

**Corporate Governance
Policy &
Voting Guidelines**

January 2019

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Table of Contents

I.	POLICY	3
II.	VOTING GUIDELINES	6
1.	REPORTS & ACCOUNTS	6
2.	DIVIDENDS	7
3.	BOARD OF DIRECTORS	7
4.	COMPENSATION	10
5.	AUDITORS	13
6.	ISSUE OF CAPITAL	13
7.	MERGERS / ACQUISITIONS	14
8.	RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTIONS	14
9.	VOTING RIGHTS	15
10.	OTHERS	15
III.	STEWARDSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT	17
IV.	SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL	23
	CONTROVERSIAL WEAPONS	22
	CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON DISCLOSURE	24
	PRI	24
	PARTNERSHIPS AND AFFILIATIONS	25

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

I. POLICY

Corporate Governance addresses the agency problems that are induced by the separation of ownership and control in the modern corporation. J.P. Morgan Asset Management ('JPMAM') is committed to delivering superior investment performance to its clients worldwide. We believe that one of the drivers of investment performance is an assessment of the corporate governance principles and practices of the companies in which we invest our clients' assets and we expect those companies to demonstrate high standards of governance in the management of their business at all times.

We have set out herein the principles which provide the framework for our corporate governance and proxy voting activity. Although these apply primarily to the UK and Europe and therefore principally concern accounts managed from the London office, our colleagues in New York, Tokyo and Hong Kong have similar guidelines, consistent with law and best practice in these different locations. Full details are available on request.

Our UK Guidelines are based on the revised UK Corporate Governance Code. Any company complying with its provisions can usually expect JPMAM to support its corporate governance policies. JPMAM works closely with the UK Financial Reporting Council (FRC) and the Investment Association (IA), and we abide by these organisations' corporate governance principles and also take their guidance into account when implementing our policy. If a company chooses to deviate from the provisions of the Code, we will give the explanations due consideration and take them into account as appropriate, based on our overall assessment of the standards of corporate governance evidenced at the company.

For Continental European markets, we expect companies to comply with local Corporate Governance Codes, where they exist. We fully recognise that, in certain European markets, there are areas where local law or practice prescribe differing structures or processes to those found in the UK, which must be taken into account. In markets where a comparable standard does not exist, we will use our own Guidelines as the primary basis for our voting and corporate governance activity, whilst taking local market practice into consideration where applicable. JPMAM also is a member of the European Funds and Asset Management Association (EFAMA), the International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN) and the Asian Corporate Governance Association (ACGA), and will take their guidance into account where appropriate.

In our view, our Guidelines meet with the requirements of the US Department of Labor recommendations as they apply to ERISA and US Mutual Funds.

Voting

JPMAM manages the voting rights of the shares entrusted to it as it would manage any other asset (although it should be noted that not all of our clients delegate voting authority to us. Some do not authorise us to vote, or delegate voting to a third party). It is the policy of JPMAM to vote shares held in its clients' portfolios in a prudent and diligent manner, based exclusively on our reasonable judgement of what will best serve the financial interests of the beneficial owners of the security. So far as is practicable we will vote at all of the meetings called by companies in which we are invested.

It should be noted that JPMAM treats every proxy on a case-by-case basis, voting for or against each resolution, or actively withholding our vote as appropriate. Our primary concern at all times is the best economic interests of our clients. These Guidelines are therefore an indication only of JPMAM's normal voting policy. The investment analyst or portfolio manager always has discretion to override the policy should individual circumstances dictate.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Certain markets require that shares being tendered for voting purposes are temporarily immobilised from trading until after the shareholder meeting has taken place. Other markets require a local representative to be hired in order to attend the meeting and vote in person on our behalf, empowered with Power of Attorney documentation which can represent considerable cost to clients. Elsewhere, notably Emerging Markets, it may not always be possible to obtain sufficient information to make an informed decision in good time to vote, or there may be specific financial risks where, for example, voting can preclude participating in certain types of corporate action. In these instances, it may sometimes be in our clients' best interests to intentionally refrain from voting in certain overseas markets from time to time.

As our Guidelines are primarily targeted at companies listed on main stock exchanges, it is sometimes difficult for smaller companies to apply the same corporate governance rules and we will look at any issues for such companies on a case-by-case basis. We would, however, encourage them to apply the highest possible standards of governance.

Proxy Committee

Responsibility for the formulation of voting policy in each region rests with the Proxy Committee, whose role is to review JPMAM's corporate governance policy and practice in respect of investee companies and to provide a focal point for corporate governance issues. Each Committee is composed of senior analysts, portfolio managers, governance professionals, and can call upon members of legal and compliance, or other specialists, as appropriate. Committees meet at least quarterly, or more frequently as circumstances dictate. Each regional Committee reports, in turn, to the Global Head of Equity, which has overall responsibility for our approach to governance issues worldwide, and for ensuring that regional policies comply with the firm's global governance principles.

Stewardship and Engagement

As long-term owners, we regard regular, systematic and direct contact with senior company management, both executive and non-executive, as crucially important. For UK and European companies in particular, corporate governance specialists routinely attend scheduled one-to-one meetings alongside analysts and portfolio managers, as well as convene dedicated meetings as required in order to debate areas of concern. Full details of our Stewardship and Engagement Policy are contained in Part III of this document.

JPMAM was a founding signatory to the UK Stewardship Code and we believe that our existing stewardship policies meet or exceed the standard required under the Code. Our full statement of compliance is available to view or download on our website.

Sustainability

JPMAM believes that non-financial issues, such as social, environmental and sustainability issues can have an economic impact on our clients' investments. We expect the companies in which we invest to behave in a manner consistent with these wider obligations. Full details are contained in Part IV of this document.

Conflicts of Interest

Typical conflicts include where JPMC or its Affiliates are involved in a transaction at an investee company, or provide banking or other services, or where JPM personnel sit on other company boards.

In order to maintain the integrity and independence of JPMAM's proxy voting decisions, JPMorgan Chase (including JPMAM) has established formal barriers designed to restrict the flow of information between JPMC's securities, lending, investment banking and other

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

divisions to JPMAM investment professionals. The policy is available to download from our website.

A conflict is deemed to exist when voting in relation to JPMorgan Chase & Co, or for JPMorgan Funds, or when JPMAM has knowledge that a JPMorgan affiliate is an advisor or has rendered a fairness opinion with respect to the matter being voted upon. When such conflicts are identified, JPMAM will call upon an independent third-party to make the voting decision, either in accordance with JPMAM voting guidelines or by the third party using its own guidelines, or when a JPMorgan affiliate receives a voting recommendation from a third party, as guided by Compliance. In certain circumstances, we may elect not to vote. A record of all such decisions is available to clients on request.

Stocklending

Stock which is lent cannot normally be voted, as the right to vote is effectively lent with the shares. For routine voting, JPMAM views the revenue from lending activities to be of more value to the client than the ability to vote. However, we reserve the right to recall stock on loan in exceptional circumstances, in order to protect our clients' interests in the event of a particularly important or close vote, or if we feel lent stock risks being used in a manner which may impede ongoing engagement activity.

Finally, it should be pointed out that this document is intended as an overview only. Specific issues should always be directed to your account administrator or portfolio manager, or the J.P. Morgan Corporate Governance Team.

J.P. Morgan Asset Management

London Proxy Committee

January 2019

II. VOTING GUIDELINES

1. REPORTS & ACCOUNTS

Annual Report

Reports and accounts should be both detailed and transparent and should be submitted to shareholders for approval. They should meet accepted reporting standards, such as those prescribed by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) and should meet with the spirit as well as the letter of those reporting standards. We agree with the UK Corporate Governance Code, that the company's annual report and accounts, when taken as a whole, should be fair, balanced and understandable, a primary outcome of which is for the narrative sections of the annual report to reflect more accurately the company's position, performance and prospects

The annual report should include a statement of compliance with relevant codes of best practice, in markets where they exist, together with detailed explanations regarding any area of non-compliance.

Legal disclosure varies from market to market. If, in our opinion, a company's standards of disclosure (whilst meeting minimum legal requirements) are insufficient in any particular area, we will inform company management of our concerns. Depending on the circumstances, we will either abstain or vote against the resolution concerned. Similar consideration would relate to the use of inappropriate accounting methods.

Remuneration Report

The remuneration policy as it relates to senior management should ideally be presented to shareholders as a separate voting item. We would expect the report to contain full details of all aspects of individual director's emoluments. We will endeavour to engage with the company or seek an explanation regarding any areas of remuneration which fall outside our guidelines and we will abstain or vote against the remuneration report and, if appropriate, members of the Remuneration Committee, if we feel that explanation is insufficient. Any material changes to compensation arrangements should be put to shareholders for approval.

We encourage companies to provide information on the ratio of CEO pay to median employee pay, and explain the reasons for changes to the ratio year on year and how it is consistent with the company's wider policies on employee pay, reward and progression. Companies should also have regard to gender pay gaps (if any) and indicate to shareholders how the issue is to be addressed.

Several markets worldwide now have a binding vote on remuneration policy. In our view, remuneration policies should stand the test of time, and should not need amendment on an annual or biennial basis. We would therefore expect votes on remuneration policies to occur normally every third year, the maximum allowed under the regulations, and will regard it as concerning where companies feel the need to bring proposed changes to shareholders more frequently than this. Similarly, reporting under the new regulations should not necessarily lead to an increase in the volume of data provided. Investors expect clear and concise reports that are effective at communicating how executive pay is linked to delivery of the company's strategy in the long-term.

see Compensation

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

2. DIVIDENDS

Proposals for the payment of dividends should be presented to shareholders for approval and should be fully disclosed in advance of the meeting. We will vote against dividend proposals if we deem the payout ratio to be too low, or if the earnings and cash cover are inadequate and payment of the proposed dividend would prejudice the solvency or future prospects of the company.

3. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Board Structure

Companies should be controlled by an effective board, with an appropriate balance of executive and non-executive directors, such that no single stakeholder or group of stakeholders has a disproportionate or undue level of influence. JPMAM is generally in favour of unitary boards of the type found in the UK, as opposed to tiered board structures. We find that unitary boards offer flexibility while, with a tiered structure, there is a risk of upper tier directors becoming remote from the business, while lower tier directors become deprived of contact with outsiders of wider experience. No director should be excluded from the requirement to submit him/herself for re-election on a regular basis.

In our view, the board has a vital role to play in shaping and embedding a healthy corporate culture. The values and standards of behaviour set by the board are an important influence on culture within the organisation and we believe there are strong links between governance and establishing a culture that supports long-term success. In our view, there is a role for the board in establishing and promoting the culture, values and ethics of the company and in setting the 'tone from the top'. We agree with the UK Financial Reporting Council (FRC), that a company's culture should promote integrity and openness, value diversity and be responsive to the views of shareholders and wider stakeholders.

Board Independence

JPMAM believes that a strong independent element to a board is essential to the effective running of a company. The calibre and number of non-executive directors on a board should be such that their views will carry significant weight in the board's decisions.

We agree with the ICGN, that the majority of a board should be independent, especially if the company has a joint Chairman / CEO. JPMAM will use its voting powers to encourage appropriate levels of board independence, whilst taking into account local market practice

In order to help assess their contribution to the company, the time spent by each non-executive director should be disclosed to shareholders, as well as their attendance at board and committee meetings. Boards should also create and maintain a formal succession plan, to ensure orderly refreshment of the board, and minimise over-dependence on any certain individual.

Chairman

Boards should be headed by an effective Chairman, who is independent on appointment, and who meets the same ongoing independence criteria, including tenure, as other non-executive directors. There should be a clear division of responsibilities at the head of a company, such that no one individual has unfettered powers of decision. JPMAM believes that the roles of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer should normally be separate and will generally vote against combined posts.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Board Size

Board size should be appropriate to the size and complexity of the company. JPMAM will exercise its voting powers in favour of reducing excessively-large boards wherever possible. Boards with more than 15 directors are usually deemed excessively large, whereas less than 5 directors may be too small to provide sufficient levels of independence for key committees.

Board Diversity

JPMAM is committed to supporting inclusive organisations where everyone can succeed on merit, regardless of gender, sexual orientation, disability or ethnic and religious background. Recruiting individuals with unique skills, experiences and diverse backgrounds is a fundamental part of strengthening a business, and is an important consideration when searching for new board members. Although we do not endorse quotas, we expect boards to have a strategy to improve female representation in particular. To this end, we generally support the target of one-third of board positions being held by women, as recommended by the UK Government's Women on Boards Report, the Davies Review and the Hampton-Alexander Review. We will utilise our voting power to bring about change where companies are lagging, as well as engage with Nominations Committees where appropriate. We also expect companies to consider diversity in its widest sense, both at board level and throughout the business.

Board Committees

Boards should delegate key oversight functions, such as responsibility for Audit, Nominations and Remuneration issues, to independent committees. The Chairman and members of any committee should be clearly identified in the annual report. Any committee should have the authority to engage independent advisers where appropriate at the company's expense.

Audit Committees should consist solely of non-executive directors, who are independent of management. The Committee should include at least one person with appropriate financial qualifications but they should all undergo appropriate training that provides and maintains a reasonable degree of financial literacy. Formal arrangements should be in place for the committee to hold regular meetings with external auditors, without executive or staff presence and they should have an explicit right of unrestricted access to company documents and information.

Nomination Committees should be majority-independent and have an independent chair. The responsibilities of the Committee should include assessing the skills, diversity and competencies of directors, to ensure that the board has an appropriate range of expertise. The Committee should also manage the process for formally evaluating the performance of the board, its committees and directors, and reporting on this process to shareholders in the Annual Report, as well as maintaining formal and transparent arrangements for succession planning for the board and senior executives.

Remuneration Committees should be majority-independent and have an independent chair. The responsibilities of the Committee should include reviewing and recommending policies relating to remuneration, retention and termination of senior executives, ensuring that, through these policies, executives are properly motivated to drive the long term success of the company, and that incentives are appropriately aligned, and overseeing the remuneration framework for non-executive directors. The Remuneration Committee should be ready to engage with and where necessary, receive feedback from, relevant stakeholders including large institutional shareholders and the wider workforce.

See Remuneration Report

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Boards of banks, or other large or complex companies, should establish a Risk Committee to provide independent oversight and advice to the board on the current risk exposures of the entity and future risk strategy, in order to manage these issues effectively within their business. These bodies should give a summary of their activities in the Annual Report.

Director Independence

We agree with the ICGN that a director will generally be deemed to be independent if he or she has no significant financial, familial or other ties with the company which might pose a conflict and has not been employed in an executive capacity by the company for at least the previous ten years.

A non-executive director who has served more than three terms (or ten years) in the same capacity can no longer normally be deemed to be independent. Directors staying on beyond this duration would require the fullest explanation to shareholders, and we would expect such directors to offer themselves for re-election annually.

In determining our vote, we will always consider independence issues on a case-by-case basis, taking into account any exceptional individual circumstances, together with local markets' differing attitudes to director independence.

Director's Liability

In certain markets, this proposal asks shareholders to give blanket discharge from responsibility for all decisions made during the previous financial year. Depending on the market, this resolution may or may not be legally binding and may not release the board from its legal responsibility.

JPMAM will usually vote against discharging the board from responsibility in cases of pending litigation, or if there is evidence of wrongdoing for which the board must be held accountable.

Companies may arrange Directors and Officers ('D&O') liability insurance to indemnify executives in certain circumstances, such as class action lawsuits and other litigation. JPMAM generally supports such proposals, although we do not approve of arrangements where directors are given 100% indemnification, as this could absolve them of responsibility for their actions and encourage them to act recklessly. Such arrangements should not extend to third parties, such as auditors.

Multiple Directorships

Non-executive directors should have sufficient time to meet their board responsibilities. In order to be able to devote sufficient time to his or her duties, we would not normally expect a non-executive to hold more than three significant directorships at any one time. For executives, only one additional non-executive post would normally be considered appropriate without further explanation.

We agree with the UK Corporate Governance Code that no single individual should chair more than one major listed company.

Investment Trust and Fund Directors

In the UK, the Boards of investment trust companies are unusual in being normally comprised solely of non-executive directors. JPMAM generally prefers that the majority of such boards (including the Chairman) are independent of the management company. We believe this to be appropriate and expect investment trust boards to comply with the Association of Investment Companies (AIC) Code of Corporate Governance.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

We note that the AIC Code does not make explicit recommendations on board tenure. We take this into account when assessing director independence, although we agree with the AIC that investment trust companies should have a formal policy on tenure and that any director serving beyond three terms should offer themselves for re-election annually. We also believe that at least half of the board of an investment trust company (including the Chairman) should be non-executive directors having served for less than nine years, in order to ensure that the board does not become ossified with a large number of long-serving directors.

SICAV and other fund board directors should comply with the ALFI Code of Conduct, or equivalent codes where they exist.

4. COMPENSATION

Directors' Contracts

JPMAM believes that directors' contracts should be of one year's duration or less, and payments on termination should not exceed one year's fixed compensation. This is accepted market best practice in the UK as well as other major European markets. Special provisions whereby additional payment becomes due in the event of a change of control are an inappropriate use of shareholder funds and should be discouraged. Market practice regarding the length of director's service contracts varies enormously: JPMAM is cognisant that it would be inappropriate to enforce UK standards in some other markets. To this end, JPMAM will take into account local market practice when making judgements in this area. Company Chairmen should not normally have executive-style contractual arrangements with the company which include severance terms.

Executive Director's Remuneration

Executive remuneration is and will remain a contentious issue, particularly the overall quantum of remuneration. Policy in this area cannot easily be prescribed by any code or formula to cater for all circumstances and must depend on responsible and well-informed judgement on the part of remuneration committees. Any remuneration policy should be transparent, simple to understand and fully disclosed to shareholders in a separate Remuneration Report within the Annual Report. Compensation should contain both a fixed element, set by reference to the external market but always cognisant of pay within a company's general workforce, and a variable element, which fully aligns the executive with shareholders and where superior awards can only be achieved by attaining superior performance.

Due consideration should also be given to the effective management of risk within the business. This should be reflected in remuneration arrangements, in order to incentivise appropriate behaviours and, more importantly, discourage excessive risk taking, which may be detrimental to shareholders. Compensation arrangements should provide alignment between managers and shareholders across the cycle, and due consideration should be given to devices such as clawback or bonus/malus arrangements in order to avoid payment for failure.

JPMAM will generally vote against shareholder proposals to restrict arbitrarily the compensation of executives or other employees. We feel that the specific amounts and types of employee compensation are within the ordinary business responsibilities of the board and the company management. However, the remuneration of executive directors should be determined by independent remuneration committees and fully disclosed to shareholders. Any stock option plans or long-term incentive plans should meet our guidelines for such plans set forth herein.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

We believe firmly that directors should be encouraged to hold meaningful amounts of company stock, equivalent to at least two year's salary, which should be maintained for the duration of employment.

Transaction bonuses, one-off retention awards, or other retrospective ex-gratia payments, should not be made. Similarly, recruitment awards for incoming executives should be limited to the value of awards forgone, and be granted on equivalent terms.

Non-Executive Director's Remuneration

JPMAM believes that non-executive directors should be paid, at least in part, in shares of the company wherever possible, in order to align their interests with the interests of shareholders. Performance criteria, however, should never be attached. Non-executive directors should not be awarded share options or performance based share awards.

Fixed Compensation

Executives are entitled to a basic salary set by reference to the external market and in particular benchmarked against the company's immediate peers. Acknowledging that salary often forms the basis for variable compensation, we believe annual increases in salary should be limited and generally in line with the wider workforce of the company. Substantial increases in salary should be fully justified to shareholders. We do not approve of large increases in fixed salary as a retention mechanism.

Variable Compensation

We generally prefer any variable compensation arrangement to have a short-term and long-term component. Annual bonuses are now a common feature of compensation packages. We prefer that bonuses be capped at a multiple of salary benchmarked against a company's sector. In industries that operate an overall bonus pool we at least expect a cap on the overall potential pool. Whilst we recognise that annual bonus targets are often, though not always, commercially sensitive, we expect a high degree of disclosure on performance metrics (pre-award) and performance against those metrics (post-award). Payment of bonus for executives should take the form of cash and shares deferred for a defined period of time. Bonus malus and/or clawback are also expected features of any bonus scheme.

For the long-term component, share-based Long-Term Incentive Plans (LTIPs) and Share Option Schemes (SOSs) should be designed to give directors incentive to perform at the highest levels, and grants under such schemes should be subject to appropriate performance criteria which are challenging and which reflect the company's long-term strategy and objectives over an appropriate period (at least three years, and preferably five years or more) There should be no award for below-median performance, and awards for at-median performance should be modest. Beneficiaries should be encouraged to retain any resultant shares for a suitable time, and should not benefit from free-matching shares for no other reason than a decision to defer compensation already earned. Restricted Share Awards (RSAs), which substitute traditional performance criteria in exchange for long-term ownership of company stock, may be appropriate for some companies. Any move to RSAs should be fully justified by the remuneration committee. We will also wish to satisfy our selves that the company has demonstrated historically appropriate levels of remuneration and has established a relationship of trust with shareholders. If moving from traditional long-term incentives to restricted shares, the remuneration committee should consider the appropriate level of discount to award levels, to reflect the certainty of restricted shares. Restricted shares should, in our view, be retained for a period of time after retirement or departure from the company, in order to incentivise executives to ensure an orderly transition.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

We will generally vote against the re-setting of performance conditions on existing awards, the cancellation and re-issue, re-testing or re-pricing of underwater awards, the backdating of awards or discounted awards.

All incentive plans should be clearly explained and fully disclosed to both shareholders and participants and put to shareholders for approval. Furthermore, each director's awards, awarded or vested, should be detailed, including term, performance conditions, exercise prices (if any), and the market price of the shares at the date of exercise. They should also take into account appropriate levels of dilution. Best practice requires that share options be fully expensed, so that shareholders can assess their true cost to the company. The assumptions and methodology behind the expensing calculation should also be explained to shareholders.

In all markets JPMAM will vote in favour of well-structured schemes with keen incentives and clear and specific performance criteria, which are challenging in nature and fully disclosed to shareholders in advance. We also favour simplicity both in the number of variable incentive schemes and in their structure. We will vote against payments which are excessive, or performance criteria which are undemanding, or where there is excessive discretion exercised by remuneration committees. We will also oppose incentive arrangements which are not subject to formal caps, or appropriate tapering arrangements. We would expect remuneration committees to explain why criteria are considered to be challenging and how they align the interests of shareholders with the interests of the recipients.

Pensions

JPMAM believes that executive pension arrangements should mirror those of the wider workforce particularly with regard to contribution levels. JPMAM believes it is inappropriate for executives to participate in pension arrangements which are materially different to those of employees (such as continuing to participate in a final salary arrangement, when employees have been transferred to a defined contribution scheme). One-off payments into individual director's pension schemes, changes to pension entitlements and waivers concerning early retirement provisions must be fully disclosed and justified to shareholders.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

5. AUDITORS

Auditor Independence

Auditors must provide an independent and objective check on the way in which the financial statements have been prepared and presented. JPMAM will vote against the appointment or re-appointment of auditors who are not perceived as being independent, or where there has been an audit failure. The length of time both the audit company and the audit partner have served in their capacity with a given company may be a factor in determining independence.

Auditor Rotation

In order to safeguard the independence of the audit, companies should rotate their auditor over time. We agree with the provisions of the UK Competition Commission, that companies should put their external audit contract out to competitive tender at least every ten years.

Auditor Remuneration

Companies should be encouraged to distinguish clearly between audit and non-audit fees. Audit committees should keep under review the non-audit fees paid to the auditor, both in relation to the size of the total audit fee and in relation to the company's total expenditure on consultancy. A mechanism should be in place to ensure that consultancy work is put out to competitive tender.

We would oppose non-audit fees consistently exceeding audit fees, where no explanation was given to shareholders. Audit fees should never be excessive.

Auditor Indemnification

JPMAM is opposed to the use of shareholders' funds to indemnify auditors.
see Audit Committee

6. ISSUE OF CAPITAL

Issue of Equity

In most countries, company law requires that shareholder approval be obtained in order to increase the authorised share capital of the company. Any new issue of equity should take into account appropriate levels of dilution.

JPMAM believes strongly that any new issue of equity should first be offered to existing shareholders on a pre-emptive basis. Pre-emption rights are a fundamental right of ownership and we will vote against 'cash box' structures or other attempts to suspend, bypass or eliminate pre-emption rights, unless they are for purely technical reasons (e.g. rights offers which may not be legally offered to shareholders in certain jurisdictions). We prefer that these issuances are sought annually, and generally do not support multi-year capital issuances, or shares which are issued at a preferential discount to third parties as part of a related-party transaction.

JPMAM will vote against increases in capital which would allow the company to adopt 'poison pill' takeover defence tactics, or where the increase in authorised capital would dilute shareholder value in the long-term.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Issue of Debt

JPMAM will vote in favour of proposals which will enhance a company's long-term prospects. We will vote against any uncapped or poorly-defined increase in bank borrowing powers or borrowing limits, as well as issuances which would result in the company reaching an unacceptable level of financial leverage, where there is a material reduction in shareholder value, or where such borrowing is expressly intended as part of a takeover defence.

Share Repurchase Programmes

JPMAM will vote in favour of share repurchase or buy-back programmes where the repurchase would be in the best interests of shareholders and where the company is not thought to be able to use the cash in a more useful way. We will vote against abusive schemes, or where shares are repurchased at an inappropriate point in the cycle, or when shareholders' interests could be better served by deployment of the cash for alternative uses.

7. MERGERS / ACQUISITIONS

Mergers and acquisitions are always referred to individual portfolio managers and/or investment analysts for a case-by-case decision, based exclusively on the best economic interests of our clients. In exceptional circumstances, we will split our vote and vote differently for individual clients depending on the respective desired investment outcomes of our portfolio managers. JPMAM may occasionally split its vote between different client constituents for technical reasons, such as cross-border mergers where certain groups of clients may not be able to hold the resultant stock, or to reflect differing portfolio strategies and/or investment outcomes.

As a general rule, JPMAM will favour mergers and acquisitions where the proposed acquisition price represents fair value, where shareholders cannot realise greater value through other means and where all shareholders receive fair and equal treatment under the merger/acquisition terms.

8. RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTIONS

Related party transactions (RPTs) are common in a number of jurisdictions. These are transactions between a company and its related parties, and generally come in two forms: one-off transactions, typically asset purchases or disposals, and; recurring transactions occurring during the ordinary course of business, usually in the form of the ongoing sale and purchase of goods and services.

According to the materiality and nature of the transaction, the RPT may need to be disclosed and submitted to a shareholder meeting for approval. Any shareholder who has a material interest in the transaction should abstain from voting on the resolution. If a RPT requires shareholder approval, the company should establish a board committee comprising solely of independent directors, and appoint an independent advisor to prepare a recommendation to minority shareholders.

We will assess one-off transactions on a case by case basis. Where we are convinced by the strategic rationale and the fairness of the transaction terms, we will vote in favour. At the same time, we would expect the independent directors to disclose how they have made their recommendation to minority shareholders, so that shareholders can make an informed decision on this transaction.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

For recurring transactions, we would expect that details are disclosed in the Annual Report, and that they be subject to shareholders' approval on a periodic basis. We would expect all such transactions to have been conducted on an arms-length basis, on normal commercial terms.

9. VOTING RIGHTS

JPMAM believes in the fundamental principle of 'one share, one vote'. Accordingly, we will vote to phase out dual voting rights or classes of share which either confer special voting rights to certain stakeholders, or restricted voting rights and we will oppose attempts to introduce new ones. We are opposed to mechanisms that skew voting rights, such as voting right limits or cumulative voting; directors should represent all shareholders equally and voting power should accrue in direct proportion to the shareholder's equity capital commitment to the company.

Minority shareholders should be protected from abusive actions by, or in the interests of, controlling shareholders, acting either directly or indirectly, and should have effective means of redress. Shareholders should also have the right to formally approve material related-party transactions at Annual General Meetings.

While certain fundamental changes to a company's business, Articles of Association, or share capital should require a supermajority vote, voting on routine business should require a simple majority only (51%). We will generally oppose amendments to require inappropriate supermajority votes, or supermajority requirements which are being introduced as a tool to entrench management.

10. OTHERS

Poison Pills

Poison pills, or shareholder rights plans, are devices designed to defend against hostile takeover. Typically, they give shareholders of a target company or a friendly third party, the right to purchase shares at a substantial discount to market value, or shares with special conversion rights in the event of a pre-defined 'triggering event' occurring (such as an outsider's acquisition of a certain percentage of stock). Corporations may or may not be able to adopt poison pills without shareholder approval, depending on the market.

JPMAM is fundamentally opposed to any artificial barrier to the efficient functioning of markets. The market for corporate control should, ultimately, be for shareholders, not managers, to decide. We find no clear evidence that poison pills enhance shareholder value. Rather, they are used as tools to entrench management.

JPMAM will generally vote against anti-takeover devices and support proposals aimed at revoking existing plans. Where anti-takeover devices exist, they should be fully disclosed to shareholders and shareholders should be given the opportunity to review them periodically.

Composite Resolutions

Agenda items at shareholder meetings should be presented in such a way that they can be voted upon clearly, distinctly and unambiguously. We normally oppose deliberately vague, composite or 'bundled' resolutions, depending on the context and local market practice.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Any amendments to Articles of Association should be presented to shareholders in such a way that they can be voted on independently. Shareholders should similarly be able to vote on the election of directors individually, rather than in bundled slates.

AOB

We will generally vote against 'any other business' resolutions where we cannot determine the exact nature of the business to be voted on.

Social / Environmental Issues

Companies should conduct their business in a manner which recognises their responsibilities to employees and other stakeholders, as well as broader society and the environment. Full details of our sustainability policy are available in Part IV of this document.

JPMAM reviews shareholder proposals concerning social and environmental issues. In normal circumstances, the consideration of social issues in investment decisions is the duty of directors; nevertheless from time to time, a company's response to the circumstances of a particular social or environmental issue may have economic consequences, either directly or indirectly. In these cases, the economic effects are considered as primary when determining our vote.

Where management is proposing changes with a social, environmental or ethical dimension, these proposals should be in line with our Social and Environmental policy. *see Social and Environmental*

Charitable Issues

Charitable donations are generally acceptable, provided they are within reasonable limits and fully disclosed to shareholders.

Political Issues

JPMAM does not support the use of shareholder funds for political donations.

J.P. Morgan Asset Management

London Proxy Committee

January 2019

III. STEWARDSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT

J.P. Morgan Asset Management ('JPMAM') recognises its wider stewardship responsibilities to its clients as a major asset owner. To this end, we support the revised FRC Stewardship Code and the EFAMA Stewardship Code, which set out the responsibilities of institutional shareholders in respect of investee companies. JPMAM endorses these Codes for its UK and European investments, and supports the Principles as best practice elsewhere. We believe that regular engagement with the companies in which we invest is central to our investment process and we also recognise the importance of being an 'active' owner on behalf of our clients. Our approach to the seven Principles of the FRC Code and how we apply them are set out below.

Institutional investors should:

1. Publicly disclose their policy on how they will discharge their stewardship responsibilities.

JPMAM's primary activity in the investment chain is as an asset manager for both institutional and retail clients. Although we manage our equity portfolios using a number of different investment processes, we are predominantly a long-term active investor. Our aim is to produce the best risk-adjusted returns that align with our clients' objectives.

We take a research-driven approach to sustainable investing. Although the precise methodology is tailored to each investment strategy, we believe Environmental, Social and Governance ('ESG') considerations, particularly those related to governance, can play a critical role in long-term investment strategy. As an active investment manager, engagement is an important and ongoing component of our investment process, and we view frequent and direct contact with company management as critically important. When considering investment options, we supplement our proprietary thinking with research from a variety of third-party specialist providers and engage directly with companies on a wide array of ESG issues. Our governance specialists regularly attend scheduled one-on-one company meetings alongside investment analysts to help identify and discuss relevant issues.

JPMAM's investors and corporate governance specialists undertake four broad areas of activity, with the aim of identifying and mitigating ESG risk in our portfolios:

- i). Analysis of the ESG profiles of the companies in which we invest, in order to identify outliers requiring further engagement;
- ii). Engagement with investee companies, in order to understand issues and promote best practice;
- iii). Informed, investor-led proxy voting;
- iv). Reporting to clients

Engagement with companies takes place on a wide range of issues, including strategy, performance, risk, capital structure, and corporate governance issues

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

including strategy, performance, risk, capital structure, and corporate governance issues including board and oversight structures, skills and diversity, culture and remuneration. JPMAM does not outsource any of its engagement activity. Proxy votes are assessed on a case-by-case basis by governance specialists in conjunction with the analyst or portfolio manager where appropriate.

Where a company deviates from the UK Corporate Governance Code (or equivalent overseas codes, where they exist), JPMAM will always give due consideration to the explanation where it is given.

Copies of our Corporate Governance Policy are available on request, or to download from our website:-

<https://am.jpmorgan.com/uk/institutional/corporate-governance>

Although these policies apply primarily to investments in the UK and Europe and therefore principally concern accounts managed from the London office, our offices in New York, Tokyo and Hong Kong have similar guidelines, consistent with local law and best practice in these different jurisdictions. Full details are available on request.

2. **Have a robust policy on managing conflicts of interest in relation to stewardship which should be publicly disclosed.**

As part of our broader Safeguard Policy, JPMAM has established formal barriers designed to restrict the flow of information between JPMC's securities lending, investment banking and other divisions to JPMAM's investment professionals, as well as in order to maintain the integrity and independence of our proxy voting decisions and engagement activity. We have established physical and electronic information barriers which are designed to prevent the exchange or misuse of material, non-public information obtained by various "insider" businesses of JPMC Group. Employees within an "insider" business unit are prohibited from passing on sensitive information to those in an "outside" business unit who cannot access the information. The overarching principle of JPMAM is that it is considered to be a "public area" that invests and trades in securities based upon publicly available market information and, therefore, if any member of JPMAM anywhere in the world is made an "insider", this restricts the firm globally and may not be in the interests of its clients. Occasionally, inside information may be received, for instance, as part of a pre-sounding for a forthcoming issue of securities. In these instances, we will apply our wall-crossing procedures. However, the period for which JPMAM is an insider should be as short as possible.

Before the start of any meeting or conversation we will make clear to brokers and issuers that, if they inadvertently make JPMAM "insiders", it will be detrimental to the ongoing relationship. It is therefore a condition that, where JPMAM is made an insider, the broker (or other person) providing the information should give JPMAM the opportunity to decline before being provided with any such information. Where JPMAM is made "inside", the individual(s) in receipt of such information must contact Compliance immediately. Transactions in the securities of the issuer are prohibited with immediate effect, as well as recommendations of transactions for clients or own personal accounts, and impacted securities are placed on a "Banned List" where trading activity is systematically restricted globally across the JPMAM group. These restrictions are

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

only lifted either once the transaction has been made public, or when confirmation has been received that the information is no longer relevant.

Typical conflicts include where a JPMorgan Affiliate, or another member of the JPMC Group may be involved in a transaction, or have a material interest or relationship with, an investee company, or where JPM personnel sit on portfolio company boards, or where we are casting proxy votes in respect of 'own' funds, or inhouse investment trusts. In these situations, we will seek guidance from our Compliance Department and/or call upon an independent third party to make the voting decision.

The full policy document relating to conflicts of interest is available to download from our website:-

<https://am.jpmorgan.com/uk/institutional/frc-stewardship-code>

3. Monitor their investee companies.

JPMAM has over 1,200 investment professionals, including over 200 career analysts, tasked with monitoring and engaging with companies and constructing our clients' portfolios. They are supported by teams of corporate governance specialists, located in the 'front office' in order to better interact with investors regarding governance and stewardship issues. Within equities, this currently comprises three professionals in London, two in New York, and two in Asia. We have also nominated ESG co-ordinators and points of contact within other asset classes, including our fixed income and global real assets divisions. We undertake several thousand company visits and one-to-one meetings each year, as well as several hundred meetings specifically to discuss ESG issues.

In London, the team maintains a proprietary database containing detailed governance models for over 700 Pan-European companies, including all FTSE100 and selected FTSE250 and other companies, which evolve over time as we engage with companies and understand issues.

These models are updated regularly, and notes of engagements with companies are retained in order to form a clear audit trail. The corporate governance team also has full access to our main Research Notes database, and publishes notes and company profiles where appropriate which are available to all of our investment professionals. For analyst-driven investment processes in London, these models are used to generate proprietary ESG rankings and ratings, which are incorporated into analysts' models and stock rankings.

Where JPMAM deems it appropriate, we will enter into active dialogue with companies, except to the extent that we may risk becoming insiders or coming into receipt of material, non-public information, which may preclude us from dealing in the shares of the company concerned (although appropriate wall-crossing procedures do exist, if deemed in the best interests of our clients).

Where appropriate, JPMAM will attend key AGMs where we have a major holding, although it should be noted that JPMAM votes at nearly 8,000 shareholder meetings a year in 80 markets worldwide and, clearly, this is not practicable except in very exceptional circumstances.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

4. Establish clear guidelines on when and how they will escalate their stewardship activities.

JPMAM has established clear guidelines on how we escalate our engagement activities in order to protect our clients' interests. We meet routinely with the senior executives of our investee companies at least annually; in the event that we are not satisfied with either their responsiveness or strategy, we may seek to meet with the chairman or other independent director(s), or express our concerns through the company's advisers. Where appropriate, we will hold joint engagement meetings with other investors who share our concerns. We may also use our proxy votes in order to try and bring about management change. In extremis, we will consider submitting a shareholder resolution, or requisitioning an EGM in order to bring about change, or to protect our clients' interests. We also reserve the right to sell out of a stock completely if the company is unresponsive, if we feel that is in the best interests of our clients.

Decisions to escalate will always be made on a case-by-case basis, in conjunction with the analyst and/or portfolio manager, taking into account the materiality of risk in our view, combined with the direction of travel on the issue as a result of our engagement.

Catalysts for further engagement can include escalating concerns over management failure in relation to strategy, or a lack of responsiveness in relation to succession planning or board composition, typically where we feel boards are not sufficiently independent, or do not have the right diversity of skills, background and experience.

Material concerns over executive compensation can also be a trigger for escalation, especially where issues persist over more than a year, or where we have been involved in a pay consultation, and our concerns have been ignored. Other triggering events can include a company being added to an alert list by one of our specialist third-party providers, for example where a company is subject to legal fines or censure, or allegations of bribery and corruption, or where a pollution event, or other environmental issue arises.

5. Be willing to act collectively with other investors where appropriate.

Subject to applicable laws and regulations in the relevant jurisdictions, JPMAM frequently works with other investors in collective engagement exercises with companies where appropriate (for example under the auspices of the UK Investor Forum and other formal and informal bodies), in order to enhance the effectiveness of our engagement. Circumstances where such collective engagement takes place include board succession planning, remuneration and AGM-related issues, as well as broader strategy issues. The named contact for this purpose is available on the Stewardship page of our website.

6. Have a clear policy on voting and disclosure of voting activity.

JPMAM manages the voting rights of the shares entrusted to it as it would manage any other asset. It is the policy of JPMAM to vote shares held in its clients' portfolios in a prudent and diligent manner, based on our reasonable

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

judgment of what will best serve the long-term interests of our clients. So far as is practicable we will vote at all of the meetings called by companies in which we are invested. We treat every proxy on a case-by-case basis, voting for or against each resolution, or actively withholding our vote as appropriate.

JPMAM votes at nearly 8,000 shareholder meetings each year, in more than 80 markets worldwide. We endeavour to vote in all markets, wherever possible, unless there are certain technical reasons in overseas markets which preclude us from voting, such as share-blocking or power of attorney requirements, or unless there is a conflict of interest, in which case we may be advised not to vote by our Compliance Department. Votes are investor-led and made on a case-by-case basis, and we do not always support the board. The investment analyst or portfolio manager always has discretion to override the policy should individual circumstances dictate.

We have comprehensive proxy voting policies in each region, covering the United States, the UK & Europe, and Asia Pacific & Emerging Markets, consistent with law and best practice in these different locations. As standards of corporate governance vary widely in overseas markets, we have adopted a principles-based, rather than rules-based approach to voting in international markets, based on local corporate governance codes (where they exist) and internationally recognised standards, such as OECD Guidelines and the guidance of the International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN).

Our voting policy as it relates to UK companies is based on the revised UK Corporate Governance Code. Any company complying with its provisions can usually expect JPMAM to support its corporate governance policies. We are also a member of the UK Investment Association (IA), and take their principles and guidance into account when implementing our policy. If a company chooses to deviate from the provisions of the Code, we will give the explanations due consideration and take them into account as appropriate, based on our overall assessment of the standards of corporate governance evidenced at the company.

JPMAM retains the services of the ISS voting agency, although its analyses form only the 'base case' voting recommendation and we will frequently take a differing view, based on the results of our engagement activity or our own insights. We also retain the services of MSCI and ISS-Ethix to assist us with weapons screening and certain social and environmental issues for interested clients.

A decision to vote against can be triggered by a recommendation from our service providers, or concerns from the analyst or portfolio manager, or where a company has been identified as an outlier or lagging its peers, or has been unresponsive in our request to engage. A decision to vote against management or abstain, or to override the recommendations of our voting agent or our proxy voting policy, is always documented, along with a rationale for that decision. Except where a holding is *de minimis*, we endeavour to inform the company of our decision in advance, in order to give them the opportunity to discuss the issues with us prior to voting.

Overall responsibility for the formulation of voting policy rests with the Proxy Committee, whose role is to review JPMAM's corporate governance policy and practice in respect of investee companies, and to provide an escalation point for voting and corporate governance issues. The Committee is composed of senior analysts, portfolio managers and corporate governance specialists and can call upon members of legal and compliance, or other specialists, as appropriate.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

There are equivalent Committees in each region which report, in turn, to our Global Head of Equities.

JPMAM has disclosed its proxy voting and engagement activity to its clients for many years. We also disclose selected voting highlights and engagement activity, as well as our detailed voting record, publicly on our website. These can be viewed by following the link:-

<https://am.jpmorgan.com/uk/institutional/frc-stewardship-code>

JPMAM and its clients may participate in stocklending programmes. It is not the policy of JPMAM to recall stock on loan for routine votes, where the revenue from lending activities is deemed to be of more value to the client than the ability to vote. However, we will recall stock on loan in exceptional circumstances, in order to protect our clients' interests in the event of a particularly important or close vote. It should be noted that some of our clients participate in third-party lending arrangements directly with their custodians, which may be invisible to JPMAM.

7. Report periodically on their stewardship and voting activities.

JPMAM maintains a clear record of its proxy voting and engagement activity. We also produce detailed quarterly voting and engagement activity reports for our clients, and publish summary information on our public website. These reports provide qualitative as well as quantitative information, including commentary on our activities in relation to proxy voting, engagement, market developments and social and environmental issues.

The proxy voting function is independently verified by our external auditor as part of the ISAE 3402 review, and oversight of our broader engagement process is also verified in accordance with AAF 01/06 as part of the monitoring stipulated by our UK investment trusts.

JPMAM believes that public disclosure of certain ongoing engagement with companies would be prejudicial to that engagement activity and would not be in the best interests of our clients. In these circumstances, we may decide not to disclose that activity publicly, or refrain from reporting until after the event.

The Proxy Committee has agreed to review this approach periodically, in accordance with the Principles. Finally, it should be pointed out that this statement is intended as an overview only. Specific issues should always be directed to your account administrator or portfolio manager, or the J.P. Morgan Corporate Governance Team.

Our Statement of Compliance with the UK Stewardship Code can be viewed here:

<https://am.jpmorgan.com/uk/institutional/frc-stewardship-code>

Or follow the link to the FRC website:

<https://www.frc.org.uk/Our-Work/Codes-Standards/Corporate-governance/UK-Stewardship-Code/UK-Stewardship-Code-statements.aspx>

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

IV. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL

Clients entrust us to manage their portfolios and rely on our deep knowledge of markets, industries and companies. Our investment professionals engage with company management on an ongoing basis to evaluate the drivers of performance, which often include relevant ESG factors. We strive to integrate ESG factors across our investment platforms and increase the transparency around this to our clients. Through our global expertise and industry access, we identify key sustainable investing trends and share best-in-class capabilities from investment approaches to measurement.

JPMAM believes that companies should act in a socially responsible manner. They should conduct their business in a way which recognises their responsibilities to employees and other stakeholders in the long-term, as well as broader society and the environment.

We have adopted a positive engagement approach to social, environmental and sustainability issues. Thus, specific assets or types of assets are not excluded from portfolios explicitly on social, environmental or ethical criteria (unless specifically requested by clients, or required by local legislation). Rather, analysts take such issues into account as part of the mainstream analytical and stock selection process.

Although JPMAM's priority at all times is the best economic interests of its clients, we recognise that, increasingly, non-financial issues such as social and environmental factors have the potential to impact the share price, as well as the reputation of companies. Specialists within the ESG Team are tasked with assessing how companies deal with and report on social and environmental risks and issues specific to their sectors and/or industry. This analysis is then used to identify outliers within our investee companies which require further engagement. Engagement will either take place at scheduled company one-to-one meetings, or at dedicated meetings with non-executive directors, or Corporate Social Responsibility ('CSR') specialists (where they exist), or via the company's broker. Our engagement activity is reported to clients on a quarterly basis.

Where social or environmental issues are the subject of a proxy vote, JPMAM will consider the issue on a case-by-case basis, keeping in mind the best economic interests of our clients. Increasingly, shareholder proposals are being used by activist groups to target companies as a means of promoting single-issue agendas. In these instances, it is important to differentiate between constructive resolutions, intended to bring about genuine social or environmental improvement, and hostile proposals intended to limit management power, which may in fact ultimately destroy shareholder value.

In formulating our policy, we have endeavoured not to discriminate against individual companies or sectors purely on the grounds of the particular business sector in which they are involved. Thus a tobacco company or a company in an extractive industry will not be automatically marked down because their sector is perceived as 'unfriendly'.

We expect major listed companies in particular to have established a CSR Committee or similar body with responsibility for this area. Such a function should have direct access to the board and, ideally, there should be a designated main board director responsible for these issues. We would normally expect companies to publish a separate CSR Report, or to provide a CSR statement within their Annual Report, or on their website.

Controversial Weapons

The only exception to this approach is where investment in a particular sector or activity is prohibited by clients or by local legislation. Investment in landmines, cluster munitions and depleted uranium armour and ammunition (so-called 'controversial weapons') is

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

prohibited in certain European jurisdictions and, as a result, these names are excluded from our fund range. Full details are available on request.

Climate Change and Carbon Disclosure

Scientific research finds that an increasing concentration of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere is warming the planet, posing significant risks to the prosperity and growth of the global economy. In meeting our clients' needs, we consider a variety of global market risks and investment objectives, including a wide range of environmental risks and impacts they may pose to long-term portfolio returns. We recognize that climate change may create investment risk and opportunity across the various entities in which we invest on behalf of our clients, and companies that fail to manage these risks may subject shareholders to losses. To this end, we now have the capability to calculate the carbon footprint of individual equity portfolios, in order to assist portfolio managers and respond to client questions on carbon emissions.

Climate policy risk has gained focus more recently as climate change-related laws and regulations emerge globally. For further details on our approach to these issues, please see our Investment Perspective on Climate Risk document, copies of which are available to download on our public website.

Principles of Responsible Investment

J.P. Morgan Asset Management is a signatory to the United Nations-supported Principles of Responsible Investment ('PRI'), which commits participants to six Principles, with the aim of incorporating ESG criteria into their processes when making stock selection decisions and promoting ESG disclosure. The Principles and how we deal with them are set out below:

1. Incorporate ESG into investment analysis and decision-making

JPMAM has a dedicated ESG team in London, located in the 'front office' in order to better advise analysts and portfolio managers regarding ESG issues. The ESG Team routinely benchmarks companies in our investment universe versus our Guidelines in order to identify outliers. This then drives our proxy voting and engagement activity. This engagement is ongoing and does not only occur at the time of an AGM. Fund managers in each region take non-financial issues into account as part of the investment process where they have the potential to impact the valuation. For investment processes managed in London, our proprietary ESG scores are incorporated into analysts' ratings and stock rankings.

2. Be active owners and incorporate ESG into ownership policies and practices

Investment managers in all locations undertake regular contact with senior managers of investee companies to discuss issues and promote the interests of our clients. Investment professionals in all locations also have access to specialist ESG data and resources, in order to assist them in their investment decisions. JPMAM also votes at nearly 8,000 AGMs in over 80 markets worldwide. Votes are investor-led and made on a case-by-case basis. There are ESG policy documents available for each region, as well as a Global Policy, all of which are updated at least annually.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

3. Seek appropriate ESG disclosure in investee companies

JPMAM participates in a number of initiatives aimed at improving transparency and disclosure at investee companies, as well as stock exchanges, regulators and other bodies worldwide. As investors, we continually scrutinise companies' Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility reports and encourage appropriate levels of disclosure.

4. Promote the Principles

JPMAM works both independently and with trade associations and other industry bodies, as well as other formal and informal networks, to promote the Principles within the industry.

5. Work together to enhance effectiveness

We also participate in joint investor networks such as ICGN, as well as engagement activity under the auspices of various local trade bodies, in order to enhance our effectiveness. Where appropriate, we also work with our competitors in collective engagement exercises with companies on ESG issues.

6. Report our activities

JPMAM produces detailed quarterly ESG activity reports for all of its clients, and also publishes summary information on its public website.

Partnerships and Affiliations

JPMAM is also a member of, or participant in, a number of industry initiatives in the Social and Environmental space. For further information, see the dedicated ESG page on our website, where you can download additional material on issues, including our approach to climate change:

www.jpmorgan.com/esg

For more details of the policies of our parent JPMorgan Chase & Co, please visit their dedicated ESG page by following the link:-

www.jpmorganchase.com/corporate/About-JPMC/esg

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Produced by:

Robert G Hardy

Managing Director

Head of Corporate Governance

+44 20 7742 5736

robert.g.hardy@jpmorgan.com

Version 21.00

Published January 2019

For Investment Professional use only – not for retail use or distribution

This document has been produced for information purposes only and as such the views contained herein are not to be taken as an advice or recommendation to buy or sell any investment or interest thereto. Reliance upon information in this material is at the sole discretion of the reader. Any research in this document has been obtained and may have been acted upon by J.P. Morgan Asset Management for its own purpose. The results of such research are being made available as additional information and do not necessarily reflect the views of J.P.Morgan Asset Management. Any forecasts, figures, opinions, statements of financial market trends or investment techniques and strategies expressed are unless otherwise stated, J.P. Morgan Asset Management's own at the date of this document. They are considered to be reliable at the time of writing, may not necessarily be all-inclusive and are not guaranteed as to accuracy. They may be subject to change without reference or notification to you. Both past performance and yield may not be a reliable guide to future performance and you should be aware that the value of securities and any income arising from them may fluctuate in accordance with market conditions. There is no guarantee that any forecast made will come to pass.

J.P. Morgan Asset Management is the brand name for the asset management business of JPMorgan Chase & Co and its affiliates worldwide. You should note that if you contact J.P. Morgan Asset Management by telephone those lines may be recorded and monitored for legal, security and training purposes. You should also take note that information and data from communications with you will be collected, stored and processed by J.P. Morgan Asset Management in accordance with the EMEA Privacy Policy which can be accessed through the following website <http://www.jpmorgan.com/pages/privacy>.

Issued in Continental Europe by JPMorgan Asset Management (Europe) Société à responsabilité limitée, European Bank & Business Centre, 6 route de Trèves, L-2633 Senningerberg, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, R.C.S. Luxembourg B27900, corporate capital EUR 10.000.000.

Issued in the UK by JPMorgan Asset Management (UK) Limited which is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Registered in England No. 01161446. Registered address: 25 Bank St, Canary Wharf, London E14 5JP, United Kingdom.