

NATIONWIDE FUND ADVISORS

GENERAL

The Board of Trustees of Nationwide Mutual Funds and Nationwide Variable Insurance Trust (the “Funds”) has approved the continued delegation of the authority to vote proxies relating to the securities held in the portfolios of the Funds to each Fund’s investment adviser or subadviser, some of which advisers and subadvisers use an independent service provider, as described below.

Nationwide Fund Advisors (“NFA” or the “Adviser”), is an investment adviser that is registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”) pursuant to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended (the “Advisers Act”). NFA currently provides investment advisory services to registered investment companies (hereinafter referred to collectively as “Clients”).

Voting proxies that are received in connection with underlying portfolio securities held by Clients is an important element of the portfolio management services that NFA performs for Clients. NFA’s goal in performing this service is to make proxy voting decisions: (i) to vote or not to vote proxies in a manner that serves the best economic interests of Clients; and (ii) that avoid the influence of conflicts of interest. To implement this goal, NFA has adopted proxy voting guidelines (the “Proxy Voting Guidelines”) to assist it in making proxy voting decisions and in developing procedures for effecting those decisions. The Proxy Voting Guidelines are designed to ensure that, where NFA has the authority to vote proxies, all legal, fiduciary, and contractual obligations will be met.

The Proxy Voting Guidelines address a wide variety of individual topics, including, among other matters, shareholder voting rights, anti-takeover defenses, board structures and the election of directors, executive and director compensation, reorganizations, mergers, and various shareholder proposals.

The proxy voting records of the Funds are available to shareholders on the Trust’s website, www.nationwidefunds.com, and the SEC’s website.

HOW PROXIES ARE VOTED

NFA has delegated to Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”), an independent service provider, the administration of proxy voting for Client portfolio securities directly managed by NFA, subject to oversight by NFA’s “Proxy Voting Committee.” ISS, a Delaware corporation, provides proxy-voting services to many asset managers on a global basis. The NFA Proxy Voting Committee has reviewed, and will continue to review annually, the relationship with ISS and the quality and effectiveness of the various services provided by ISS.

Specifically, ISS assists NFA in the proxy voting and corporate governance oversight process by developing and updating the “ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines,” which are incorporated into the Proxy Voting Guidelines, and by providing research and analysis, recommendations regarding votes, operational implementation, and recordkeeping and reporting services. NFA’s decision to retain ISS is based principally on the view that the services that ISS provides, subject to oversight by NFA, generally will result in proxy voting decisions which serve the best economic interests of Clients. NFA has reviewed, analyzed, and determined that the ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines are consistent with the views of NFA on the various types of proxy proposals. When the ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines do not cover a specific proxy issue and ISS does not provide a recommendation: (i) ISS will notify NFA; and (ii) NFA will use its best judgment in voting proxies on behalf of the Clients. A summary of the ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines is set forth below.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

NFA does not engage in investment banking, administration or management of corporate retirement plans, or any other activity that is likely to create a potential conflict of interest. In addition, because Client proxies are voted by ISS pursuant to the pre-determined ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines, NFA generally does not make an actual determination of how to vote a particular proxy, and, therefore, proxies voted on behalf of Clients do not reflect any conflict of interest. Nevertheless, the Proxy Voting Guidelines address the possibility of such a conflict of interest arising.

The Proxy Voting Guidelines provide that, if a proxy proposal were to create a conflict of interest between the interests of a Client and those of NFA (or between a Client and those of any of NFA's affiliates, including Nationwide Fund Distributors LLC and Nationwide), then the proxy should be voted strictly in conformity with the recommendation of ISS. To monitor compliance with this policy, any proposed or actual deviation from a recommendation of ISS must be reported by the NFA Proxy Voting Committee to the chief counsel for NFA. The chief counsel for NFA then will provide guidance concerning the proposed deviation and whether a deviation presents any potential conflict of interest. If NFA then casts a proxy vote that deviates from an ISS recommendation, the affected Client (or other appropriate Client authority) will be given a report of this deviation.

CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH PROXIES WILL NOT BE VOTED

NFA, through ISS, shall attempt to process every vote for all domestic and foreign proxies that they receive; however, there may be cases in which NFA will not process a proxy because it is impractical or too expensive to do so. For example, NFA will not process a proxy in connection with a foreign security if the cost of voting a foreign proxy outweighs the benefit of voting the foreign proxy, when NFA has not been given enough time to process the vote, or when a sell order for the foreign security is outstanding and proxy voting would impede the sale of the foreign security. Also, NFA generally will not seek to recall the securities on loan for the purpose of voting the securities unless it is in the best interests of the applicable Fund to do so.

DELEGATION OF PROXY VOTING TO SUBADVISERS TO FUNDS

For any Fund, or portion of a Fund that is directly managed by a subadviser, the Trustees of the Fund and NFA have delegated proxy voting authority to that sub-adviser. Each subadviser has provided its proxy voting policies to NFA for review and these proxy voting policies are described below. Each subadviser is required to represent quarterly to NFA that (1) all proxies of the Fund(s) advised by the sub-adviser were voted in accordance with the subadviser's proxy voting policies as provided to NFA and (2) there have been no material changes to the subadviser's proxy voting policies.

ISS' 2018 U.S. Proxy Voting Concise Guidelines

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Voting on Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections

General Recommendation: Generally vote for director nominees, except under the following circumstances:

Independence

Vote against¹ or withhold from non-independent directors (Executive Directors and Non-Independent Non-Executive Directors per ISS' Categorization of Directors) when:

- Independent directors comprise 50 percent or less of the board;
- The non-independent director serves on the audit, compensation, or nominating committee;
- The company lacks an audit, compensation, or nominating committee so that the full board functions as that committee; or
- The company lacks a formal nominating committee, even if the board attests that the independent directors fulfill the functions of such a committee.

Composition

Attendance at Board and Committee Meetings: Generally vote against or withhold from directors (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case²) who attend less than 75 percent of the aggregate of their board and committee meetings for the period for which they served, unless an acceptable reason for absences is disclosed in the proxy or another SEC filing. Acceptable reasons for director absences are generally limited to the following:

- Medical issues/illness;
- Family emergencies; and
- Missing only one meeting (when the total of all meetings is three or fewer).

If the proxy disclosure is unclear and insufficient to determine whether a director attended at least 75 percent of the aggregate of his/her board and committee meetings during his/her period of service, vote against or withhold from the director(s) in question.

Overboarded Directors: Generally vote against or withhold from individual directors who:

- Sit on more than five public company boards; or
- Are CEOs of public companies who sit on the boards of more than two public companies besides their own— withhold only at their outside boards³.

Diversity: Highlight boards with no gender diversity. However, no adverse vote recommendations will be made due to any lack of gender diversity.

Responsiveness

Vote case-by-case on individual directors, committee members, or the entire board of directors as appropriate if:

- The board failed to act on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the shares cast in the previous year. Factors that will be considered are:
 - Disclosed outreach efforts by the board to shareholders in the wake of the vote;
 - Rationale provided in the proxy statement for the level of implementation;
 - The subject matter of the proposal;
 - The level of support for and opposition to the resolution in past meetings;
 - Actions taken by the board in response to the majority vote and its engagement with shareholders;
 - The continuation of the underlying issue as a voting item on the ballot (as either shareholder or management proposals); and
 - Other factors as appropriate.
- The board failed to act on takeover offers where the majority of shares are tendered;
- At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold/against votes of the shares cast and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the high withhold/against vote.

Vote case-by-case on Compensation Committee members (or, in exceptional cases, the full board) and the Say on Pay proposal if:

- The company's previous say-on-pay received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast. Factors that will be considered are:
 - The company's response, including:
 - Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors, including the frequency and timing of engagements and the company participants (including whether independent directors participated);
 - Disclosure of the specific concerns voiced by dissenting shareholders that led to the say-on-pay opposition;
 - Disclosure of specific and meaningful actions taken to address shareholders' concerns;
 - Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
 - Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
 - The company's ownership structure; and
 - Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.
- The board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received the plurality of votes cast.

Accountability

Vote against or withhold from the entire board of directors (except new nominees⁴, who should be considered case-by- case) for the following:

Problematic Takeover Defenses/Governance Structure

Poison Pills: Vote against or withhold from all nominees (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by- case) if:

- The company has a poison pill that was not approved by shareholders⁵. However, vote case-by-case on nominees if the board adopts an initial pill with a term of one year or less, depending on the disclosed rationale for the adoption, and other factors as relevant (such as a commitment to put any renewal to a shareholder vote).
- The board makes a material adverse modification to an existing pill, including, but not limited to, extension, renewal, or lowering the trigger, without shareholder approval.

Classified Board Structure: The board is classified, and a continuing director responsible for a problematic governance issue at the board/committee level that would warrant a withhold/against vote recommendation is not up for election. All appropriate nominees (except new) may be held accountable.

Removal of Shareholder Discretion on Classified Boards: The company has opted into, or failed to opt out of, state laws requiring a classified board structure.

Director Performance Evaluation: The board lacks mechanisms to promote accountability and oversight, coupled with sustained poor performance relative to peers. Sustained poor performance is measured by one- and three-year total shareholder returns in the bottom half of a company's four-digit GICS industry group (Russell 3000 companies only). Take into consideration the company's five-year total shareholder return and operational metrics. Problematic provisions include but are not limited to:

- A classified board structure;
- A supermajority vote requirement;
- Either a plurality vote standard in uncontested director elections, or a majority vote standard in contested elections;
- The inability of shareholders to call special meetings;
- The inability of shareholders to act by written consent;
- A multi-class capital structure; and/or
- A non-shareholder-approved poison pill.

Unilateral Bylaw/Charter Amendments and Problematic Capital Structures: Generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the board amends the company's bylaws or charter without shareholder approval in a manner that materially diminishes shareholders' rights or that could adversely impact shareholders, considering the following factors:

- The board's rationale for adopting the bylaw/charter amendment without shareholder ratification;
- Disclosure by the company of any significant engagement with shareholders regarding the amendment;
- The level of impairment of shareholders' rights caused by the board's unilateral amendment to the bylaws/charter;
- The board's track record with regard to unilateral board action on bylaw/charter amendments or other entrenchment provisions;
- The company's ownership structure;
- The company's existing governance provisions;
- The timing of the board's amendment to the bylaws/charter in connection with a significant business development; and
- Other factors, as deemed appropriate, that may be relevant to determine the impact of the amendment on shareholders.

Unless the adverse amendment is reversed or submitted to a binding shareholder vote, in subsequent years vote case-by-case on director nominees. Generally vote against (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the directors:

- Classified the board;
- Adopted supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter; or
- Eliminated shareholders' ability to amend bylaws.

Problematic Governance Structure - Newly public companies: For newly public companies, generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if, prior to or in connection with the company's public offering, the company or its board adopted bylaw or charter provisions materially adverse to shareholder rights, or implemented a multi-class capital structure in which the classes have unequal voting rights considering the following factors:

- The level of impairment of shareholders' rights;
- The disclosed rationale;

- The ability to change the governance structure (e.g., limitations on shareholders' right to amend the bylaws or charter, or supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter);
- The ability of shareholders to hold directors accountable through annual director elections, or whether the company has a classified board structure;
- Any reasonable sunset provision; and
- Other relevant factors.

Unless the adverse provision and/or problematic capital structure is reversed or removed, vote case-by-case on director nominees in subsequent years.

Restrictions on Shareholders' Rights

Restricting Binding Shareholder Proposals: Generally vote against or withhold from the members of the governance committee if:

- The company's governing documents impose undue restrictions on shareholders' ability to amend the bylaws. Such restrictions include, but are not limited to: outright prohibition on the submission of binding shareholder proposals, or share ownership requirements or time holding requirements in excess of SEC Rule 14a-8. Vote against on an ongoing basis.

Problematic Audit-Related Practices

Generally vote against or withhold from the members of the Audit Committee if:

- The non-audit fees paid to the auditor are excessive;
- The company receives an adverse opinion on the company's financial statements from its auditor; or
- There is persuasive evidence that the Audit Committee entered into an inappropriate indemnification agreement with its auditor that limits the ability of the company, or its shareholders, to pursue legitimate legal recourse against the audit firm.

Vote case-by-case on members of the Audit Committee and potentially the full board if:

- Poor accounting practices are identified that rise to a level of serious concern, such as: fraud; misapplication of GAAP; and material weaknesses identified in Section 404 disclosures. Examine the severity, breadth, chronological sequence, and duration, as well as the company's efforts at remediation or corrective actions, in determining whether withhold/against votes are warranted.

Problematic Compensation Practices

In the absence of an Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation (Say on Pay) ballot item or in egregious situations, vote against or withhold from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);
- The company maintains significant problematic pay practices; or
- The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Generally vote against or withhold from the Compensation Committee chair, other committee members, or potentially the full board if:

- The company fails to include a Say on Pay ballot item when required under SEC provisions, or under the company's declared frequency of say on pay; or
- The company fails to include a Frequency of Say on Pay ballot item when required under SEC provisions.

Generally vote against members of the board committee responsible for approving/setting non-employee director compensation if there is a pattern (i.e. two or more years) of awarding excessive non-employee director compensation without disclosing a compelling rationale or other mitigating factors.

Problematic Pledging of Company Stock:

Vote against the members of the committee that oversees risks related to pledging, or the full board, where a significant level of pledged company stock by executives or directors raises concerns. The following factors will be considered:

- The presence of an anti-pledging policy, disclosed in the proxy statement, that prohibits future pledging activity;
- The magnitude of aggregate pledged shares in terms of total common shares outstanding, market value, and trading volume;
- Disclosure of progress or lack thereof in reducing the magnitude of aggregate pledged shares over time;
- Disclosure in the proxy statement that shares subject to stock ownership and holding requirements do not include pledged company stock; and
- Any other relevant factors.

Governance Failures

Under extraordinary circumstances, vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board, due to:

- Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight⁶, or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
- Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
- Egregious actions related to a director's service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company.

Voting on Director Nominees in Contested Elections

Vote-No Campaigns

General Recommendation: In cases where companies are targeted in connection with public "vote-no" campaigns, evaluate director nominees under the existing governance policies for voting on director nominees in uncontested elections. Take into consideration the arguments submitted by shareholders and other publicly available information.

Proxy Contests/Proxy Access — Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on the election of directors in contested elections, considering the following factors:

- Long-term financial performance of the company relative to its industry;
- Management's track record;
- Background to the contested election;
- Nominee qualifications and any compensatory arrangements;
- Strategic plan of dissident slate and quality of the critique against management;
- Likelihood that the proposed goals and objectives can be achieved (both slates); and
- Stock ownership positions.

In the case of candidates nominated pursuant to proxy access, vote case-by-case considering any applicable factors listed above or additional factors which may be relevant, including those that are specific to the company, to the nominee(s) and/or to the nature of the election (such as whether or not there are more candidates than board seats).

Independent Chair (Separate Chair/CEO)

General Recommendation: Generally vote for shareholder proposals requiring that the chairman's position be filled by an independent director, taking into consideration the following:

- The scope of the proposal;
- The company's current board leadership structure;
- The company's governance structure and practices;
- Company performance; and
- Any other relevant factors that may be applicable.

Regarding the scope of the proposal, consider whether the proposal is precatory or binding and whether the proposal is seeking an immediate change in the chairman role or the policy can be implemented at the next CEO transition.

Under the review of the company's board leadership structure, ISS may support the proposal under the following scenarios absent a compelling rationale: the presence of an executive or non-independent chair in addition to the CEO; a recent recombination of the role of CEO and chair; and/or departure from a structure with an independent chair. ISS will also consider any recent transitions in board leadership and the effect such transitions may have on independent board leadership as well as the designation of a lead director role.

When considering the governance structure, ISS will consider the overall independence of the board, the independence of key committees, the establishment of governance guidelines, board tenure and its relationship to CEO tenure, and any other factors that may be relevant. Any concerns about a company's governance structure will weigh in favor of support for the proposal.

The review of the company's governance practices may include, but is not limited to, poor compensation practices, material failures of governance and risk oversight, related-party transactions or other issues putting director independence at risk, corporate or management scandals, and actions by management or the board with potential or realized negative impact on shareholders. Any such practices may suggest a need for more independent oversight at the company thus warranting support of the proposal.

ISS' performance assessment will generally consider one-, three-, and five-year TSR compared to the company's peers and the market as a whole. While poor performance will weigh in favor of the adoption of an independent chair policy, strong performance over the long term will be considered a mitigating factor when determining whether the proposed leadership change warrants support.

Proxy Access

General Recommendation: Generally vote for management and shareholder proposals for proxy access with the following provisions:

- **Ownership threshold:** maximum requirement not more than three percent (3%) of the voting power;
- **Ownership duration:** maximum requirement not longer than three (3) years of continuous ownership for each member of the nominating group;
- **Aggregation:** minimal or no limits on the number of shareholders permitted to form a nominating group;
- **Cap:** cap on nominees of generally twenty-five percent (25%) of the board.

Review for reasonableness any other restrictions on the right of proxy access. Generally vote against proposals that are more restrictive than these guidelines.

CAPITAL/RESTRUCTURING

Common Stock Authorization

General Recommendation: Vote for proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares where the primary purpose of the increase is to issue shares in connection with a transaction on the same ballot that warrants support.

Vote against proposals at companies with more than one class of common stock to increase the number of authorized shares of the class of common stock that has superior voting rights.

Vote against proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares if a vote for a reverse stock split on the same ballot is warranted despite the fact that the authorized shares would not be reduced proportionally.

Vote case-by-case on all other proposals to increase the number of shares of common stock authorized for issuance. Take into account company-specific factors that include, at a minimum, the following:

- **Past Board Performance:**
 - The company's use of authorized shares during the last three years;

- The Current Request:
 - Disclosure in the proxy statement of the specific purposes of the proposed increase;
 - Disclosure in the proxy statement of specific and severe risks to shareholders of not approving the request; and
 - The dilutive impact of the request as determined relative to an allowable increase calculated by ISS (typically 100 percent of existing authorized shares) that reflects the company's need for shares and total shareholder returns.

ISS will apply the relevant allowable increase below to requests to increase common stock that are for general corporate purposes (or to the general corporate purposes portion of a request that also includes a specific need):

- Most companies: 100 percent of existing authorized shares.
- Companies with less than 50 percent of existing authorized shares either outstanding or reserved for issuance: 50 percent of existing authorized shares.
- Companies with one- and three-year total shareholder returns (TSRs) in the bottom 10 percent of the U.S. market as of the end of the calendar quarter that is closest to their most recent fiscal year end: 50 percent of existing authorized shares.
- Companies at which both conditions (B and C) above are both present: 25 percent of existing authorized shares.

If there is an acquisition, private placement, or similar transaction on the ballot (not including equity incentive plans) that ISS is recommending FOR, the allowable increase will be the greater of (i) twice the amount needed to support the transactions on the ballot, and (ii) the allowable increase as calculated above.

Mergers and Acquisitions

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on mergers and acquisitions. Review and evaluate the merits and drawbacks of the proposed transaction, balancing various and sometimes countervailing factors including:

- Valuation - Is the value to be received by the target shareholders (or paid by the acquirer) reasonable? While the fairness opinion may provide an initial starting point for assessing valuation reasonableness, emphasis is placed on the offer premium, market reaction, and strategic rationale.
- Market reaction - How has the market responded to the proposed deal? A negative market reaction should cause closer scrutiny of a deal.
- Strategic rationale - Does the deal make sense strategically? From where is the value derived? Cost and revenue synergies should not be overly aggressive or optimistic, but reasonably achievable. Management should also have a favorable track record of successful integration of historical acquisitions.
- Negotiations and process - Were the terms of the transaction negotiated at arm's-length? Was the process fair and equitable? A fair process helps to ensure the best price for shareholders. Significant negotiation "wins" can also signify the deal makers' competency. The comprehensiveness of the sales process (e.g., full auction, partial auction, no auction) can also affect shareholder value.
- Conflicts of interest - Are insiders benefiting from the transaction disproportionately and inappropriately as compared to non-insider shareholders? As the result of potential conflicts, the directors and officers of the company may be more likely to vote to approve a merger than if they did not hold these interests. Consider whether these interests may have influenced these directors and officers to support or recommend the merger. The CIC figure presented in the "ISS Transaction Summary" section of this report is an aggregate figure that can in certain cases be a misleading indicator of the true value transfer from shareholders to insiders. Where such figure appears to be excessive, analyze the underlying assumptions to determine whether a potential conflict exists.
- Governance - Will the combined company have a better or worse governance profile than the current governance profiles of the respective parties to the transaction? If the governance profile is to change for the worse, the burden is on the company to prove that other issues (such as valuation) outweigh any deterioration in governance.

COMPENSATION

Executive Pay Evaluation

- Underlying all evaluations are five global principles that most investors expect corporations to adhere to in designing and administering executive and director compensation programs:

- Maintain appropriate pay-for-performance alignment, with emphasis on long-term shareholder value: This principle encompasses overall executive pay practices, which must be designed to attract, retain, and appropriately motivate the key employees who drive shareholder value creation over the long term. It will take into consideration, among other factors, the link between pay and performance; the mix between fixed and variable pay; performance goals; and equity-based plan costs;
- Avoid arrangements that risk “pay for failure”: This principle addresses the appropriateness of long or indefinite contracts, excessive severance packages, and guaranteed compensation;
- Maintain an independent and effective compensation committee: This principle promotes oversight of executive pay programs by directors with appropriate skills, knowledge, experience, and a sound process for compensation decision-making (e.g., including access to independent expertise and advice when needed);
- Provide shareholders with clear, comprehensive compensation disclosures: This principle underscores the importance of informative and timely disclosures that enable shareholders to evaluate executive pay practices fully and fairly;
- Avoid inappropriate pay to non-executive directors: This principle recognizes the interests of shareholders in ensuring that compensation to outside directors is reasonable and does not compromise their independence and ability to make appropriate judgments in overseeing managers’ pay and performance. At the market level, it may incorporate a variety of generally accepted best practices.

Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation—Management Proposals (Management Say-on-Pay)

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on ballot items related to executive pay and practices, as well as certain aspects of outside director compensation.

Vote against Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation (Say-on-Pay or “SOP”) if:

- There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);
- The company maintains significant problematic pay practices;
- The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Vote against or withhold from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- There is no SOP on the ballot, and an against vote on an SOP would otherwise be warranted due to pay-for-performance misalignment, problematic pay practices, or the lack of adequate responsiveness on compensation issues raised previously, or a combination thereof;
- The board fails to respond adequately to a previous SOP proposal that received less than 70 percent support of votes cast;
- The company has recently practiced or approved problematic pay practices, including option repricing or option backdating; or
- The situation is egregious.

Primary Evaluation Factors for Executive Pay

Pay-for-Performance Evaluation

ISS annually conducts a pay-for-performance analysis to identify strong or satisfactory alignment between pay and performance over a sustained period. With respect to companies in the Russell 3000 or Russell 3000E Indices⁷, this analysis considers the following:

1. Peer Group⁸ Alignment:

- The degree of alignment between the company’s annualized TSR rank and the CEO’s annualized total pay rank within a peer group, each measured over a three-year period.
- The rankings of CEO total pay and company financial performance within a peer group, each measured over a three-year period.
- The multiple of the CEO’s total pay relative to the peer group median in the most recent fiscal year.

2. Absolute Alignment⁹ – the absolute alignment between the trend in CEO pay and company TSR over the prior five fiscal years – i.e., the difference between the trend in annual pay changes and the trend in annualized TSR during the period.

If the above analysis demonstrates significant unsatisfactory long-term pay-for-performance alignment or, in the case of companies outside the Russell indices, misaligned pay and performance are otherwise suggested, our analysis may include any of the following qualitative factors, as relevant to evaluating how various pay elements may work to encourage or to undermine long-term value creation and alignment with shareholder interests:

- The ratio of performance- to time-based equity awards;
- The overall ratio of performance-based compensation;
- The completeness of disclosure and rigor of performance goals;
- The company's peer group benchmarking practices;
- Actual results of financial/operational metrics, such as growth in revenue, profit, cash flow, etc., both absolute and relative to peers;
- Special circumstances related to, for example, a new CEO in the prior FY or anomalous equity grant practices (e.g., bi-annual awards);
- Realizable pay¹⁰ compared to grant pay; and
- Any other factors deemed relevant.

Problematic Pay Practices

The focus is on executive compensation practices that contravene the global pay principles, including:

- Problematic practices related to non-performance-based compensation elements;
- Incentives that may motivate excessive risk-taking; and
- Options backdating.

Problematic Pay Practices related to Non-Performance-Based Compensation Elements

Pay elements that are not directly based on performance are generally evaluated case-by-case considering the context of a company's overall pay program and demonstrated pay-for-performance philosophy. Please refer to ISS' Compensation FAQ document for detail on specific pay practices that have been identified as potentially problematic and may lead to negative recommendations if they are deemed to be inappropriate or unjustified relative to executive pay best practices. The list below highlights the problematic practices that carry significant weight in this overall consideration and may result in adverse vote recommendations:

- Repricing or replacing of underwater stock options/SARS without prior shareholder approval (including cash buyouts and voluntary surrender of underwater options);
- Extraordinary perquisites or tax gross-ups, including any gross-up related to a secular trust or restricted stock vesting, or lifetime perquisites;
- New or extended agreements that provide for:
 - Excessive CIC payments (generally exceeding 3 times base salary and average/target/most recent bonus);
 - CIC severance payments without involuntary job loss or substantial diminution of duties ("single" or "modified single" triggers);
 - CIC payments with excise tax gross-ups (including "modified" gross-ups);
 - Multi-year guaranteed awards that are not at risk due to rigorous performance conditions;
 - Liberal CIC definition combined with any single-trigger CIC benefits;
- Insufficient executive compensation disclosure by externally-managed issuers (EMIs) such that a reasonable assessment of pay programs and practices applicable to the EMI's executives is not possible;
- Any other provision or practice deemed to be egregious and present a significant risk to investors.

Incentives that may Motivate Excessive Risk-Taking

- Multi-year guaranteed awards;
- A single or common performance metric used for short- and long-term incentives;
- Lucrative severance packages;
- High pay opportunities relative to industry peers;
- Disproportionate supplemental pensions; or
- Mega equity grants that provide overly large upside opportunity.

Factors that potentially mitigate the impact of risky incentives include rigorous claw-back provisions, robust stock ownership/holding guidelines, and limitations on accelerated vesting triggers.

Options Backdating

The following factors should be examined case-by-case to allow for distinctions to be made between “sloppy” plan administration versus deliberate action or fraud:

- Reason and motive for the options backdating issue, such as inadvertent vs. deliberate grant date changes;
- Duration of options backdating;
- Size of restatement due to options backdating;
- Corrective actions taken by the board or compensation committee, such as canceling or re-pricing backdated options, the recouping of option gains on backdated grants; and
- Adoption of a grant policy that prohibits backdating, and creates a fixed grant schedule or window period for equity grants in the future.

Compensation Committee Communications and Responsiveness

Consider the following factors case-by-case when evaluating ballot items related to executive pay on the board’s responsiveness to investor input and engagement on compensation issues:

- Failure to respond to majority-supported shareholder proposals on executive pay topics; or
- Failure to adequately respond to the company’s previous say-on-pay proposal that received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast, taking into account:
 - The company’s response, including:
 - Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors, including the frequency and timing of engagements and the company participants (including whether independent directors participated);
 - Disclosure of the specific concerns voiced by dissenting shareholders that led to the say-on-pay opposition;
 - Disclosure of specific and meaningful actions taken to address shareholders’ concerns;
- Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
- Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
- The company’s ownership structure; and
- Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.

Equity-Based and Other Incentive Plans

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on certain equity-based compensation plans¹¹ depending on a combination of certain plan features and equity grant practices, where positive factors may counterbalance negative factors, and vice versa, as evaluated using an “equity plan scorecard” (EPSC) approach with three pillars:

- **Plan Cost:** The total estimated cost of the company’s equity plans relative to industry/market cap peers, measured by the company’s estimated Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT) in relation to peers and considering both:
- SVT based on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants, plus outstanding unvested/unexercised grants; and
- SVT based only on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants.

Plan Features:

- Discretionary or automatic single-triggered award vesting upon a change in control (CIC);
- Discretionary vesting authority;
- Liberal share recycling on various award types;
- Lack of minimum vesting period for grants made under the plan;
- Dividends payable prior to award vesting.

Grant Practices:

- The company’s three-year burn rate relative to its industry/market cap peers;
- Vesting requirements in most recent CEO equity grants (3-year look-back);

- The estimated duration of the plan (based on the sum of shares remaining available and the new shares requested, divided by the average annual shares granted in the prior three years);
- The proportion of the CEO's most recent equity grants/awards subject to performance conditions;
- Whether the company maintains a claw-back policy;
- Whether the company has established post-exercise/vesting share-holding requirements.

Generally vote against the plan proposal if the combination of above factors indicates that the plan is not, overall, in shareholders' interests, or if any of the following egregious factors apply:

- Awards may vest in connection with a liberal change-of-control definition;
- The plan would permit repricing or cash buyout of underwater options without shareholder approval (either by expressly permitting it – for NYSE and Nasdaq listed companies – or by not prohibiting it when the company has a history of repricing – for non-listed companies);
- The plan is a vehicle for problematic pay practices or a significant pay-for-performance disconnect under certain circumstances; or
- Any other plan features are determined to have a significant negative impact on shareholder interests.

SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Global Approach

Issues covered under the policy include a wide range of topics, including consumer and product safety, environment and energy, labor standards and human rights, workplace and board diversity, and corporate political issues. While a variety of factors goes into each analysis, the overall principle guiding all vote recommendations focuses on how the proposal may enhance or protect shareholder value in either the short or long term.

General Recommendation: Generally vote case-by-case, taking into consideration whether implementation of the proposal is likely to enhance or protect shareholder value, and in addition the following will also be considered:

- If the issues presented in the proposal are more appropriately or effectively dealt with through legislation or government regulation;
- If the company has already responded in an appropriate and sufficient manner to the issue(s) raised in the proposal;
- Whether the proposal's request is unduly burdensome (scope or timeframe) or overly prescriptive;
- The company's approach compared with any industry standard practices for addressing the issue(s) raised by the proposal;
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not reasonable and sufficient information is currently available to shareholders from the company or from other publicly available sources; and
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not implementation would reveal proprietary or confidential information that could place the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Climate Change/Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

General Recommendation: Generally vote for resolutions requesting that a company disclose information on the financial, physical, or regulatory risks it faces related to climate change on its operations and investments or on how the company identifies, measures, and manages such risks, considering:

- Whether the company already provides current, publicly-available information on the impact that climate change may have on the company as well as associated company policies and procedures to address related risks and/or opportunities;
- The company's level of disclosure compared to industry peers; and
- Whether there are significant controversies, fines, penalties, or litigation associated with the company's climate change-related performance.

Generally vote for proposals requesting a report on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from company operations and/or products and operations, unless:

- The company already discloses current, publicly-available information on the impacts that GHG emissions may have on the company as well as associated company policies and procedures to address related risks and/or opportunities;

- The company's level of disclosure is comparable to that of industry peers; and
- There are no significant, controversies, fines, penalties, or litigation associated with the company's GHG emissions.

Vote case-by-case on proposals that call for the adoption of GHG reduction goals from products and operations, taking into account:

- Whether the company provides disclosure of year-over-year GHG emissions performance data;
- Whether company disclosure lags behind industry peers;
- The company's actual GHG emissions performance;
- The company's current GHG emission policies, oversight mechanisms, and related initiatives; and
- Whether the company has been the subject of recent, significant violations, fines, litigation, or controversy related to GHG emissions.

Board Diversity

General Recommendation: Generally vote for requests for reports on a company's efforts to diversify the board, unless:

- The gender and racial minority representation of the company's board is reasonably inclusive in relation to companies of similar size and business; and
- The board already reports on its nominating procedures and gender and racial minority initiatives on the board and within the company.

Vote case-by-case on proposals asking a company to increase the gender and racial minority representation on its board, taking into account:

- The degree of existing gender and racial minority diversity on the company's board and among its executive officers;
- The level of gender and racial minority representation that exists at the company's industry peers;
- The company's established process for addressing gender and racial minority board representation;
- Whether the proposal includes an overly prescriptive request to amend nominating committee charter language;
- The independence of the company's nominating committee;
- Whether the company uses an outside search firm to identify potential director nominees; and
- Whether the company has had recent controversies, fines, or litigation regarding equal employment practices.

Gender Pay Gap

General Recommendation: Generally vote case-by-case on requests for reports on a company's pay data by gender, or a report on a company's policies and goals to reduce any gender pay gap, taking into account:

- The company's current policies and disclosure related to both its diversity and inclusion policies and practices and its compensation philosophy and fair and equitable compensation practices;
- Whether the company has been the subject of recent controversy, litigation, or regulatory actions related to gender pay gap issues; and
- Whether the company's reporting regarding gender pay gap policies or initiatives is lagging its peers.

Data Security, Privacy, and Internet Issues

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on proposals requesting the disclosure or implementation of data security, privacy, or information access and management policies and procedures, considering:

- The level of disclosure of company policies and procedures relating to data security, privacy, freedom of speech, information access and management, and Internet censorship;
- Engagement in dialogue with governments or relevant groups with respect to data security, privacy, or the free flow of information on the Internet;
- The scope of business involvement and of investment in countries whose governments censor or monitor the Internet and other telecommunications;
- Applicable market-specific laws or regulations that may be imposed on the company; and
- Controversies, fines, or litigation related to data security, privacy, freedom of speech, or Internet censorship.

Lobbying

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on proposals requesting information on a company's lobbying (including direct, indirect, and grassroots lobbying) activities, policies, or procedures, considering:

- The company's current disclosure of relevant lobbying policies, and management and board oversight;
- The company's disclosure regarding trade associations or other groups that it supports, or is a member of, that engage in lobbying activities; and
- Recent significant controversies, fines, or litigation regarding the company's lobbying-related activities.

Political Contributions

General Recommendation: Generally vote for proposals requesting greater disclosure of a company's political contributions and trade association spending policies and activities, considering:

- The company's policies, and management and board oversight related to its direct political contributions and payments to trade associations or other groups that may be used for political purposes;
- The company's disclosure regarding its support of, and participation in, trade associations or other groups that may make political contributions; and
- Recent significant controversies, fines, or litigation related to the company's political contributions or political activities.

Vote against proposals barring a company from making political contributions. Businesses are affected by legislation at the federal, state, and local level; barring political contributions can put the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Vote against proposals to publish in newspapers and other media a company's political contributions. Such publications could present significant cost to the company without providing commensurate value to shareholders.

FOOTNOTES

¹ In general, companies with a plurality vote standard use "Withhold" as the contrary vote option in director elections; companies with a majority vote standard use "Against". However, it will vary by company and the proxy must be checked to determine the valid contrary vote option for the particular company.

² New nominees who served for only part of the fiscal year are generally exempted from the attendance policy.

³ Although all of a CEO's subsidiary boards will be counted as separate boards, ISS will not recommend a withhold vote for the CEO of a parent company board or any of the controlled (>50 percent ownership) subsidiaries of that parent, but may do so at subsidiaries that are less than 50 percent controlled and boards outside the parent/subsidiary relationships.

⁴ A "new nominee" is any current nominee who has not already been elected by shareholders and who joined the board after the problematic action in question transpired. If ISS cannot determine whether the nominee joined the board before or after the problematic action transpired, the nominee will be considered a "new nominee" if he or she joined the board within the 12 months prior to the upcoming shareholder meeting.

⁵ Public shareholders only, approval prior to a company's becoming public is insufficient.

⁶ Examples of failure of risk oversight include, but are not limited to: bribery; large or serial fines or sanctions from regulatory bodies; significant adverse legal judgments or settlement; or hedging of company stock.

⁷ The Russell 3000E Index includes approximately 4,000 of the largest U.S. equity securities.

⁸ The revised peer group is generally comprised of 14-24 companies that are selected using market cap, revenue (or assets for certain financial firms), GICS industry group, and company's selected peers' GICS industry group, with size constraints, via a process designed to select peers that are comparable to the subject company in terms of revenue/assets and industry, and also within a market-cap bucket that is reflective of the company's. For Oil, Gas & Consumable Fuels companies, market cap is the only size determinant.

⁹ Only Russell 3000 Index companies are subject to the Absolute Alignment analysis.

¹⁰ ISS research reports include realizable pay for S&P 1500 companies.

¹¹ Proposals evaluated under the EPSC policy generally include those to approve or amend (1) stock option plans for employees and/or employees and directors, (2) restricted stock plans for employees and/or employees and directors, and (3) omnibus stock incentive plans for employees and/or employees and directors; amended plans will be further evaluated case-by-case.

Allianz Global Investors U.S. LLC (“Allianz”)

Policy Statement

Allianz typically votes proxies on behalf of client accounts pursuant to its discretionary investment management authority, unless a client has not granted voting authority to Allianz. Allianz seeks to exercise its proxy voting responsibilities in accordance with its fiduciary duties, and has designed these policies and procedures to meet applicable fiduciary standards. Thus, Allianz seeks to vote client account proxies in a manner consistent with the best interests of its clients. These policies and procedures do not apply to any client account proxies for which such client has either (a) explicitly retained authority and discretion to vote its own proxies or (b) delegated such authority and discretion to a third party. Allianz assumes no responsibility for the voting of any proxies on behalf of such clients.

Allianz has adopted the Allianz Global Investors Global Corporate Governance Guidelines and Proxy Voting Policy (the “Proxy Guidelines”), which are reasonably designed to ensure that proxy voting is conducted in the best interest of its clients. The Proxy Guidelines provide a general framework for Allianz’s proxy voting analysis and are intended to address the most significant and frequent voting issues that arise at Allianz’s investee companies’ shareholder meetings. However, the Proxy Guidelines are not intended to be rigid rules, and Allianz’s consideration of the merits of a particular proposal may cause Allianz to vote in a manner that deviates from the approach set forth in the Proxy Guidelines.

Proxy Voting Procedures

Allianz has retained one or more unaffiliated third-party proxy research and voting service providers (“Proxy Voting Service”), to assist it in researching and voting proxies. With respect to each proxy received, the Proxy Voting Service researches the ballot proposals and provides a recommendation to Allianz as to how to vote on each proposal based on the Proxy Voting Service’s research of the individual facts and circumstances and the Proxy Voting Service’s application of its research findings to the Proxy Guidelines.

In some cases a portfolio manager, research analyst or proxy analyst from Allianz’s Global ESG team may propose to override a policy recommendation made by the Proxy Voting Service. In such cases, Allianz will review the proxy to determine whether there is a material conflict between the interests of Allianz (including the employee proposing the vote) and the interests of Allianz’s clients. If a material conflict does exist, Allianz will seek to address the conflict in good faith and in the best interests of the applicable client accounts, as described more fully below. In the absence of a material conflict, the proxy will be reviewed by a proxy analyst and the relevant portfolio managers and/or research analysts and, from time to time as may be necessary, Allianz’s Head of ESG Research (or equivalent), to determine how the proxy will be voted.

Mitigating Conflicts of Interest

Allianz has adopted and implemented policies and procedures, including the procedures described in this section, which are reasonably designed to ensure that client account proxies are voted in the best interest of clients. Such policies and procedures are in part designed to identify and address material conflicts of interest that may arise between the interests of Allianz and its clients, as well as identify material conflicts of interest that portfolio managers, proxy analysts and research analysts may have, to ensure any such conflicted individuals refrain from participating in the proxy voting process or that the conflicts are otherwise mitigated. With respect to personal conflicts of interest, Allianz’s Code of Ethics requires all employees to conduct themselves with integrity and distinction, to put first the interests of the firm’s clients, and to take care to avoid even the appearance of impropriety. Portfolio managers, research analysts, proxy analysts, or Proxy Committee members with a personal conflict of interest regarding a particular proxy vote must recuse themselves and not participate in the voting decisions with respect to that proxy.

With respect to the voting process, as described above, most votes are based on the independent recommendation of the unaffiliated, third party Proxy Voting Service, which recommendations are in turn based on the Proxy Voting Service’s independent review and research of each proxy and its independent application of the Proxy Guidelines.

In those cases in which a proxy analyst, portfolio manager or research analyst proposes to override a policy recommendation made by the Proxy Voting Service or the Proxy Voting Service has not provided a recommendation, the proxy analyst and relevant portfolio managers and/or research analysts will review the proxy to ensure any recommendation appears based on a sound investment rationale and assess whether any business or other relationship, or any other potential conflict of interest, may be influencing the proposed vote on that company's proxy. In the event a material conflict is identified, Allianz will convene the Proxy Committee to review the proxy and make a decision how to vote. Proposed votes that raise potential material conflicts of interest are promptly resolved by the Proxy Committee prior to the time Allianz casts its vote.

As a further safeguard, while Allianz includes members from different parts of the organization on the Proxy Committee, Allianz does not include individuals whose primary duties relate to client relationship management, marketing, or sales. Finally, any voting decision by the Proxy Committee must include a vote from a member of at least one of the Risk, Legal, or Compliance functions.

Allianz may vote proxies in accordance with other relevant procedures that have been approved and implemented to address specific types of conflicts. For example, when a material conflict between the interests of Allianz and its clients has been identified, Allianz may abstain from voting.

Cost-Benefit Analysis Involving Voting Proxies

Allianz may abstain from voting client proxies if, based on its evaluation of relevant criteria, it determines that the costs associated with voting a proxy exceed the expected benefits to affected clients. The primary aim of this cost-benefit analysis is to determine whether it is in a client's best economic interest to vote its proxies. If the costs associated with voting a proxy outweigh the expected benefit to the client, Allianz may refrain from voting that proxy.

The circumstances under which Allianz may refrain from voting may include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) proxy statements and ballots being written in a foreign language, (2) untimely notice of a shareholder meeting, (3) requirements to vote proxies in person, (4) restrictions on a foreigner's ability to exercise votes, and (5) requirements to provide local agents with power of attorney to execute the voting instructions. Such proxies are voted on a best-efforts basis.

Proxy voting in certain countries requires "share blocking." To vote proxies in such countries, shareholders must deposit their shares shortly before the date of the meeting with a designated depository and the shares are then restricted from being sold until the meeting has taken place and the shares are returned to the shareholders' custodian banks. Absent compelling reasons, Allianz believes the benefit to its clients of exercising voting rights does not outweigh the effects of not being able to sell the shares. Therefore, if share blocking is required Allianz generally abstains from voting.

Allianz will be unable to vote securities on loan under securities lending arrangements into which Allianz's clients have entered. However, under rare circumstances such as voting issues that may have a significant impact on the investment, if the client holds a sufficient number of shares to have a material impact on the vote, Allianz may request that the client recall securities that are on loan if it determines that the benefit of voting outweighs the costs and potential lost revenue to the client and the administrative burden of retrieving the securities.

WCM Investment Management, LLC (“WCM”)

WCM accepts responsibility for voting proxies whenever requested by a Client or as required by law. Each Client’s investment management agreement should specify whether WCM is to vote proxies relating to securities held for the Client’s account. If the agreement is silent as to the proxy voting and no instructions from the client are on file, WCM will assume responsibility of proxy voting.

Special Rule in the Case of ERISA Accounts.

Unless proxy voting responsibility has been expressly reserved and is being exercised by another “named fiduciary” for an ERISA plan Client, WCM, as the investment manager for the account, must vote all proxies relating to securities held for the plan’s account. Please refer to ERISA Accounts section below for further details.

In cases in which WCM has proxy voting authority for securities held by its advisory clients, WCM will ensure securities are voted for the exclusive benefit, and in the best economic interest, of those clients and their beneficiaries, subject to any restrictions or directions from a client. Such voting responsibilities will be exercised in a manner that is consistent with the general antifraud provisions of the Advisers Act, and the Proxy Voting rule, Rule 206(4)-6, as well as with WCM’s fiduciary duties under federal and state law to act in the best interests of its clients.

1. Third Party Proxy Voting Service

In general, WCM believes that its clients’ best economic interest with regards to proxy voting is best served by engaging an independent firm that specializes in researching companies and their management for the purpose of increasing investor’s potential financial gain through voting proxies. WCM has therefore engaged and adopted the following proxy voting policies of Glass Lewis: U.S. Policy, International Policy and Investment Manager Policy. In the event of a special client request, WCM will also accommodate the following styles: Taft Hartley, Public Pension, ESG (environmental, social and government practice) and Management Supportive. In limited circumstances, however, WCM may choose to vote a proxy against the recommendation of Glass Lewis, if WCM believes such vote is in the best economic interest of its clients. In such cases, this decision will be made by the Investment Strategy Group (“ISG”) who will maintain documentation to support WCM’s decision.

The purpose of Glass Lewis’ proxy research and advice is to facilitate shareholder voting in favor of governance structures that will drive performance, create shareholder value and maintain a proper tone at the top. Because Glass Lewis is not in the business of providing consulting services to public companies, it can focus solely on the best interests of investors. Glass Lewis’ approach to corporate governance is to look at each company individually and determine what is in the best interests of the shareholders of each particular company. Research on proxies covers more than just corporate governance – Glass Lewis analyzes accounting, executive compensation, compliance with regulation and law, risks and risk disclosure, litigation and other matters that reflect on the quality of board oversight and company transparency.

2. Role of the Proxy Admin.

The Proxy Admin oversees and administers the firm’s proxy voting process. For each Client, the Proxy Admin initially determines whether:

- WCM is vested with proxy voting responsibility or whether voting is reserved to the Client or delegated to another designee;
- the Client has adopted a proxy voting policy that WCM is required to follow; and
- the Client requires any periodic report of votes cast for its account or any comparative report of votes cast in relation to its proxy voting policy, if different from WCM’s.

Once a Client account is established and proxy voting responsibility is determined, the Proxy Admin is responsible for ensuring that proxy materials for each account to be voted are received and voted in a timely manner. The Proxy Admin instructs registered owners of record (e.g. the Client, Trustee or Custodian) that receive proxy materials from the issuer or its information agent to send proxies electronically directly to ProxyEdge. WCM has engaged ProxyEdge, a third party service provider, to: (1) provide notification of impending votes; (2) vote proxies based on Glass Lewis and/or WCM recommendations; and (3) maintain records of such votes electronically. The PA, in conjunction with ProxyEdge, ensures that information is compiled and maintained for each Client for which WCM votes proxies, showing the issuer’s name, meeting date and manner in which votes were cast on each proposal. WCM shares client holdings and other relevant information with ProxyEdge to ensure that votes are cast and captured accurately, and relies on ProxyEdge to compile and

maintain voting records electronically. Proxy materials received inadvertently for Client accounts over which WCM has no voting authority are forwarded on to Clients.

3. Role of the Analyst and ISG

If a proposal requires case-by-case analysis, the Analyst brings a recommendation to the ISG for decision. The ISG is ultimately responsible for voting case-by-case proposals. The ISG also has authority to override the recommendation of Glass Lewis when the ISG believes such vote is in the best economic interest of WCM's clients. Documentation will be provided by the ISG and maintained by the Proxy Admin supporting the rationale for any vote cast against the recommendation of Glass Lewis and case-by-case proposals.

4. Certain Proxy Votes May Not Be Cast

In some cases, WCM may determine that it is in the best interests of our clients to abstain from voting certain proxies. WCM will abstain from voting in the event any of the following conditions are met with regard to a proxy proposal:

- Neither Glass Lewis' recommendation nor specific client instructions cover an issue;
- In circumstances where, in WCM's judgment, the costs of voting the proxy exceed the expected benefits to the Client.

In addition, WCM will only seek to vote proxies for securities on loan when such a vote is deemed to have a material impact on the account. Materiality is determined by the ISG.

Further, in accordance with local law or business practices, many foreign companies prevent the sales of shares that have been voted for a certain period beginning prior to the shareholder meeting and ending on the day following the meeting ("share blocking"). Depending on the country in which a company is domiciled, the blocking period may begin a stated number of days prior to the meeting (e.g., one, three or five days) or on a date established by the company. While practices vary, in many countries the block period can be continued for a longer period if the shareholder meeting is adjourned and postponed to a later date. Similarly, practices vary widely as to the ability of a shareholder to have the "block" restriction lifted early (e.g., in some countries shares generally can be "unblocked" up to two days prior to the meeting whereas in other countries the removal of the block appears to be discretionary with the issuer's transfer agent). WCM believes that the disadvantage of being unable to sell the stock regardless of changing conditions generally outweighs the advantages of voting at the shareholder meeting for routine items. Accordingly, WCM generally will not vote those proxies subject to "share blocking."

5. Identifying and Dealing with Material Conflicts of Interest between WCM and Proxy Issuer

WCM may choose to vote a proxy against the recommendation of Glass Lewis, if WCM believes such vote is in the best economic interest of its clients. Such a decision will be made and documented by the ISG. Because WCM retains this authority, it creates a potential conflict of interest between WCM and the proxy issuer. As a result, WCM may not overrule Glass Lewis' recommendation with respect to a proxy unless the following steps are taken by the CCO:

- a. The CCO must determine whether WCM has a conflict of interest with respect to the issuer that is the subject of the proxy. The CCO will use the following standards to identify issuers with which WCM may have a conflict of interest.
 - (1.) Significant Business Relationships – The CCO will determine whether WCM may have a significant business relationship with the issuer, such as, for example, where WCM manages a pension plan. For this purpose, a "significant business relationship" is one that: (i) represents 1% or \$1,000,000 of WCM's revenues for the fiscal year, whichever is less, or is reasonably expected to represent this amount for the current fiscal year; or (ii) may not directly involve revenue to WCM but is otherwise determined by the CCO to be significant to WCM.
 - (2.) Significant Personal/Family Relationships – the CCO will determine whether any employees who are involved in the proxy voting process may have a significant personal/family relationship with the issuer. For this purpose, a "significant personal/family relationship" is one that would be reasonably likely to influence how WCM votes proxies. To identify any such relationships, the CCO shall obtain information about any significant personal/family relationship between any employee of WCM who is involved in the proxy voting process (e.g., ISG members) and senior employees of issuers for which WCM may vote proxies.

- b. If the CCO determines that WCM has a conflict of interest with respect to the issuer, the CCO shall determine whether the conflict is “material” to any specific proposal included within the proxy. If not, then WCM can vote the proxy as determined by the ISG. The CCO shall determine whether a proposal is material as follows:
 - (1.) Routine Proxy Proposals – Proxy proposals that are “routine” shall be presumed not to involve a material conflict of interest for WCM, unless the ISG has actual knowledge that a routine proposal should be treated as material. For this purpose, “routine” proposals would typically include matters such as the selection of an accountant, uncontested election of directors, meeting formalities, and approval of an annual report/financial statements.
 - (2.) Non-Routine Proxy Proposals – Proxy proposals that are “non-routine” shall be presumed to involve a material conflict of interest for WCM, unless the CCO determines that WCM’s conflict is unrelated to the proposal in question (see 3. below). For this purpose, “non-routine” proposals would typically include any contested matter, including a contested election of directors, a merger or sale of substantial assets, a change in the articles of incorporation that materially affects the rights of shareholders, and compensation matters for management (e.g., stock option plans, retirement plans, profit sharing or other special remuneration plans).
 - (3.) Determining that a Non-Routine Proposal is Not Material–As discussed above, although non-routine proposals are presumed to involve a material conflict of interest, the CCO may determine on a case-by-case basis that particular non-routine proposals do not involve a material conflict of interest. To make this determination, the CCO must conclude that a proposal is not directly related to WCM’s conflict with the issuer or that it otherwise would not be considered important by a reasonable investor. The CCO shall record in writing the basis for any such determination.
- c. For any proposal where the CCO determines that WCM has a material conflict of interest, WCM may vote a proxy regarding that proposal in any of the following manners:
 - (1.) Obtain Client Consent or Direction– If the CCO approves the proposal to overrule the recommendation of Glass Lewis, WCM shall fully disclose to each client holding the security at issue the nature of the conflict, and obtain the client’s consent to how WCM will vote on the proposal (or otherwise obtain instructions from the client as to how the proxy on the proposal should be voted).
 - (2.) Use Glass Lewis’ Recommendation – Vote in accordance with Glass Lewis’ recommendation.
- d. For any proposal where the CCO determines that WCM does not have a material conflict of interest, the ISG may overrule Glass Lewis’ recommendation if the ISG reasonably determines that doing so is in the best interests of WCM’s clients. If the ISG decides to overrule Glass Lewis’ recommendation, the ISG will maintain documentation to support their decision.

6. Dealing with Material Conflicts of Interest between a Client and Glass Lewis or Proxy Issuer

In the event that WCM is notified by a client regarding a conflict of interest between them and Glass Lewis or the proxy issuer, the CCO will evaluate the circumstances and either:

- a. elevate the decision to the ISG who will make a determination as to what would be in the Client’s best interest;
- b. if practical, seek a waiver from the Client of the conflict; or
- c. if agreed upon in writing with the Clients, forward the proxies to affected Clients allowing them to vote their own proxies.

7. Maintenance of Proxy Voting Records

As required by Rule 204-2 under the Advisers Act, as amended, WCM will maintain or procure the maintenance of the following records relating to proxy voting for a period of at least five years:

- a. a copy of these Proxy Policies, as they may be amended from time to time;
- b. copies of proxy statements received regarding Client securities, unless these materials are available electronically through the SEC’s EDGAR system;

- c. a record of each proxy vote cast on behalf of its Clients;
- d. a copy of any internal documents created by WCM that were material to making the decision how to vote proxies on behalf of its Clients; and
- e. each written Client request for information on how WCM voted proxies on behalf of the Client and each written response by WCM to oral or written Client requests for this information.

As permitted by Rule 204-2(c), electronic proxy statements and the record of each vote cast on behalf of each Client account will be maintained by ProxyEdge. WCM shall obtain and maintain an undertaking from ProxyEdge to provide it with copies of proxy voting records and other documents relating to its Clients' votes promptly upon request. WCM and ProxyEdge may rely on the SEC's EDGAR system to keep records of certain proxy statements if the proxy statements are maintained by issuers on that system (e.g., large U.S.-based issuers).

8. Disclosure

WCM will provide all Clients a summary of these Proxy Policies, either directly or by delivery to the Client of a copy of its Form ADV, Part 2A containing such a summary, and information on how to obtain a copy of the full text of these Proxy Policies and a record of how WCM has voted the Client's proxies. Upon receipt of a Client's request for more information, WCM will provide to the Client a copy of these Proxy Policies and/or in accordance with the Client's stated requirements, how the Client's proxies were voted during the period requested. Such periodic reports will not be made available to third parties absent the express written request of the Client. However, to the extent that WCM serves as a sub-adviser to another adviser to a Client, WCM will be deemed to be authorized to provide proxy voting records on such Client accounts to such other adviser.