

Questions from the Public
Border to Coast Joint Committee Meeting
25th November 2025

Question 1 - Mr M Ashraf

As-Salaam Alaikum

Good Morning Chair, Councillors, Directors and Officers,

First, despite knowing how timelines work, I would like to give my thanks that Border to Coast has divested from israeli government bonds.

The thought that some scheme members were directly enabling israel's policies of live-streamed Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing against members of their own families continues to be too much, but your actions have partially ameliorated that suffering and for that I am grateful. I ask that you finish the task as layed out by the People's Petition in June 2025 and Divest from complicit israeli companies and armament companies that have enabled the live-streamed Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing that continues despite the ceasefire in Gaza and at a more slower pace in Jerusalem and the West Bank where supposedly there is no war but there continues to be occupation.

Given that the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has found it plausible that israel's acts could amount to Genocide and has ordered preventive measures, and that the UN Human Rights Council has documented numerous potential war crimes, the legal and reputational risks associated with holdings in israeli government bonds and companies complicit in these acts as well as armament companies have increased exponentially.

Could you detail the specific, proactive steps Border to Coast has taken to conduct enhanced due diligence on these specific holdings and how can the israeli government bonds divestment be made irreversible?

To reiterate, previous questions on this issue have been met with references to your general Responsible Investment policy and your engagement strategies. However, the scale and severity of the current live-streamed Genocide in Gaza demand more than mere gradual engagement.

Will Border to Coast make a clear and public commitment today to a systematic review of all such assets against the criteria of your own Environmental, Social and Governance factors and International Law, including the Rome Statute which is applicable via the United Kingdom's International Criminal Court Act of 2001, with a view to full divestment, as this now constitutes a clear and material financial risk?

Will Border to Coast immediately freeze and then reverse any investments in companies that do not abide by the UN Global Compact Principles, and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises?

I will preface the following with my thanks to the chairs and secretary for the times when there has been more than three questions per meeting.

What roughly, is the amount of the, population, scheme members and investment funds of the now 18 regions of Border to Coast?

How will you ensure that your recent enlargement will not deleteriously effect your already very tiny public democratic engagement which currently stands, as per your protocol at 3 questions every three months for a population and scheme membership in the 10s of millions?

Instead how can you expand and deepen the public democratic engagement that something as simple as asking questions can bring?

Thank you in advance to the officers for taking the time to answer my question.

Question 2 – Ms. June Cattell

I would first like say how pleased I am that Border to Coast has decided that it should no longer invest in Israeli Bonds. This will be a relief to all the members many of whom believe their money should be in investments that take into account humanitarian principles and do no harm. I feel you have made an important step in making our funds more responsible and ethical.

You have said members that you are not and are not required to be an ethical organisation. Yet you do make ethical choices in your investments in relation to the information you have about for example, climate, arms, modern slavery, working conditions. You do have responsibilities under the human Rights act to consider these issues as well as issues such as illegal occupation, illegal military action, occupation and ethnic cleansing in your investment decisions.

It is time for organisations like yourselves to make a stand against the horrendous human rights abuses taking place in Palestine. The killings continue in Gaza and the West Bank, genocide is not over, Palestine is still occupied and Israel an apartheid state

I would like to draw Border to Coast's attention to the **Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 "From Economy of Occupation to the Economy of genocide"** This report details how corporate entities such as pension funds are complicit morally and legally in the occupation, apartheid, genocide and ethnic cleansing in Palestinian lands.

Have all of you who are responsible for investing the money of South Yorkshire members pensions read this report and considered your actions in relation to human rights abuses in Palestine and other other areas of conflict?

It refers to the UN Guiding Principles " The UN Guiding principles expect corporate entities to ensure that they are not implicated in human rights

violations by undertaking periodic human rights due diligence (HRDD) to identify concerns *and* adjust their conduct.^[336] Additionally, in situations of armed conflict, occupation and other instances of widespread violence, corporate entities are expected to engage in heightened human rights due diligence throughout the period of the conflict. “

Has Border to Coast undertaken heightened human rights due diligence in relation to the arms companies it invests in that are selling arms to Israel and also the companies operating in the Occupied Palestinian territories.

The report reminds us that the United Nations General Principles apply to all corporate enterprises, “regardless of their size, sector, operational context, ownership and structure.”^[327] The responsibility of corporate entities for human rights violations and crimes under international law exists independently from that of States and irrespective of the action States do or do not take to ensure they respect human rights. Consequently, corporations must respect human rights even if a State where they operate does not, and they may be held accountable even if they have complied with the domestic laws where they operate.^[328] In other words, compliance with domestic laws is not a defense to responsibility or liability. “

How is Border to Coast going to demonstrate its respect for International law and human rights and in line with its commitment to the UN Global Compact and comply with its guidance on responsible investment in conflict -affected and high risk areas.

<https://www.un.org/unispal/document/a-hrc-59-23-from-economy-of-occupation-to-economy-of-genocide-report-special-rapporteur-francesca-albanese-palestine-2025/>

https://d306pr3pise04h.cloudfront.net/docs/issues_doc%2FPeace_and_Business%2FGuidance_RB.pdf

Question 3 – Olwyn Hocking

The weight of responsibility borne by Chairs and Trustees of Pension Funds was highlighted in the Open Letter delivered to this month’s World Pensions Summit (link [here](#)). It urges that “*the views and long-term interests of all savers, including those under 35, are heard and represented in key strategy decisions.*” The BCPP Fossil Free campaign recently reminded Annual Conference attendees that current projections mean “*younger members face frightening temperature rises, excess mortality, less secure food and freshwater, rising seas and irreversible tipping points*”.

Question: “What intergenerational fairness methodology does BCPP use when weighting outcomes of its investment strategy for members in different age cohorts? Are the outcomes for savers under 35 specifically noted as part of key strategy

decisions, as requested in the Open Letter? If so, do they include the predicted unpleasant retirement outcomes for younger fund members, outlined above?"