a single counterparty to quote.

Quality of execution

Our Equity futures and options oversight was undertaken by our Equity TCA provider Bloomberg BTCA. Our analysis of the TCA data shows that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes in 2020.

Execution venues:

We did not add or remove any counterparties in 2020. The percentages shown in the RTS28 report below do not add up to 100% because the majority of our trades were not executed via an RFQ execution platform.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Citigroup Inc (6SHG14ZSSL CXXQSBB395)	29.09%	33.82%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPL TWKTBV3E584)	20.53%	19.23%	0.00%
JPMorgan Chase & Co (815DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	19.64%	9.05%	0.00%
Bank of America Corp (9DJT3UXIJZJI4WXO774)	8.88%	12.00%	0.00%
Morgan Stanley (IGJSJL3JD5P30I6NJZ34)	7.45%	4.38%	0.00%

Execution RTS 28

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
TradeWeb	1.19%	2.89%	0.00%

ii) Swaps and other equity derivatives

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For equity swap transactions price and size were our most important execution factors. For securities where liquidity is good Insight will direct order flow to counterparties which provide the best price taking into account the size of the order and the ability of the counterparty to execute on a timely basis. For large volume orders, programme trades or illiquid product, execution factors such as speed and likelihood of execution became more important. In addition Fund Manager limits or instructions formed part of our execution strategy decision making process where specific parameters or requirements of a trade may influence our decision to trade high touch for example interacting with a brokers risk price or low touch for example executing via a brokers algorithm.

In addition, counterparties are selected based upon factors such as fund manager limits or instructions and any client instructions or restrictions.

Quality of execution

Pre trade we used a number of tools to help determine positioning and availability of IOI's, this data is used by our traders to help determine their trade presentation strategies. Post trade we used Bloomberg BTCA to analyse our achieved executions which were measured against a number of benchmarks which included arrival price, executed price and expected market impact. Where available, we used trading venues peer comparison data to further benchmark our outcomes. In addition, we monitored counterparty turnover, venue performance, counterparty hit ratios and concentrations.

Separate and specific reviews were undertaken of all our trades executed via a broker provided algorithms and each algorithm's outcomes was reviewed against expected outcomes and peer algorithm performance.

Our analysis shows that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes in 2020.

Execution venues:

We did not add or remove any equity derivative execution brokers in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
JPMorgan Chase & Co (815DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	18.77%	14.00%	0.00%
Goldman Sachs Group Inc (784F5XWPLTWKTBV3E584)	18.42%	6.89%	0.00%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	17.03%	5.50%	0.00%
Credit Suisse Group AG (549300506SI9CRFV9Z86)	10.81%	5.82%	0.00%
Barclays Plc (213800LBQA1Y9L22JB70)	7.29%	6.27%	0.00%

k) Exchange traded products (exchange traded funds, exchange traded notes, and exchange traded commodities)

Relative importance given to the execution factors

This section comprises our ETF (Exchange Traded Funds) trading, for ETF's price and size were the primary best execution factors. The majority of our orders were traded on an RFQ basis via Tradeweb. This means that typically several brokers would be asked to quote for each trade, and we traded with the broker showing the most competitive price for our trade. A small proportion of larger trades were executed directly with our counterparty, this was to prevent information leakage, hence the percentages shown below in the RTS28 section do not add up to 100%.

Quality of execution

We monitored our ETF trading using similar methodology and providers as for our Equity trading, with Bloomberg BTCA being used as an external TCA provider. Because an RFQ trading protocol was used for the majority of our ETF trades particular emphasis was placed on counterparty hit ratios and concentrations.

As can be seen from the top five counterparties table below Jane Street captured a dominant share of our total ETF traded volume. This reflected their strength in several of the key ETF's we traded and all trades they won were shown in competition via RFQ ensuring we obtained the best available market price from a range of counterparties.

Our analysis shows that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes in 2020.

Execution venues

No ETF counterparties were added or removed in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Jane Street Group LLC (5493002N1VX6KHGYO08)	50.75%	33.53%	0.00%
Flow Traders (549300Z7LIC6NFIJL947)	37.29%	24.63%	0.00%
Bluefin Europe LLP (549300Q2Z3B0BNFSSC21)	2.22%	2.37%	0.00%
Deutsche Bank AG (7LTFWZYICNSX8D621K86)	2.16%	4.75%	0.00%
Susquehanna Financial Group LLLP (549300UHLZVQ1CWNT812)	1.93%	3.56%	0.00%

Execution RTS 28

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
TradeWeb	91.24%	96.74%	0.00%

m) Other instruments

Relative importance given to the execution factors

We have included in this section all our loans trading. Price and counterparty availability were typically the primary execution factors for this asset class but with consideration also given to facility agent where the tranche levels are small which would amplify trading/transfer costs. Consideration was also given to the ability to execute in volatile markets and the ability of the counterparty to maintain their level. Secondary market turnover was lower than in many other asset classes so counterparty turnover numbers can be driven by primary issuance.

Quality of execution

Our monitoring of loan trading was undertaken internally within our second line function. A random sample deep dive approach was taken.

Our analysis showed that we achieved consistently competitive outcomes in 2020.

Execution venues:

As secondary turnover is low our choice of counterparty was often driven by primary flow and whom the issuing lead manager was. Similarly, for secondary market trading Loans often had a limited number of counterparties able and willing to trade and we therefore often had little choice over counterparty. No loan counterparties were added or removed in 2020.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Islay Finance Limited (635400CVQNHQOV7WEC18)	9.99%	1.56%	0.00%
Credit Suisse Group AG (549300506SI9CRFV9Z86)	7.11%	13.28%	0.00%
JPMorgan Chase & Co (815DZWZKVSZI1NUHU748)	5.64%	12.66%	0.00%
Deutsche Bank AG (7LTFWZYICNSX8D621K86)	4.69%	4.69%	0.00%
Citigroup Inc (6SHGI4ZSSLCXXQSBB395)	4.30%	5.31%	0.00%

Securities financing transactions

Relative importance given to the execution factors

For Repo and reverse repo transactions, factors such as client limits, counterparty exposure limits, counterparty restrictions and price were our primary execution factors. Where funds had existing counterparty exposures up to or close to exposure limits this could limit our availability of counterparties and influence the number of competitive quotes obtained. Where possible we asked every eligible counterparty to quote and traded with the best quote received.

Quality of execution

For this asset class the quality of execution is monitored internally. We plotted the rate paid against maturity and challenged any outliers to the curve. In addition, counterparty exposures were closely monitored. Our analysis showed that we achieved consistently competitive price outcomes whilst maintaining a sufficient spread of counterparty exposure.

Execution venues:

The Repo market is a constantly evolving market with new products, for example cleared repo, and new counterparties appearing over time. Volumes executed with any specific counterparty can vary substantially; this variance is principally driven by issuers changing funding requirements and pricing competitiveness. We did not add or remove any counterparties to Insight's approved Repo counterparty list in 2020.

Note for repo and reverse repo transactions we have followed the prescribed reporting format, but the volume numbers below can be misleading. For example if we have two repo exposures of the same size with one rolling daily and the other rolling weekly the daily rolling repo would contribute five times the amount to our volume traded figures whilst being exactly the same size and giving the same exposure to our counterparty. So those counterparties that we have a greater portion of short term rolled exposure to will naturally gravitate towards the top end of our turnover chart below.

Notification if <1 average trade per business day in the previous year: N

Top 5 venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)	Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class	Proportion of orders executed as percentage of total in that class	Percentage of directed orders
Royal Bank of Canada (ES7IP3U3RHIGC71XB11)	27.80%	10.03%	0.00%
BNP Paribas SA (R0MUWSFPU8MPRO8K5P83)	11.63%	5.49%	0.00%
Barclays Plc (213800LBQA1Y9L22JB70)	9.66%	7.95%	0.00%
Banco Santander SA (I4H45493006QMFDDMYWIAM13)	6.58%	5.12%	0.00%
Credit Agricole CIB (1VUV7VQFKUOQSJ21A208)	5.74%	5.73%	0.00%

Appendix I List of financial instruments

Classes of financial instrument	Trading platform	Counterparty
(a) Equities – Shares & Depositary Receipts		
(i) Tick size liquidity bands 5 and 6 (from 2000 trades per day)		✓
(ii) Tick size liquidity bands 3 and 4 (from 80 to 1999 trades per day)		✓
(iii) Tick size liquidity band 1 and 2 (from 0 to 79 trades per day)		✓
(iv) Tick size liquidity band Other (No banding)		✓
(b) Debt instruments		
(i) Bonds	✓	✓
(ii) Money markets instruments		✓
(c) Interest rates derivatives		
(i) Futures and options admitted to trading on a trading venue		✓
(ii) Swaps, forwards, and other interest rates derivatives		✓
(d) credit derivatives		
(i) Futures and options admitted to trading on a trading venue		Not traded blank section removed
(ii) Other credit derivatives	✓	✓
(e) currency derivatives		
(i) Futures and options admitted to trading on a trading venue		✓
(ii) Swaps, forwards, and other currency derivatives	✓	✓
(f) Structured finance instruments	✓	✓
(g) Equity Derivatives		
(i) Options and Futures admitted to trading on a trading venue	✓	✓
(ii) Swaps and other equity derivatives		✓
(h) Securitized Derivatives		
(i) Warrants and Certificate Derivatives		Not traded blank section removed
(ii) Other securitized derivatives		Not traded blank section removed
(i) Commodities derivatives and emission allowances Derivatives		
(i) Options and Futures admitted to trading on a trading venue		Not traded blank section removed
(ii) Other commodities derivatives and emission allowances derivatives		Not traded blank section removed
(j) Contracts for difference		Not traded blank section removed
(k) Exchange traded products (Exchange traded funds, exchange traded notes and exchange traded commodities)	✓	✓

Classes of financial instrument	Trading platform	Counterparty
(l) Emission allowances		Not traded blank section removed
(m) Other instruments		Contains loans only
Securities financing transactions	✓	✓

 www.insightinvestment.com

 [@insightinvestim](https://twitter.com/insightinvestim)

 [company/insight-investment](https://www.linkedin.com/company/insight-investment)

Unless otherwise attributed the views and opinions expressed are those of Insight Investment at the time of publication and are subject to change. This document may not be used for the purposes of an offer or solicitation to anyone in any jurisdiction in which such offer or solicitation is not authorised or to any person to whom it is unlawful

to make such offer or solicitation. Insight does not provide tax or legal advice to its clients and all investors are strongly urged to seek professional advice regarding any potential strategy or investment. Issued by Insight Investment Management (Global) Limited. Registered office 160 Queen Victoria Street, London EC4V 4LA. Registered in England and Wales. Registered number 00827982. Authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. FCA Firm reference number 119308.

13958-05-19