

Report on top five execution venues
Reporting period: 2022

This report summarizes the top five execution venues of financial instruments, that LEON MFO Investments Limited (the Company) executed for clients in 2022.

CLASS OF INSTRUMENT:	EQUITY AND EQUITY FUNDS				
Notification if <1 average trade per business day	Y	(Y/N)	# trades:	488	
Top 5 venues by volume	% of volume	% of orders	% of passive	% of aggressive	% of directed
1. EFG Bank (Luxemburg) S.A	37%	20%	8%	92%	0%
2. Bank Julius Baer & Co. Ltd	34%	28%	3%	97%	0%
3. UBS Switzerland AG	10%	6%	6%	94%	0%
4. Pictet & Cie (Europe) S.A	9%	3%	6%	94%	0%
5. Bank Vontobel AG	6%	18%	0%	100%	0%
CLASS OF INSTRUMENT:	BOND AND BOND FUNDS				
Notification if <1 average trade per business day	Y	(Y/N)	# trades:	612	
Top 5 venues by volume	% of volume	% of orders	% of passive	% aggressive	% of directed
1. Bank Julius Baer & Co. Ltd	44%	22%	26%	74%	0%
2. EFG Bank (Luxemburg) S.A	23%	42%	19%	81%	0%
3. J.P. Morgan Private Bank	15%	17%	15%	85%	0%
4. Union Bancaire Privee UBP SA	9%	4%	48%	52%	0%
5. Pictet & Cie (Europe) S.A	6%	3%	42%	58%	0%

CLASS OF INSTRUMENT:	ALTERNATIVE FUNDS AND STRUCTURED				
Notification if <1 average trade per business day	Y	(Y/N)	# trades:	88	
Top 5 venues by volume	% of volume	% of orders	% of passive	% aggressive	% of directed
1. Bank Julius Baer & Co. Ltd	44%	23%	0%	100%	0%
2. EFG Bank (Luxemburg) S.A	35%	50%	0%	100%	0%
3. Bank Vontobel AG	8%	14%	0%	100%	0%
4. Union Bancaire Privee UBP SA	6%	6%	0%	100%	0%
5. Pictet & Cie (Europe) S.A	5%	2%	0%	100%	0%

(a) an explanation of the relative importance the firm gave to the execution factors of price, costs, speed, likelihood of execution or any other consideration including qualitative factors when assessing the quality of execution:

According to agreements between the Company and its clients this point is not applicable.

(b) a description of any close links, conflicts of interests, and common ownerships with respect to any execution venues used to execute orders:

The Company has no close links, conflicts of interest, and common ownerships with respect to the execution venues.

(c) a description of any specific arrangements with any execution venues regarding payments made or received, discounts, rebates or non-monetary benefits received:

During the reporting period, the Company did not receive any remuneration, discount or non-monetary benefit for routing Client orders to execution venues, which would infringe any conflicts of interest or inducement requirements under MiFID II.

(d) an explanation of the factors that led to a change in the list of execution venues listed in the firm's execution policy, if such a change occurred:

No such changes occurred.

(e) an explanation of how order execution differs according to client categorisation, where the firm treats categories of clients differently and where it may affect the order execution arrangements:

This point is not applicable as the Company has only professional clients.

(f) an explanation of whether other criteria were given precedence over immediate price and cost when executing retail client orders and how these other criteria were instrumental in delivering the best possible result in terms of the total consideration to the client:

This point is not applicable as the Company doesn't have retail clients.

(g) an explanation of how the investment firm has used any data or tools relating to the quality of execution, including any data published under Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/575:

According to agreements between the Company and its clients this point is not applicable.