

## RTS 28 Quality of Execution Annual Report

Firm: PGGM Vermogensbeheer BV

Calendar Year Disclosure Period: 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2018

Date: 30 April 2019

Summary of classes of instruments included in this report, and class of instruments not included in this report (because PGGM has not executed client orders in that class of instruments)<sup>1</sup>:

Classes of instruments included in this report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Debt Instruments</i></li><li>• <i>Equities</i></li><li>• <i>Credit derivatives</i></li><li>• <i>Futures</i></li></ul>

RTS 28 reporting requires firms to classify executed orders as “passive”, “aggressive” or “directed”, where these are defined as the following:

- “passive” order means an order entered into the order book that provided liquidity;
- “aggressive” order means an order entered into the order book that took liquidity;
- “directed” order means an order where a specific execution venue was specified by the client prior to the execution of the order.

Only orders executed directly on exchange would be eligible for this “passive” or “aggressive” classification. This not the case with PGGM. Trading volume identified as “passive” or “aggressive” in the following reporting is therefore not applicable.

PGGM does not have any client relationships where the client directs PGGM to use a specific venue. There are therefore no directed orders.

---

<sup>1</sup> As defined in Annex 1 of [RTS 28](#).

<b>Class of instrument</b>	Debt Instruments
<b>General observations</b>	Debt instruments include both bonds and money market instruments.
<b>Summary of analysis</b>	
<b>Execution factors</b>	<p>PGGM defines the best possible result as a proper balance between cost, service and client added value within the existing risk and regulatory frameworks. PGGM takes into account the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability factors</li> <li>• Relationship factors</li> <li>• Service consistency</li> <li>• Footprint</li> <li>• Price</li> <li>• Cost of execution</li> <li>• Nature and size of the order</li> <li>• Speed and likelihood of execution</li> <li>• Settlement factors</li> <li>• All other relevant factors</li> </ul> <p>Cost is determined as total cost. This includes price, and all other costs of execution, such as venue rebates, clearing cost, settlement cost and/or third party execution cost.</p> <p>Best Execution is a process that cannot always be drilled down to a single execution. Elements such as sustainability factors, relationship factors and service consistency need to be monitored and valued over a longer period of time.</p>
<b>Close links, conflicts of interest and common ownership with respect to execution venues</b>	<b>Close links</b> PGGM has no close links with execution venues/brokers that were used to execute orders
	<b>Conflicts of interest</b> PGGM has no conflicts of interest to report.
	<b>Common ownerships</b> PGGM has no common ownership to report.
<b>Specific arrangements with execution venues regarding payments made or</b>	PGGM has no specific arrangements to report.

<b>received, discounts, rebates or non-monetary benefits received</b>	
<b>Factors leading to a change in the list of execution venues listed in the order execution policy</b>	There were no changes to the list of execution venues/brokers in PGGM's Order Execution Policy.
<b>Differentiation across client categories</b>	N/A - all of PGGM's clients are classified as professional clients
<b>Use of data / tools relating to quality of execution</b>	<p>PGGM has used the data and/or tools relating to quality of execution coming from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order management System</li> <li>• Trading venues</li> <li>• In house TCA report</li> <li>• In house Broker review</li> </ul>
<b>Use of consolidated tape provider output</b>	PGGM has not used output from consolidated tape providers, as no useful consolidated tape data was available in 2018 for this instrument type.
<b>Use of DEA</b>	No direct electronic access to execution venues we used. The list of the top 5 venues:

	<b>Class of Instrument</b>					
	<b>Notification if &lt;1 average trade per business day in the previous year</b>		<b>Debt Instruments</b>			
	<b>Top 5 Venues in terms of volume (descending order)</b>	<b>Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Proportion of orders executed traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Percentage of passive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of aggressive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of directed orders</b>
	XAMS Euronext Amsterdam	23,16%	7,93%	na	na	na
	XPAR Euronext Paris	16,83%	6,15%	na	na	na
	FRAA BOERSE FRANKFURT - REGULIERTER MARKT	16,13%	5,36%	na	na	na
	XFRA Deutsche Boerse AG	11,33%	5,70%	na	na	na
	XBRU Euronext Brussels	9,37%	5,14%	na	na	na
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>PGGM evaluates both the execution as well as its counterparties along the benchmark of its best execution definition.</p> <p>To evaluate brokers and counterparties a broker review is used. The 2018 broker review indicates that counterparties used acted in line with PGGM's best execution policy.</p> <p>Evaluation of transactions is done via a Transaction Cost Analysis (TCA) report. This report evaluates the cost and footprint on a transaction basis as well as over all transactions. The 2018 TCA report indicates that PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy.</p> <p>An exemption report is set up and is monitored by Compliance. In 2018 no incidents were reported.</p> <p>Electronic trading platforms are selected on basis of functionality, counterparties connected, liquidity offered and user-friendliness. Periodically PGGM evaluates the offerings available in the market to see if the proper platforms are installed and used. The 2018 evaluation indicates that platforms used meet the requirements in line with PGGM's best execution policy.</p> <p>The output of the used tools indicates that PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy during 2018.</p>					

<b>Class of instrument</b>	Equities
<b>General observations</b>	In 2018 Bloomberg has been the preferred execution venue. This venue is used to route 100% of the orders to brokers execution desks or broker algorithms. It supports an electronic order workflow, it facilitates the products PGGM uses and provides access to all our counterparties. The use of this venue aids to our commitment to realise best execution.
<b>Summary of analysis</b>	
<b>Execution factors</b>	<p>PGGM defines the best possible result as a proper balance between cost, service and client added value within the existing risk and regulatory frameworks. PGGM takes into account the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability factors</li> <li>• Relationship factors</li> <li>• Service consistency</li> <li>• Footprint</li> <li>• Price</li> <li>• Cost of execution</li> <li>• Nature and size of the order</li> <li>• Speed and likelihood of execution</li> <li>• Settlement factors</li> <li>• All other relevant factors</li> </ul> <p>Best Execution is a process that cannot always be drilled down to a single execution. Elements such as sustainability factors, relationship factors and service consistency need to be monitored and valued over a longer period of time. Monitoring of transactions is done on a trade by trade base.</p>
<b>Close links, conflicts of interest and common ownership with respect to execution venues</b>	<b>Close links</b> PGGM has no close links with execution venues/brokers that were used to execute orders
	<b>Conflicts of interest</b> PGGM has no conflicts of interest to report.
	<b>Common ownerships</b> PGGM has no common ownership to report.
<b>Specific arrangements with execution venues regarding payments made or received, discounts, rebates or non-monetary</b>	PGGM has no specific arrangements to report.

<b>benefits received</b>	
<b>Factors leading to a change in the list of execution venues listed in the order execution policy</b>	There were no changes to the list of execution venues/brokers in the PGGM's Order Execution Policy.
<b>Differentiation across client categories</b>	N/A - all of the PGGM's clients are classified as professional clients
<b>Use of data / tools relating to quality of execution</b>	PGGM has used the data and/or tools relating to quality of execution coming from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order management System</li> <li>• Trading venues</li> <li>• In house TCA report</li> <li>• In house Broker review</li> </ul>
<b>Use of consolidated tape provider output</b>	The Firm has not used output from consolidated tape providers.
<b>Use of DEA</b>	No direct electronic access to execution venues we used. The list of the top 5 venues:

Class of Instrument	Equities				
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 a percentage of total in that class	Percentage of passive orders	Percentage of aggressive orders	Percentage of directed orders
XLON London Stock Exchange	26,28%	4,42%	na	na	na
XNYS New York Stock Exchange	13,90%	8,17%	na	na	na
XETR Deutsche Kassenverein AG Deutsche Boerse	12,99%	4,16%	na	na	na
XHKG The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong	12,39%	69,51%	na	na	na
XNGS NASDAQ/NGS (GLOBAL SELECT MARKET)	9,67%	5,80%	na	na	na
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>PGGM evaluates both the execution as well as its counterparties along the benchmark of its best execution definition.</p> <p>To evaluate brokers and counterparties a broker review is used. The 2018 broker review indicates that counterparties used acted in line with PGGM's best execution policy.</p> <p>Evaluation of transactions is done with Transaction Cost Analysis (TCA). This report evaluates the costs on a transaction basis. For 2018 PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy.</p> <p>An exemption report is set up and is monitored by Compliance. In 2018 no incidents were reported.</p> <p>Electronic trading platforms are selected on basis of functionality, counterparties connected, liquidity offered and user-friendliness. Periodically PGGM evaluates the offerings available in the market to see if the proper platforms are installed and used. The 2018 evaluation indicates that platforms used meet the requirements in line with PGGM's best execution policy.</p> <p>The output of the used tools indicates that PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy during 2018.</p>				

<b>Class of instrument</b>	Credit Derivatives
<b>General observations</b>	In 2018 all CDS trades have been executed with Citibank. This counterparty best suited our requirements. Positions have been closed with the same counterparty to avoid novation costs. .
<b>Summary of analysis</b>	
<b>Execution factors</b>	<p>PGGM defines the best possible result as a proper balance between cost, service and client added value within the existing risk and regulatory frameworks. PGGM takes into account the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability factors</li> <li>• Relationship factors</li> <li>• Service consistency</li> <li>• Footprint</li> <li>• Price</li> <li>• Cost of execution</li> <li>• Nature and size of the order</li> <li>• Speed and likelihood of execution</li> <li>• Settlement factors</li> <li>• All other relevant factors</li> </ul> <p>Best Execution is a process that cannot always be drilled down to a single execution. Elements such as sustainability factors, relationship factors and service consistency need to be monitored and valued over a longer period of time. Monitoring of transactions is done on a trade by trade base.</p>
<b>Close links, conflicts of interest and common ownership with respect to execution venues</b>	<b>Close links</b> PGGM has no close links with execution venues/brokers that were used to execute orders
	<b>Conflicts of interest</b> PGGM has no conflicts of interest to report.
	<b>Common ownerships</b> PGGM has no common ownership to report.
<b>Specific arrangements with execution venues regarding payments made or received, discounts, rebates or</b>	PGGM has no specific arrangements to report.



<b>non-monetary benefits received</b>																									
<b>Factors leading to a change in the list of execution venues listed in the order execution policy</b>	There were no changes to the list of execution venues/brokers in the PGGM's Order Execution Policy.																								
<b>Differentiation across client categories</b>	N/A - all of the PGGM's clients are classified as professional clients																								
<b>Use of data / tools relating to quality of execution</b>	<p>PGGM has used the data and/or tools relating to quality of execution coming from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order management System</li> <li>• Trading venues</li> <li>• In house TCA report</li> <li>• In house Broker review</li> </ul>																								
<b>Use of consolidated tape provider output</b>	The Firm has not used output from consolidated tape providers.																								
<b>Use of DEA</b>	<p>No direct electronic access to execution venues we used. The list of the top 5 venues:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Class of Instrument</b></th> <th colspan="5"><b>Credit Derivatives</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th><b>Notification if &lt; 1 average trade per business day in the previous year</b></th> <th colspan="5"><b>N</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th><b>Top 5 Venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)</b></th> <th><b>Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class</b></th> <th><b>Proportion of orders executed as a percentage of total in that class</b></th> <th><b>Percentage of passive orders</b></th> <th><b>Percentage of aggressive orders</b></th> <th><b>Percentage of directed orders</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CITI GR LONDEN XKZZ2JZF41MRHTR1V493</td> <td>100,00%</td> <td>100,00%</td> <td>na</td> <td>na</td> <td>na</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Class of Instrument</b>	<b>Credit Derivatives</b>					<b>Notification if &lt; 1 average trade per business day in the previous year</b>	<b>N</b>					<b>Top 5 Venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)</b>	<b>Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Proportion of orders executed as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Percentage of passive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of aggressive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of directed orders</b>	CITI GR LONDEN XKZZ2JZF41MRHTR1V493	100,00%	100,00%	na	na	na
<b>Class of Instrument</b>	<b>Credit Derivatives</b>																								
<b>Notification if &lt; 1 average trade per business day in the previous year</b>	<b>N</b>																								
<b>Top 5 Venues ranked in terms of volume (descending order)</b>	<b>Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Proportion of orders executed as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Percentage of passive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of aggressive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of directed orders</b>																				
CITI GR LONDEN XKZZ2JZF41MRHTR1V493	100,00%	100,00%	na	na	na																				
<b>Conclusion</b>	PGGM evaluates both the execution as well as its counterparties along the benchmark of its best execution definition.																								

	<p>To evaluate brokers and counterparties a broker review is used. The 2018 broker review indicates that counterparties used acted in line with PGGM's best execution policy.</p> <p>Evaluation of transactions is done with Transaction Cost Analysis (TCA). This report evaluates the costs on a transaction basis. For 2018 PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy.</p> <p>An exemption report is set up and is monitored by Compliance. In 2018 no incidents were reported.</p> <p>Electronic trading platforms are selected on basis of functionality, counterparties connected, liquidity offered and user-friendliness. Periodically PGGM evaluates the offerings available in the market to see if the proper platforms are installed and used. The 2018 evaluation indicates that platforms used meet the requirements in line with PGGM's best execution policy</p> <p>The output of the used tools indicates that PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy during 2018.</p>
--	--

<b>Class of instrument</b>	Futures
<b>General observations</b>	
<b>Summary of analysis</b>	
<b>Execution factors</b>	<p>PGGM defines the best possible result as a proper balance between cost, service and client added value within the existing risk and regulatory frameworks. PGGM takes into account the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability factors</li> <li>• Relationship factors</li> <li>• Service consistency</li> <li>• Footprint</li> <li>• Price</li> <li>• Cost of execution</li> <li>• Nature and size of the order</li> <li>• Speed and likelihood of execution</li> <li>• Settlement factors</li> <li>• All other relevant factors</li> </ul> <p>Best Execution is a process that cannot always be drilled down to a single execution. Elements such as sustainability factors, relationship factors and service consistency need to be monitored and valued over a longer period of time. Monitoring of transactions is done on a trade by trade base.</p>
<b>Close links, conflicts of interest and common ownership with respect to execution venues</b>	<p><b>Close links</b> PGGM has no close links with execution venues/brokers that were used to execute orders</p>
	<p><b>Conflicts of interest</b> PGGM has no conflicts of interest to report.</p>
	<p><b>Common ownerships</b> PGGM has no common ownership to report.</p>
<b>Specific arrangements with execution venues regarding payments made or received, discounts, rebates or non-monetary</b>	PGGM has no specific arrangements to report.

<b>benefits received</b>																															
<b>Factors leading to a change in the list of execution venues listed in the order execution policy</b>	There were no changes to the list of execution venues/brokers in the PGGM's Order Execution Policy.																														
<b>Differentiation across client categories</b>	N/A - all of the PGGM's clients are classified as professional clients																														
<b>Use of data / tools relating to quality of execution</b>	PGGM has used the data and/or tools relating to quality of execution coming from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order management System</li> <li>• Trading venues</li> <li>• In house TCA report</li> <li>• In house Broker review</li> </ul>																														
<b>Use of consolidated tape provider output</b>	The Firm has not used output from consolidated tape providers.																														
<b>Use of DEA</b>	No direct electronic access to execution venues we used. The list of the top 5 venues: <table border="1" data-bbox="280 954 2047 1422"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Class of Instrument</b></th> <th colspan="5"></th> </tr> <tr> <th><b>Notification if &lt;1 average trade per business day in the previous year</b></th> <th colspan="5" style="text-align: center;"><b>Futures</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th><b>Top 5 Venues in terms of volume (descending order)</b></th> <th><b>Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class</b></th> <th><b>Proportion of orders executed traded as a percentage of total in that class</b></th> <th><b>Percentage of passive orders</b></th> <th><b>Percentage of aggressive orders</b></th> <th><b>Percentage of directed orders</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>XCBT Chicago Board of Trade</td> <td style="text-align: center;">81,13%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">97,76%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">na</td> <td style="text-align: center;">na</td> <td style="text-align: center;">na</td> </tr> <tr> <td>XEUR EUREX Deutschland</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18,87%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2,24%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">na</td> <td style="text-align: center;">na</td> <td style="text-align: center;">na</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Class of Instrument</b>						<b>Notification if &lt;1 average trade per business day in the previous year</b>	<b>Futures</b>					<b>Top 5 Venues in terms of volume (descending order)</b>	<b>Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Proportion of orders executed traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Percentage of passive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of aggressive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of directed orders</b>	XCBT Chicago Board of Trade	81,13%	97,76%	na	na	na	XEUR EUREX Deutschland	18,87%	2,24%	na	na	na
<b>Class of Instrument</b>																															
<b>Notification if &lt;1 average trade per business day in the previous year</b>	<b>Futures</b>																														
<b>Top 5 Venues in terms of volume (descending order)</b>	<b>Proportion of volume traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Proportion of orders executed traded as a percentage of total in that class</b>	<b>Percentage of passive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of aggressive orders</b>	<b>Percentage of directed orders</b>																										
XCBT Chicago Board of Trade	81,13%	97,76%	na	na	na																										
XEUR EUREX Deutschland	18,87%	2,24%	na	na	na																										

<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>PGGM evaluates both the execution as well as its counterparties along the benchmark of its best execution definition.</p> <p>To evaluate brokers and counterparties a broker review is used. The 2018 broker review indicates that counterparties used acted in line with PGGM's best execution policy.</p> <p>Evaluation of transactions is done with Transaction Cost Analysis (TCA). This report evaluates the costs on a transaction basis. For 2018 PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy.</p> <p>An exemption report is set up and is monitored by Compliance. In 2018 no incidents were reported.</p> <p>Electronic trading platforms are selected on basis of functionality, counterparties connected, liquidity offered and user-friendliness. Periodically PGGM evaluates the offerings available in the market to see if the proper platforms are installed and used. The 2018 evaluation indicates that platforms used meet the requirements in line with PGGM's best execution policy.</p> <p>The output of the used tools indicates that PGGM acted in line with its best execution policy during 2018.</p>
-------------------	--