

Global Proxy Voting Procedures and Guidelines

**North America, Europe, Middle
East, Africa, Central America,
South America, and Asia**

April 1, 2018

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Contents

I.	JPMorgan Asset Management Global Proxy Voting Procedures	3
A.	Objective	3
B.	Proxy Committee	3
C.	The Proxy Voting Process	3
D.	Material Conflicts of Interest	5
E.	Escalation of Material Conflicts of Interest	6
F.	Recordkeeping	6
II.	Proxy Voting Guidelines	8
A.	North America	9
1.	Board of Directors	10
2.	Proxy Contests	11
3.	Ratification of Auditors	12
4.	Proxy Contest Defenses	12
5.	Tender Offer Defenses	14
6.	Miscellaneous Board Provisions	15
7.	Miscellaneous Governance Provisions	17
8.	Capital Structure	18
9.	Executive and Director Compensation	19
10.	Incorporation	22
11.	Mergers and Corporate Restructurings	22
12.	Social and Environmental Issues	23
13.	Foreign Proxies	25
14.	Pre-Solicitation Contact	25
B.	Europe, Middle East, Africa, Central America and South America	27
C.	Asia ex Japan	52
D.	Japan	69

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

I. JPMorgan Asset Management Global Proxy Voting Procedures

A. Objective

As an investment adviser within JPMorgan Asset Management, each of the entities listed on Exhibit A attached hereto (each referred to individually as a “JPMAM Entity” and collectively as “JPMAM”) may be granted by its clients the authority to vote the proxies of the securities held in client portfolios. In such cases, JPMAM’s objective is to vote proxies in the best interests of its clients. To further that objective, JPMAM adopted these Procedures.

These Procedures incorporate detailed guidelines for voting proxies on specific types of issues (the “Guidelines”). The Guidelines have been developed and approved by the relevant Proxy Committee (as defined below) with the objective of encouraging corporate action that enhances shareholder value. Because proxy proposals and individual company facts and circumstances may vary, JPMAM may not always vote proxies in accordance with the Guidelines.

B. Proxy Committee

To oversee the proxy-voting process on an ongoing basis, a Proxy Committee has been established for each global location where proxy-voting decisions are made. Each Proxy Committee is composed of a Proxy Administrator (as defined below) and senior officers from among the Investment, Legal, Compliance and Risk Management Departments. The primary functions of each Proxy Committee are to periodically review general proxy-voting matters; to determine the independence of any third-party vendor which it has delegated proxy voting responsibilities and to conclude that there are no conflicts of interest that would prevent such vendor from providing such proxy voting services prior to delegating proxy responsibilities; review and approve the Guidelines annually; and provide advice and recommendations on general proxy-voting matters as well as on specific voting issues to be implemented by the relevant JPMAM Entity. The Proxy Committee may delegate certain of its responsibilities to subgroups composed of at least 3 Proxy Committee members. The Proxy Committee meets at least semi-annually, or more frequently as circumstances dictate.

C. The Proxy Voting Process

JPMAM investment professionals monitor the corporate actions of the companies held in their clients’ portfolios. To assist JPMAM investment professionals with public companies’ proxy voting proposals, a JPMAM Entity may, but shall not be obligated to, retain the services of an independent proxy voting service (“Independent Voting Service”). The Independent Voting Service is assigned responsibility for various functions, which may include one or more of the following: coordinating with client custodians to ensure that all proxy materials are processed in a timely fashion; providing JPMAM with a comprehensive analysis of each proxy proposal and providing JPMAM with

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

recommendations on how to vote each proxy proposal based on the Guidelines or, where no Guideline exists or where the Guidelines require a case-by-case analysis, on the Independent Voting Service's analysis; and executing the voting of the proxies in accordance with Guidelines and its recommendation, except when a recommendation is overridden by JPMAM, as described below. If those functions are not assigned to an Independent Voting Service, they are performed or coordinated by a Proxy Administrator (as defined below). The Proxy Voting Committee has adopted procedures to identify significant proxies and to recall shares on loan.¹

Situations often arise in which more than one JPMAM client invests in the same company or in which a single client may invest in the same company but in multiple accounts. In those situations, two or more clients, or one client with different accounts, may be invested in strategies having different investment objectives, investment styles, or portfolio managers. As a result, JPMAM may cast different votes on behalf of different clients or on behalf of the same client with different accounts.

Each JPMAM Entity appoints a JPMAM professional to act as a proxy administrator ("Proxy Administrator") for each global location of such entity where proxy-voting decisions are made. The Proxy Administrators are charged with oversight of these Procedures and the entire proxy-voting process. Their duties, in the event an Independent Voting Service is retained, include the following: evaluating the quality of services provided by the Independent Voting Service; escalating proposals identified by the Independent Voting Service as non-routine, but for which a Guideline exists (including, but not limited to, compensation plans, anti-takeover proposals, reincorporation, mergers, acquisitions and proxy-voting contests) to the attention of the appropriate investment professionals and confirming the Independent Voting Service's recommendation with the appropriate JPMAM investment professional (documentation of those confirmations will be retained by the appropriate Proxy Administrator); escalating proposals identified by the Independent Voting Service as not being covered by the Guidelines (including proposals requiring a case-by-case determination under the Guidelines) to the appropriate investment professional and obtaining a recommendation with respect thereto; reviewing recommendations of JPMAM investment professionals with respect to proposals not covered by the Guidelines (including proposals requiring a case-by-case determination under the Guidelines) or to override the Guidelines (collectively, "Overrides"); referring investment considerations regarding Overrides to the Proxy Committee, if necessary; determining, in the case of Overrides, whether a material conflict, as described below, exists; escalating material conflicts to the Proxy Committee; and maintaining the records required by these Procedures.

¹ The Proxy Voting Committee may determine: (a) not to recall securities on loan if, in its judgment, the negative consequences to clients of recalling the loaned securities would outweigh the benefits of voting in the particular instance or (b) not to vote certain foreign securities positions if, in its judgment, the expense and administrative inconvenience or other burdens outweigh the benefits to clients of voting the securities.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

In the event investment professionals are charged with recommending how to vote the proxies, the Proxy Administrator's duties include the following: reviewing recommendations of investment professionals with respect to Overrides; referring investment considerations regarding such Overrides to the Proxy Committee, if necessary; determining, in the case of such Overrides, whether a material conflict, as described below, exists; escalating material conflicts to the Proxy Committee; and maintaining the records required by these Procedures.

In the event a JPMAM investment professional makes a recommendation in connection with an Override, the investment professional must provide the appropriate Proxy Administrator with a written certification ("Certification") which shall contain an analysis supporting his or her recommendation and a certification that he or she (A) received no communication in regard to the proxy that would violate either the J.P. Morgan Chase ("JPMC") Safeguard Policy (as defined below) or written policy on information barriers, or received any communication in connection with the proxy solicitation or otherwise that would suggest the existence of an actual or potential conflict between JPMAM'S interests and that of its clients and (B) was not aware of any personal or other relationship that could present an actual or potential conflict of interest with the clients' interests.

For certain commingled funds that are index replication portfolios, JPMAM is permitted in certain instances to delegate its proxy voting authority in whole or in part to the Independent Voting Service. This delegation may occur where JPMAM is restricted under applicable laws from voting a particular security or to permit JPMAM to utilize exemptions applicable to positions in bank or bank holding company stocks held in such funds. Additionally, where securities are held only in certain passive index tracking portfolios and not owned in our active accounts, the proxy may be voted in accordance with the Independent Voting Service's recommendation if JPMAM's guidelines require case by case determination. For separate accounts utilizing the Global Bank Opportunities strategy, JPMAM will delegate its proxy voting to the Independent Voting Service.

D. Material Conflicts of Interest

The U.S. Investment Advisers Act of 1940 requires that the proxy-voting procedures adopted and implemented by a U.S. investment adviser include procedures that address material conflicts of interest that may arise between the investment adviser's interests and those of its clients. To address such material potential conflicts of interest, JPMAM relies on certain policies and procedures. In order to maintain the integrity and independence of JPMAM's investment processes and decisions, including proxy-voting decisions, and to protect JPMAM's decisions from influences that could lead to a vote other than in its clients' best interests, JPMC (including JPMAM) adopted a Safeguard Policy, and established formal informational barriers designed to restrict the flow of information from JPMC's securities, lending, investment banking and other divisions to JPMAM investment

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

professionals. The information barriers include, where appropriate: computer firewalls; the establishment of separate legal entities; and the physical separation of employees from separate business divisions. Material conflicts of interest are further avoided by voting in accordance with JPMAM's predetermined Guidelines. When an Override occurs, any potential material conflict of interest that may exist is analyzed in the process outlined in these Procedures.

Examples of such material conflicts of interest that could arise include circumstances in which: (i) management of a JPMAM investment management client or prospective client, distributor or prospective distributor of its investment management products, or critical vendor, is soliciting proxies and failure to vote in favor of management may harm JPMAM's relationship with such company and materially impact JPMAM's business; or (ii) a personal relationship between a JPMAM officer and management of a company or other proponent of a proxy proposal could impact JPMAM's voting decision.

A conflict is deemed to exist when the proxy is for JPMorgan Chase & Co. stock or for J.P. Morgan Funds, or when the proxy administrator has actual knowledge indicating that a JPMorgan affiliate is an investment banker or rendered a fairness opinion with respect to the matter that is the subject of the proxy vote. When such conflicts are identified, the proxy will be voted by an independent third party either in accordance with JPMorgan proxy voting guidelines or by the third party using its own guidelines.

E. Escalation of Material Conflicts of Interest

When an Override occurs, the investment professional must complete the Certification and the Proxy Administrator will review the circumstances surrounding such Certification. When a potential material conflict of interest has been identified, the Proxy Administrator, and as necessary, a legal representative from the Proxy Committee will evaluate the potential conflict and determine whether an actual material conflict of interest exists, and if so, will recommend how the relevant JPMAM entity will vote the proxy. Sales and marketing professionals will be precluded from participating in the decision-making process.

Depending upon the nature of the material conflict of interest, JPMAM, in the course of addressing the material conflict, may elect to take one or more of the following measures, or other appropriate action: removing certain JPMAM personnel from the proxy voting process; "walling off" personnel with knowledge of the material conflict to ensure that such personnel do not influence the relevant proxy vote; voting in accordance with the applicable Guidelines, if any, if the application of the Guidelines would objectively result in the casting of a proxy vote in a predetermined manner; or deferring the vote to the Independent Voting Service, if any, which will vote in accordance with its own recommendation.

The resolution of all potential and actual material conflict issues will be documented in order to demonstrate that JPMAM acted in the best interests of its clients.

F. Recordkeeping

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

JPMAM is required to maintain in an easily accessible place for seven (7) years all records relating to the proxy voting process. Those records include the following:

- a copy of the JPMAM Proxy Voting Procedures and Guidelines;
- a copy of each proxy statement received on behalf of JPMAM clients;
- a record of each vote cast on behalf of JPMAM client holdings;
- a copy of all documents created by JPMAM personnel that were material to making a decision on the voting of client securities or that memorialize the basis of the decision;
- a copy of the documentation of all dialogue with issuers and JPMAM personnel created by JPMAM personnel prior to the voting of client securities; and
- a copy of each written request by a client for information on how JPMAM voted proxies on behalf of the client, as well as a copy of any written response by JPMAM to any request by a JPMAM client for information on how JPMAM voted proxies on behalf of our client.

It should be noted that JPMAM reserves the right to use the services of the Independent Voting Service to maintain certain required records in accordance with all applicable regulations.

Exhibit A

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

J.P. Morgan Asset Management (UK) Limited

J.P. Morgan Investment Management Inc.

JF Asset Management Limited

J.P. Morgan Asset Management (Singapore) Limited

JF International Management Inc.

J.P. Morgan Private Investments, Inc.

Bear Stearns Asset Management

II. Proxy Voting Guidelines

JPMAM is a global asset management organization with the capabilities to invest in securities of issuers located around the globe. Because the regulatory framework and the business cultures and practices vary from region to region, our proxy voting guidelines have been customized for each region to take into account such variations.

JPMAM currently has four sets of proxy voting guidelines covering the regions of (1) North America, (2) Europe, Middle East, Africa, Central America and South America (3) Asia (ex-Japan) and (4) Japan, respectively. Notwithstanding the variations among the guidelines, all of these guidelines have been designed with the uniform objective of encouraging corporate action that enhances shareholder value. As a general rule, in voting proxies of a particular security, each JPMAM Entity will apply the guidelines of the region in which the issuer of such security is organized.

In March 2007, JPMAM signed the Principles for Responsible Investment, an initiative of the UN Secretary-General.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

A. North America

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

1. Board of Directors

A. Uncontested Director Elections

Votes on director nominees should be made on a case-by-case (for) basis. Votes generally will be WITHHELD from directors who:

- 1) attend less than 75 percent of the board and committee meetings without a valid excuse for the absences
- 2) adopt or renew a poison pill without shareholder approval, does not commit to putting it to shareholder vote within 12 months of adoption (or in the case of an newly public company, do not commit to put the pill to a shareholder vote within 12 months following the IPO), or reneges on a commitment to put the pill to a vote, and has not yet received a withhold recommendation for this issue.
- 3) are inside or affiliated outside directors and sit on the audit, compensation, or nominating committees. For purposes of defining "affiliation" we will apply either the NYSE listing rule for companies listed on that exchange or the NASDAQ listing rule for all other companies.
- 4) ignore a shareholder proposal that is approved by a i) majority of the shares outstanding, or ii) majority of the votes cast. The review period will be the vote results over a consecutive two year time frame.
- 5) are inside or affiliated outside directors and the full board serves as the audit, compensation, or nominating committee or the company does not have one of these committees
- 6) WITHHOLD votes from insiders and affiliated outsiders on boards that are not at least majority independent. In the case of a controlled company, vote case-by case on the directors.
- 7) WITHHOLD from directors who are CEOs of publicly-traded companies who serve on more than two public boards (besides his or her own board) and all other directors who serve on more than four public company boards.
- 8) WITHHOLD votes from compensation committee members where there is a pay-for performance disconnect for Russell 3000 companies. (See 9a – Stock-Based Incentive Plans, last paragraph). WITHHOLD votes from compensation committee members if the company does not submit one-time transferable stock options to shareholders for approval.
- 9) WITHHOLD votes from audit committee members in circumstances in which there is evidence (such as audit reports or reports mandated under the Sarbanes Oxley Act) that there exists material weaknesses in the company's internal controls.
- 10) WITHHOLD votes from compensation committee members who were present at the time of the grant of backdated options or options the pricing or

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

the timing of which we believe may have been manipulated to provide additional benefits to executives.

- 11) WITHHOLD votes from directors when there is a demonstrated history of poor performance or inadequate risk oversight.
- 12) WITHHOLD votes from directors and/or committee members when the board adopts changes to the company's by-laws or charter without shareholder approval if the changes materially diminish shareholder rights.
- 13) for newly public companies, vote case-by-case on directors as we believe the company should have the appropriate time frame to mature and better its governance structure and practices.

B. CEO Votes

Except as otherwise described above, we generally do not vote against a sitting CEO in recognition of the impact the vote may have on the management of the company.

C. Proxy Access

Generally vote for shareholder proposals requesting companies to amend their by-laws in order to facilitate shareholders' ability to nominate candidates for directors as long as the minimum threshold of share ownership is 5% (defined as either a single shareholder or group of shareholders) and the minimum holding period of share ownership is 3 years. Generally, we will oppose proposals which restrict share ownership thresholds to a single shareholder.

We recognize the importance of shareholder access to the ballot process as one means to ensure that boards do not become self-perpetuating and self-serving. We generally support the board when they have adopted proxy access at a 3% / 3 year threshold either through a majority supported shareholder ballot or by adopting the bylaw on its own initiative. However, we are also aware that some proposals may promote certain interest groups to the detriment of shareholders generally and could be disruptive to the nomination process. Hence, we will generally vote against shareholder proposals which seek to amend an existing proxy access by law unless the terms of the proxy access right is unduly restrictive to shareholders.

2. Proxy Contests

A. Election of Directors

Votes in a contested election of directors must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, considering

the following factors: long-term financial performance of the subject company relative to its industry; management's track record; background to the proxy contest; qualifications of director nominees (both slates); evaluation of what each side is offering shareholders as well as the likelihood that the proposed objectives and goals can be met; and stock ownership positions.

B. Reimburse Proxy Solicitation Expenses

Decisions to provide full reimbursement for dissidents waging a proxy contest should be made on a case-by-case basis.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

3. Ratification of Auditors

Vote for proposals to ratify auditors, unless an auditor has a financial interest in or association with the company, and is therefore not independent; or there is reason to believe that the independent auditor has rendered an opinion that is neither accurate nor indicative of the company's financial position.

Generally vote against auditor ratification and withhold votes from Audit Committee members if non-audit fees exceed audit fees.

Vote case-by-case on auditor Rotation Proposals: tenure of Audit Firm; establishment and disclosure of a renewal process whereby the auditor is regularly evaluated for both audit quality and competitive price; length of the rotation period advocated in the proposal; significant audit related issues; and number of annual Audit Committee meetings held and the number of financial experts that serve on the Audit Committee.

Generally vote against auditor indemnification and limitation of liability; however we recognize there may be situations where indemnification and limitations on liability may be appropriate.

4. Proxy Contest Defenses

A. Board Structure: Staggered vs. Annual Elections

Proposals regarding classified boards will be voted on a case-by-case basis. Classified boards normally will be supported if the company's governing documents contain each of the following provisions:

- Majority of board composed of independent directors,
- Nominating committee composed solely of independent directors,
- Do not require more than a two-thirds shareholders' vote to remove a director, revise any bylaw or revise any classified board provision,
- Confidential voting (however, there may be a provision for suspending confidential voting during proxy contests),
- Ability of shareholders to call special meeting or to act by written consent with 90 days' notice,
- Absence of superior voting rights for one or more classes of stock,
- Board does not have the sole right to change the size of the board beyond a stated range that been approved by shareholders, and
- Absence of shareholder rights plan that can only be removed by the incumbent directors (dead-hand poison pill).

B. Shareholder Ability to Remove Directors

Vote against proposals that provide that directors may be removed only for cause.

Vote for proposals to restore shareholder ability to remove directors with or without cause.

Vote against proposals that provide that only continuing directors may elect replacements to fill board vacancies.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Vote for proposals that permit shareholders to elect directors to fill board vacancies.

C. Cumulative Voting

Cumulative voting proposals will be voted on a case-by-case basis. If there are other safeguards to ensure that shareholders have reasonable access and input into the process of nominating and electing directors, cumulative voting is not essential.

Generally, a company's governing documents must contain the following provisions for us to vote against restoring or providing for cumulative voting:

- Annually elected board,
- Majority of board composed of independent directors,
- Nominating committee composed solely of independent directors,
- Confidential voting (however, there may be a provision for suspending confidential voting during proxy contests),
- Ability of shareholders to call special meeting or to act by written consent with 90 days' notice,
- Absence of superior voting rights for one or more classes of stock,
- Board does not have the sole right to change the size of the board beyond a stated range that has been approved by shareholders, and
- Absence of shareholder rights plan that can only be removed by the incumbent directors (dead-hand poison pill).

D. Shareholder Ability to Call Special Meeting

Vote against proposals to restrict or prohibit shareholder ability to call special meetings so long as the ability to call special meetings requires the affirmative vote of less than 15% of the shares outstanding. The ability to call special meetings enables shareholders to remove directors or initiate a shareholder resolution without having to wait for the next scheduled meeting, should require more than a *de minimis* number of shares to call the meeting and subject the company to the expense of a shareholder meeting.

Vote for proposals that remove restrictions on the right of shareholders to act independently of management.

E. Shareholder Ability to Act by Written Consent

We generally vote for proposals to restrict or prohibit shareholder ability to take action by written consent. The requirement that all shareholders be given notice of a shareholders' meeting and matters to be discussed therein seems to provide a reasonable protection of minority shareholder rights.

We generally vote against proposals to allow or facilitate shareholder action by written consent.

F. Shareholder Ability to Alter the Size of the Board

Vote for proposals that seek to fix the size of the board.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Vote against proposals that give management the ability to alter the size of the board without shareholder approval.

5. Tender Offer Defenses

A. Poison Pills

Vote for shareholder proposals that ask a company to submit its poison pill for shareholder ratification.

Review on a case-by-case basis shareholder proposals to redeem a company's poison pill.

Studies indicate that companies with a rights plan secure higher premiums in hostile takeover situations.

Review on a case-by-case basis management proposals to ratify a poison pill. We generally look for shareholder friendly features including a two- to three-year sunset provision, a permitted bid provision, a 20 percent or higher flip-in provision, and the absence of dead-hand features.

If the board refuses to redeem the pill 90 days after an offer is announced, ten percent of the shares may call a special meeting or seek a written consent to vote on rescinding the pill.

B. Fair Price Provisions

Vote proposals to adopt fair price provisions on a case-by-case basis, evaluating factors such as the vote required to approve the proposed acquisition, the vote required to repeal the fair price provision, and the mechanism for determining the fair price.

Generally, vote against fair price provisions with shareholder vote requirements greater than a majority of disinterested shares.

C. Greenmail

Vote for proposals to adopt antigreenmail charter or bylaw amendments or otherwise restrict a company's ability to make greenmail payments.

D. Unequal Voting Rights

Generally, vote against dual-class recapitalizations as they offer an effective way for a firm to thwart hostile takeovers by concentrating voting power in the hands of management or other insiders.

Vote for dual-class recapitalizations when the structure is designed to protect economic interests of investors.

E. Supermajority Shareholder Vote Requirement to Amend Charter or Bylaws

Vote against management proposals to require a supermajority shareholder vote to approve charter and bylaw amendments. Supermajority provisions violate the principle that a simple majority of voting shares should be all that is necessary to effect change regarding a company.

Vote for shareholder proposals to lower supermajority shareholder vote requirements for charter and bylaw amendments.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

F. Supermajority Shareholder Vote Requirement to Approve Mergers

Vote against management proposals to require a supermajority shareholder vote to approve mergers and other significant business combinations. Supermajority provisions violate the principle that a simple majority of voting shares should be all that is necessary to effect change regarding a company.

Vote for shareholder proposals to lower supermajority shareholder vote requirements for mergers and other significant business combinations.

6. Miscellaneous Board Provisions

A. Separate Chairman and CEO Positions

We will generally vote for proposals looking to separate the CEO and Chairman roles unless the company has governance structures in place that can satisfactorily counterbalance a combined chairman and CEO/president post. Such a structure should include most or all of the following:

- Designated lead director, appointed from the ranks of the independent board members with clearly delineated duties. At a minimum these should include:
 - (1) Presides at all meetings of the board at which the chairman is not present, including executive sessions of the independent directors,
 - (2) Serves as liaison between the chairman and the independent directors,
 - (3) Approves information sent to the board,
 - (4) Approves meeting agendas for the board,
 - (5) Approves meeting schedules to assure that there is sufficient time for discussion of all agenda items,
 - (6) Has the authority to call meetings of the independent directors, and
 - (7) If requested by major shareholders, ensures that he is available for consultation and direct communication;
- 2/3 of independent board;
- All-independent key committees;
- Committee chairpersons nominated by the independent directors;
- CEO performance is reviewed annually by a committee of outside directors; and
- Established governance guidelines.

Additionally, the company should not have underperformed its peers and index on a one-year and three-year basis, unless there has been a change in the Chairman/CEO position within that time. Performance will be measured according to shareholder returns against index and peers.

B. Lead Directors and Executive Sessions

In cases where the CEO and Chairman roles are combined, we will vote for the appointment of a "lead" (non-insider) director and for regular "executive" sessions (board meetings taking place without the CEO/Chairman present).

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

C. Majority of Independent Directors

We generally vote for proposals that call for the board to be composed of a majority of independent directors. We believe that a majority of independent directors can be an important factor in facilitating objective decision making and enhancing accountability to shareholders.

Vote for shareholder proposals requesting that the board's audit, compensation, and/or nominating committees include independent directors exclusively.

Generally vote for shareholder proposals asking for a 2/3 independent board.

D. Stock Ownership Requirements

Vote for shareholder proposals requiring directors to own a minimum amount of company stock in order to qualify as a director or to remain on the board, so long as such minimum amount is not excessive or unreasonable.

E. Hedging / Pledging of Securities

We support full disclosure of the policies of the company regarding pledging and/or hedging of company stocks by executives and board directors. We will vote FOR shareholder proposals which ask for disclosure of this policy. We will vote Case by Case for directors if it is determined that hedging and /or pledging of securities has occurred.

F. Term of Office

Vote against shareholder proposals to limit the tenure of outside directors. Term limits pose artificial and arbitrary impositions on the board and could harm shareholder interests by forcing experienced and knowledgeable directors off the board.

G. Board Composition

We support board refreshment, independence, and a diverse skillset for directors. We believe that board composition should contribute to overall corporate strategies and risk management and will evaluate the board's skills, expertise, and qualifications. We generally will vote case-by-case on shareholder proposals which seek to force the board to add specific expertise or to change the composition of the board.

H. Director and Officer Indemnification and Liability Protection

Proposals concerning director and officer indemnification and liability protection should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Vote against proposals to limit or eliminate director and officer liability for monetary damages for violating the relevant duty of care.

Vote against indemnification proposals that would expand coverage beyond legal expenses to acts, such as negligence, that are more serious violations of fiduciary obligations than mere carelessness.

Vote for proposals that provide such expanded coverage in cases when a director's or officer's legal defense was unsuccessful only if: (1) the director was found to have acted in good faith and in a manner that he reasonably believed was in the company's best interests, and (2) the director's legal expenses would be covered.

I. Board Size

Vote for proposals to limit the size of the board to 15 members.

J. Majority Vote Standard

We would generally vote for proposals asking for the board to initiate the appropriate process to amend the company's governance documents (certificate of incorporation or bylaws) to provide that director nominees shall be elected by the affirmative vote of the majority of votes cast at an annual meeting of shareholders. We would generally review

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

on a case-by-case basis proposals that address alternative approaches to a majority vote requirement.

7. Miscellaneous Governance Provisions

A. Independent Nominating Committee

Vote for the creation of an independent nominating committee.

B. Confidential Voting

Vote for shareholder proposals requesting that companies adopt confidential voting, use independent tabulators, and use independent inspectors of election as long as the proposals include clauses for proxy contests as follows: In the case of a contested election, management should be permitted to request that the dissident group honor its confidential voting policy. If the dissidents agree, the policy remains in place. If the dissidents do not agree, the confidential voting policy is waived.

Vote for management proposals to adopt confidential voting.

C. Equal Access

Vote for shareholder proposals that would give significant company shareholders equal access to management's proxy material in order to evaluate and propose voting recommendations on proxy proposals and director nominees and to nominate their own candidates to the board.

D. Bundled Proposals

Review on a case-by-case basis bundled or "conditioned" proxy proposals. In the case of items that are conditioned upon each other, examine the benefits and costs of the packaged items. In instances where the joint effect of the conditioned items is not in shareholders' best interests, vote against the proposals. If the combined effect is positive, support such proposals.

E. Charitable Contributions

Vote against shareholder proposals regarding charitable contributions. In the absence of bad faith, self-dealing, or gross negligence, management should determine which contributions are in the best interests of the company.

F. Date/Location of Meeting

Vote against shareholder proposals to change the date or location of the shareholders' meeting. No one site will meet the needs of all shareholders.

G. Include Nonmanagement Employees on Board

Vote against shareholder proposals to include nonmanagement employees on the board. Constituency representation on the board is not supported, rather decisions are based on director qualifications.

H. Adjourn Meeting if Votes are Insufficient

Vote for proposals to adjourn the meeting when votes are insufficient. Management has additional opportunities to present shareholders with information about its proposals.

I. Other Business

Vote for proposals allowing shareholders to bring up "other matters" at shareholder meetings.

J. Disclosure of Shareholder Proponents

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Vote for shareholder proposals requesting that companies disclose the names of shareholder proponents. Shareholders may wish to contact the proponents of a shareholder proposal for additional information.

K. Exclusive Venue

Generally, vote for management proposals which seek shareholder approval to make the state of incorporation the exclusive forum for disputes, if the company is a Delaware corporation; otherwise, vote on a case-by-case basis on management proposals which seek shareholder approval to make the state of incorporation, or another state, the exclusive forum for disputes.

8. Capital Structure

A. Common Stock Authorization

Review proposals to increase the number of shares of common stock authorized for issue on a case-by-case basis.

Vote against proposals to increase the number of authorized shares of a class of stock that has superior voting rights in companies that have dual-class capital structure.

B. Stock Distributions: Splits and Dividends

Vote for management proposals to increase common share authorization for a stock split, provided that the increase in authorized shares would not result in an excessive number of shares available for issuance given a company's industry and performance as measured by total shareholder returns.

C. Reverse Stock Splits

Vote for management proposals to implement a reverse stock split that also reduces the number of authorized common shares to a level where the number of shares available for issuance is not excessive given a company's industry and performance in terms of shareholder returns.

Vote case-by-case on proposals to implement a reverse stock split that does not proportionately reduce the number of shares authorized for issue.

D. Blank Check Preferred Authorization

Vote against proposals authorizing the creation of new classes of preferred stock with unspecified voting, conversion, dividend distribution, and other rights ("blank check" preferred stock).

Vote for proposals to create "blank check" preferred stock in cases when the company expressly states that the stock will not be used as a takeover device.

Vote for proposals to authorize preferred stock in cases when the company specifies voting, dividend, conversion, and other rights of such stock and the terms of the preferred stock appear reasonable.

Vote case-by-case on proposals to increase the number of blank check preferred shares after analyzing the number of preferred shares available for issue given a company's industry and performance as measured by total shareholder returns.

E. Shareholder Proposals Regarding Blank Check Preferred Stock

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Vote for shareholder proposals to have blank check preferred stock placements, other than those shares issued for the purpose of raising capital or making acquisitions in the normal course of business, submitted for shareholder ratification.

F. Adjustments to Par Value of Common Stock

Vote for management proposals to reduce the par value of common stock. The purpose of par value is to establish the maximum responsibility of a shareholder in the event that a company becomes insolvent.

G. Restructurings/Recapitalizations

Review proposals to increase common and/or preferred shares and to issue shares as part of a debt restructuring plan or if the company is in danger of being delisted on a case-by-case basis. Consider the following issues:

Dilution—How much will ownership interest of existing shareholders be reduced, and how extreme will dilution to any future earnings be?

Change in Control—Will the transaction result in a change in control of the company?

Bankruptcy—Generally, approve proposals that facilitate debt restructurings unless there are clear signs of self-dealing or other abuses.

H. Share Repurchase Programs

Vote for management proposals to institute open-market share repurchase plans in which all shareholders may participate on equal terms.

I. Targeted Share Placements

These shareholder proposals ask companies to seek stockholder approval before placing 10% or more of their voting stock with a single investor. The proposals are in reaction to the placements by various companies of a large block of their voting stock in an ESOP, parent capital fund or with a single friendly investor, with the aim of protecting themselves against a hostile tender offer. These proposals are voted on a case by case basis after reviewing the individual situation of the company receiving the proposal.

9. Executive and Director Compensation

A. Stock-based Incentive Plans

Votes with respect to compensation plans should be determined on a case-by-case basis. The analysis of compensation plans focuses primarily on the transfer of shareholder wealth (the dollar cost of pay plans to shareholders). Other matters included in our analysis are the amount of the company's outstanding stock to be reserved for the award of stock options, whether the exercise price of an option is less than the stock's fair market value at the date of the grant of the options, and whether the plan provides for the exchange of outstanding options for new ones at lower exercise prices.

In addition, we will assess the structure of the equity plan taking into consideration certain plan features as well as grant practices. This will include whether dividends are paid or accrued to the unvested equity awards. Once the cost of the plan is estimated and other features are taken into consideration, the plan will be reviewed to determine if it is in the best interest of the shareholders. Problematic pay practices will have a bearing on whether we support the plan. We will consider the pay practices of other companies in the relevant industry and peer companies in this analysis.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Review case-by-case stock based plans for companies which rely heavily upon stock for incentive compensation, taking into consideration the factors mentioned above. These companies include high growth and financial services companies where the plan cost as measured by shareholder value transfer (SVT) appears to be high.

For companies in the Russell 3000 we will generally vote against a plan and/or withhold from members of the compensation committee, when there is a disconnect between the CEO's pay and performance (an increase in pay and a decrease in performance), the main source for the pay increase is equity-based, and the CEO participates in the plan being voted on. Specifically, if the company has negative one- and three-year total shareholder returns, and its CEO also had an increase in total direct compensation from the prior year, it would signify a disconnect in pay and performance. If more than half of the increase in total direct compensation is attributable to the equity component, we would generally recommend against the equity plan in which the CEO participates.

B. Approval of Cash or Cash-and-Stock Bonus Plans

Vote for cash or cash-and-stock bonus plans to exempt the compensation from limits on deductibility under the provisions of Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code.

C. Shareholder Proposals to Limit Executive and Director Pay

Generally, vote for shareholder proposals that seek additional disclosure of executive and director pay information.

Review on a case-by-case basis all other shareholder proposals that seek to limit executive and director pay.

Review on a case-by-case basis shareholder proposals for performance pay such as indexed or premium priced options if a company has a history of oversized awards and one-, two- and three-year returns below its peer group.

D. Say on Pay – Advisory Vote

Generally, review on a case-by-case basis executive pay and practices as well as certain aspects of outside director compensation.

Where the company's Say on Pay proposal received 60% or less support on its previous Say on Pay proposal, WITHHOLD votes for the compensation committee and or vote against the current Say on Pay proposal unless the company has demonstrated active engagement with shareholders to address the issue as well as the specific actions taken to address the low level of support.

In the case of externally-managed REITs, generally vote against the advisory vote as there is a lack of transparency in both compensation structure and payout.

Say on Pay - Frequency

JPMAM will review compensation versus long-term performance on an annual basis.

E. Golden and Tin Parachutes

Review on a case-by-case basis all proposals to ratify or cancel golden or tin parachutes. Favor golden parachutes that limit payouts to two times base salary, plus guaranteed retirement and other benefits.

Change-in-control payments should only be made when there is a significant change in company ownership structure, and when there is a loss of employment or substantial change in job duties associated with the change in company ownership structure

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

("double-triggered"). Change-in-control provisions should exclude excise tax gross-up and eliminate the acceleration of vesting of equity awards upon a change in control unless provided under a double-trigger scenario.

Generally vote case-by-case for proposals calling companies to adopt a policy of obtaining shareholder approval for any future agreements and corporate policies that could oblige the company to make payments or awards following the death of a senior executive in the form of unearned salary or bonuses, accelerated vesting or the continuation in force of unvested equity grants, perquisites and other payments or awards made in lieu of compensation. This would not apply to any benefit programs or equity plan proposals for which the broad-based employee population is eligible.

F. 401(k) Employee Benefit Plans

Vote for proposals to implement a 401(k) savings plan for employees.

G. Employee Stock Purchase Plans

Vote for qualified employee stock purchase plans with the following features: the purchase price is at least 85 percent of fair market value; the offering period is 27 months or less; and potential voting power dilution (shares allocated to the plan as a percentage of outstanding shares) is ten percent or less.

Vote for nonqualified employee stock purchase plans with the following features: broad-based participation (i.e., all employees of the company with the exclusion of individuals with five percent or more of beneficial ownership of the company); limits on employee contribution, which may be a fixed dollar amount or expressed as a percentage of base salary; company matching contribution up to 25 percent of the employee's contribution, which is effectively a discount of 20 percent from market value; and no discount on the stock price on the date of purchase since there is a company matching contribution

H. Option Expensing

Generally, vote for shareholder proposals to expense fixed-price options.

I. Option Repricing

In most cases, we take a negative view of option repricings and will, therefore, generally vote against such proposals. We do, however, consider the granting of new options to be an acceptable alternative and will generally support such proposals.

J. Stock Holding Periods

Generally vote against all proposals requiring executives to hold the stock received upon option exercise for a specific period of time.

K. Transferable Stock Options

Review on a case-by-case basis proposals to grant transferable stock options or otherwise permit the transfer of outstanding stock options, including cost of proposal and alignment with shareholder interests.

L. Recoup Bonuses

Vote case-by-case on shareholder proposals to recoup unearned incentive bonuses or other incentive payments made to senior executives if it is later determined that fraud, misconduct, or negligence significantly contributed to a restatement of financial results that led to the awarding of unearned incentive compensation.

M. Two Tiered Compensation

Vote against proposals to adopt a two tiered compensation structure for board directors.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

10. Incorporation

A. Reincorporation Outside of the United States

Review on a case-by-case basis proposals to reincorporate the company outside of the U.S.

B. Voting on State Takeover Statutes

Review on a case-by-case basis proposals to opt in or out of state takeover statutes (including control share acquisition statutes, control share cash-out statutes, freezeout provisions, fair price provisions, stakeholder laws, poison pill endorsements, severance pay and labor contract provisions, antigreenmail provisions, and disgorgement provisions).

C. Voting on Reincorporation Proposals

Proposals to change a company's state of incorporation should be examined on a case-by-case basis. Review management's rationale for the proposal, changes to the charter/bylaws, and differences in the state laws governing the companies.

11. Mergers and Corporate Restructurings

A. Mergers and Acquisitions

Votes on mergers and acquisitions should be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account factors including the following: anticipated financial and operating benefits; offer price (cost vs. premium); prospects of the combined companies; how the deal was negotiated; and changes in corporate governance and their impact on shareholder rights.

B. Nonfinancial Effects of a Merger or Acquisition

Some companies have proposed a charter provision which specifies that the board of directors may examine the nonfinancial effect of a merger or acquisition on the company. This provision would allow the board to evaluate the impact a proposed change in control would have on employees, host communities, suppliers and/or others. We generally vote against proposals to adopt such charter provisions. We feel it is the directors' fiduciary duty to base decisions solely on the financial interests of the shareholders.

C. Corporate Restructuring

Votes on corporate restructuring proposals, including minority squeezeouts, leveraged buyouts, "going private" proposals, spin-offs, liquidations, and asset sales, should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

D. Spin-offs

Votes on spin-offs should be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on the tax and regulatory advantages, planned use of sale proceeds, market focus, and managerial incentives.

E. Asset Sales

Votes on asset sales should be made on a case-by-case basis after considering the impact on the balance sheet/working capital, value received for the asset, and potential elimination of diseconomies.

F. Liquidations

Votes on liquidations should be made on a case-by-case basis after reviewing management's efforts to pursue other alternatives, appraisal value of assets, and the compensation plan for executives managing the liquidation.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

G. Appraisal Rights

Vote for proposals to restore, or provide shareholders with, rights of appraisal. Rights of appraisal provide shareholders who are not satisfied with the terms of certain corporate transactions the right to demand a judicial review in order to determine a fair value for their shares.

H. Changing Corporate Name

Vote for changing the corporate name.

12. Social and Environmental Issues

We believe that a company's environmental policies may have a long-term impact on the company's financial performance. We believe that good corporate governance policies should consider the impact of company operations on the environment and the cost of compliance with laws and regulations relating to environmental matters, physical damage to the environment (including the costs of clean-ups and repairs), consumer preferences and capital investments related to climate change. Furthermore, we believe that corporate shareholders have a legitimate need for information to enable them to evaluate the potential risks and opportunities that climate change and other environmental matters pose to the company's operations, sales and capital investments. We acknowledge that many companies disclose their practices relating to social and environmental issues and that disclosure is improving over time. We generally encourage a level of reporting that is not unduly costly or burdensome and which does not place the company at a competitive disadvantage, but which provides meaningful information to enable shareholders to evaluate the impact of the company's environmental policies and practices on its financial performance.

With regard to social issues, among other factors, we consider the company's labor practices, supply chain, how the company supports and monitors those issues, what types of disclosure the company and its peers currently provide, and whether the proposal would result in a competitive disadvantage for the company.

In evaluating how to vote environmental proposals, considerations may include but are not limited to the following—

Issuer Considerations

- Asset profile of the company, including whether it is exposed to potentially declining demand for the company's products or services due to environmental considerations
- capital deployment of the company
- cost structure of the company, including its position on the cost curve, expected impact of future carbon tax and exposure to high fixed operating costs
- corporate behavior of the company, including whether senior management is incentivized for long-term returns
- demonstrated capabilities of the company, its strategic planning process, and past performance
- current level of disclosure of the company and consistency of disclosure across its industry
- whether the company incorporates environmental or social issues in a risk assessment or risk reporting framework

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Proposal Considerations

- would adoption of the proposal inform and educate shareholders and have companies that adopted proposal provided insightful and meaningful information that would allow shareholders to evaluate the long-term risks and performance of the company
- does the proposal require disclosure that is already addressed by existing and proposed mandated regulatory requirements or formal guidance at the local, state, or national level or the company's existing disclosure practices
- does the proposal create the potential for unintended consequences such as a competitive disadvantage.

In general, we support management disclosure practices that are overall consistent with the goals and objective expressed above. Proposals with respect to companies that have been involved in controversies, fines or litigation are expected to be subject to heightened review and consideration.

A. Military Business

Vote case-by-case on defense issue proposals.

Vote case-by-case on disclosure reports that seek additional information on military-related operations.

B. International Labor Organization Code of Conduct

Vote case-by-case on proposals to endorse international labor organization code of conducts.

Vote case-by-case on disclosure reports that seek additional information on company activities in this area.

C. Promote Human Rights

Vote case-by-case on proposals to promote human rights.

Vote case-by-case on disclosure reports that seek additional information on company activities regarding human rights.

D. Equal Employment Opportunity and Discrimination

Vote case-by-case on proposals regarding equal employment opportunities and discrimination.

Vote case-by-case on disclosure reports that seek additional information about affirmative action efforts, particularly when it appears that companies have been unresponsive to shareholder requests.

E. Animal Rights

Vote case-by-case on proposals that deal with animal rights.

F. Product Integrity and Marketing

Vote case-by-case on proposals that ask companies to end their production of legal, but socially questionable, products.

Vote case-by-case on disclosure reports that seek additional information regarding product integrity and marketing issues.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Vote case-by-case on resolutions requesting the disclosure and implementation of Internet privacy and censorship policies and procedures.

Vote case-by-case on proposals requesting the company to report on its policies, initiatives/procedures, oversight mechanisms related to toxic materials, including certain product line toxicities, and/or product safety in its supply chain.

G. Human Resources Issues

Vote case-by-case on proposals regarding human resources issues.

Vote case-by-case on disclosure reports that seek additional information regarding human resources issues.

H. Link Executive Pay with Social and/or Environmental Criteria

Vote case-by-case on proposals to link executive pay with the attainment of certain social and/or environmental criteria.

Vote case-by-case on disclosure reports that seek additional information regarding this issue.

I. High Risk Markets

Vote case-by-case on requests for the company to review and report on the financial and reputation risks associated with operations in “high risk” markets, such as a terrorism-sponsoring state or otherwise.

J. Political Contribution

Generally vote against proposals asking the company to affirm political non-partisanship in the workplace.

Vote against proposals to publish the company’s political contributions taking into consideration recent, significant controversies, fines or litigation regarding the company’s political contributions or trade association spending.

13. Foreign Proxies

Responsibility for voting non-U.S. proxies rests with our Proxy Voting Committees located in London, Tokyo, and Hong Kong. The Proxy Committee is composed of senior analysts and portfolio managers and officers of the Legal and Compliance Department.

14. Pre-Solicitation Contact

From time to time, companies will seek to contact analysts, portfolio managers and others in advance of the formal proxy solicitation to solicit support for certain contemplated proposals. Such contact can potentially result in the recipient receiving material non-public information and result in the imposition of trading restrictions. Accordingly, pre-solicitation contact should occur only under very limited circumstances and only in accordance with the terms set forth herein.

What is material non-public information?

The definition of material non-public information is highly subjective. The general test, however, is whether or not such information would reasonably affect an investor's decision to buy, sell or hold securities, or whether it would be likely to have a significant market impact. Examples of such information include, but are not limited to:

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

- a pending acquisition or sale of a substantial business;
- financial results that are better or worse than recent trends would lead one to expect;
- major management changes;
- an increase or decrease in dividends;
- calls or redemptions or other purchases of its securities by the company;
- a stock split, dividend or other recapitalization; or
- financial projections prepared by the Company or the Company's representatives.

What is pre-solicitation contact?

Pre-solicitation contact is any communication, whether oral or written, formal or informal, with the Company or a representative of the Company regarding proxy proposals prior to publication of the official proxy solicitation materials. This contact can range from simply polling investors as to their reaction to a broad topic, e.g., "How do you feel about dual classes of stock?" to very specific inquiries, e.g., "Here's a term sheet for our restructuring. Will you vote to approve this?"

Determining the appropriateness of the contact is a factual inquiry which must be determined on a case-by-case basis. For instance, it might be acceptable for us to provide companies with our general approach to certain issues. Promising our vote, however, is prohibited under all circumstances. Likewise, discussion of our proxy guidelines, in whole or in part, with a company or others is prohibited. In the event that you are contacted in advance of the publication of proxy solicitation materials, please notify the Legal/Compliance Department immediately. The Company or its representative should be instructed that all further contact should be with the Legal/Compliance Department.

It is also critical to keep in mind that as a fiduciary, we exercise our proxies solely in the best interests of our clients. Outside influences, including those from within J.P. Morgan Chase should not interfere in any way in our decision making process. Any calls of this nature should be referred to the Legal/Compliance Department for response.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

B. Europe, Middle East, Africa, Central America and South America

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Table of Contents

I. POLICY	29
II. VOTING GUIDELINES	32
1. REPORTS & ACCOUNTS	32
2. DIVIDENDS	32
3. BOARD OF DIRECTORS	33
4. COMPENSATION	35
5. AUDITORS	38
6. ISSUE OF CAPITAL	39
7. MERGERS / ACQUISITIONS	39
8. RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTIONS	40
9. VOTING RIGHTS	40
10. OTHERS	40
III. STEWARDSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT	42
IV. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL	48
1. CONTROVERSIAL WEAPONS	49
2. CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON DISCLOSURE	49
3. PRI	50
4. PARTNERSHIPS AND AFFILIATIONS	50

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).

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 a Global Proxy Committee, chaired by 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.

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 2018

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.

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

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.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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.

We agree with the UK Financial Reporting Council (FRC), that 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 the culture, values and ethics of the company and in setting the 'tone from the top'.

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. 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.

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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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 and competencies of directors to ensure that the board has an appropriate range of expertise, managing the process for evaluating the performance of the board, its committees and directors, and reporting on this process to shareholders in the Annual Report, and maintaining formal and transparent arrangements for the selection, appointment and re-appointment of directors to the board.

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 report should be the responsibility of the Remuneration Committee.

See Remuneration Report

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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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

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.

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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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.

We believe firmly that directors should be encouraged to hold meaningful amounts of company stock, equivalent to at least one year's salary, and two years or more for chief executives, 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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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, for example where an executive has been promoted, 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.

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.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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 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

Pension arrangements should be transparent and cost-neutral to shareholders. 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.

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. 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 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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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.

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.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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.

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.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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.

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 JPMAM's 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 2018

III. STEWARDSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT

Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.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, which sets out the responsibilities of institutional shareholders in respect of investee companies. JPMAM endorses the Stewardship Code for its UK 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 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 governance 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. An assessment of social and environmental issues, where they have the potential to impact the valuation.

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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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 and this policy 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 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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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 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 over 10,000 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 included below, and is also 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 judgment of what will best serve the long-term interests of our clients. So far as is

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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 over 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 Ethix SRI Advisors 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 always 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 a Global Proxy Committee, chaired by 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.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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 prohibited in certain European jurisdictions and, as a result, these names are excluded from our stock universe for our entire Luxembourg-domiciled SICAV 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 analyst-driven investment processes 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 10,000 AGMs in over 70 markets worldwide. Votes are investor-led and made on a case-by-case basis. There are

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

ESG policy documents available for each region, as well as a Global Policy, all of which are updated at least annually.

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

Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.

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 20.00

Published January 2018

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.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

C. Asia ex Japan

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Table of Contents

I. Corporate Governance Principles	54
II. Policy and Procedures	55
III. Policy Voting Guidelines	57

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

I. Corporate Governance Principles

J.P. Morgan Asset Management (JPMAM) is committed to meeting client objectives by delivering the strongest possible risk-adjusted returns. We believe that a key contributor to this is a thorough understanding of the corporate governance practices of the companies in which we invest. We expect all our investee companies to demonstrate the highest standards of governance in the management of their businesses, as far as is reasonably practicable.

We have set out herein the main principles which underpin our corporate governance policies and proxy voting activities. These principles are based on the OECD's Principles of Corporate Governance, as well as on the governance codes of the jurisdictions in which our investee companies are domiciled. But regardless of location or jurisdiction, we believe companies should abide by the following:

Board and Director Responsibilities

Companies should be headed by an effective and responsible board, whose function is to drive the long term success of the company. It should establish the company's purpose, strategy and values, and define and embody its culture. It should be able to make decisions on behalf of all shareholders, separate from the individual interests of management or controlling shareholders. The board should set strategic objectives and oversee operational performance. At the same time it should be responsible for establishing prudent and effective risk controls to protect the company's assets and safeguard shareholder interests. Finally, the board should be responsible for selecting the key executives tasked with developing and executing corporate strategy, and for ensuring that executive remuneration is aligned with the longer term interests of the company and its shareholders. All directors should act in the best interests of the company and its shareholders, consistent with their statutory and fiduciary obligations.

Shareholder Rights

Shareholders should have the opportunity to participate and vote in general meetings, and should be furnished with sufficient information on a timely basis to make informed voting decisions. Arrangements that enable certain shareholders to obtain a disproportionate degree of control relative to their equity ownership should be disclosed upfront, and anti-takeover devices should not be used to shield management and the board from ongoing accountability.

Equitable Treatment

All shareholders of the same class should be treated equally, and all shares within the same class should carry the same rights. Impediments to cross border voting should be eliminated, and companies should not make it difficult or expensive for shareholders to cast their votes. Minority shareholders should be protected from unfair and / or abusive actions by controlling shareholders.

Role of Stakeholders

Stakeholders, including individual employees and their representative bodies, should be able to communicate their concerns about illegal or unethical practices to the board, and their rights should not be compromised for doing so. Where stakeholders participate in

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

the corporate governance process, they should have access to relevant and timely information for that participation to be effective.

Disclosure and Transparency

Companies should ensure that accurate information on all matters of relevance is publicly disclosed, to allow shareholders to make an informed and balanced assessment of a company's performance and its prospects. This should include its operating performance, its financial condition, and its governance policies. Information about board members, including their qualifications, other company directorships and their level of independence should be disclosed, so that shareholders can make an informed assessment of their suitability in their proxy voting decisions.

Our assessment of corporate governance practice is based on the regulations and codes of best practice in the jurisdictions in which our investee companies are domiciled. Any company complying with these codes, and with the general principles stated above, should usually expect to receive our support, as long as it meets the standards set out in this document. We are members, inter alia, of the Council of Institutional Investors (CII), the International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN), and the Asian Corporate Governance Association (ACGA), and as such, we take guidance from these groups. If a company chooses to deviate from the provisions of the governance codes specific to its jurisdiction, we will give its explanation due consideration and take this into account in our proxy voting, based on our assessment of its governance standards.

II. Policy and Procedures

Proxy Committee

The responsibility for JPMAM's voting policy for portfolios managed in the Asia Pacific region (outside Japan) lies with the Asia ex-Japan Proxy Committee. The Committee's role is to review JPMAM's corporate governance policy and practices in respect of investee companies, and to oversee the proxy voting process. The Committee is composed of senior personnel from our Investment and Corporate Actions teams, supported by specialists from Legal, Compliance and other relevant groups. The Committee meets quarterly and reports into the IM Asia Risk and Controls Committee, as well as the firm's Global Proxy Committee. The Global Proxy Committee, chaired by the Global Head of Equity, has overall responsibility for our approach to governance issues worldwide, and for ensuring that all regional policies comply with the firm's global governance principles.

Proxy Voting

Where authorized to do so, JPMAM manages the voting rights of the shares entrusted to us, as we would manage any asset. We vote proxies of shares held in client portfolios in a prudent and diligent manner, based on our reasonable judgment of what is in the best interests of clients. Voting is investor-led and is decided on a case by case basis. So far as is practicable, we vote at all meetings called by companies, in which we are invested.

To assist us in the filing of proxies, JPMAM retains the services of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), a proxy voting services advisor. As part of this service, ISS makes recommendations on each board resolution requiring a shareholder vote. While we take note of these recommendations, we are not obliged to follow them if we have a contrary view; our portfolio managers vote according to our own governance

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

principles and guidelines, and our research insights. Records of our voting activities are maintained by our Corporate Actions group, and any deviation from our stated policies is documented, to ensure all proxies are exercised appropriately.

Certain markets may require that shares being tendered for voting are temporarily immobilized from trading until after the shareholder meeting has taken place. Other markets may require a local representative to be hired, under a Power-of-Attorney, to attend the meeting and vote on our behalf; this can incur considerable additional cost to clients. Finally, 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 circumstances where voting can preclude participating in certain types of corporate actions. In these instances, it may sometimes be in clients' best interests to intentionally refrain from voting. But in all other circumstances we endeavour to exercise our voting responsibilities on clients' behalf.

We note that it can be difficult for smaller companies in emerging economies to apply the same governance standards, as it is for companies operating in developed economies and markets. We will look at any governance related issues of such companies on a case-by-case basis, and take their context into account before arriving at our voting decision. Nevertheless, we encourage all companies to apply the highest standards of governance wherever possible, in the belief that strong standards of governance will ultimately translate into improved shareholder returns.

Stewardship and Engagement

As long term owners, active monitoring of company performance and corporate strategy is an essential component of our stewardship. To discharge these responsibilities, we seek to engage actively with the companies in which we invest, to keep abreast of strategic and operating developments and to ensure that our clients' interests are represented and protected. Where appropriate, our governance specialists will convene meetings with company representatives at boardroom level to debate issues of particular concern. Full details of our stewardship policies and engagement activities are available for download from our website.

Sustainability

JPMAM believes that, in addition to their legal obligations, companies should act in a socially responsible manner. Non-financial environmental and social issues have the potential to seriously impair the economic value of our investments, as well create significant reputational damage. We expect the companies, in which we invest, to behave in an ethical and responsible manner, observing their wider obligations to the societies in which they operate, and to the environment. Companies will only thrive in the long term if they put sustainability at the heart of their governance processes. Details of our approach to Environmental and Social issues are contained in the Appendix to this document.

Conflicts of interest

JPMAM is part of the JP Morgan Chase group (JPMC), which provides a range of banking and investment services. Conflicts of interest arise from time to time in the normal course of business, both within and between, JPMC affiliates. Procedures are in place to make sure these conflicts can be identified, managed and resolved. Typical conflicts may include instances where a JPMC affiliate is involved in a transaction at an investee company, is providing banking or other services at that company, or where JPMC connected personnel may sit on this or related company boards.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

In order to maintain the integrity and independence of our voting decisions, businesses within the JPMC group have established formal barriers designed to restrict the flow of information between affiliated entities. This includes information from JPMC's securities, investment banking and custody divisions to JPMAM's investment professionals. A formal policy with respect to Conflicts of interest Disclosure has been established to manage such conflicts, and is available for download from our website.

Where a material conflict of interest is identified with respect to proxy voting, JPMAM may contact individual clients to approve any voting decision, may call upon independent third parties (eg, our proxy voting service advisor) to make the voting decision on our behalf, or may elect not to exercise the proxy. A record of all such decisions is kept by the Corporate Actions group and is available to clients upon request.

III. Policy Voting Guidelines

1. Report and Accounts

Annual Report

Company reports and accounts should be detailed and transparent, and should be submitted to shareholders for approval. They should meet accepted reporting standards, such as those prescribed by of the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), and should meet with the spirit as well as the letter of those reporting standards. They should be fair, balanced and understandable, and the narrative sections covering inter alia, corporate strategy, operating activities, financial conditions and risk management should accurately detail the company's position, performance and prospects.

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

Legal disclosure varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. If, in our opinion, a company's standards of disclosure (whilst meeting minimum legal requirements) are insufficient, we will inform company management of our concerns. Depending on the circumstances, we will either abstain from voting, or vote against the relevant resolution put to shareholders. Similar considerations, relating to the use of inappropriate or overly aggressive accounting methods, also apply.

Remuneration Report

Establishing an effective remuneration policy for senior executives is a key consideration at board level. The purpose of remuneration is to attract, retain and reward competent executives who can drive the long term growth of the company. As such, ensuring that remuneration is appropriate for the role assigned should therefore be a particular concern of shareholders. Ideally a company's remuneration policy, as it relates to senior management, should be presented to shareholders as a separate voting item. However we recognize that practices differ between jurisdictions, and this is not yet standard practice in Asia.

At the same time, we would expect companies to disclose the main components of remuneration for key directors and executives. In the event that remuneration awards fall

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

outside our guidelines, we will endeavor to seek an explanation from the company, and may vote against remuneration reports or members of the Remuneration Committee, if satisfactory explanations are not forthcoming.

Where shareholders are able to exercise a binding vote on remuneration policies, we believe that such policies should stand the test of time and not be continually updated and amended. We would expect votes on remuneration policies to occur every three years, and will seek explanations where companies feel the need to propose changes more frequently. Shareholders should expect clear and concise reports that are effective at communicating how executive pay is linked to the delivery of the company's strategy over the forecast time horizon, and how it is aligned to shareholder interests.

2. Dividends

Practice differs by jurisdiction as to whether companies are required to submit dividend resolutions for approval at shareholder meetings. In some jurisdictions, dividends can be declared by board resolution alone. However, in those jurisdictions where shareholder approval is mandated, we may vote against such proposals if we deem the payout ratio to be too low, particularly if cash is being hoarded with little strategic intent. Conversely, if we consider a proposed dividend to be too high in relation to a company's underlying earnings capability, we may also vote against the resolution, if we believe this could jeopardize the company's long term prospects and solvency.

3. Board and Directors

Board Structure

Companies should be controlled by an effective board, with an appropriate balance of executive and non-executive members. The board is where strategic decisions are made, governance is exercised and risk is overseen. Boards should be comprised of competent, high calibre individuals with the necessary mix of skills and experience to provide objective oversight of management. JPMAM believes that diverse and inclusive boards foster constructive challenge, guard against "group think" and lead to better decision making. We therefore welcome policies that focus on diversity as a key part of board recruitment and planning.

JPMAM is generally in favor of unitary boards, as opposed to tiered board structures, but we note that board structures differ according to jurisdictions and legal traditions. In general we find that unitary boards are the most effective governance structure. With a tiered structure, there is a risk that upper tier supervisory directors can become remote from the specifics of the business, while lower tier directors can lack contact with outsiders of relevant and broad experience. But irrespective of the structure, no director should be excluded from the requirement to submit him/herself for re-election on a regular basis. The ability to shape the composition of boards via the proxy voting mechanism is a visible means for shareholders to exercise their ownership responsibilities.

JPMAM believes that one of the key functions of a board is to set a company's values and standards, and to create a corporate culture geared to long term sustainable performance. Culture is a key ingredient in the long term success of the company. Moreover the standards of behavior set by the board should resonate throughout the broader organization. We believe there are strong links between high standards of governance, a healthy and robust corporate culture, and superior shareholder returns.

Board Independence

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

JPMAM believes that a strong independent board is essential to the effective running of a company. The number of independent directors on a board should be sufficient so that their views carry weight in the board's decision-making processes. Where possible, we would prefer that the majority of members on a board should be independent to encourage the broadest representation of views.

Tests applied to determine "independence" differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In Asia this issue is particularly contentious, given the family relationships that tend to predominate within corporate entities, and the region's close-knit business culture. We believe that non-executive directors cannot be considered truly independent for the purposes of board or committee composition, if any individual:

- Is, or has been, an employee of the company or group within the last five years;
- Has, or has had a material business relationship with the company, either directly or as a partner, director, or senior employee of a body providing such services;
- Has close family ties with any of the company's advisors, directors, or senior employees;
- Represents a significant shareholder;
- Has served on the board for more than nine years from the date of first election.

Where we believe there to be an insufficient number of independent directors on a board, we will consider voting against the re-election of some, or all directors at shareholder meetings, unless an acceptable explanation is provided.

Boards should create and maintain a formal succession plan, to ensure the orderly refreshment of board membership, and to minimize over-dependence on a narrow cohort of individuals.

Chairman

Boards should be headed by an effective Chairman, who is independent on appointment. There should be a clear division of responsibilities at the head of a company, such that no one individual has unfettered powers of decision-making. JPMAM believes that the roles of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer should generally be separate to provide for a separation of responsibilities. But in instances where the two roles are combined, a Lead Independent Director should be identified to provide oversight over executive decisions, and to maintain an alternative channel of communication between the board and its shareholders.

In instances where a company does not have an independent Chairman or a designated lead director, and where a satisfactory explanation has not been provided, JPMAM will consider voting against the re-election of the Chairman, and other directors, at shareholder meetings.

Board Size

Boards should be appropriate to the size and complexity of the company. JPMAM will exercise its voting powers in favor of reducing excessively large boards wherever possible. Unless the size and complexity of the company demands it, boards with more than 15 directors are usually deemed too large, whereas boards with less than five directors are too small to provide sufficient levels of independent representation on key governance committees.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Board Diversity

JPMAM is committed to the principle of diversity where everyone, regardless of gender, sexual orientation, disability or ethnic and religious background, can succeed on merit. Recruiting individuals with unique experiences and diverse backgrounds is a fundamental part of strengthening a business, and is an important consideration when searching for new board members. We expect boards to have a strategy to improve female representation in particular, and we will utilize our voting power to bring about change where companies are lagging in this respect. As a matter of principle we expect our investee companies to be committed to diversity and inclusiveness in their general recruitment policies, and we will press for evidence of this as we engage with them to fulfil our stewardship responsibilities.

Board Committees

To strengthen the governance process, boards should delegate key oversight functions, such as responsibility for Audit, Nomination 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. A demonstrably independent audit is essential for investor confidence. The Committee should include at least one person with a specialist financial background, but all committee members should undergo appropriate training that provides for, and maintains, a reasonable level of financial literacy. The terms of reference of the Audit Committee should include the power to determine the scope of the audit process, to review the effectiveness of the external auditor, and to access any information arising from the internal audit process. Formal arrangements should be in place for the Committee to hold regular meetings with external auditors, without executive or staff involvement, and it should have the right of unrestricted access to all necessary company information to enable it to discharge its responsibilities.

Nomination Committees should be majority-independent and have an independent chair. The responsibilities of the committee should include: assessing the skills and competencies of directors to ensure that the board has an appropriate range of expertise; managing the process for evaluating the performance of the board, its committees and directors, and maintaining formal and transparent arrangements for the selection, appointment and re-appointment of directors to the board. The Committee should report on its activities to shareholders in the Annual Report.

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 Committee should report on its activities to shareholders in the Annual Report. *See Remuneration Report above.*

Boards of banks, insurance companies, and other large or complex companies, should consider establishing a Risk Committee to provide independent oversight and advice to the board on the risk management strategy of the company. As with other committees, this committee should give a summary of its activities in the Annual Report.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Director Independence

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 of interest, and has not been employed in an executive capacity by the company for at least the previous five years.

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

In determining our vote, we will always consider independence issues on a case-by-case basis, taking into account any exceptional individual circumstances.

Multiple Directorships

To carry out their responsibilities effectively, non-executive directors must be able to commit an appropriate amount of time to board matters. In order to be able to devote sufficient time to his or her duties, we would not normally expect a non-executive director to hold more than three significant directorships at any one time. However, in the case of related group companies, we believe it is reasonable for an individual to hold a higher number of directorships, as long as this does not impact his/her ability to discharge his/her duties. In our view, it is the responsibility of the Chairman to ensure that all directors are participating actively, and are contributing proportionately to the work-load of the board.

For executive directors, only one additional non-executive post would normally be considered appropriate without further explanation.

Meeting Attendance

Directors should ensure they attend all board meetings and relevant committee meetings within their remit. We will consider voting against director re-election proposals for individuals with poor attendance records, unless compelling reasons for absence are disclosed.

Directors' Liability

In certain markets, shareholders are asked to give boards a blanket discharge from responsibility for all decisions made during the previous financial year. Depending on the jurisdiction, 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.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

4. Remuneration

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. 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 directors' service contracts vary enormously: to this end, JPMAM will take into account local market practices when making judgments in this area. Company Chairmen should not normally have executive-style contractual arrangements with the company which include severance terms.

Executive Director Remuneration

The key purpose of remuneration is to attract, retain and reward key personnel who are fundamental to the long term success of the company. Executive remuneration is, and will, remain a contentious area, particularly the overall quantum of remuneration. Policy in this area cannot easily be prescribed by any one code or formula to cater for all circumstances and it must depend on responsible and well-informed judgments 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. At a senior executive level, remuneration should contain both a fixed element - set by reference to the external market - and a variable element, which fully aligns the executive with shareholder interests, and where superior awards can only be achieved by achieving superior performance against well-defined metrics.

Due consideration should be given to the effective management of risk within the business. This should be reflected in remuneration arrangements, which incentivize appropriate behavior and discourage excessive risk taking. Compensation arrangements should provide for an alignment between managers and shareholders across the cycle, and due consideration should be given to arrangements, such as bonus claw-backs, 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 remit of the board and company managements. However, the remuneration of executive directors should be determined by independent remuneration committees and fully disclosed to shareholders. We would expect that stock option plans or long-term incentive plans should meet our compensation guidelines (see below).

We believe firmly that executive directors should be encouraged to hold meaningful amounts of company stock throughout the duration of their board tenure. However, transaction bonuses, one-off retention awards, or other retrospective ex-gratia payments, should not be made, and we will vote against such awards when proposed at shareholder meetings. Recruitment awards for incoming executives should be limited to the value of awards forgone, and be granted on equivalent terms.

Fixed Compensation

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Executives are entitled to a basic salary set by reference to the external market, and in particular benchmarked against the company's immediate peers. While acknowledging that salary often forms the basis for variable compensation arrangements, we believe annual increases in salary should be limited, and generally be in line with the wider workforce of the company. Substantial increases in salary, for example, where an executive has been promoted, 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 both 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 and benchmarked against the sector in which the company operates. Whilst we recognize that annual bonus targets are often commercially sensitive, we expect a high degree of disclosure on performance metrics (pre-award) and performance against those metrics (post-award). Payment of bonuses for executives should take the form of cash and shares deferred for a defined period of time. Bonus "malus" and/or claw-back arrangements should be a feature of any variable compensation scheme.

For the long-term component of variable compensation schemes, share-based Long-Term Incentive Plans (LTIPs) and Share Option Schemes (SOSs) should be designed to give executives an incentive to perform at the highest levels; 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. 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 the duration of their employment.

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, and the backdating of awards or discounted awards.

All incentive plans should be clearly explained and disclosed to shareholders, and put to a shareholder vote for approval. Furthermore, each director's awards, awarded or vested, should be detailed, including the 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 expensed fully, 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.

JPMAM will vote in favor of well-structured compensation schemes with keen incentives and clear and specific performance criteria, which are challenging in nature and fully disclosed to shareholders. We also favor simplicity, both in the number of variable incentive schemes and in their structure. We will vote against payments which we deem are excessive or performance criteria which are undemanding. We would expect remuneration committees to explain why criteria are considered to be challenging, and how they align the interests of recipients with the long term interests of shareholders.

Pension Arrangements

Pension arrangements should be transparent and cost-neutral to shareholders. JPMAM believes it is inappropriate for executives to participate in pension arrangements, which

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

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 an individual director's pension scheme, changes to pension entitlements, and waivers concerning early retirement provisions should be fully disclosed and justified to shareholders.

Non-Executive Director 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. Neither should they receive retrospective ex-gratia payments at the termination of their service on the board.

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. The appointment of a company's auditor should be reviewed and approved by shareholders on an annual basis. JPMAM will vote against the appointment or re-appointment of auditors who are not perceived as independent. The length of time that both the audit company and the audit partner have served in their capacity may be a factor in determining independence.

Auditor Rotation

In order to safeguard the independence of the audit, companies should rotate their designated auditor over time. We believe that companies should put their external audit contract out to tender at least every ten years.

Auditor Remuneration

We expect companies to make a detailed disclosure on 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 services. 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, particularly if no explanation is given to shareholders.

Auditor Indemnification

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

6. Capital Management

Issue of Equity

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Company law requires that shareholder approval be obtained to increase the share capital of a company, but any new issue of equity should take into account expected levels of dilution. We will generally vote in favor of equity increases which enhance a company's long term prospects, but we will vote against issuance terms that we consider excessively dilutive.

JPMAM believes strongly that any new issue of equity should first be offered to existing shareholders before being made available more broadly. Pre-emption rights are a fundamental right of ownership and we will generally vote against any attempts to deprive shareholders of these rights, except under very limited terms. At the same time, companies should have the ability to issue additional equity to provide flexibility in their financing arrangements. In many jurisdictions, companies routinely ask shareholders for authority to issue new equity up to a certain percentage of issued capital, and up to a maximum discount to prevailing market prices (the so-called "general mandate").

As shareholders, we recognize the flexibility that the general mandate gives companies, and we wish to be supportive of such proposals. However, we also recognize that these mandates can be open to abuse, particularly if this results in excessively dilutive issuance. In particular, we believe the maximum number of additional shares represented by these proposals should be limited to 10% of existing equity capital, and the maximum discount of such issues to prevailing prices should similarly be limited to 10%.

We note that the listing rules in some jurisdictions permit issuance on considerably more relaxed terms than implied by these limits. In Hong Kong, for example, companies can seek approval to issue up to 20% of issued equity, at up to a 20% discount to prevailing market prices. We believe strongly that the dilution risk implied by these limits is excessive, and we tend to vote against such requests, unless a strong explanation has been provided justifying such terms.

When seeking shareholder approval for a general mandate, we would expect a company to provide the following details:

- An explanation of the need for a general mandate request, and the rationale for the size of the issue and the discount cap,
- Details of placements made under the general mandate during the preceding three years,
- Details of alternative methods of financing that may have been considered by the board.

In particular JPMAM will vote against equity issues, which allows the company to adopt "poison pill" takeover defence tactics, or where the increase in authorized capital excessively dilutes existing shareholder interests.

Issue of Debt

JPMAM will generally vote in favor of debt issuance proposals, which we believe will enhance a company's long-term prospects. At the same time, we will vote against any uncapped or poorly-defined increase in bank borrowing powers or borrowing limits, as well as debt issuance which could result in an unacceptable degree of financial leverage assumed. We will also vote against proposals to increase borrowings, expressly as part of a takeover defence.

Share Repurchase Programs

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

JPMAM will generally vote in favor of share repurchase or buy-back programs where we believe the repurchase is in the best interests of shareholders. At the same time, we will vote against abusive repurchase schemes, or when shareholders' interests could be better served by deployment of the cash for alternative uses. When purchased, we prefer that such shares are cancelled immediately, rather than taken into Treasury for re-issuance at a later date.

7. Mergers and Acquisitions

Mergers and acquisitions are always considered on a case-by-case basis, and votes are determined exclusively by the best interests of our clients. In exceptional circumstances, we may split our vote and vote differently for individual clients depending on unique client circumstances. JPMAM may also split its vote between different clients for technical reasons, such as cross-border mergers, where certain clients may not be able to hold the resultant security in portfolios.

JPMAM will vote in favor of mergers/acquisitions where the proposed acquisition price represents fair value for shareholders, where shareholders cannot realize greater value through other means, and where all shareholders receive equal treatment under the merger/acquisition terms. Where the transaction involves related parties – see below – we would expect the board to establish a committee of independent directors to review the transaction and report separately to shareholders. There should be a clear value enhancing rationale for the proposed transaction.

8. Related Party Transactions

Related party transactions (RPTs) are common in a number of Asia Pacific jurisdictions. These are transactions between a company and its related parties, and generally come in two forms: a) one-off transactions, typically asset purchases or disposals, and b), 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 favor. 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.

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

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

JPMAM believes in the fundamental principle of “one share, one vote”. The right to vote at shareholder meetings is the central mechanism through which shareholders can exercise their rights as owners of an entity. Moreover it underpins effective stewardship. We believe that granting special voting rights to certain stakeholders, or permitting voting rights that are disproportionate to a shareholder’s effective economic interest is detrimental to the efficient functioning of markets. At the very least it, it prevents less favored ordinary shareholders from holding managements and boards to account for the use of their capital.

Where possible we will vote to phase out all classes of shares, which either grant special voting rights to certain stakeholders, or permit voting rights that are disproportionate to a shareholder’s effective economic interest. And we will oppose all attempts to introduce new share classes with weighted voting rights (or no voting rights at all!). We are opposed to all mechanisms that skew voting rights, such that one share does not equal one vote. Directors should represent all shareholders equally and voting power should be held in direct proportion to a shareholder’s economic interest in the company.

Where listing rules permit weighted or skewed voting rights to take effect, we will lobby for the introduction of additional safeguards to protect the interests of minority shareholders. As with controlling shareholders, minority shareholders should be protected from abusive actions by shareholders with superior voting rights, and should have effective means of redress.

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 that require inappropriate supermajority votes, or use supermajority requirements as a tool to entrench existing management.

9. Environmental and Social Issues

Companies should conduct their business in a manner which recognizes their responsibilities to employees and other stakeholders, as well as to the environment and broader society. More information on our approach to Environment and Social issues is included as an Appendix to this document.

JPMAM reviews all shareholder proposals concerning environmental and social issues. In normal circumstances, the consideration of such issues within the normal course of business is the duty of management and the board. Nevertheless, from time to time, a company’s response to the circumstances of a particular environmental or social issue may have wider ramifications. 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 JPMAM’s Environmental and Social policy framework.

See Appendix - Environmental and Social

10. Other Corporate Governance Matters

Poison Pills

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Poison pills, and other anti-takeover devices, are arrangements 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” (such as an outsider’s acquisition of a certain percentage of company stock). Companies may be able to adopt poison pills without shareholder approval, depending on the jurisdiction concerned.

JPMAM is fundamentally opposed to any artificial barrier to the efficient functioning of markets. The market for corporate control should, ultimately, be for all shareholders to decide. We find no clear evidence that poison pills enhance shareholder value. Rather, they tend to be used as tools to entrench existing management.

JPMAM will generally vote against anti-takeover devices and support proposals aimed at revoking such 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 so 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. Likewise we will generally vote against “any other business” resolutions, where the exact nature of the proposal has not been presented to shareholders in advance.

Any amendments to a company’s 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 as part of bundled slates.

Shareholder Resolutions

Whilst we recognize the importance of the rights of shareholders to submit proposals to general meetings, we will not support those which are frivolous, or which have otherwise been addressed adequately by management or the board within their remits. But where such proposals demonstrably enhance shareholder rights, or are in the long term interest of all shareholders, they will receive our support.

Charitable Donations

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

Political Donations

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

J.P. Morgan Asset Management

Asia ex-Japan Proxy Committee

February 2018

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

D. Japan

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Table of contents

Basic Policy on Corporate Governance	71
1. Purpose of proxy voting	71
2. Proxy voting principles	71
Voting Guidelines	73
1. Distribution of income/Dividends and share buybacks	73
2. Boards and Directors	73
3. Director's Remuneration	75
4. Appointment of external audit firms	76
5. Poorly performing companies	76
6. Anti-social activities	77
7. Cross-shareholdings	77
8. Adoption of anti-hostile takeover measures	77
9. Capital Structure	78
10. Mergers / Acquisitions	78
11. Social and Environmental Issues	78
12. Conflicts of Interest	79
13. Shareholder proposals	79

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Basic Policy on Corporate Governance

JPMorgan Asset Management (Japan) Ltd adopted the Japanese version of the Stewardship Code in May 2014; subsequently in August 2014, we disclosed the steps we follow with regard to the 7 principles of the Code. We recognize the importance of corporate governance when evaluating companies and we will continue with our efforts to engage with companies as responsible institutional investors. We now fully endorse the revised version of the Stewardship Code introduced in May 2017.

We also positively evaluate the Corporate Governance Code effective from June 2015, which we believe will serve to further enhance corporate governance in Japan.

J.P. Morgan Asset Management is a signatory to the United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment (UN 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.

1. Purpose of proxy voting

JPMorgan Asset Management (Japan) Ltd (AMJ) manages the voting rights of the shares entrusted to it as it would manage any other asset. It is the policy of AMJ to vote in a prudent and diligent manner, based exclusively on our reasonable judgment of what will best serve the financial interests of the beneficial owners of the security. When exercising our vote, our aim is to evaluate the governance of the company concerned and maximize returns to shareholders over the long term.

2. Proxy voting principles

- We will vote at all of the meetings called by companies in which we are invested on behalf of our clients who have authorized us to vote.
- In principle, we will not abstain or withhold our vote. This is to prevent the worst possible outcome, a shareholder meeting failing to meet its quorum and thereby not be effective.
- It should be noted that AMJ scrutinises every proxy on a case-by-case basis, keeping in mind the best economic interests of our clients. We seek an improvement in the long term earnings or a prevention of deterioration in earnings of the company concerned.
- 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. If any agenda item is couched in vague terms or lacking in explanation, so that it would be possible to interpret the item in a manner detrimental to the rights of shareholders, in principle we will not support such a proposal.
- Our engagement with a company as a shareholder is not limited to voting at the shareholders' meeting. In the course of meetings with company management, we encourage the exercise of sound management with due consideration for social, environmental and ethical issues and engagement with shareholders. For example, if an accident / incident or corporate misconduct which could negatively impact the company's economic value occurs, we will seek the implementation and announcement of improvement plans and timely disclosure to shareholders as deemed appropriate.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

This document provides the proxy voting guidelines and policy. It is also meant to encompass activities such as engagement with company management. We regard regular, systematic and direct contact with senior company management, both executive and non-executive, as crucially important.

31st March 2018

JPMorgan Asset Management (Japan) Ltd.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Voting Guidelines

1. Distribution of income/Dividends and share buybacks

As investors, we are seeking sustainable earnings growth over the medium to long term and an expansion in shareholder value of the companies we invest in; thus we believe that concentrating solely on shareholders returns would not be appropriate. During different phases in a company's development, we understand that the balance between retained earnings, capital expenditure and investment in the business, and returns to shareholders will change.

As a general rule, we will vote against any proposal for the appropriation of profits which involves a pay-out ratio of less than 50% (after taking into account other forms of pay-outs to shareholders such as share repurchase programs), if the capital ratio is equal to or greater than 50% and there is no further need to increase the level of retained earnings. Also, even in the event that the capital ratio is less than 50%, we will vote against management if the pay-out ratio is deemed to be strikingly low (after taking into account other forms of pay-outs such as share repurchase programs) without a valid reason. We believe that, in general, companies should target a total shareholder return of 30%. The guidelines above relating to a company's capital ratio have not been applied in the case of financial institutions; the income allocation proposals for financial institutions have been assessed on a case by case basis. We note, however, that the capital ratio in the banking industry has improved in recent years and thus believe conditions look more favorable now for returns to shareholders to be enhanced. Thus we believe that financial institutions should also target a total shareholder return of 30%. In instances where we deem that further retention of earnings is no longer required, we believe a total shareholder return greater than 50% would be appropriate.

If the appropriation of profits is not tabled as an item at the annual general meeting, in principle, we will vote against the re-election of directors, in cases where the above conditions are not met.

In addition, we will oppose the dividend proposal where we believe it will prejudice the solvency or future prospects of the company.

When making our decision, we take into account the history of the company's return to shareholders, not just the outcome of the most recent financial year.

Where a company seeks to amend its articles of association to allow the distribution of income by way of board resolution, we will generally vote against such a proposal unless the company has stated its intention of moving to quarterly dividend payments.

2. Boards and Directors

Election of Directors

We will generally support the election of directors. However, if the candidate(s) infringes our guidelines with regard to the independence of directors or the number of directors, we will not support the proposal.

In addition, in the case of the re-election of directors, we will vote against candidates who infringe our guidelines pertaining to the length of tenure, pay-out ratio, poorly performing companies, anti-social activities, cross shareholdings, stock options, anti-hostile takeover measures, mergers and acquisitions, capital raising, borrowing and share repurchase programmes. Also, we will not support the re-election of external board members (external directors and external statutory auditors) whose attendance at board meetings

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

falls below 75%. Where there are no external board members, we will generally oppose the re-election of the representative director(s).

Number of Directors

Boards with more than 15 directors are deemed excessively large, and AMJ will exercise its voting powers in favour of reducing large boards wherever possible. AMJ believes a board with 15 directors or less is appropriate in Japan as well. To ensure a swift management decision-making process, in principle, we will therefore vote against a resolution for the election of directors where the premise is that the board will consist of more than 15 directors.

Director's Term of Office

Every director should be subject to a re-election process and we believe the term of office should be one year's duration or less. We will support amendment to the articles reducing the director's term of office to one year; in principle, we will vote against a proposal where the term exceeds one year.

Length of tenure

We will take the length of tenure into consideration when a director is subject to re-election. In particular, when a director who has served for a long period is offered for re-election, we will take factors such as the company's performance during that time into consideration.

Separation of Chairman and CEO

AMJ believes it is preferable if the role of Chairman and CEO is separate in Japan as well.

External Directors on the Board of Directors/Composition of the Board of Directors

We encourage the election of multiple external directors on the board of directors. Unless there are two or more external directors on the board of directors or candidates for external director at the AGM, in principle, we will vote against the election of the representative directors, such as the president of the company. When making our decision on this issue, we will not take the independence of the external director or the candidate for external director into consideration. Our decision regarding the independence of an external director will be reflected in our vote on that individual candidate. We believe that it is not only the number of external directors which is of consequence but attach importance to the composition of the board of directors. We expect companies to have due regard to issues such as diversity and consideration should be given to achieving a suitable balance in terms of the areas of expertise of the individual board members. 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. We also expect companies to consider diversity in its widest sense, both at board level and throughout the business. We seek to deepen our understanding of the board structure through our engagement with companies.

Since April 2016, we have stated there should be two more external members on the board of directors. We are now looking for one third of the board to be comprised of external directors, and starting in April 2018, in principle, we will vote against the election of the representative directors, such as the president of the company, unless that is the case.

Independence of external directors

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

Even if the candidate for external director meets the standards of local Japanese requirements, we believe the following candidates cannot be deemed independent without adequate explanation from the company; we will judge such a candidate to be subject to a conflict of interest and oppose their election as an external director.

- Was or is employed at an affiliate company
- Was or is employed at a large shareholder or major business partner
- Was or is employed at a legal firm, accounting firm, taxation firm, consultant or financial institution such as a bank where a business relationship exists with the company concerned so that a conflict of interest exists
- An external director whose tenure exceeds 10 years.

Any other candidate who also appears subject to a conflict of interest will be opposed. These criteria apply equally to directors at boards with committees, boards with statutory auditors and boards with supervisory committees.

We will generally support a proposal to change the structure of the board from a statutory auditor type to one with a board with committees. We support measures to delegate key oversight functions such as Remuneration, Nomination and Audit to independent committees. We will also generally support a change to a board with supervisory committee, provided the company provides a clear and rational explanation behind such a move.

Dismissal of Directors

In principle, we will vote against measures to make the dismissal of directors more difficult.

Election of Statutory Auditors

We will generally support the election of statutory auditors. In the case of the re-election of statutory auditors, we will vote against candidates who infringe our guidelines pertaining to anti-social activities.

Independence of external statutory auditors

Even if the candidate for external statutory auditor meets the standards of local Japanese requirements, we believe the following candidates cannot be deemed independent without adequate explanation from the company; we will judge such a candidate to be subject to a conflict of interest and oppose their election as an external statutory auditor.

- Was or is employed at an affiliate company
- Was or is employed at a large shareholder or major business partner
- Was or is employed at a legal firm, accounting firm, taxation firm, consultant or financial institution such as a bank where a business relationship exists with the company concerned so that a conflict of interest exists
- An external statutory auditor whose tenure exceeds 10 years.

Any other candidate who also appears subject to a conflict of interest will be opposed. These criteria apply equally to candidates for alternate external statutory auditors.

3. Director's Remuneration

The voting decision will be made in a comprehensive manner taking into account matters such as the recent trend in the company's earnings. In principle, we will support shareholder resolutions in favour of the disclosure of individual director's remuneration and bonus payments.

We support the disclosure of the structure of director's remuneration and the linkage of director's remuneration to the company's performance.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

In cases where there has been anti-social activity or the company has had poor performance, votes will be cast against the re-election of directors, where this is deemed appropriate. However, where there are no other appropriate proposals, we may vote against an increase in directors' pay or the payment of bonuses.

Retirement bonus

The voting decision will be made in a comprehensive manner taking into account matters such as the recent trend in the company's earnings. In principle, we will support shareholder resolutions in favour of the disclosure of individual director's retirement bonus payments.

AMJ will vote against

- Golden parachutes
- Retirement bonus payments to external directors and external statutory auditors.

In cases where there has been anti-social activity or the company has had poor performance, votes will be cast against the re-election of directors, where this is deemed appropriate. However, where there are no other appropriate proposals, we may vote against the payment of retirement bonuses to directors.

Stock Options

Long-term incentive arrangements, such as share option schemes and L-TIPs, should be dependent upon challenging performance criteria and there should be no award for below median performance. The terms should be clearly explained and fully disclosed to shareholders and participants. We will vote against the proposal if the terms are unclear. Deep discount stock option plans will only be supported if exercise is prohibited in the first three years following the award. We will generally vote against the cancellation and re-issue, re-testing or re-pricing, of underwater options. Transaction bonuses, or other retrospective ex-gratia payments, should not be made. In general, we will not support a proposal where the dilution from existing schemes and the new program requiring AGM approval exceeds 10%. AMJ believes that external directors and external statutory auditors, as well as third parties such as clients should not be participants in incentive schemes.

If there is no opportunity to indicate our view at the shareholders meeting and we hold a negative view regarding the stock option program, we may oppose the re-election of directors.

4. Appointment of external audit firms

Auditors must provide an independent and objective check on the way in which the financial statements have been prepared and presented. We will oppose an appointment where we believe a conflict of interest may exist.

Exemption from liability

Apart from those instances where local rules allow, in general, we will vote against a limitation in the legal liability of directors and statutory auditors.

We believe agreements should not be concluded with external audit firms exempting them from liability and we will oppose proposals to amend articles of association to permit the introduction of such agreements.

5. Poorly performing companies

During our scrutiny of management proposals at AGMs, we will be cognisant of the recent trend in a company's earnings. For example, where a company has seen a recurring decline in earnings, recorded a large loss, or continuously reported a noticeably low level

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

of return (such as a company with a permanently low ROE), we may determine the poor performance of the company needs to be reflected in our voting activity. (We do not have a ROE target as such, but look at the level and trend in ROE when evaluating companies). In such instances, AMJ will vote against the re-election of a director where shareholder value has been negatively impacted by the poor performance attributable to mistakes made during the director's term.

6. Anti-social activities

This is an item included within a Japanese context. There is no strict definition of anti-social activity, but in this context refers to companies, for example, subject to official sanctions from their regulatory bodies or have violated the law during the fiscal year in question. In addition, companies which have caused severe social problems or through their actions negatively impacted earnings and caused a severe loss to shareholder value will be considered. Emphasis is placed on the possibility or otherwise of the impairment of shareholder value through these activities.

AMJ expects companies which have been involved in anti-social activities to disclose such activities to shareholders, together with the countermeasures and the remedial measures adopted. If the parties directly involved in the anti-social activity remain on the board of directors, in general, we will vote against the election of those directors and/or statutory auditors concerned. However, where there are no other appropriate proposals, we may vote against the directors' remuneration, the payment of bonuses or retirement bonuses to directors, or the award of stock options.

7. Cross-shareholdings

This is an item included within a Japanese context. We do not support cross-shareholdings and in principle favour their liquidation. We will refer to the company's purpose and rationale for cross-shareholdings provided in the Corporate Governance Report and in the event we believe there is insufficient rationale for the holding of equities, we will vote against the re-election of directors.

8. Adoption of anti-hostile takeover measures

AMJ considers such measures on a case-by-case basis. In principle we will oppose such measures, unless it is clear such measures are necessary and effective and will serve to enhance shareholder value. AMJ will generally vote against anti-takeover devices and support proposals aimed at revoking existing plans. AMJ will vote against increases in capital where the increase in authorised capital would dilute shareholder value in the long-term. Also, if management adopts other measures which fulfill the function of an anti-hostile takeover measure without seeking shareholder approval, methods of expressing a vote against management will be determined as deemed appropriate.

In a Japanese context, the following are among the steps we believe that can be viewed as "poison pill" equivalents: 1) MPO financings; 2) increases in authorized share capital without adequate explanation; 3) large scale dilution to parties other than shareholders; 4) issuance of "golden shares"; 5) deliberate changes as to the timing of re-election of directors; 6) lengthy extensions to the directors' term. From the viewpoint of the safeguarding of shareholder rights, we will oppose the re-election of directors, for example, in this context.

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

9. Capital Structure

Issue of classified stock

We will oppose the issue of classified stock without a rational explanation regarding the purpose of such a means of fund-raising.

Increase in the authorized share capital

AMJ will vote against the increase in the authorized share capital when we believe this will be detrimental to shareholder value.

Capital Increase

Capital increases will be judged on a case-by-case basis depending on its purpose. AMJ will vote against capital increases if the purpose is to defend against a takeover.

When new shares are issued, in principle, we believe existing shareholders should be given precedence. Even if this is not the case, we will look at each instance with due care.

If there is no opportunity to indicate our view at the shareholders meeting and we hold a negative view regarding a capital increase during the fiscal year in question, we will oppose the election of directors.

Borrowing of Funds

AMJ will vote against abrupt increases in borrowing of funds if the purpose is to defend against a takeover. If there is no opportunity to indicate our view at the shareholders meeting and we hold a negative view regarding the borrowing of funds, we will oppose the re-election of directors.

Share Repurchase Programs

AMJ will vote in favour of share repurchase programs if it leads to an increase in the value of the company's shares. If there is no opportunity to indicate our view at the shareholders meeting and we hold a negative view regarding the share repurchase program, we will oppose the re-election of directors.

10. Mergers / Acquisitions

Mergers and acquisitions must only be consummated at a price representing fair value. If there is no opportunity to indicate our view at the shareholders meeting and we hold a negative view regarding the merger/acquisition, we will oppose the re-election of directors.

11. Social and Environmental Issues

JPMAM is a signatory to UN PRI based on the belief that due consideration of ESG issues as part of the investment process of evaluating companies is essential in terms of the preservation and creation of shareholder value over the mid to long term. Companies have a social responsibility towards its employees, other stakeholders, the society at large with due regard for the environment. The approach to ESG of investee companies and those companies we research will impact their mid to long term earnings and can impact their reputation; thus, we make investment decisions reflecting an ESG assessment.

We do believe, however, that where sustainability issues are the subject of a proxy vote, a distinction needs to be made between shareholder proposals which are being used by activist groups to target companies as a means of promoting single-issue agendas which can impair shareholder value and limit the power of management, and those which are

Corporate Governance Policy & Voting Guidelines

constructive with the aim of improving the society and the environment in a meaningful manner. AMJ will consider the issue on a case-by-case basis, keeping in mind at all times the best economic interests of our clients. 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.

AMJ does not exclude specific assets or types of assets on purely social, environmental or ethical criteria (unless specifically requested by clients). We do, however, engage with company management on sustainability issues as part of the analytical process.

12. Conflicts of Interest

In order to maintain the integrity and independence of AMJ's proxy-voting decisions, without undue influence from business relations with investee companies and to avoid conflicts of interest, AMJ refers to the view of third party governance specialists to form an objective and rational judgment.

There is a possibility that conflicts of interest may arise with other group companies within the JPMorgan Chase (the ultimate parent company of JPMAM) group as such companies may be providing funds or acting as the underwriter for investee companies. In order to maintain the integrity and independence of AMJ's proxy-voting decisions, JPMorgan Chase has established formal barriers designed to restrict the flow of information between its securities, lending, investment banking and other divisions to investment professionals in the Asset Management division.

Nonetheless, where a potential material conflict of interest has been identified, AMJ, within the scope permitted by regulations and with clients, will call upon an independent third-party to make the voting decision, or it will contact individual clients to approve any voting decision, or may elect not to vote.

13. Shareholder proposals

We will apply the same standards for all proposals with the aim of improving shareholder value. Therefore, whether the proposal has been made by management or by a shareholder will not influence our decision making.