



---

# Proxy Voting Policy

July 2021

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>2</b>	Introduction & General Approach
<b>3</b>	Voting Guidelines
<b>6</b>	Roles & Responsibilities
<b>7</b>	Conflicts of Interest
<b>8</b>	Voting Procedures, Corporate Actions, Class Actions, and Record Keeping
<b>9</b>	Policy Review

## Introduction

As a registered investment adviser and fiduciary, Pzena Investment Management, LLC (“PIM”) exercises our responsibility, where applicable, to vote in a manner that, in our judgement, is solely in the client’s best interest and will maximize long-term shareholder value. The following policies and procedures have been established to ensure decision making is consistent with PIM’s fiduciary responsibilities and applicable regulations under the Investment Company Act, Advisers Act and ERISA.

## General Approach

Each proxy that comes to PIM to be voted shall be evaluated per the prudent process described below, in terms of what is in the best interest of our clients. We deem the best interest of clients to be solely that which maximizes shareholder value and yields the best economic results (e.g., higher stock prices, long-term financial health, and stability). We will not subordinate the interests of our clients to any non-pecuniary interests nor will we promote non-pecuniary benefits or goals unrelated to our clients’ long-term financial interests.

PIM’s standard Investment Advisory Agreement provides that until notified by the client to the contrary, PIM shall have the right to vote all proxies for securities held in that client’s account. Where PIM has voting responsibility on behalf of a client, and absent any client specific instructions, we generally follow the Voting Guidelines (“Guidelines”) set forth below. These Guidelines, however, are not intended as rigid rules and do not cover all possible proxy topics. Each proxy issue will be considered individually and PIM reserves the right to evaluate each proxy vote on a case-by-case basis, as long as voting decisions reflect what is in the best interest of our clients.

To the extent that, in voting proxies for an account subject to ERISA, PIM determines that ERISA would require voting a proxy in a manner different from these Guidelines, PIM may override these Guidelines as necessary in order to comply with ERISA. Additionally, because clients, including ERISA clients, do not pay any additional fees or expenses specifically related to our proxy voting, there is not a need to consider the costs related to proxy voting impacting the value of an investment or investment performance.

In those instances where PIM does not have proxy voting responsibility, we shall forward any proxy materials to the client or to such other person as the client designates.

## Proxy Voting Limitations

While, subject to the considerations discussed above, PIM uses our best efforts to vote proxies, in certain circumstances it may be impractical or impossible to do so. Such instances include but are not limited to share blocking, securities lending, if PIM concludes that abstention is in our clients’ economic interests and/or the value of the portfolio holding is indeterminable or insignificant.

## Voting Guidelines

The following Guidelines summarize PIM’s positions on various issues of concern to investors and give an indication of how portfolio securities generally will be voted. These Guidelines are not exhaustive and do not cover all potential voting issues or the intricacies that may surround individual proxy votes. Actual proxy votes may also differ from the Guidelines presented, as we will evaluate each individual proxy on its own merit.

It is also worth noting that PIM considers the reputation, experience and competence of a company’s management and board when it researches and evaluates the merits of investing in a particular security. In general, PIM has confidence in the abilities and motives of the board and management of the companies in which we invest.

### 1) Routine Business

PIM will typically vote in accordance with the board and management on the items below and other routine issues when adequate information on the proposal is provided.

- i. Change in date and place of annual meeting (if not associated with a takeover);
- ii. Change in company name;
- iii. Approval of financial statements;
- iv. Reincorporation (unless to prevent takeover attempts);
- v. Stock splits; or
- vi. Amend bylaws/articles of association to bring in line with changes in local laws and regulations.

PIM will oppose vague, overly broad, open-ended, or general “other business” proposals for which insufficient detail or explanation is provided or risks or consequences of a vote in favor cannot be ascertained.

### 2) Capital Structure

**Stock Issuance.** PIM will consider on a case-by-case basis all proposals to increase the issuance of

common stock, considering company-specific factors that include, at a minimum:

- i. Past board performance (use of authorized shares during the prior three years);
- ii. Stated purpose for the increase;
- iii. Risks to shareholders of not approving the request; or
- iv. Potential dilutive impact.

PIM will generally vote for such proposals (without preemptive rights) up to a maximum of 20% more than currently issued capital over a specified period, while taking into account management’s prior use of these preemptive rights. PIM will, however, vote against such proposals if restrictions on discounts are inadequate and/or the limit on the number of times the mandate may be refreshed are not in line with local market practices.

### 3) Audit Services

PIM is likely to support the approval of auditors unless,

- i. Independence is compromised
- ii. Non-audit (“other”) fees are greater than the sum of the audit fees<sup>1</sup>, audit-related fees<sup>2</sup> and permissible tax fees<sup>3</sup>;
- iii. There is reason to believe the independent auditor has rendered an opinion which is neither accurate nor indicative of the company’s financial position; or
- iv. Serious concerns about accounting practices are identified such as fraud, misapplication of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”) and material weaknesses identified in Section 404 disclosures of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002

PIM will also apply a case-by-case assessment to shareholder proposals asking companies to prohibit their auditors from engaging in non-audit services (or capping the level of non-audit services), taking into account whether the non-audit fees are excessive (per the formula above) and whether the company

<sup>1</sup> Audit fees shall mean fees for statutory audits, comfort letters, attest services, consents, and review of filings with the SEC

<sup>2</sup> Audit-related fees shall mean fees for employee benefit plan audits, due diligence related to M&A, audits in connection with acquisitions, internal control reviews, consultation on financial accounting and reporting standards

<sup>3</sup> Tax fees shall mean fees for tax compliance (tax returns, claims for refunds and tax payment planning) and tax consultation and planning (assistance with tax audits and appeals, tax advice relating to M&A, employee benefit plans and requests for rulings or technical advice from taxing authorities)

has policies and procedures in place to limit non-audit services or otherwise prevent conflicts of interest.

#### 4) Compensation

PIM supports reasonable incentive programs designed to attract and retain key talent. PIM typically supports management's discretion to set compensation for executive officers, so long as the plan aligns management and shareholder interests. PIM evaluates each plan in detail to assess whether the plan provides adequate incentive to reward long-term performance and the impact on shareholder value (e.g. dilution).

**Say on Pay.** PIM prefers a shareholder vote on compensation plans to provide a mechanism to register discontent with the plan itself or management team performance. As long as such proposals are non-binding and worded in a generic manner (unrestrictive to actual company plans), PIM will support them. In evaluating these proposals, PIM will generally consider, at minimum: company performance, pay practices relative to industry peers, potentially problematic pay practices and/or past unresponsive behavior.

Circumstances where PIM may oppose these proposals include:

- i. Restricts the company's ability to hire new, suitable management; or
- ii. Restricts an otherwise responsible management team in some other way harmful to the company.

**Pay for Performance.** PIM will generally support plans under which 50% or more of the shares awarded to top executives are tied to performance goals. Maintaining appropriate pay-for-performance alignment means executive pay practices must be designed to attract, retain, and appropriately motivate the key employees who drive shareholder value creation over the long term. Our evaluation of this issue will take into consideration, among other factors, the link between pay and performance; the mix between fixed and variable pay; performance goals; equity-based plan costs; and dilution.

**Incentive Options.** PIM is generally supportive of incentive options that provide the appropriate degree of pay-for-performance alignment (as per the above) and are therefore in shareholder best interest. PIM will vote on a case-by-case basis depending on certain plan features and equity grant practices, where positive factors may counterbalance negative factors, and vice versa.

However, the following would generally cause PIM to vote against a management incentive arrangement:

- i. The proposed plan is in excess of 10% of shares;
- ii. Company has issued 3% or more of outstanding shares in a single year in the recent past;
- iii. The new plan replaces an existing plan before the existing plan's termination date and some other terms of the new plan are likely to be adverse to the maximization of investment returns; or
- iv. The proposed plan resets options, or similarly compensates executives, for declines in a company's stock price. This includes circumstances where a plan calls for exchanging a lower number of options with lower strike prices for an existing larger volume of options with high strike prices, even when the option valuations might be considered the same total value. However, this would not include instances where such a plan seeks to retain key executives who have been undercompensated in the past.

**Golden Parachutes / Severance Agreements.** PIM will vote on a case-by-case basis, considering at minimum existing change-in-control arrangements maintained with named executive officers and new or extended arrangements.

PIM will generally vote against such proposals if:

- i. The proposed arrangement is excessive or not reasonable in light of similar arrangements for other executives in the company or in the company's industry;
- ii. The proposed parachute or severance arrangement is considerably more financially attractive than continued employment. Although PIM will apply a case-by-case analysis of this issue, as a general rule, a proposed severance arrangement which is three or more times greater than the affected executive's then current compensation shall be voted against; or
- iii. The triggering mechanism in the proposed arrangement is solely within the recipient's control (e.g., resignation).

**Tax Deductibility.** Votes to amend existing plans to increase shares reserved and to qualify for tax deductibility under the provisions of Section 162(m) should be considered on a case-by-case basis, considering the overall impact of the amendment(s).

**Pay Peer Groups.** PIM prefers that compensation peer groups are based on the industry not size, revenue or balance sheet.

## 5) Board

**Director Elections.** PIM generally will evaluate director nominees individually and as a group based on our assessment of record and reputation, business knowledge and background, shareholder value mindedness, accessibility, corporate governance abilities, time commitment, attention and awareness, independence, and character. PIM will apply a case-by-case approach to determine whether to vote for or against directors nominated by outside parties whose interests may conflict with our interests as shareholders, regardless of whether management agrees with the nomination.

**Board Independence.** PIM will generally withhold votes from or vote against any insiders on audit, compensation or nominating committees, and from any insiders and affiliated outsiders on boards that are not at least majority independent. PIM also prefers companies to have compensation and audit committees composed of entirely independent directors.

PIM may vote in favor of any such directors in exceptional circumstances where the company has shown significant improvement.

**Board Size.** PIM believes there is no optimal size or composition that fits every company. However, PIM prefers that the number of directors cannot be altered significantly without shareholder approval; otherwise potentially allowing the size of the board to be used as an anti-takeover defense.

**Board Tenure.** PIM believes that any restrictions on a director's tenure, such as a mandatory retirement age or length of service limits, could harm shareholder interests by forcing experienced and knowledgeable directors off the board. However, PIM prefers that boards do not have more than 50% of members serving for longer than ten years to avoid board entrenchment and 'group-think'.

**Chairman/CEO.** PIM will evaluate and vote proposals to separate the Chairman and CEO positions in a company on a case-by-case basis based on our assessment of the strength of the company's governing structure, the independence of the board and compliance with NYSE and NASDAQ listing requirements, among other factors. When the positions of Chairman and CEO are combined, PIM prefers that the company has a lead independent director to provide some independent oversight.

**Cumulative Voting.** PIM will generally vote against proposals to establish cumulative voting, as this leads to misaligned voting and economic interest in a company.

PIM will, however, vote in favor of proposals for cumulative voting at controlled companies where insider voting power is greater than 50%.

**Director Over-Boarding.** PIM will vote such proposals on a case-by-case basis but prefers that directors do not sit on more than three additional boards. In evaluating these proposals PIM will consider, at minimum, management tenure, director business expertise and director performance.

**Classified Boards.** PIM generally opposes classified boards because this makes a change in board control more difficult and hence may reduce the accountability of the board to shareholders. However, these proposals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and will consider, at minimum, company and director performance.

**Board Diversity.** PIM is generally supportive of a diverse board (age, race, gender etc.) that is representative of its customers and stakeholders. That said, PIM does not believe in board quotas or any restrictions on director tenure that could harm shareholder interests by preventing qualified board candidates from being nominated or forcing experienced or knowledgeable directors off the board.

## 6) Shareholder Rights

In general PIM does not support any proposals designed to limit shareholder rights; below we have outlined some of the issues we consider most important.

**Special Meetings.** PIM generally supports proposals enabling shareholders to call a special meeting of a company so long as at least a 15% threshold with a one-year holding period is necessary for shareholders to do so. However, on a case-by-case basis, a 10% threshold may be deemed more appropriate should particular circumstances warrant; for example, in instances where executive compensation or governance has been an issue for a company.

**One Share, One Vote.** PIM is generally opposed to proposals to create dual-class capitalization structures as these provide disparate voting rights to different groups of shareholders with similar economic investments. However, PIM will review proposals to eliminate a dual-class structure on a case-by-case basis, considering, at minimum, management's prior record.

**Supermajority.** PIM does not support supermajority voting provisions with respect to corporate governance issues unless it would be in the best interest of

shareholders. In general, vesting a minority with veto power over shareholder decisions could deter tender offers and hence adversely affect shareholder value.

**Proxy Access.** PIM will assess these proposals on a case-by-case basis, but generally supports proxy access proposals that include an ownership level and holding period of at least 3% for three years or 10% for one year.

## 7) Social/Environmental

PIM will consider environmental and social proposals on their own merits and make a case-by-case assessment. PIM will consider supporting proposals that address material issues if we believe they will protect and/or enhance the long-term value of the company.

While PIM is generally supportive of resolutions seeking additional ESG disclosures, such proposals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration whether the requested disclosure is material, incremental and of reasonable cost to the business.

## 8) Anti-Takeover

PIM generally supports anti-takeover measures that are in the best interest of shareholders and does not support anti-takeover measures such as poison pills that entrench management and/or thwart maximization of investment returns.

# Roles & Responsibilities

## Role of ISS

PIM has engaged Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”) to provide a proxy analysis with research and a vote recommendation for each shareholder meeting of the companies in our client portfolios. In engaging and continuing to engage ISS, PIM has determined that, where applicable, ISS proxy voting guidelines are consistent with ERISA’s fiduciary duties including that the votes are made in the best interest of our clients, focus on yielding the best economic results for our clients. ISS also votes, records and generates a voting activity report for our clients and assists us with recordkeeping and the mechanics of voting. In no circumstance shall ISS have the authority to vote proxies except in accordance with standing or specific instructions given to it by PIM. PIM retains responsibility for instructing ISS how to vote, and we still apply our own Guidelines as set forth herein. PIM does not utilize pre-population or automated voting except as a safeguard mechanism designed to ensure that, in the unlikely event that we fail to submit vote instructions for a particular proxy, our shares will still get voted. If PIM does not issue instructions for a particular vote, the default is for ISS to mark the ballots in accordance with our Guidelines (when they specifically cover the item being

voted on), and to refer all other items back to PIM for instruction (when there is no PIM policy covering the vote).

When voting a proxy for a security that PIM’s Research team does not cover, we will vote in accordance with our Guidelines (when they specifically cover the item being voted on) and defer to ISS’s recommendations on all other items.

Periodically, PIM’s Vendor Management Committee conducts a due diligence review of ISS, through which it reviews and evaluates certain key policies and procedures submitted to us by ISS. On a quarterly basis, PIM reviews proxy voting reports for a sample of accounts by comparing and reconciling them against one another and against our internal holdings information for those accounts. PIM also samples and reviews proxy votes when testing our Proxy Voting Policy, as part of our regular compliance testing procedures. Further, PIM reviews ISS’ procedures for receiving additional information from issuers after a proxy has been sent, incorporating that information into its recommendations, and sending that information and/or updated recommendations to PIM.

## Role of Analyst

The analyst who is responsible for covering the company also votes the associated proxies since they have first-hand in-depth knowledge of the company. In evaluating proxy issues, the analyst will utilize a variety of sources to help come to a decision:

- i. Information gathered through in-depth research and on-going company analyses performed by our investment team in making buy, sell and hold decisions for our client portfolios. This process includes regular external engagements with senior management of portfolio companies and internal discussions with Portfolio Managers (“PMs”) and the Chief Investment Officer (“CIO”), as needed;
- ii. ISS reports to help identify and flag factual issues of relevance and importance;
- iii. Information from other sources, including the management of a company presenting a proposal, shareholder groups, and other independent proxy research services; and/or
- iv. Where applicable, any specific guidelines designated in writing by a client.

## Proxy Voting Committee

To help make sure that PIM votes client proxies in accordance with our fiduciary obligation to maximize shareholder value, we have established a Proxy Voting Committee (“the Committee”) which is responsible for overseeing the Guidelines. The Committee consists of representatives from

Legal and Research, including our Chief Compliance Officer (“CCO”), Director of Research (“DOR”), and at least one PM (who represents the interests of all PIM’s portfolio managers and is responsible for obtaining and expressing their opinions at committee meetings). The Committee will meet at least once annually and as often as necessary to oversee our approach to proxy voting.

The DOR is responsible for monitoring the analyst’s compliance with the Guidelines, the CCO is responsible for monitoring overall compliance with these procedures and an internally-designated “Proxy Coordinator” is responsible for day-to-day proxy voting activities.

## Conflicts of Interest

PIM is sensitive to conflicts of interest that may arise in the proxy voting process. PIM believes that application of the Guidelines should, in most cases, adequately address any potential conflicts of interest. However, if an actual or potential material conflict of interest has been identified, PIM has put in place a variety of different mitigation strategies as outlined below.

A potential material conflict of interest could exist in the following situations:

- i. PIM manages any pension or other assets affiliated with a publicly traded company, and also holds that company’s or an affiliated company’s securities in one or more client portfolios;
- ii. PIM has a client relationship with an individual who is a corporate director, or a candidate for a corporate directorship of a public company whose securities are in one or more client portfolios; or
- iii. A PIM officer, director or employee, or an immediate family member thereof is a corporate director, or a candidate for a corporate directorship of a public company whose securities are in one or more client portfolios. For purposes hereof, an immediate family member is generally defined as a spouse, child, parent, or sibling.

If a potential material conflict of interest exists, the following procedures will be followed:

- i. If our proposed vote is consistent with the Guidelines, above, we will vote in accordance with our proposed vote;
- ii. If our proposed vote is consistent with or not covered by our Guidelines, but is consistent with the recommendations of ISS, we will vote in accordance with ISS recommendations; and
- iii. If our proposed vote is inconsistent with or not covered by our Guidelines, and is inconsistent with

the recommendations of ISS, the CCO and the DOR (or their respective designees) (the “Conflicts Committee”) will review the potential conflict and determine whether the potential conflict is material.

- a. If the Conflicts Committee determines that the potential conflict is not material, we will vote in accordance with the proposed vote.
- b. If the Conflicts Committee determines the potential conflict is material, the Conflicts Committee will review the proposed vote, the analysis and rationale for the vote recommendation, the recommendations of ISS and any other information the Conflicts Committee may deem necessary in order to determine whether the proposed vote is reasonable and not influenced by any material conflicts of interest. The Conflicts Committee may seek to interview the research analysts or portfolio managers or any other party it may deem necessary for making its determination.
  - i. If the Conflicts Committee determines the proposed vote is reasonable and not influenced by any conflicts of interest, we will vote in accordance with our proposed vote.
  - ii. If the Conflicts Committee cannot determine that the proposed vote is reasonable and not influenced by any conflict of interest, the Conflicts Committee will determine the best course of action in the best interest of the clients which may include deferring to the ISS recommendation or notifying each client who holds the relevant securities of the potential conflict, to seek such client’s voting instruction.

On an annual basis, we will review and assess the conflicts policies and Code of Conduct that ISS posts on its website for sufficiency in addressing potential conflict of interest, self-dealing and improper influence issues that may affect voting recommendations by ISS. PIM will also periodically review samples of ISS’ recommendations for voting proxies, after the vote has occurred, to ensure that ISS’ recommendations are consistent with ISS’ proxy voting guidelines, as applicable. PIM’s analysts also incorporate information regarding ISS’ potential conflicts of interest into their process when evaluating and voting proxies, and on a quarterly basis, our DOR reviews an updated list of ISS’ significant client relationships.

## Other Situations

**Client Conflict.** Where PIM manages the assets of a proponent of a shareholder proposal for a company whose securities are in one or more client portfolios, the following guidance should be followed:

- i. The identity of the proponent of a shareholder proposal shall not be given any substantive weight (either positive or negative) and shall not otherwise influence an analyst's determination whether a vote for or against a proposal is in the best interest of our clients.
- ii. Where PIM determines that it is in the best interest of our clients to vote against that proposal, a designated member of PIM's client service team will notify the client-proponent and give that client the option to direct PIM in writing to vote the client's proxy differently than it is voting the proxies of our other clients.
- iii. If the proponent of a shareholder proposal is a PIM client whose assets under management with PIM constitute 30% or more of PIM's total assets under management, and PIM has determined that it is in the best interest of our clients to vote for that proposal, PIM will disclose its intention to vote for such proposal to each additional client who also holds the securities of the company soliciting the vote on such proposal and for whom PIM has authority to vote proxies. If a client does not object to the vote within three business days of delivery of such disclosure, PIM will be free to vote such client's proxy as stated in such disclosure.

**Analyst Conflict.** If the analyst voting the proxy also beneficially owns shares of the company in his/her personal trading accounts, they must notify the Proxy Coordinator and the DOR must sign off on the analyst's votes for that company. It is the responsibility of each analyst to disclose such personal interest and obtain such approval. Any other owner, partner, officer, director, or employee of PIM who has a personal or financial interest in the outcome of the vote is prohibited from attempting to influence the proxy voting decision of PIM personnel responsible for voting client securities.

## Voting Procedures

If an analyst desires to vote contrary to the Guidelines set forth in this proxy voting policy or the written proxy voting policy designated by a specific client, the analyst will discuss the vote with the CIO, and/or DOR and/or a PM for the strategy in which the security is held. The CIO, DOR and/or the PM, shall, in turn, determine how to vote the proxy based on the analyst's recommendation and the long-term

economic impact such vote will have on the securities held in client portfolios. If the CIO, DOR and/or the PM agree with the analyst's recommendation and determine that a contrary vote is advisable the analyst will provide written documentation of the reasons for the vote.

## Vote Processing

It is understood that PIM's and ISS' ability to commence voting proxies for new or transferred accounts is dependent upon the actions of custodian's and banks in updating their records and forwarding proxies. PIM will not be liable for any action or inaction by any Custodian or bank with respect to proxy ballots and voting.

## Client Communication

PIM will include a copy of these proxy voting policies and procedures, as they may be amended from time to time, in each new account pack sent to prospective clients. We also will update our ADV disclosures regarding these policies and procedures to reflect any material additions or other changes to them, as needed. Such ADV disclosures will include an explanation of how to request copies of these policies and procedures as well as any other disclosures required by Rule 206(4)-6 of the Advisers Act.

## Return Proxies

The CCO or designee shall send or cause to be sent (or otherwise communicate) all votes to the company or companies soliciting the proxies within the applicable time period designated for return of such votes, unless not possible to do so due to late receipt or other exigent circumstances.

## Corporate Actions

PIM is responsible for monitoring both mandatory (e.g. calls, cash dividends, exchanges, mergers, spin-offs, stock dividends and stock splits) and voluntary (e.g. rights offerings, exchange offerings, and tender offers) corporate actions. Operations personnel will ensure that all corporate actions received are promptly reviewed and recorded in PIM's portfolio accounting system, and properly executed by the custodian banks for all eligible portfolios. On a daily basis, a file of PIM's security database is sent to a third-party service, Vantage, via an automated upload which then provides corporate action information for securities included in the file. This information is received and acted upon by the Operations personnel responsible for corporate action processing. In addition, PIM receives details on voluntary and mandatory corporate actions from the custodian banks via email or online system and all available data is used to properly understand each corporate event.

**Voluntary Corporate Actions.** The Portfolio Management team is responsible for providing guidance to Operations on the course of action to be taken for each voluntary corporate action received in accordance with the standards described above for proxy voting, including, but not limited to, acting in the best interest of clients to maximize long-term shareholder value and yield the best economic results. In some instances, if consistent with such standards, the Portfolio Management team may maintain standing instructions on particular event types. As appropriate, Legal and Compliance may be consulted to determine whether certain clients may participate in certain corporate actions. Operations personnel will then notify each custodian bank, either through an online interface, via email, or with a signed faxed document of the election selected. Once all necessary information is received and the corporate action has been vetted, the event is processed in the portfolio accounting system and filed electronically. A log of holdings information related to the corporate action is maintained for each portfolio in order to confirm accuracy of processing.

## Class Actions

PIM shall not have any responsibility to initiate, consider or participate in any bankruptcy, class action or other litigation against or involving any issue of securities held in or formerly held in a client account or to advise or take any action on behalf of a client or former client with respect to any such actions or litigation.

## Record Keeping

PIM or ISS, on PIM's behalf, maintains (i) copies of the proxy materials received by PIM for client securities; (ii) records of proxies that were not received and what actions were taken to obtain them; (iii) votes cast on behalf of clients by account; (iv) records of any correspondence made regarding specific proxies and the voting thereof; (v) client requests for proxy voting information (including reports to mutual fund clients for whom PIM has proxy voting authority containing information they need to satisfy their annual reporting obligations under Rule 30b-1-4 and to complete Form N-PX); (vi) documents prepared by PIM to inform and/or memorialize a voting decision, including these policies and procedures and any documentation related to a material conflict of interest; and (vii) records of any deviations from broad Guidelines. Such records will be maintained for a minimum of six years.

## Policy Review

The Proxy Voting Committee reviews these Voting Guidelines and procedures at least annually and makes such changes as it deems appropriate, considering current trends and developments in corporate governance and related issues, as well as operational issues facing PIM and applicable regulations under the Investment Company Act, Advisers Act and ERISA.