

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.

DIMENSIONAL FUND ADVISORS LP

Introduction

Dimensional Fund Advisors LP (“Dimensional”) is an investment adviser registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) pursuant to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the “Advisers Act”). Dimensional is the parent or indirect parent company of Dimensional Fund Advisors Ltd. (“DFAL”), DFA Australia Limited (“DFAA”), Dimensional Fund Advisors Pte. Ltd. (“DFAP”) and Dimensional Japan Ltd. (“DFAJ”) (Dimensional, DFAL, DFAA, DFAP and DFAJ are collectively referred to as the “Advisors”). DFAL and DFAA are also registered as investment advisers under the Advisers Act.

The Advisors provide investment advisory or subadvisory services to various types of clients, including registered funds, unregistered commingled funds, defined benefit plans, defined contribution plans, private and public pension funds, foundations, endowment funds and other types of investors. These clients frequently give the Advisors the authority and discretion to vote proxies relating to the underlying securities beneficially held by such clients. Also, a client may, at times, ask an Advisor to share its proxy voting policies, procedures, and guidelines without the client delegating full voting discretion to the Advisor. Depending on the client, an Advisor’s duties may include making decisions regarding whether and how to vote proxies as part of an investment manager’s fiduciary duty under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended (“ERISA”).

The following Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures (the “Policy”) address the Advisors’ objectives for voting proxies received by the Advisors on behalf of client accounts or funds to the extent that relationships with such clients are subject to the Advisers Act or ERISA or the clients are registered investment companies under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the “40 Act”), including The DFA Investment Trust Company, DFA Investment Dimensions Group Inc., Dimensional Investment Group Inc. and Dimensional Emerging Markets Value Fund (together, the “Dimensional Investment Companies”). The Advisors believe that this Policy is reasonably designed to meet their goal of seeking to vote (or refrain from voting) proxies in a manner consistent with applicable legal standards and in the best interests of clients, as understood by the Advisors at the time of the vote.

Exhibit A to this Policy includes a summary of the Advisors’ current Proxy Voting Guidelines and will change from time to time (the “Guidelines”). The Investment Committee of Dimensional has determined that, in general, voting proxies pursuant to the Guidelines should be in the best interests of clients. Therefore, an Advisor will usually instruct voting of proxies in accordance with the Guidelines. The Guidelines provide a framework for analysis and decision making, but do not address all potential issues. In order to be able to address all the relevant facts and circumstances related to a proxy vote, the Advisors reserve the right to instruct votes counter to the Guidelines if, after a review of the matter, an Advisor believes that a client’s best interests would be served by such a vote. In such circumstance, the analysis will be documented in writing and periodically presented to the Committee (as hereinafter defined). To the extent that the Guidelines do not cover potential voting issues, an Advisor may consider the spirit of the Guidelines and instruct the vote on such issues in a manner that the Advisor believes would be in the best interests of the client.

The Advisors may, but will not ordinarily, take social concerns into account in voting proxies with respect to securities held by clients, including those held by socially screened portfolios or accounts. The Advisors will ordinarily take environmental concerns into account in voting proxies with respect to securities held by certain sustainability screened portfolios or accounts, to the extent permitted by applicable law and guidance.

The Advisors have retained certain third party proxy service providers (“Proxy Advisory Firms”) to provide information on shareholder meeting dates and proxy materials, translate proxy materials printed in a foreign language, provide research on proxy proposals, operationally process votes in accordance with the Guidelines on behalf of the clients for whom the Advisors have proxy voting responsibility, and provide reports concerning the proxies voted (“Proxy Voting Services”). Although the Advisors retain third-party service providers for proxy issues, the Advisors remain responsible for proxy voting decisions. The Advisors use commercially reasonable efforts to oversee any directed delegation to Proxy Advisory Firms, upon which the Advisors rely to carry out the Proxy Voting Services. In the event that the Guidelines are not implemented precisely as the Advisors intend because of the actions or omissions of any Proxy Advisory Firms, custodians or sub-custodians or other agents, or any such persons experience any irregularities (e.g., misvotes or missed votes), then such instances will not necessarily be deemed by the Advisors as a breach of this Policy.

Prior to the selection of any new Proxy Advisory Firms and annually thereafter or more frequently if deemed necessary by Dimensional, the Corporate Governance Committee (as defined below) will consider whether the Proxy Advisory Firm: (i) has the capacity and competency to adequately analyze proxy issues and (ii) can make its recommendations in an impartial manner and in consideration of the best interests of the Advisors' clients. Such considerations may include some or all of the following: (i) periodic sampling of votes cast by the Proxy Advisory Firm to review that the Guidelines adopted by the Advisors are being followed, (ii) onsite visits to the Proxy Advisory Firm office and/or discussions with the Proxy Advisory Firm to determine whether the Proxy Advisory Firm continues to have the capacity and competency to carry out its proxy obligations to the Advisors, (iii) a review of the Proxy Advisory Firm's policies and procedures, with a particular focus on those relating to identifying and addressing conflicts of interest and monitoring that current and accurate information is used in creating recommendations, (iv) requesting the Proxy Advisory Firm to notify the Advisors if there is a change in the Proxy Advisory Firm's material policies and procedures, particularly with respect to conflicts, or material business practices (e.g., entering or exiting new lines of business), and reviewing any such change, and (v) in case of an error made by the Proxy Advisory Firm, discussing the error with the Proxy Advisory Firm and determining whether appropriate corrective and preventive action is being taken.

Procedures for Voting Proxies

The Investment Committee at Dimensional is generally responsible for overseeing each Advisor's proxy voting process. The Investment Committee has formed a Corporate Governance Committee (the "Corporate Governance Committee" or the "Committee") composed of certain officers, directors and other personnel of the Advisors and has delegated to its members authority to (i) oversee the voting of proxies and the Proxy Advisory Firms, (ii) make determinations as to how to instruct the vote on certain specific proxies, (iii) verify ongoing compliance with this Policy and (iv) review this Policy from time to time and recommend changes to the Investment Committee. The Committee may designate one or more of its members to oversee specific, ongoing compliance with respect to this Policy and may designate personnel of each Advisor to instruct the vote on proxies on behalf of an Advisor's clients, such as authorized traders of the Advisors (collectively, "Authorized Persons"). The Committee may recommend changes to this Policy to seek to act in a manner consistent with the best interests of the clients.

Generally, the Advisors analyze relevant proxy materials on behalf of their clients and seek to instruct the vote (or refrain from voting) proxies in accordance with this Policy and the Guidelines. Therefore, an Advisor typically will not instruct votes differently for different clients unless a client has expressly directed the Advisor to vote differently for such client's account. In the case of separate accounts, where an Advisor has contractually agreed to follow a client's individualized proxy voting guidelines, the Advisor will seek to instruct such vote on the client's proxies pursuant to the client's guidelines.

Each Advisor seeks to vote (or refrain from voting) proxies for its clients in a manner that the Advisor determines is in the best interests of its clients and which seeks to maximize the value of the client's investments. When voting (or electing to refrain from voting) proxies for clients subject to ERISA, each Advisor shall seek to consider those factors that may affect the value of the ERISA client's investment and not subordinate the interests of the client's participants and beneficiaries on their retirement income to unrelated objectives. In some cases, the Advisor may determine that it is in the best interests of clients to refrain from exercising the clients' proxy voting rights. The Advisor may determine that voting is not in the best interests of a client and refrain from voting if the costs, including the opportunity costs, of voting would, in the view of the Advisor, exceed the expected benefits of voting to the client. For securities on loan, the Advisor will balance the revenue-producing value of loans against the difficult-to-assess value of casting votes. It is the Advisors' belief that the expected value of casting a vote generally will be less than the securities lending income, either because the votes will not have significant economic consequences or because the outcome of the vote would not be affected by an Advisor recalling loaned securities for voting. Each Advisor does intend to recall securities on loan if, based upon information in the Advisor's possession, it determines that voting the securities is likely to materially affect the value of a client's investment and that it is in the client's best interests to do so.

In cases where an Advisor does not receive a solicitation or enough information within a sufficient time (as reasonably determined by the Advisor) prior to the proxy-voting deadline, the Advisor or its service provider may be unable to vote.

Generally, the Advisors do not intend to invest to seek to change or influence control of a company and do not intend to engage in shareholder activism with respect to a pending vote. If an issuer's management, shareholders or proxy solicitors contact an Advisor with respect to a pending vote, a member of the Committee (or its delegatee) may listen to such party and discuss this Policy with such party.

International Proxy Voting

While the Advisors utilize the Policy and Guidelines for both their international and domestic portfolios and clients, there are some significant differences between voting U.S. company proxies and voting non-U.S. company proxies. For U.S. companies, it is usually relatively easy to vote proxies, as the proxies are typically received automatically and may be voted by mail or electronically. In most cases, the officers of a U.S. company soliciting a proxy act as proxies for the company's shareholders.

With respect to non-U.S. companies, however, it is typically both difficult and costly to vote proxies due to local regulations, customs or other requirements or restrictions, and such circumstances and expected costs may outweigh any anticipated economic benefit of voting. The major difficulties and costs may include: (i) appointing a proxy; (ii) obtaining reliable information about the time and location of a meeting; (iii) obtaining relevant information about voting procedures for foreign shareholders; (iv) restrictions on trading securities that are subject to proxy votes (share-blocking periods); (v) arranging for a proxy to vote locally in person; (vi) fees charged by custody banks for providing certain services with regard to voting proxies; and (vii) foregone income from securities lending programs. The Advisors do not intend to vote proxies of non-U.S. companies if they determine that the expected costs of voting outweigh any anticipated economic benefit to the client of voting. The Advisors intend to make their determination on whether to vote proxies of non-U.S. companies on a client by client basis, and generally seek to implement uniform voting procedures for all proxies of companies in each country. The Advisors periodically review voting logistics, including costs and other voting difficulties, on a client by client and country by country basis, in order to determine if there have been any material changes that would affect the Advisors' determinations and procedures. In the event an Advisor is made aware of and believes that an issue to be voted is likely to materially affect the economic value of a portfolio, that its client's vote is reasonably likely to influence the ultimate outcome of the contest, and that the expected benefits to the client of voting the proxies exceed the expected costs, the Advisor will seek to make reasonable efforts to vote such proxies.

Conflicts of Interest

Occasions may arise where an Authorized Person, the Committee, an Advisor, or an affiliated person of an Advisor may have a conflict of interest in connection with the proxy voting process. A conflict of interest may exist, for example, if an Advisor is actively soliciting investment advisory business from the company soliciting the proxy. However, proxies that the Advisors receive on behalf of their clients generally will be voted in accordance with the predetermined Guidelines. Therefore, proxies voted typically should not be affected by any conflicts of interest.

In the limited instances where (i) an Authorized Person is considering voting a proxy contrary to the Guidelines (or in cases for which the Guidelines do not prescribe a particular vote and the proposed vote is contrary to the recommendation of Institutional Shareholder Services, Inc., a Proxy Advisory Firm ("ISS")), and (ii) the Authorized Person believes a potential conflict of interest exists, the Authorized Person will disclose the potential conflict to a member of the Committee. Such disclosure will describe the proposal to be voted upon and disclose any potential conflict of interest including but not limited to any potential personal conflict of interest (e.g., familial relationship with company management) the Authorized Person may have relating to the proxy vote, in which case the Authorized Person will remove himself or herself from the proxy voting process.

If the Committee member has actual knowledge of a conflict of interest and recommends a vote contrary to the Guidelines (or in the case where the Guidelines do not prescribe a particular vote and the proposed vote is contrary to the recommendation of ISS), the Committee member will bring the vote to the Committee, which will (a) determine how the vote should be cast, keeping in mind the principle of preserving shareholder value or (b) determine to abstain from voting, unless abstaining would be materially adverse to the Client's interest. To the extent the Committee makes a determination regarding how to vote or to abstain for a proxy on behalf of a Dimensional Investment Company in the circumstances described in this paragraph, the Advisor will report annually on such determinations to the respective Board of Directors/Trustees of the Dimensional Investment Company.

Availability of Proxy Voting Information and Recordkeeping

Each Advisor will inform those clients for which it has voting authority how to obtain information from the Advisor about how it voted with respect to client securities. The Advisor will provide those clients with a summary of its proxy voting guidelines, process and policies and will inform the clients how they can obtain a copy of the complete Policy upon request. If an Advisor is registered under the Advisers Act, the Advisor will also include such information described in the preceding two sentences in Part 2A of its Form ADV.

Recordkeeping

The Advisors will also keep records of the following items: (i) their proxy voting guidelines, policies and procedures; (ii) proxy statements received regarding client securities (unless such statements are available on the SEC's Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval (EDGAR) system); (iii) records of votes they cast on behalf of clients, which may be maintained by a Proxy Advisory Firm if it undertakes to provide copies of those records promptly upon request; (iv) records of written client requests for proxy voting information and an Advisor's responses (whether a client's request was oral or in writing); (v) any documents prepared by an Advisor that were material to making a decision how to vote, or that memorialized the basis for the decision; (vi) a record of any testing conducted on any Proxy Advisory Firm's votes; and (vii) a copy of each version of the Proxy Advisory Firm's policies and procedures provided to the Advisors. The Advisors will maintain these records in an easily accessible place for at least six years from the end of the fiscal year during which the last entry was made on such records. For the first two years, each Advisor will store such records at one of its principal offices.

Disclosure

Dimensional shall disclose in the statements of additional information of the Dimensional Investment Companies a summary of procedures which Dimensional uses to determine how to vote proxies relating to portfolio securities of the Dimensional Investment Companies. The disclosure will include a description of the procedures used when a vote presents a conflict of interest between shareholders and Dimensional, DFA Securities LLC ("DFAS") or an affiliate of Dimensional or DFAS.

The semi-annual reports of the Dimensional Investment Companies shall indicate that the procedures are available: (i) by calling Dimensional collect; or (ii) on the SEC's website. If a request for the procedures is received, the requested description must be sent within three business days by a prompt method of delivery.

Dimensional, on behalf of each Dimensional Investment Company it advises, shall file its proxy voting record with the SEC on Form N-PX no later than August 31 of each year, for the twelve-month period ending June 30 of the current year. Such filings shall contain all information required to be disclosed on Form N-PX.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 As the SEC has stated, "There may even be times when refraining from voting a proxy is in the client's best interest, such as when the adviser determines that the cost of voting the proxy exceeds the expected benefit to the client...For example, casting a vote on a foreign security may involve additional costs such as hiring a translator or traveling to the foreign country to vote the security in person." See Proxy Voting by Investment Advisers, Release No. IA-2106 (Jan. 31, 2003). Additionally, the Department of Labor has stated that it "recognizes that in some special cases voting proxies may involve out of the ordinary costs or unusual requirements, for example in the case of voting proxies on shares of certain foreign corporations. Thus, in such cases, a fiduciary should consider whether the plan's vote, either by itself or together with the votes of other shareholders, is expected to have an effect on the value of the plan's investment that warrants the additional cost of voting." See Preamble to Department of Labor Interpretive Bulletin 2016-1, 81 FR 95883 (December 29, 2016).
- 2 If a client does not share with its Advisor information regarding the cost of voting proxies for certain non-US companies or in certain countries, the Advisor will presume, in making its determinations, that the costs incurred by the client for voting those proxies are similar to those incurred by voting for a Dimensional Investment Company.

THOMPSON, SIEGEL & WALMSLEY LLC

Thompson, Siegel & Walmsley LLC (“TSW”) acknowledges it has a fiduciary obligation to its clients that requires it to monitor corporate events and vote client proxies. TSW has adopted and implemented written policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure that proxies for domestic and foreign stock holdings are voted in the best interest of our clients on a best efforts basis. TSW recognizes that it (i) has a fiduciary responsibility under the Employee Retirement Income Securities Act (ERISA) to vote proxies prudently and solely in the best interest of plan participants and beneficiaries (ii) will vote stock proxies in the best interest of the client (non-ERISA) when directed (together, our “clients”). TSW has developed its policy to be consistent with, wherever possible, enhancing long-term shareholder value and leading corporate governance practices. TSW has retained the services of Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS). ISS is a Registered Investment Adviser under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. As a leading provider of proxy voting and corporate governance services with 20+ years of experience, ISS serves more than 1,700 institutions. ISS’s core business is to analyze proxies and issue informed research and objective vote recommendations for more than 38,000 companies across 115 markets worldwide. ISS provides TSW proxy proposal research and voting recommendations and votes accounts on TSW’s behalf under the guidance of ISS’s standard voting guidelines which include:

- Operational Issues
- Board of Directors
- Proxy Contests
- Anti-takeover Defenses and Voting Related Issues
- Mergers and Corporate Restructurings
- State of Incorporation
- Capital Structure
- Executive & Director Compensation
- Equity Compensation Plans
 - Specific Treatment of Certain Award Types in Equity Plan Evaluations
 - Other Compensation Proposals & Policies
 - Shareholder Proposals on Compensation
- Corporate Responsibility
- Consumer Issues and Public Safety
- Environment and Energy
- General Corporate Issues
- Labor Standards and Human Rights
- Military Business
- Workplace Diversity
- Mutual Fund Proxies

TSW’s proxy coordinator is responsible for monitoring ISS’s voting procedures on an ongoing basis. TSW’s general policy regarding the voting of proxies is as follows:

Proxy Voting Guidelines:

Routine and/or non-controversial, general corporate governance issues are normally voted with management; this would include the Approval of Independent Auditors.

Occasionally, ISS may vote against management’s proposal on a particular issue; such issues would generally be those deemed likely to reduce shareholder control over management, entrench management at the expense of shareholders, or in some way diminish shareholders’ present or future value. From time to time TSW will receive and act upon the client’s specific instructions regarding proxy proposals. TSW reserves the right to vote against any proposals motivated by political, ethical or social concerns. TSW and ISS will examine each issue solely from an economic perspective.

A complete summary of ISS’s voting guidelines, domestic & foreign, are available at: <https://www.issgovernance.com/policy-gateway>

Conflicts of Interest:

Occasions may arise during the voting process in which the best interests of the clients conflicts with TSW’s interests. Conflicts of interest generally include (i) business relationships where TSW has a substantial business relationship with, or is actively soliciting business from, a company soliciting proxies (ii) personal or family relationships whereby an employee of TSW has a family member or other personal relationship that is affiliated with a company soliciting proxies, such as a spouse who serves as a director of a public company. A conflict could also exist if a substantial business relationship exists with a proponent or opponent of a particular initiative. If TSW determines that a material conflict of interest exists, TSW will instruct ISS to vote using ISS’s standard policy guidelines which are derived independently from TSW.

Proxy Voting Process:

- Upon timely receipt of proxy materials, ISS will automatically release vote instructions on client's behalf as soon as custom research is completed. TSW retains authority to override the votes (before cut-off date) if they disagree with the vote recommendation.
- The Proxy Coordinator will monitor the voting process at ISS via Proxy Exchange website (ISS's online voting and research platform). Records of which accounts are voted, how accounts are voted, and how many shares are voted are kept electronically with ISS.
- For proxies not received at ISS, TSW and ISS will make a best efforts attempt to receive ballots from the clients' custodian.
- TSW will be responsible for account maintenance – opening and closing of accounts, transmission of holdings and account environment monitoring.
- Order Implementation Manager (proxy oversight representative) will keep abreast of any critical or exceptional events or events qualifying as a conflict of interest via ISS Proxy Exchange website and email. TSW has the ability to override vote instructions, and the Order Implementation Manager will consult with TSW's Investment Policy Committee or product managers in these types of situations.
- All proxies are voted solely in the best interest of clients.
- Proactive communication takes place via regular meetings with ISS's Client Relations Team.

Practical Limitations Relating to Proxy Voting:

While TSW uses its best efforts to vote proxies, in certain circumstances it may be impractical or impossible for TSW to do so. Identifiable circumstances include:

- Limited Value. TSW may abstain from voting in those circumstances where it has concluded to do so would have no identifiable economic benefit to the client-shareholder.
- Unjustifiable Cost. TSW may abstain from voting when the costs of or disadvantages resulting from voting, in TSW's judgment, outweigh the economic benefits of voting.
- Securities Lending. Certain of TSW's clients engage in securities lending programs under which shares of an issuer could be on loan while that issuer is conducting a proxy solicitation. As part of the securities lending program, if the securities are on loan at the record date, the client lending the security cannot vote that proxy. Because TSW generally is not aware of when a security may be on loan, it does not have an opportunity to recall the security prior to the record date. Therefore, in most cases, those shares will not be voted and TSW may not be able fully to reconcile the securities held at record date with the securities actually voted.
- Failure to Receive Proxy Statements. TSW may not be able to vote proxies in connection with certain holdings, most frequently for foreign securities, if it does not receive the account's proxy statement in time to vote the proxy.

Proxy Voting Records & Reports:

- The proxy information is maintained by ISS on TSW's behalf and includes the following: (i) name of the issuer, (ii) the exchange ticker symbol, (iii) the CUSIP number, (iv) the shareholder meeting date, (v) a brief description of the matter brought to vote; (vi) whether the proposal was submitted by management or a shareholder, (vii) how the proxy was voted (for, against, abstained), (viii) whether the proxy was voted for or against management, and (ix) documentation materials to make the decision. TSW's Proxy Coordinator coordinates retrieval and report production as required or requested.
- Clients will be notified annually of their ability to request a copy of our proxy policies and procedures. A copy of how TSW voted on securities held is available free of charge upon request from our clients or by calling us toll free at (800) 697-1056.