

## Veritas Asset Management LLP

### Global Strategies Voting Policy

Veritas Asset Management LLP (“Veritas”) has a commitment to evaluate and vote proxy resolutions in the best interests of our clients. We will vote on all proxy proposals, amendments, consents or resolutions relating to client securities and will vote against management where we strongly believe that to do so is in the best interests of the client. This will primarily occur where the matter to be voted upon will materially affect shareholder value.

Governance of a company is key to Environmental and Social risk factors. A well-run business with management focused on long term risks and challenges that deploys its capital accordingly, is most likely to meet the Veritas quality characteristics sought from each investment. Where a company deviates once an investment is made, voting is one method that can be used to challenge management. It is often utilized alongside engagement.

#### Areas considered

##### 1. Accountability and Transparency

The management of a company should be accountable to its board of directors and the board accountable to shareholders. The appointment of directors and an independent board are key to good corporate governance. Directors are expected to be competent individuals and they should be accountable and responsive to shareholders. Veritas supports an independent, diverse board of directors, and prefers that key committees such as audit and compensation committees be comprised of independent directors. Generally speaking, we would prefer the separation of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) positions but this would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

When meeting management we focus on their long-term vision and how capital is deployed. We seek long term, predictable and sustainable businesses. A company that is dominant today, is not guaranteed future success if its management does not address the future risks and have incentives that are aligned with long term shareholders.

Any activity performed or information published by management can materially affect shareholder value. The ability to create value for shareholders largely depends on the predictability of management in the way it deploys the cash it generates. How reliable and transparent the management of a company is very important as is the timely disclosure of information. Any activity that is unusual or out of character would cause concern.

##### 2. Alignment

###### (a) Compensation

A company's equity-based compensation plan should be in alignment with the shareholders' long-term interests. Veritas believes that executive compensation should be directly linked to the performance of the company and any incentive plan is fair and reasonable. Severance compensation arrangements will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Excessive "golden parachutes" are not in the interest of long-term shareholders. The Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) should focus on longer time periods which means management not only focus on short term risks but where relevant environmental and social risks.

(b) Capital Structure

Veritas will review, on a case-by-case basis, proposals by companies to increase authorized shares and the purpose for the increase. Generally, we would not be in favour of dual-class capital structures to increase the number of authorized shares where that class of stock would have superior voting rights.

(c) Environmental and Social issues

Companies may face significant financial, legal and reputational risks resulting from poor environmental and social practice. Those companies that are managed well are often effective in dealing with the relevant environmental and social issues that pertain to their business. Good quality sustainable companies will move quickly to address data protection issues, reduce carbon emissions, understand the need for lower drug pricing etc., and identify potential in becoming part of the solution to a growing problem. Companies that do not adjust where necessary become disrupted and the predictability of cash flows is significantly reduced.

## Environmental, Social and Governance (“ESG”) - Red Line Voting

The Red Line initiative was developed by the Association of Member Nominated Trustees (“AMNT”) to enable pension schemes to take a more active ownership role. Whilst segregated clients own the underlying equity and can direct managers on how to vote, pooled fund investors own units in an underlying fund making it difficult to direct voting. The AMNT developed a set of Red Lines which are voting instructions covering a wide range of environmental, social and governance issues. The environmental Red Lines are in furtherance of the UN Global Compact and were formulated with substantial advice from CDP (formerly the Carbon Disclosure Project). The social Red Lines are in furtherance of the UN Global Compact and the Financial Reporting Council’s UK Corporate Governance Code. The governance Red Lines were developed after studying the voting and engagement policies of the AMNT’s largest pension schemes and basing the Red Lines on the consensus. If one of the 37 Red Lines is breached, the Manager votes in accordance with the Red Line (usually against management) or explains why it has not done so (‘comply or explain’).

### Veritas Global application

We understand and agree with the principles behind the AMNT initiative. Investment Managers are the stewards of client capital and all shareholders have a right to direct their Manager on how to vote. The Red Lines are not blunt instructions that the Manager must adhere to. Rather, should a manager decide not to vote in accordance with what might look like a breach of the company’s fiduciary duty, then a detailed explanation would be required.

The Red Lines acknowledge the importance of Governance in ESG. The majority of Red Lines relate back to management and how the business is being run. Whilst some Red Lines may arguably be too aggressive, they provide an opportunity to help educate clients as to why Veritas may think differently on a particular issue.

As an example of Red Line application, voting against senior management for not having a climate change committee is more relevant where the company is a significant carbon producer and needs to do something about it as opposed to one that produces very little carbon and perhaps needs to focus more on data protection. Here we may choose to vote with management and highlight to them areas in which they could improve. Indeed, we have a policy to engage with those companies in which we are invested on behalf of clients, that do not disclose their carbon output and / or have climate policies in place.

The shortfall for a Global Equity Manager like Veritas is that the Red Lines were designed to be applied to UK Equities only. Due to this and our strong belief to vote all resolutions irrespective of where the company is listed, we have instructed Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”) to apply (where applicable) the Red Lines globally to all of our funds. We also apply these rules across all Segregated Global Equity mandates where the client has not elected to vote themselves.

## Voting Integral to the Investment process

Veritas runs concentrated portfolios. Typically, we look for 25-40 stocks that will achieve a real-return objective for our clients. We have a dedicated Global investment team that understands the businesses we invest in on behalf of our clients. The aim is to buy high quality companies at the right price. The best people to assess whether a company is good quality or whether it is carrying out activities/practices that will be potentially detrimental to shareholders are our investment analysts and Portfolio Managers. Whilst we will take third party views into consideration, such as ISS, AMNT Red Lines, and even questions raised by clients who use proxy firms like Hermes etc., it is important that where mandated, the final decision rests with the Veritas investment team.

There have been cases where resolutions brought against management by shareholders for good reason have failed simply because third party proxy firms have recommended voting against the resolution and with management. Veritas maintains independence of decision based on detailed knowledge of the company.

Voting on key issues is rarely done in isolation and is often a follow up post engaging with management. A decision to vote in favour of management could be conditional to implementing a course of action e.g. introducing more Non-Executive Directors within a set time period or adjusting a Long-Term Incentive Plan.

An integral part of the investment process is rating management on a number of criteria relating to sustainability/ vision/ cash deployment. Any drift in the rating will trigger a review of the position and potential engagement/ voting activity.

## Reporting

Reporting is becoming increasingly important. It is clear clients wish to understand the rationale for portfolio positioning and for any necessary engagement / voting on controversial issues. Within the detailed quarterly report sent to clients there will be a summary of the votes cast over the quarter and an explanation of any votes against management.

We also have a separate voting section relating specifically to the ESG Red Lines. We follow the suggested practice of the AMNT for Red Line Voting of 'comply or explain'. Where a red line has been breached, we will either vote against management or explain why we have not done so.

This together with details on any engagement with a company in our quarterly reports, ensures our clients remain well informed.

## Vote Execution

The investment analyst will receive all relevant proxies and determine if he or she believes that Veritas should vote in favour or against management. After discussing with the Portfolio Manager and making a final decision, the analyst will instruct the custodian or prime broker via the Operations Team how to vote. This is done via ISS, and the role of the Operations Team is to ensure that the voting of proxies is done in a timely manner. The Role of the Chief Operating Officer ("COO") is to monitor the effectiveness of these policies.

Veritas uses ISS to execute voting on behalf of clients. We have also mandated ISS to construct a customized screen for various ESG issues which incorporates the AMNT Red Lines, on a best endeavors basis. The AMNT Red Line Voting Policy contains 37 guidelines covering topics associated with ESG. Should any of the 37 red lines be breached, the instruction is to either vote against management or explain why not. Given this Red Line Voting Policy was developed principally for pooled fund investors (who have been unable to direct votes) and for UK stocks only, we have instructed ISS to apply the guidelines globally where applicable and apply the policy across all clients.

The investment analysts will consider the guidelines and any research when making their decision. In the case where a vote goes against a red line or where Veritas decides to vote against management for non-Red Line resolution, an explanation will be provided in the reporting. On occasion, we may decide to vote against management where the recommendation has been a vote in favour and again an explanation will be given.

## Veritas Accountability

Veritas is a signatory of the United Nations Principle of Responsible Investment (“UNPRI”) which requires detailed annual reports in order to remain a member. Veritas is also ranked as Tier 1 by the Financial Reporting Council (“FRC”) in respect of its Stewardship Code. Veritas is also signed up to the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (“TCFD”). Veritas is committed to engaging with the AMNT to improve on the set of guidelines in their Red Line Voting policy in order that the policy can be applied to global mandates.

## Conflicts of Interest

We believe that as we are a privately owned, independently run partnership, and as our only business activity is asset management; we do not encounter some of the conflicts faced by larger financial services companies. Notwithstanding this, we still ensure that we have a robust conflicts of interest policy which clearly sets out how we identify, consider, mitigate, manage, disclose and record all conflicts, ensuring they are dealt with in a manner that is not prejudicial to any of our clients.

We seek to act in the best interests of all clients when considering proxy voting. Conflicts of interest may arise from time to time, such as voting on matters affecting an investee company, whose pension scheme may be one of our clients<sup>1</sup>, or where our clients are shareholders in two companies involved in both sides of a deal or dispute.

On a monthly basis, the ESG team at Veritas, reconciles the firm’s list of investee companies against its client list in the CRM system. If no conflicts are identified, the Compliance team will be advised of a nil report. In the event that a conflict is identified, the Compliance team will be notified, and the item will be logged in the conflicts of interest register, along with the date of the next AGM or EGM for the investee company (if available). Notification of the conflict will also be provided to the Operations team and the Investment team who will be instructed to abstain from voting until informed otherwise.

The ESG team provide ongoing monitoring to ensure that the conflicts of interest register is kept up to date, with the deletion or addition of any conflicts as necessary, and the relevant teams will be notified of any changes to ensure that voting is carried out in accordance with this policy. The Management Committee oversees this process and are informed of any amendments to the conflicts of interest register.

For further information please contact: [esg@vamllp.com](mailto:esg@vamllp.com)

Veritas Asset Management LLP, 1

Smart’s Place,

London,

WC2B 5LW

<http://www.vamllp.com/>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes investments that are not held in the legal name of the underlying client and investments made via third party platforms.