



INTERNATIONAL PROXY PAPER POLICY GUIDELINES

AN OVERVIEW OF THE GLASS LEWIS APPROACH TO PROXY ADVICE

JANUARY 1, 2020

SUMMARY OF CHANGES FOR THE 2020 INTERNATIONAL PROXY PAPER GUIDELINES

Following is a summary of the significant changes to the 2020 International Proxy Paper Policy Guidelines:

MARKET-SPECIFIC CONTEXT: We have added a clarification that these guidelines represent a summary of our global policy approach. For information on the detailed implementation of our general policies described in this document, please refer to the publicly available Glass Lewis policy guidelines for the relevant country.

BOARD INDEPENDENCE: We have clarified that we generally consider a director representing a shareholder who owns more than 10% of a company's issued share capital to be affiliated, except where local regulations or best practice set a different ownership threshold.

SLATE BOARD ELECTIONS: We have clarified that we typically recommend voting against the entire slate of directors when the board proposes to elect directors as a slate and we have concerns regarding the independence of the board or any of its key committees.

SEPARATION OF CHAIR AND CEO: We have updated our policy to reflect that we may recommend voting against the chair of the nominating committee when the chair and CEO roles are combined and the board has not appointed an independent presiding or lead director.

SHARE ISSUES: We have updated our policy to reflect that in general, we will support proposals to issue shares (with pre-emption rights) when the requested increase is equal to or less than the current issued share capital. In some countries, if a proposal seeks to issue shares exceeding 33% of issued share capital, the company should explain the specific rationale, which we analyze on a case-by-case basis. Further, this policy applies to proposals to increase authorized capital where such proposals authorize the issue of new shares without requiring further shareholder approval.

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: We have updated our policy to state that we will generally recommend voting against say-on-pay proposals where reliance on short-term (i.e. less than two-year) performance targets is excessive.

CLAWBACK PROVISIONS: We have clarified that we do not usually recommend voting against a say-on-pay proposal solely on the basis of the absence of a clawback provision. However, we generally view clawback or malus as best practice provisions and their absence may be a contributing factor to a negative recommendation.

INTRODUCTION

These guidelines provide a general overview of the Glass Lewis approach to proxy advice globally. Glass Lewis publishes separate, detailed policy guidelines for all major global markets, which are publicly available on the Glass Lewis website. Glass Lewis policies are largely based on the regulations, listing rules, codes of best practice and other relevant standards set in each country. While these guidelines provide a high-level overview of our general policy approach, implementation varies in accordance with relevant requirements or best practices in each market. For detailed information on the implementation of the policy approach described below, refer to the Glass Lewis policy guidelines for the relevant country.

I. ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

Board of Directors

Boards are put in place to represent shareholders and protect their interests. Glass Lewis seeks boards with a proven record of protecting shareholders and delivering value over the medium- and long-term. In our view, boards working to protect and enhance the best interests of shareholders typically include some independent directors (the percentage will vary by local market practice and regulations), boast a record of positive performance, have directors with diverse backgrounds, and appoint directors with a breadth and depth of experience.

Board Composition

We look at each individual on the board and examine his or her relationships with the company, the company's executives and with other board members. The purpose of this inquiry is to determine whether pre-existing personal, familial or financial relationships are likely to impact the decisions of that board member.

Where the company does not disclose the names or backgrounds of director nominees with sufficient time in advance of the shareholder meeting to evaluate their independence, performance or skills we will consider recommending voting against or abstaining from voting on the directors' election.

We recommend voting in favor of governance structures that will drive positive performance and enhance shareholder value. The most crucial test of a board's commitment to the company and to its shareholders is the performance of the board and its members. The performance of directors in their capacity as board members and as executives of the company, when applicable, and in their roles at other companies where they serve is critical to this evaluation.

We believe a director is independent if he or she has no material financial, familial or other current relationships with the company, its executives or other board members except for service on the board and standard fees paid for that service. Relationships that have existed within the three-five years prior to the inquiry are usually considered to be "current" for purposes of this test.

In our view, a director is affiliated if he or she has a material financial, familial or other relationship with the company or its executives, but is not an employee of the company. This includes directors whose employers have a material financial relationship with the Company. This also includes a director who owns or controls, directly or indirectly, 10% or more of the company's voting stock (except where local regulations or best practice set a different threshold).

We define an inside director as one who simultaneously serves as a director and as an employee of the company. This category may include a chairman of the board who acts as an employee of the company or is paid as an employee of the company.

Although we typically vote for the election of independent directors, we will recommend voting against directors for the following reasons:

- A director who attends less than 75% of the board and applicable committee meetings.
- A director who is also the CEO of a company where a serious restatement has occurred after the CEO certified the pre-restatement financial statements.
- An affiliated director where the board is not sufficiently independent in accordance with market best practice standards.

We also feel that the following conflicts of interest may hinder a director's performance and will therefore recommend voting against a:

- Director who presently sits on an excessive number of boards.
- Director, or a director whose immediate family member, provides material professional services to the company at any time during the past five years.
- Director, or a director whose immediate family member, engages in airplane, real estate or other similar deals, including perquisite type grants from the company.
- Director with an interlocking directorship.

Slate Elections

In some countries, companies elect their board members as a slate, whereby shareholders are unable to vote on the election of each individual director, but rather are limited to voting for or against the board as a whole. If we have concerns about the independence of the board or any of its key committees, significant concerns regarding the background or experience of one or more of the nominees, or any other board-related concerns in markets where directors are generally elected individually, we will recommend voting against the entire slate of directors.

Board Committee Composition

We believe that independent directors should serve on a company's audit, compensation, nominating and governance committees. We will support boards with such a structure and encourage change where this is not the case.

Review of Risk Management Controls

We believe companies, particularly financial firms, should have a dedicated risk committee, or a committee of the board charged with risk oversight, as well as a chief risk officer who reports directly to that committee, not to the CEO or another executive. In cases where a company has disclosed a sizable loss or writedown, and where a reasonable analysis indicates that the

company's board-level risk committee should be held accountable for poor oversight, we would recommend that shareholders vote against such committee members on that basis. In addition, in cases where a company maintains a significant level of financial risk exposure but fails to disclose any explicit form of board-level risk oversight (committee or otherwise), we will consider recommending to vote against the chairman of the board on that basis.

Classified Boards

Glass Lewis favors the repeal of staggered boards in favor of the annual election of directors. We believe that staggered boards are less accountable to shareholders than annually elected boards. Furthermore, we feel that the annual election of directors encourages board members to focus on protecting the interests of shareholders.

Board Tenure and Refreshment

Glass Lewis strongly supports routine director evaluation, including independent external reviews, and periodic board refreshment to foster the sharing of diverse perspectives in the boardroom and the generation of new ideas and business strategies. In our view, a director's experience can be a valuable asset to shareholders because of the complex, critical issues that boards face. This said, we recognize a lack of refreshment can contribute to a lack of board responsiveness to poor company performance. We may consider recommending voting against directors with a lengthy tenure (e.g. over 12 years) when we identify significant performance or governance concerns indicating that a fresh perspective would be beneficial and we find no evidence of board refreshment.

Board Diversity

Glass Lewis values the importance of board diversity, believing there are a number of benefits from having individuals with a variety of backgrounds serving on boards.. We consider the diversity of backgrounds, skills and experience of directors when evaluating board diversity. If a board has failed to address material concerns regarding the mix of skills and experience of the non-executive directors or when it fails to meet legal requirements or the best practice standard prevalent in the market for gender quotas and has not disclosed any cogent explanation or plan regarding its approach to board diversity, we will consider recommending voting against the chair of the nominating committee.

Board Responsiveness

Glass Lewis believes that any time 20% or more of shareholders vote contrary to the recommendation of management, the board should, depending on the issue, demonstrate some level of responsiveness to address the concerns of shareholders, particularly in the case of a compensation or director election proposal. While the 20% threshold alone will not automatically generate a negative vote recommendation from Glass Lewis on a future proposal (e.g., to recommend against a director nominee, against a remuneration proposal, etc.), it will be a contributing factor to recommend a vote against management's recommendation in the event we determine that the board did not respond appropriately.

As a general framework, our evaluation of board responsiveness involves a review of the publicly available disclosures released following the date of the company's last annual meeting up through the publication date of our most current Proxy Paper.

Separation of the Roles of Chair and CEO

Glass Lewis believes that separating the roles of corporate officers and the chair of the board is a better governance structure than a combined executive/chair position. The role of executives is to manage the business on the basis of the course charted by the board. Executives should be in the position of reporting and answering to the board for their performance in achieving the goals set out by such board. This becomes much more complicated when management actually sits on, or chairs, the board.

We view an independent chair as better able to oversee the executives of the company and set a pro-shareholder agenda without the management conflicts that a CEO and other executive insiders often face. This, in turn, leads to a more proactive and effective board of directors that is looking out for the interests of shareholders above all else.

In the absence of an independent chair, we support the appointment of a presiding or lead director with authority to set the agenda for the meetings and to lead sessions outside the presence of the insider chair.

We may recommend voting against the chair of the nominating committee when the chair and CEO roles are combined and the board has not appointed an independent presiding or lead director.

II. FINANCIAL REPORTING

Accounts and Reports

Many countries require companies to submit the annual financial statements, director reports and independent auditors' reports to shareholders at a general meeting. We will usually recommend voting in favor of these proposals except when there are concerns about the integrity of the statements/reports. However, should the audited financial statements, auditor's report and/or annual report not be published at the writing of our report, we will recommend that shareholders abstain from voting on this proposal.

Income Allocation (Distribution of Dividends)

In many countries, companies must submit the allocation of income for shareholder approval. We will generally recommend voting for such a proposal. However, we will give particular scrutiny to cases where the company's dividend payout ratio is exceptionally low or excessively high relative to its peers and the company has not provided a satisfactory explanation.

Appointment of Auditors and Authority to Set Fees

We believe that role of the auditor is crucial in protecting shareholder value. Like directors, auditors should be free from conflicts of interest and should assiduously avoid situations that require them to make choices between their own interests and the interests of the shareholders. We generally support management's recommendation regarding the selection of an auditor and support granting the board the authority to fix auditor fees except in cases where we believe the independence of an incumbent auditor or the integrity of the audit has been compromised. However, we generally recommend voting against ratification of the auditor and/or authorizing the board to set auditor fees for the following reasons:

- When audit fees added to audit-related fees total less than one-half of total fees.
- When there have been any recent restatements or late filings by the company where the auditor bears some responsibility for the restatement or late filing (e.g., a restatement due to a reporting error).
- When the company has aggressive accounting policies.
- When the company has poor disclosure or lack of transparency in financial statements.
- When there are other relationships or issues of concern with the auditor that might suggest a conflict between the interest of the auditor and the interests of shareholders.
- When the company is changing auditors as a result of a disagreement between the company and the auditor on a matter of accounting principles or practices, financial statement disclosure or auditing scope or procedures.
- Where the auditor's tenure is lengthy (e.g. over 10 years) and when we identify any ongoing litigation or significant controversies which call into question an auditor's effectiveness

III. COMPENSATION

Compensation Report/Compensation Policy

We closely review companies' remuneration practices and disclosure as outlined in company filings to evaluate management-submitted advisory compensation report and policy vote proposals. In evaluating these proposals, which can be binding or non-binding depending on the country, we examine how well the company has disclosed information pertinent to its compensation programs, the extent to which overall compensation is tied to performance, the performance metrics selected by the company and the levels of remuneration in comparison to company performance and that of its peers.

We will usually recommend voting against approval of the compensation report or policy when the following occur:

- Gross disconnect between pay and performance;
- Performance goals and metrics are inappropriate or insufficiently challenging;
- Lack of disclosure regarding performance metrics and goals as well as the extent to which the performance metrics, targets and goals are implemented to enhance company performance and encourage prudent risk-taking;
- Excessive weighting of short-term (e.g., generally less than three year) performance measurement in incentive plans;
- Excessive discretion afforded to or exercised by management or the compensation committee to deviate from defined performance metrics and goals in making awards;
- Ex gratia or other non-contractual payments have been made and the reasons for making the payments have not been fully explained or the explanation is unconvincing;
- Guaranteed bonuses are established;
- Egregious or excessive bonuses, equity awards or severance payments;
- Excessive increases (e.g. over 10%) in fixed payments such as salary or pension entitlements that are not adequately justified

In addition, we look for the presence of other structural safeguards, such as clawback and malus policies for incentive plans. The absence of such safeguards may contribute to a negative recommendation.

Long-Term Incentive Plans

Glass Lewis recognizes the value of equity-based incentive programs. When used appropriately, they can provide a vehicle for linking an employee's pay to a company's performance, thereby aligning their interests with those of shareholders. Tying a portion of an employee's compensation to the performance of the Company provides an incentive to maximize share value. In addition, equity-based compensation is an effective way to attract, retain and motivate key employees. In order to allow for meaningful shareholder review, we believe that incentive programs should generally include: (i) specific and appropriate performance goals; (ii) a maximum award pool; and (iii) a maximum award amount per employee. In addition, the payments made should be reasonable relative to the performance of the business and total compensation to those covered by the plan should be in line with compensation paid by the Company's peers.

Performance-Based Equity Compensation

Glass Lewis believes in performance-based equity compensation plans for senior executives. We feel that executives should be compensated with equity when their performance and that of the company warrants such rewards. While we do not believe that equity-based compensation plans for all employees need to be based on overall company performance, we do support such limitations for grants to senior executives (although even some equity-based compensation of senior executives without performance criteria is acceptable, such as in the case of moderate incentive grants made in an initial offer of employment). Boards often argue that such a proposal would hinder them in attracting talent. We believe that boards can develop a consistent, reliable approach, as boards of many companies have, that would still attract executives who believe in their ability to guide the company to achieve its targets.

We generally recommend that shareholders vote in favor of performance-based option requirements. There should be no retesting of performance conditions for all share- and option-based incentive schemes. We will generally recommend that shareholders vote against performance-based equity compensation plans that allow for re-testing.

Director Compensation

Glass Lewis believes that non-employee directors should receive appropriate types and levels of compensation for the time and effort they spend serving on the board and its committees. Director fees should be reasonable in order to retain and attract qualified individuals. We support compensation plans that include non performance-based equity awards. Glass Lewis compares the costs of these plans to the plans of peer companies with similar market capitalizations in the same country to help inform its judgment on this issue.

Retirement Benefits for Directors

We will typically recommend voting against proposals to grant retirement benefits to non-executive directors. Such extended payments can impair the objectivity and independence of these board members. Directors should receive adequate compensation for their board service through initial and annual fees.

Limits on Executive Compensation

As a general rule, Glass Lewis believes that shareholders should not seek to micromanage executive compensation programs. Such matters should be left to the board's compensation committee. We view the election of directors, and specifically those who sit on the compensation committee, as an appropriate mechanism for shareholders to express their disapproval or support of board policy on this issue. Further, we believe that companies whose pay-for-performance is in line with their peers should be granted the flexibility to compensate their executives in a manner that drives sustainable growth. However, Glass Lewis favors performance-based compensation as an effective means of motivating executives to act in the best interests of shareholders. Performance-based compensation may be limited if a chief executive's pay is capped at a low level rather than flexibly tied to the performance of the company.

IV. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Amendments to the Articles of Association

We will evaluate proposed amendments to a company's articles of association on a case-by-case basis. We are opposed to the practice of bundling several amendments under a single proposal because it prevents shareholders from evaluating each amendment on its own merits. In such cases, we will analyze each change individually and will recommend voting for the proposal only when we believe that the amendments on balance are in the best interests of shareholders.

Anti-Takeover Measures

Dual-Class Share Structures

Glass Lewis believes dual-class voting structures are typically not in the best interests of common shareholders. We believe the economic stake of each shareholder should match their voting power and that no small group of shareholders, family or otherwise, should have voting rights different from those of other shareholders.

We generally consider a dual-class share structure to reflect negatively on a company's overall corporate governance. Because we believe that allowing one vote per share best protects the interests of shareholders, we typically recommend that shareholders vote in favor of recapitalization proposals to eliminate dual-class share structures. Similarly, we will generally recommend voting against proposals to adopt a new class of common stock.

Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans)

Glass Lewis believes that poison pill plans generally are not in the best interests of shareholders. Specifically, they can reduce management accountability by substantially limiting opportunities for corporate takeovers. Rights plans can thus prevent shareholders from receiving a buy-out premium for their stock. We believe that boards should be given wide latitude in directing the activities of the company and charting the company's course. However, on an issue such as this where the link between the financial interests of shareholders and their right to consider and accept buyout offers is so substantial, we believe that shareholders should be allowed to vote on whether or not they support such a plan's implementation. In certain limited circumstances, we will support a limited poison pill to accomplish a particular objective, such as the closing of an important merger, or a pill that contains what we believe to be a reasonable 'qualifying offer' clause.

Supermajority Vote Requirements

Glass Lewis favors a simple majority voting structure except where a supermajority voting requirement is explicitly intended to protect the rights of minority shareholders in a controlled company. In the case of non-controlled companies, supermajority vote requirements act as impediments to shareholder action on ballot items that are critical to their interests. One key example is in the takeover context where supermajority vote requirements can strongly limit shareholders' input in making decisions on such crucial matters as selling the business.

Increase in Authorized Shares

Glass Lewis believes that having adequate capital stock available for issuance is important to the operation of a company. We will generally support proposals when a company could reasonably use the requested shares for financing, stock splits and stock dividends. While we believe that

having adequate shares to allow management to make quick decisions and effectively operate the business is critical, we prefer that, for significant transactions, management come to shareholders to justify their use of additional shares rather than providing a blank check in the form of large pools of unallocated shares available for any purpose.

In general, we will support proposals to increase authorized shares up to 100% of the number of shares currently authorized unless, after the increase the company would be left with less than 30% of its authorized shares outstanding. In markets where such authorities typically also authorize the board to issue new shares without separate shareholder approval, we apply the policy described below on the issuance of shares.

Issuance of Shares

Issuing additional shares can dilute existing holders in some circumstances. Further, the availability of additional shares, where the board has discretion to implement a poison pill, can often serve as a deterrent to interested suitors. Accordingly, where we find that the company has not disclosed a detailed plan for use of the proposed shares, or where the number of shares requested are excessive, we typically recommend against the issuance. In the case of a private placement, we will also consider whether the company is offering a discount to its share price.

In general, we will support proposals to authorize the board to issue shares (with pre-emption rights) when the requested increase is equal to or less than the current issued share capital. This authority should generally not exceed five years. In accordance with differing market best practice, in some countries, if a proposal seeks to issue shares exceeding 33% of issued share capital, the company should explain the specific rationale, which we analyze on a case-by-case basis.

We will also generally support proposals to suspend pre-emption rights for a maximum of 5-20% of the issued ordinary share capital of the company, depending on best practice in the country in which the company is located. This authority should not exceed five years, or less for some countries.

Repurchase of Shares

We will recommend voting in favor of a proposal to repurchase shares when the plan includes the following provisions: (i) a maximum number of shares which may be purchased (typically not more than 10-15% of the issued share capital); and (ii) a maximum price which may be paid for each share (as a percentage of the market price). that those who hold a significant minority of shares are able to elect a candidate of their choosing to the board.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISK

Glass Lewis generally believes decisions regarding day-to-day management and policy decisions, including those related to social, environmental or political issues, are best left to management and the board as they in almost all cases have more and better information about company strategy and risk. However, when there is a clear link between the subject of a shareholder proposal and value enhancement or risk mitigation, Glass Lewis will recommend in favor of such proposal where the company has failed to or inadequately addressed the issue.

We strongly feel that shareholders should not attempt to micromanage the company, its business or its executives through the shareholder initiative process. Rather, we believe shareholders should use their influence to push for governance structures that protect shareholders and promote director accountability. Shareholders should put in place a board they can trust to make informed decisions that are in the best interests of the business and its owners, and hold directors accountable through the election of directors.

To this end, we examine the circumstances at each company on a case-by-case basis. We thoroughly research each firm, using publicly available information, such as annual reports, sustainability reports, companies' websites, NGO websites, and news sources. When we identify situations where shareholder value may be at risk, we will note our concerns in the relevant section of the Proxy Paper analysis as well as in any applicable shareholder proposals. Though relatively rare, should a shareholder proposal seek action on a specific ESG issue, Glass Lewis will recommend voting in favor of such a proposal when we believe its implementation will enhance or protect shareholder value. We will also recommend voting in favor of a proposal if we believe supporting such proposal will promote disclosure of significant risk exposure.

In limited cases where a company has failed to adequately mitigate risks stemming from environmental or social practices, we will recommend shareholders vote against: (i) ratification of board and/or management acts; (ii) approving a company's accounts and reports and/or; (iii) directors (in egregious cases).