



CANADA

Proxy Voting Guidelines for TSX-Listed Companies Benchmark Policy Recommendations

Effective for Meetings on or after February 1, 2024
Published early January, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVERAGE	5
1. Routine/Miscellaneous	6
Audit-Related	6
Financial Statements/Director and Auditor Reports	6
Ratification of Auditors	6
Other Business	6
2. Board of Directors	7
Voting on Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections	7
Fundamental Principles	7
TSX Listing Requirements	7
Slate Ballots (Bundled Director Elections)	8
ISS Canadian Definition of Independence	9
Board Structure and Independence	11
Non-Independent Directors on Key Committees	11
Policy Considerations for Majority Owned Companies	12
Audit Fee Disclosure	13
Excessive Non-Audit Fees	13
Persistent Problematic Audit Related Practices	14
Director Attendance	14
Overboarded Directors	15
Board Gender Diversity	15
Board Racial and/or Ethnic Diversity	17
Former CEO/CFO on Audit/Compensation Committee	17
Climate Accountability	18
Voting on Directors for Egregious Actions	19
Board Responsiveness	20
Unilateral Adoption of an Advance Notice Provision	21
Other Board-Related Proposals	21
Classification/Declassification of the Board	21
Independent Chair (Separate Chair/CEO)	21
Majority of Independent Directors/Establishment of Committees	22
Majority Vote Standard for the Election of Directors	22
Proxy Access	22
Proxy Contests - Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections	22
Reimbursing Proxy Solicitation Expenses	23
3. Shareholder Rights & Defenses	24
Advance Notice Requirements	24
Exclusive Forum Proposals	25
Enhanced Shareholder Meeting Quorum for Contested Director Elections	25
Appointment of Additional Directors Between Annual Meetings	26

Article/By-law Amendments.....	26
Cumulative Voting	28
Confidential Voting.....	28
Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans).....	28
Reincorporation Proposals	31
Supermajority Vote Requirements	31
4. Capital/Restructuring	32
Mergers and Corporate Restructurings	32
Increases in Authorized Capital	32
Private Placement Issuances	33
Blank Cheque Preferred Stock	34
Dual-class Stock	34
Escrow Agreements	34
5. Compensation	35
Executive Pay Evaluation	35
Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation (Say-on-Pay) Management Proposals.....	35
Primary Evaluation Factors for Executive Pay	36
Voting Alternatives	36
Pay for Performance Evaluation	36
Step I: Quantitative Screen	37
Step II: Qualitative Analysis	37
Problematic Pay Practices.....	38
Board Communications and Responsiveness	40
Externally-Managed Issuers (EMIs)	40
Equity-Based Compensation Plans	41
Plan Cost	42
Overriding Negative Factors	43
Plan Amendment Provisions.....	43
Non-Employee Director (NED) Participation	45
Discretionary Participation	45
Limited Participation	45
Repricing Options	46
Repricing History	46
Other Compensation Proposals.....	46
Individual Grants.....	46
Repricing Proposals	46
Employee Stock Purchase Plans (ESPPs, ESOPs).....	47
Management Deferred Share Unit (DSU) Plans.....	48
Director Compensation.....	48
Non-Employee Director (NED) Deferred Share Unit (DSU) Plans	48
Problematic Director Compensation Practices	49
Shareholder Proposals on Compensation	49
Shareholder Advisory Vote Proposals	49
Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan (SERP) Proposals.....	50

6. Social/Environmental Issues	51
Global Approach – E&S Shareholder Proposals.....	51
Say on Climate (SoC) Management Proposals.....	51
Say on Climate (SoC) Shareholder Proposals.....	52

COVERAGE

The Canadian research team provides proxy analyses and voting recommendations for common shareholder meetings of publicly – traded Canadian-incorporated companies that are held in our institutional investor clients' portfolios. These TSX policy guidelines apply to companies listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange and the Cboe Canada. ISS reviews its universe of coverage on an annual basis, and the coverage is subject to change based on client need and industry trends.

U.S. Domestic Issuers – which have a majority of outstanding shares held in the U.S. and meet other criteria, as determined by the SEC, and are subject to the same disclosure and listing standards as U.S. incorporated companies – are generally covered under standard U.S. policy guidelines. U.S. Foreign Private Issuers that are incorporated in Canada and that do not file DEF14A reports and do not meet the SEC Domestic Issuer criteria are covered under Canadian policy.

In all cases – including with respect to other companies with cross-market features that may lead to ballot items related to multiple markets – items that are on the ballot solely due to the requirements of another market (listing, incorporation, or national code) may be evaluated under the policy of the relevant market, regardless of the “assigned” market coverage.

1. Routine/Miscellaneous

Audit-Related

Financial Statements/Director and Auditor Reports

Companies are required under their respective Business Corporations Acts (BCAs) to submit their financial statements and the auditor's report, which is included in the company's annual report, to shareholders at every Annual General Meeting (AGM). This routine item is almost always non-voting.

Ratification of Auditors

General Recommendation: Vote for proposals to ratify auditors unless the following applies:

- Non-audit ("other") fees paid to the auditor > audit fees + audit-related fees + tax compliance/preparation fees.

Background: National Instrument 52-110 - Audit Committees defines "audit services" to include the professional services rendered by the issuer's external auditor for the audit and review of the issuer's financial statements or services that are normally provided by the external auditor in connection with statutory and regulatory filings or engagements.

The instrument also sets out disclosure requirements related to fees charged by external auditors. Every issuer is required to disclose in its annual information form, with a cross-reference in the related proxy circular, fees billed by the external audit firm in each of the last two fiscal years. These fees must be broken down into four categories: Audit Fees, Audit-Related Fees, Tax Fees, and All Other Fees.

ISS recognizes that certain tax-related services, e.g., tax compliance and preparation, are most economically provided by the audit firm. Tax compliance and preparation include the preparation of original and amended tax returns, refund claims, and tax payment planning. However, other services in the tax category, e.g., tax advice, planning, or consulting fall more into a consulting category. Therefore, these fees are separated from the tax compliance/preparation category and are added to the Non-audit (Other) fees for the purpose of determining whether excessive non-audit related fees have been paid to the external audit firm in the most recent year.

In circumstances where "Other" fees include fees related to significant one-time capital restructure events, such as initial public offerings, emergence from bankruptcy, and spinoffs, and the company makes public disclosure of the amount and nature of those fees which are an exception to the standard "non-audit fee" category, then such fees may be excluded from the non-audit fees considered in determining whether non-audit fees are excessive.

Other Business

General Recommendation: Vote against all proposals on proxy ballots seeking approval for unspecified "other business" that may be conducted at the shareholder meeting as shareholders cannot know what they are approving.

2. Board of Directors

Voting on Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections

Fundamental Principles

Four fundamental principles apply when determining votes on director nominees:

Board Accountability: Practices that promote accountability and enhance shareholder trust begin with transparency into a company's governance practices (including risk management practices). These practices include the annual election of all directors by a majority of votes cast by all shareholders, affording shareholders the ability to remove directors, and providing detailed timely disclosure of voting results. Board accountability is facilitated through clearly defined board roles and responsibilities, regular peer performance review, and shareholder engagement.

Board Responsiveness: In addition to facilitating constructive shareholder engagement, boards of directors should be responsive to the wishes of shareholders as indicated by majority supported shareholder proposals or lack of majority support for management proposals (including election of directors). In the case of a company controlled through a dual-class share structure, the support of a majority of the minority shareholders should equate to majority support.

Board Independence: Independent oversight of management is a primary responsibility of the board. While true independence of thought and deed is difficult to assess, there are corporate governance practices with regard to board structure and management of conflicts of interest that are meant to promote independent oversight. Such practices include the selection of an independent chair to lead the board, structuring board pay practices to eliminate the potential for self-dealing, reducing risky decision-making, ensuring the alignment of director interests with those of shareholders rather than the interests of management, and structuring separate independent key committees with defined mandates. In addition, the board must be able to objectively set and monitor the execution of corporate strategy, with appropriate use of shareholder capital, and independently set and monitor executive compensation programs that support that strategy. Complete disclosure of all conflicts of interest and how they are managed is a critical indicator of independent oversight.

Board Composition: Companies should ensure that directors add value to the board through their specific skills and expertise and by having sufficient time and commitment to serve effectively. Boards should be of a size appropriate to accommodate diversity, expertise, and independence, while ensuring active and collaborative participation by all members. Boards should be sufficiently diverse to ensure consideration of a wide range of perspectives.

TSX Listing Requirements

Under Part IV of the Toronto Stock Exchange (TSX) Company Manual, issuers are required to provide for the annual election of directors by individual ballot and to promptly and publicly disclose the votes received for the election of each director following the meeting.

In addition, effective June 30, 2014, issuers were required to adopt a majority voting director resignation policy¹ providing that:

- If a director receives less than a majority of votes for his or her election, the director will be required to submit his or her resignation to the board for consideration;
- The board will accept the resignation absent exceptional circumstances; and
- The company will promptly issue a public statement with the board's decision regarding the director's resignation. If the board does not accept the resignation the statement must fully state the reasons for that decision.

The Cboe Canada has the same listing requirements for director elections as the TSX.

Slate Ballots (Bundled Director Elections)

General Recommendation: Generally vote withhold² for all directors nominated only by slate ballot at the annual/general or annual/special shareholders' meetings. This policy will not apply to contested director elections.

Background: Slate ballots are contrary to best practices within the Canadian market. Affording shareholders the ability to individually elect directors allows shareholders to better articulate concerns by voting withhold for those specific directors deemed to be associated with significant concerns.

Individual director elections are required for companies listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange (TSX).

¹ Controlled companies are exempt from this requirement. Distributing corporations incorporated under the *Canada Business Corporations Act* (CBCA) are subject to majority voting for uncontested director elections. Where only one nominee is up for election for each board seat and less than 50% of the votes cast by shareholders are "for" a particular director nominee, such nominee will not be elected as a director (subject to provisions in the issuer's articles). However, if an incumbent director is not elected by a majority of "for" votes at the meeting, they will still be permitted to remain as a director until the earlier of: (a) the 90th day after the day of the election; or (b) the day on which their successor is appointed or elected.

² For companies incorporated under CBCA, the valid contrary vote option for director elections is "against" rather than withhold.

ISS Canadian Definition of Independence

1. **Executive Director**
 - 1.1. Employees of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
 - 1.2. Current interim CEO or any other current interim executive of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
2. **Non-Independent Non-Executive Director**
 - Former/Interim CEOⁱⁱ
 - 2.1. Former CEO of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the past five yearsⁱⁱⁱ or of an acquired company within the past five years.
 - 2.2. Former interim CEO of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the past five yearsⁱⁱⁱ if the service was longer than 18 months or if the service was between 12 and 18 months and the compensation was high relative to that of the other directors or in line with a CEO's compensation^{iv} at that time.
 - 2.3. CEO of a former parent or predecessor firm at the time the company was sold or split off from the parent/predecessor within the past five yearsⁱⁱⁱ.
 - Controlling/Significant Shareholder
 - 2.4. Beneficial owner of company shares with more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting rights (this may be aggregated if voting power is distributed among more than one member of a group).
 - Non-CEO Executivesⁱⁱ
 - 2.5. Former executive of the company, an affiliateⁱ, or a firm acquired within the past three years.
 - 2.6. Former interim executive of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the past three years if the service was longer than 18 months or if the service was between 12 and 18 months, an assessment of the interim executive's terms of employment including compensation relative to other directors or in line with the top five NEOs at that time.
 - 2.7. Executive of a former parent or predecessor firm at the time the company was sold or split off from parent/predecessor within the past three years.
 - 2.8. Executive, former executive of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the last three years, general or limited partner of a joint venture or partnership with the company.
 - Relatives
 - 2.9. Relative^v of current executive officer^{vi} of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
 - 2.10. Relative^v of a person who has served as a CEO of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the last five years; or an executive officer of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the last three years.
 - Transactional, Professional, Financial, and Charitable Relationships^{vii}
 - 2.11. Currently provides (or a relative^v provides) professional services^{viii} to the company, its affiliatesⁱ or to its officers.
 - 2.12. Is (or a relative^v is) a partner, controlling shareholder or an employee of, an organization that provides professional services^{viii} to the company, to an affiliate of the company, or to an individual officer of the company or one of its affiliatesⁱ.
 - 2.13. Currently employed by (or a relative^v is employed by) a significant customer or supplier^{ix} of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
 - 2.14. Is (or a relative^v is) a trustee, director or employee of a charitable or non-profit organization that receives material^x grants or endowments from the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
 - 2.15. Has, or is (or a relative^v is) a partner, controlling shareholder or an employee of, an organization that has a transactional relationship with the company or its affiliatesⁱ, excluding investments in the company through a private placement.
 - Other Relationships
 - 2.16. Has a contractual/guaranteed board seat and is party to a voting agreement to vote in line with management on proposals being brought to shareholders.
 - 2.17. Founder^{xi} of the company but not currently an employee.
 - 2.18. Has any material^x relationship with the company or with any one or more members of management of the company.
 - 2.19. Non-employee officer of the company or its affiliatesⁱ if he/she is among the five most highly compensated.
 - Board Attestation
 - 2.20. Board attestation that an outside director is not independent.

3. Independent Director

3.1. No material^x ties to the company other than board seat.

Footnotes:

i "Affiliate" includes a subsidiary, sibling company, or parent company. ISS uses 50 percent control ownership by the parent company as the standard for applying its affiliate designation.

ii When there is a former CEO or other officer of a capital pool company (CPC) or special purpose acquisition company (SPAC) serving on the board of an acquired company, ISS will generally classify such directors as independent unless determined otherwise taking into account the following factors: any operating ties to the firm; and the existence of any other conflicting relationships or related party transactions.

iii The determination of a former CEO's classification following the five year cooling-off period will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Factors taken into consideration may include but are not limited to: management/board turnover, current or recent involvement in the company, whether the former CEO is or has been Executive Chair of the board or a company founder, length of service with the company, any related party transactions, consulting arrangements, and any other factors that may reasonably be deemed to affect the independence of the former CEO.

iv ISS will look at the terms of the interim CEO's compensation or employment contract to determine if it contains severance pay, long-term health and pension benefits or other such standard provisions typically contained in contracts of permanent, non-temporary CEOs. ISS will also consider if a formal search process was underway for a full-time CEO.

v Relative refers to immediate family members including spouse, parents, children, siblings, in-laws and anyone sharing the director's home.

vi Executive Officer will include: the CEO or CFO of the entity; the president of the entity; a vice-president of the entity in charge of a principal business unit, division or function; an officer of the entity or any of its subsidiary entities who performs a policy making function in respect of the entity; any other individual who performs a policy-making function in respect of the entity; or any executive named in the Summary Compensation Table.

vii The terms "Currently", "Is" or "Has" in the context of Transactional, Professional, Financial, and Charitable Relationships will be defined as having been provided at any time within the most recently completed fiscal year and/or having been identified at any time up to and including the annual shareholders' meeting.

viii Professional services can be characterized as advisory in nature, generally involve access to sensitive company information or to strategic decision-making, and typically have commission or fee-based payment structure. Professional services generally include, but are not limited to the following: investment banking/financial advisory services, commercial banking (beyond deposit services), investment services, insurance services, accounting/audit services, consulting services, marketing services, legal services, property management services, realtor services, lobbying services, executive search services and IT consulting services. "Of counsel" relationships are only considered immaterial if the individual does not receive any form of compensation from, or is a retired partner of, the firm providing the professional services. The following would generally be considered transactional relationships and not professional services: deposit services, IT tech support services, educational services, and construction services. The case of participation in a banking syndicate by a non-lead bank should be considered a transactional rather than a professional services relationship. The case of a company providing a professional service to one of its directors or to an entity with which one of its directors is affiliated, will be considered a transactional rather than a professional relationship. Insurance services and marketing services are assumed to be professional services unless the company explains why such services are not advisory.

ix If the company makes or receives annual payments exceeding the greater of \$200,000 or 5 percent of recipient's gross revenues (the recipient is the party receiving proceeds from the transaction).

x "Material" is defined as a standard of relationship (financial, personal or otherwise) that a reasonable person might conclude could potentially influence one's objectivity in the boardroom in a manner that would have a meaningful impact on an individual's ability to satisfy requisite fiduciary standards on behalf of shareholders.

xi The company's public disclosure regarding the operating involvement of the Founder with the company will be considered. If the Founder was never employed by the company, ISS may deem the Founder as an independent outsider absent any other relationships that may call into question the founding director's ability to provide independent oversight of management.

Vote case-by-case on director nominees, examining the following factors when disclosed:

- Independence of the board and key board committees;
- Disclosed commitment to board gender diversity;
- Number of board commitments;
- Attendance at board and committee meetings;
- Corporate governance provisions and takeover activity;
- Long-term company performance;
- Directors' ownership stake in the company;
- Compensation practices;
- Responsiveness to shareholder proposals; and
- Board accountability.

Board Structure and Independence

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for any Executive Director or Non-Independent, Non-Executive Director where:

- The board is less than majority independent; or
- The board lacks a separate compensation or nominating committee.

Background: The balance of board influence should reside with independent directors free of any pressures or conflicts which might prevent them from objectively overseeing strategic direction, evaluating management effectiveness, setting appropriate executive compensation, maintaining internal control processes, and ultimately driving long-term shareholder value creation. Best practice corporate governance standards do not advocate that no executive directors sit on boards. Company executives have extensive company knowledge and experience that provides a significant contribution to business decisions at the board level. In order to maintain, however, the independent balance of power necessary for independent directors to fulfill their oversight mandate and make difficult decisions that may run counter to management's self-interests, executives, former executives and other related directors should not dominate the board or continue to be involved on key board committees charged with the audit, compensation, and nomination responsibilities.

Best practice corporate governance standards recommend that the board should have:

- A majority of independent directors; and
- A nominating committee and a compensation committee composed entirely of independent directors.

Guideline Eight of the Canadian Coalition for Good Governance (CCGG)'s 2013 publication [Building High Performance Boards](#) indicates that boards should "Establish mandates for board committees and ensure committee independence." It is further recommended that key board committees "review committee charters every year and amend or confirm the mandate and procedures based on information received from the board and committee evaluation process."

Non-Independent Directors on Key Committees

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for members of the audit, compensation, or nominating committee who:

- Are Executive Directors;
- Are Controlling Shareholders; or
- Is a Non-employee officer of the company or its affiliates if he/she is among the five most highly-compensated.

Background: In order to promote independent oversight of management, the board as a whole and its key board committees should meet minimum best practice expectations of no less than majority independence. The presence of executive directors and those having significant influence over management may impede the ability of key board committees to provide independent oversight of audit, executive compensation or nomination matters. Director elections are seen to be the single most important use of the shareholder franchise.

Policy Considerations for Majority Owned Companies³

ISS policies support a one-share, one-vote principle. In recognition of the substantial equity stake held by certain shareholders, on a case-by-case basis, non-management director nominees who are or who represent a controlling shareholder of a majority owned company may be supported under ISS' board and committee independence policies if the company meets all of the following independence and governance criteria:

- The number of directors related to the controlling shareholder should not exceed the proportion of common shares controlled by the controlling shareholder. In no event, however, should the number of directors related to the controlling shareholder exceed two-thirds of the board;
- In addition to the above, if the CEO is related to the controlling shareholder, no more than one-third of the board should be related to management (as distinct from the controlling shareholder);
- If the CEO and chair roles are combined or the CEO is or is related to the controlling shareholder, then there should be an independent lead director and the board should have an effective and transparent process to deal with any conflicts of interest between the company, minority shareholders, and the controlling shareholder;
- A majority of the audit and nominating committees should be either independent directors or in addition to at least one independent director, may be directors who are related to the controlling shareholder. All members of the compensation committee should be independent of management. If the CEO is related to the controlling shareholder, no more than one member of the compensation committee should be a director who is related to the controlling shareholder; and
- Prompt disclosure of detailed vote results following each shareholder meeting.

ISS will also take into consideration any other concerns related to the board or individual directors.

If any of the above independence and governance criteria are not met, the policy exemption will not be applied. This policy will not be considered at dual class companies having common shares with unequal voting or unequal board representation rights.

Background: Canadian corporate law provides significant shareholder protections. For example, under most BCAs, a shareholder or group of shareholders having a 5 percent ownership stake in a company may requisition a special meeting for the purposes of replacing or removing directors and in most jurisdictions, directors may be removed by a simple majority vote. Shareholders also benefit from the ability to bring an oppression action against the board or individual directors of Canadian incorporated public companies.

³ A majority-owned company is defined for the purpose of this policy as a company controlled by a shareholder or group of shareholders who together have an economic ownership interest under a single class common share capital structure that is commensurate with their voting entitlement of 50 percent or more of the outstanding common shares.

Against this legal backdrop, Canadian institutions have taken steps to acknowledge and support the premise that a shareholder who has an equity stake in the common shares of a reporting issuer under a single class common share structure has a significant interest in protecting the value of that equity stake in the company and is therefore deemed to have significant alignment of interests with minority shareholders. This policy firmly supports the one-share, one-vote principle and is intended to recognize the commonality of interests between certain shareholders having a majority equity stake under a single class share structure and minority shareholders in protecting the value of their investment.

The policy is designed to exempt only non-management director nominees who are or who represent a controlling shareholder of a majority owned company, and not to circumvent ISS' benchmark voting guidelines otherwise applicable to management director nominees. For example, in accordance with benchmark policy, ISS will not support director nominees who are executives, regardless of whether or not they also are or represent a controlling shareholder, and are members of the audit committee.

Audit Fee Disclosure

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for the members of the audit committee as constituted in the most recently completed fiscal year if:

- No audit fee information is disclosed by the company within a reasonable period of time prior to a shareholders' meeting at which ratification of auditors is a voting item.

Background: The disclosure of audit fees by category is a regulatory requirement and this information is of great importance to shareholders due to the concern that audit firms could compromise the independence of a company audit in order to secure lucrative consulting services from the company.

Excessive Non-Audit Fees

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for individual directors who are members of the audit committee as constituted in the most recently completed fiscal year if:

- Non-audit fees ("other") fees paid to the external audit firm > audit fees + audit-related fees + tax compliance/preparation fees.

Background: ISS recognizes that certain tax-related services, e.g. tax compliance and preparation, are most economically provided by the audit firm. Tax compliance and preparation include the preparation of original and amended tax returns, refund claims, and tax payment planning. However, other services in the tax category, e.g. tax advice, planning, or consulting fall more into a consulting category. Therefore, these fees are separated from the tax compliance/preparation category and are added to the Non-audit (Other) fees for the purpose of determining whether excessive non-audit related fees have been paid to the external audit firm in the most recent year.

In circumstances where "Other" fees include fees related to significant one-time capital restructure events, such as initial public offerings, emergence from bankruptcy, and spinoffs, and the company makes public disclosure of the amount and nature of those fees which are an exception to the standard "non-audit fee" category, then such fees may be excluded from the non-audit fees considered in determining whether non-audit fees are excessive.

Part 2 of National Instrument 52-110 - Audit Committees states that the audit committee must be directly responsible for overseeing the work of the external auditor and that the audit committee must pre-approve all non-audit services provided to the issuer or its subsidiary entities by the issuer's external auditor. It is therefore appropriate to hold the audit committee accountable for payment of excessive non-audit fees.

Persistent Problematic Audit Related Practices

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on members of the Audit Committee and potentially the full board if adverse accounting practices are identified that rise to a level of serious concern, such as:

- Accounting fraud;
- Misapplication of applicable accounting standards; or
- Material weaknesses identified in the internal control process.

Severity, breadth, chronological sequence and duration, as well as the company's efforts at remediation or corrective actions, will be examined in determining whether withhold votes are warranted.

Background: The policy addresses those cases which could potentially raise serious concern with respect to the audit committee's oversight of the implementation by management of effective internal controls over the accounting process and financial reporting. As well, the audit committee has primary responsibility for selecting and overseeing the external audit firm that would be expected to raise concerns related to problematic accounting practices, misapplication of applicable accounting practices, or any material weakness it may identify in the company's internal controls, as well as whether fraudulent activity is uncovered during the course of the audit assignment.

Director Attendance

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for individual director nominees (except nominees who served for only part of the fiscal year or newly publicly listed companies or companies that have recently graduated to the TSX, should be considered case-by-case) if:

- The company has not adopted a majority voting director resignation policy AND the individual director has attended less than 75 percent of the aggregate of their board and key⁴ committee meetings⁵ held within the past year without a valid reason for these absences; or
- The company has adopted a majority voting director resignation policy AND the individual director has attended less than 75 percent of the aggregate of their board and key³ committee meetings⁴ held within the past year without a valid reason for the absences AND a pattern of low attendance exists based on prior years' meeting attendance.

The following should be taken into account:

- Valid reasons for absence at meetings include illness or absence due to company business;

⁴ Key committees include audit, compensation and nominating committees.

⁵ If a withhold recommendation under this policy is based solely on meeting attendance at board meetings due to a lack of disclosure concerning committee meeting attendance, this will be disclosed in ISS' report.

- Participation via telephone is acceptable;
- If the director missed one meeting or one day's meetings, votes should not be withheld even if such absence dropped the director's attendance below 75 percent;
- Board and key committee meetings include all regular and special meetings of the board duly called for the purpose of conducting board business; and
- Out of country location or residence is not a sufficient excuse not to attend board meetings, especially given technological advances in communications equipment.

Background: Corporate governance best practice supports board structures and processes that promote independent oversight and accountability. Nominating competent, committed, and engaged directors to the board also necessitates full participation in the conduct of board business in order to fulfill the many responsibilities and duties now required to meet requisite standards of care. A director who commits to serve on a public company board should be prepared and able to make attendance at and contribution to the board's meetings a priority. A pattern of absenteeism may indicate a more serious concern with a director's ability to serve and may warrant a board review and potentially the director's resignation.

Overboarded Directors

General Recommendation: Generally vote withhold for individual director nominees who:

- Are non-CEO directors and serve on more than five public company boards; or
- Are CEOs of public companies who serve on the boards of more than two public companies besides their own – withhold only at their outside boards⁶.

Transitioning directors: It is preferable for a director to step down from a board at the annual meeting to ensure orderly transitions, which may result in a director being temporarily overboarded (e.g. joining a new board in March but stepping off another board in June). ISS will generally not count a board for policy application purposes when it is publicly-disclosed that the director will be stepping off that board at its next annual meeting. This disclosure must be included within the company's proxy circular to be taken into consideration. Conversely, ISS will include the new boards that the director is joining even if the shareholder meeting with his or her election has not yet taken place.

Background: Directors must be able to devote sufficient time and energy to a board in order to be effective representatives of shareholders' interests. While the knowledge and experience that come from multiple directorships is highly valued, directors' increasingly complex responsibilities require an increasingly significant time commitment. Directors must balance the insight gained from roles on multiple boards with the ability to sufficiently prepare for, attend, and effectively participate in all of their board and committee meetings.

Board Gender Diversity

General Recommendation: For S&P/TSX Composite Index companies, generally vote withhold for the Chair of the Nominating Committee or Chair of the committee designated with the responsibility of a nominating committee,

⁶ Although a CEO's subsidiary boards will be counted as separate boards, ISS will not recommend a withhold vote for the CEO of a parent company board or any of the controlled (>50 percent ownership) subsidiaries of that parent but may do so at subsidiaries that are less than 50 percent controlled and boards outside the parent/subsidiary relationship.

or Chair of the board of directors if no nominating committee has been identified or no chair of such committee has been identified, where women comprise less than 30% of the board of directors.

S&P/TSX Composite Exemptions:

Assuming a publicly disclosed written commitment to achieve 30% representation of women on the board at or prior to the subsequent AGM, an exception will be made for companies which:

- Joined the S&P/TSX Composite Index and have not previously been subject to a 30% representation of women on the board requirement as an S&P/TSX Composite Index constituent in the past; or
- Have fallen below 30% representation of women on the board due to an extraordinary circumstance after achieving such level of representation at the preceding AGM.

For TSX companies which are **not** also S&P/TSX Composite Index constituents, generally vote withhold for the Chair of the Nominating Committee or Chair of the committee designated with the responsibility of a nominating committee, or Chair of the board of directors if no nominating committee has been identified or no chair of such committee has been identified, where there are zero women on the board of directors.

Non-S&P/TSX Composite Exemptions:

This policy will not apply to:

- Newly publicly-listed companies within the current or prior fiscal year;
- Companies that have transitioned from the TSXV within the current or prior fiscal year; or
- Companies with four or fewer directors.

Assuming a publicly disclosed written commitment to add at least one woman to the board at or prior to the subsequent AGM, an exception will be made for companies which temporarily have no women on the board due to an extraordinary circumstance after having at least one woman on the board at the preceding AGM.

Evaluate on a case-by-case basis whether withhold recommendations are warranted for additional directors at companies that fail to meet the above policy that would apply to their respective constituent group over two years or more.

Background: Gender diversity has remained a high-profile corporate governance issue in the Canadian market. Effective Dec. 31, 2014, as per [National Instrument 58-101 Disclosure of Corporate Governance Practices](#), TSX-listed issuers are required to provide proxy disclosures regarding whether, and if so how, the board or nominating committee considers the level of representation of women on the board in identifying and nominating candidates for election or re-election to the board. Also required is disclosure of policies or targets, if any, regarding the representation of women on the board. The disclosure requirement has been a catalyst for the addition of women on the boards of many widely-held TSX-listed reporting issuers. Widely-held TSX-listed company boards lacking a policy commitment and having zero female directors have been deemed to be outliers lagging market expectations in this regard.

Further to this objective, in September 2017, the Canadian 30% Club Investor Group committed to exercising ownership rights to encourage increased representation of women on S&P/TSX Composite Index company boards to a minimum 30% threshold. As the sentiment supporting representation of women on boards has steadily grown in Canada, it has become clear that a higher standard of representation by women is expected, with S&P/TSX Composite Index constituents playing a vital role in this process as market leaders.

Board Racial and/or Ethnic Diversity

General Recommendation: For companies in the S&P/TSX Composite Index, generally vote against or withhold from the Chair of the Nominating Committee or Chair of the committee designated with the responsibility of a nominating committee, or the Chair of the board of directors if no nominating committee has been identified or no chair of such committee has been identified, where:

- The board has no apparent racially or ethnically diverse members⁷; and
- The company has not provided a formal, publicly-disclosed written commitment to add at least one racially or ethnically diverse director at or prior to the next AGM.

Evaluate on a case-by-case basis whether against/withhold recommendations are warranted for additional directors at companies that fail to meet the policy over two years or more.

Background: In recent years many institutional investors have been vocal about their calls for public company boards to become more diverse. In 2020, Canada broadened disclosure requirements on board diversity for publicly traded corporations beyond gender, mandating businesses to report on each of the four employment equity groups (i.e., women, visible minorities, Indigenous peoples, and persons with disabilities) through new requirements introduced to the *Canada Business Corporations Act* (CBCA) in Bill C-25. These measures aim to foster diversity at the highest levels of corporate leadership in Canada, improve shareholder democracy, and drive shareholder value through better transparency.

Distributing corporations established under the CBCA are required to disclose to their shareholders (through their proxy circulars) and to Corporations Canada information regarding the diversity of their boards and senior management. The disclosure must include the representation of various designated groups on the board and among senior management. These designated groups include women, Indigenous peoples (First Nations, Inuit, and Métis), persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities. In addition, the CBCA requires distributing corporations to disclose whether they have a diversity and inclusion policy, and if not, to provide an explanation why not. This "comply or explain" approach is not prescriptive but is intended to foster a dialogue between distributing corporations and their shareholders, increase corporate transparency and support the push for increased diversity on boards and in senior management.

It appears to be the view of many investors that boards should aim to reflect the company's customer base and the broader societies in which they operate by including directors drawn from racial and ethnic minority groups, and also support the expectation for disclosure from companies on racial/ethnic diversity at the board level and hold the belief that all companies should disclose this information to the fullest extent possible.

Former CEO/CFO on Audit/Compensation Committee

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for any director who has served as the CEO of the company or its affiliates within the past five years, or of a company acquired within the past five years, and is a member of the

⁷ Aggregate diversity statistics provided by the board will only be considered if specific to racial and/or ethnic diversity.

Racial and/or Ethnic Diversity is defined as: Aboriginal peoples (means persons who are Indigenous, Inuit or Métis) and members of visible minorities (means persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour).

Employment Equity Act (S.C. 1995, c. 44) <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/E-5.401/section-3.html>

audit or compensation committee. Evaluate on a case-by-case basis whether support is warranted for any former CEO on the audit or compensation committee following a five-year period⁸ after leaving this executive position.

Generally vote withhold for any director who has served as the CFO of the company or its affiliates within the past three years, or of a company acquired within the past three years, and is a member of the audit or compensation committee.

Background: Although ISS policy designates former CEOs and CFOs as non-independent non-executive directors, a withhold vote will be recommended as if they were executives where they sit on either the audit or compensation committee prior to the conclusion of a cooling-off period. This policy reflects the concern that the influence of a recent former executive on these committees could compromise the committee's efficacy. In the case of an audit committee the concern relates to the independent oversight of financials for which the executive was previously responsible, while in the case of a compensation committee the concern relates to oversight of compensation arrangements which the executive may have orchestrated and over which he or she may still wield considerable influence.

The three-year cooling-off period afforded to a former CFO reflects the cooling-off period provided in National Instrument 52-110 – Audit Committees.

A five-year cooling-off period is applied for former CEOs in order to allow for the potential occurrence of significant changes within the company's management team. As well, this period allows for the exercise or expiry of the former CEOs outstanding equity awards, thereby eliminating lingering compensation ties to the company's operational performance which would have aligned the former CEO's interests with management. Following the conclusion of the five-year period, the former CEO's independence status will be re-evaluated with consideration to any other relationships which could preclude reclassification as an independent outsider.

Climate Accountability

For companies that are significant greenhouse gas (GHG) emitters, through their operations or value chain⁹, generally vote against or withhold from the incumbent chair of the responsible committee (or other directors on a case-by-case basis) in cases where ISS determines that the company is not taking the minimum steps needed to understand, assess, and mitigate risks related to climate change to the company and the larger economy.

Minimum steps to understand and mitigate those risks are considered to be the following. Both minimum criteria will be required to be in alignment with the policy:

- Detailed disclosure of climate-related risks, such as according to the framework established by the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), including:
 - Board governance measures;
 - Corporate strategy;
 - Risk management analyses; and
 - Metrics and targets.

⁸ The determination of a former CEO's classification following the five-year cooling-off period will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Factors taken into consideration may include but are not limited to: management/board turnover, current or recent involvement in the company, whether the former CEO is or has been Executive Chair of the board or a company founder, length of service, any related party transactions, consulting arrangements, and any other factors that may reasonably be deemed to affect the independence of the former CEO.

⁹ Companies defined as "significant GHG emitters" will be those on the current Climate Action 100+ Focus Group list.

- Appropriate GHG emissions reduction targets.

At this time, “appropriate GHG emissions reductions targets” will be medium-term GHG reduction targets or Net Zero-by-2050 GHG reduction targets for a company’s operations (Scope 1) and electricity use (Scope 2). Targets should cover the vast majority of the company’s direct emissions.

Background: Physical changes caused by global climate change and regulations and market changes enacted and expected to be enacted to mitigate climate change result in significant risks and/or business opportunities for companies and their shareholders that are expected to increase in the coming years.

Climate change and climate-related risks are now among the most critical topics for many investors, and this area has developed significantly over the years. Many investors around the world are seeking to better integrate climate risk considerations in their investment, engagement, and voting processes. Scientific experts have stated that there is an imperative to limit cumulative CO₂ emissions, aiming to reach net zero CO₂ emissions by mid-century, along with strong reductions in other greenhouse gas emissions in order to limit human-induced global warming.

It appears many investors support requiring minimum criteria for companies considered to be strongly contributing to climate change. Therefore, ISS is focusing on all companies currently identified as the Climate Action 100+ Focus Group, including those in Canada, and will recommend against incumbent directors, in cases where ISS determines that the company is not taking the minimum steps needed to understand, assess, and mitigate risks related to climate change to the company and the larger economy.

Companies should disclose climate risk information, such as according to the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), with either a medium-term GHG emission reductions targets or Net Zero-by-2050 GHG reduction targets for at least a company’s operations (Scope 1) and electricity use (Scope 2). Targets should cover the vast majority of the company’s direct emissions. Additional data points will be provided in the company information section for all Climate Action 100+ Focus Group companies in order to support this policy.

Voting on Directors for Egregious Actions

General Recommendation: Under extraordinary circumstances, vote withhold for directors individually, one or more committee members, or the entire board, due to:

- Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight¹⁰ or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
- Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
- Egregious actions related to the director(s)’ service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company.

Background: Director accountability and competence have become issues of prime importance given the failings in oversight exposed by the global financial crisis and subsequent events. There is also concern over the environment in the boardrooms of certain markets, where past failures appear to be no impediment to continued or new appointments at major companies and may not be part of the evaluation process at companies in considering whether an individual is, or continues to be, fit for the role and best able to serve shareholders’ interests.

¹⁰ Examples of failure of risk oversight include, but are not limited to: bribery, large or serial fines or sanctions from regulatory bodies; demonstrably poor risk oversight of environmental and social issues, including climate change; significant adverse legal judgments or settlements; or hedging of company stock.

In the event of exceptional circumstances (including circumstances relating to past performance on other boards) that raise substantial doubt about a director's ability to effectively monitor management and serve in the best interests of shareholders, a withhold vote may be recommended.

Board Responsiveness

In keeping with Canadian market expectations and improvements to provide shareholders with the ability to affect board change, a lack of board response to shareholder majority votes or majority withhold votes on directors is unacceptable and would result in one of the following:

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for continuing individual directors, nominating committee¹¹ members, or the continuing members of the entire board of directors if:

- At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold votes of the votes cast under a majority voting director resignation policy and the nominating committee⁹ has not required that the director leave the board after 90 days, or has not provided another form of acceptable response to the shareholder vote which will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis;
- At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold votes of the votes cast under a plurality voting standard and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the majority withheld vote; or
- The board failed to act¹² on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the votes cast (excluding abstentions) at the previous shareholder meeting.

As indicated at the beginning of the guidelines for Voting on Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections, board responsiveness is a fundamental principle that should apply when determining votes on director nominees.

Background: Follow-up action or response by the board is warranted in the instance where a director is not supported by a majority of the votes cast by shareholders but remains on the board at the next election. A reasonable period of time within which the board or nominating committee is expected to deal with a director resignation under these circumstances is indicated in the widely accepted version of Canadian majority voting, director resignation policies as required by the TSX.

Disclosed board response and rationale will be taken into consideration in limited extraordinary circumstances in the event that a director's resignation is not accepted by the board or the concern that caused majority shareholder opposition has not been addressed. The vote recommendation will be determined on a case-by-case basis that is deemed to be in the best interests of shareholders.

¹¹ Or other board committee charged with the duties of a nominating committee as specified in the company's majority voting director resignation policy.

¹² Responding to the shareholder proposal will generally mean either full implementation of the proposal or, if the matter requires a vote by shareholders, a management proposal on the next annual ballot to implement the proposal. Responses that involve less than full implementation will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Unilateral Adoption of an Advance Notice Provision

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for individual directors, committee members, or the entire board as appropriate in situations where an advance notice policy has been adopted by the board but has not been included on the voting agenda at the next shareholders' meeting.

Continued lack of shareholder approval of the advance notice policy in subsequent years may result in further withhold recommendations.

Background: The ability of shareholders to put forward potential nominees for election to the board is a fundamental right and should not be amended by management or the board without shareholders' approval, or, at a minimum, with the intention of receiving shareholder approval at the next annual or annual/special meeting of shareholders. As such, the board of directors, as elected representatives of shareholders' interests and as the individuals primarily responsible for corporate governance matters, should be held accountable for allowing such policies to become effective without further shareholder approval.

Furthermore, disclosures regarding these policies should be made available to shareholders (similar to shareholder proposal deadline disclosures or majority voting policy disclosures) because they are substantive changes that may impact shareholders' ability to nominate director candidates. Failure to provide such disclosure is not in shareholders' best interests.

Other Board-Related Proposals

Classification/Declassification of the Board

General Recommendation: Vote against proposals to classify the board. Vote for proposals to repeal classified boards and to elect all directors annually.

Independent Chair (Separate Chair/CEO)

General Recommendation: Vote for shareholder proposals seeking separation of the offices of CEO and chair if the company has a single executive occupying both positions.

Background: The separation of the positions of chair and CEO is supported as it is viewed as superior to the lead director concept. The positions of chair and CEO are two distinct jobs with different job responsibilities. The chair is the leader of the board of directors, which is responsible for selecting and replacing the CEO, setting executive pay, evaluating managerial and company performance, and representing shareholder interests. The CEO, by contrast, is responsible for maintaining the day-to-day operations of the company and being the company's spokesperson. It therefore follows that one person cannot fulfill both roles without conflict. An independent lead director may be an acceptable alternative as long as the lead director has clearly delineated and comprehensive duties including the full authority to call board meetings and approve meeting materials and engage with shareholders. A counterbalancing lead director alternative must be accompanied by majority independence on the board and key committees, and the absence of any problematic governance practices.

Majority of Independent Directors/Establishment of Committees

General Recommendation: Vote for shareholder proposals asking that a majority or up to two-thirds of directors be independent unless:

- The board composition already meets the proposed threshold based on ISS' definition of independence.

Vote for shareholder proposals asking that board audit, compensation, and/or nominating committees be composed exclusively of independent directors unless:

- The board's committees already meet that standard.

Majority Vote Standard for the Election of Directors

General Recommendation: Vote for resolutions requesting that: (i) the board adopt a majority voting director resignation policy for director elections or (ii) the company amend its bylaws to provide for majority voting, whereby director nominees are elected by the affirmative vote of the majority of votes cast, unless:

- A majority voting director resignation policy is codified in the company's bylaws, corporate governance guidelines, or other governing documents prior to an election to be considered; and
- The company has adopted formal corporate governance principles that provide an adequate response to both new nominees as well as "holdover" nominees (i.e. incumbent nominees who fail to receive 50 percent of votes cast).

Proxy Access

ISS supports proxy access as an important shareholder right, one that is complementary to other best-practice corporate governance features. However, in the absence of a uniform standard, proposals to enact proxy access may vary widely; as such, ISS is not setting forth specific parameters at this time and will take a case-by-case approach in evaluating these proposals.

Proxy Contests - Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case in contested elections taking into account:

- Long-term financial performance of the target company relative to its industry;
- Management's track record;
- Background to the proxy contest;
- Nominee qualifications and any compensatory arrangements;
- Strategic plan of dissident slate and quality of critique against management;
- Likelihood that the proposed goals and objectives can be achieved (both slates); and
- Stock ownership positions.

Overall Approach: When analyzing proxy contests, ISS focuses on two central questions:

- Have the dissidents met the burden of proving that board change is warranted? And, if so;
- Will the dissident nominees be more likely to affect positive change (i.e., increase shareholder value) versus the incumbent nominees?

When a dissident seeks a majority of board seats, ISS will require from the dissident a well-reasoned and detailed business plan, including the dissident's strategic initiatives, a transition plan and the identification of a qualified and credible new management team. ISS will then compare the detailed dissident plan against the incumbent plan and the dissident director nominees and management team against the incumbent team in order to arrive at a vote recommendation.

When a dissident seeks a minority of board seats, the burden of proof imposed on the dissident is lower. In such cases, ISS will not require from the dissident a detailed plan of action, nor is the dissident required to prove that its plan is preferable to the incumbent plan. Instead, the dissident will be required to prove that board change is preferable to the status quo and that the dissident director slate will add value to board deliberations including by, among other factors, considering issues from a viewpoint different from that of the current board members.

Reimbursing Proxy Solicitation Expenses

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case taking into account:

- Whether ISS recommends in favour of the dissidents, in which case we may recommend approving the dissident's out of pocket expenses if they are successfully elected and the expenses are reasonable.

3. Shareholder Rights & Defenses

Advance Notice Requirements

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on proposals to adopt or amend an advance notice board policy or to adopt or amend articles or by-laws containing or adding an advance notice requirement. These provisions will be evaluated to ensure that all of the provisions included within the requirement solely support the stated purpose of the requirement. The purpose of advance notice requirements, as generally stated in the market, is:

- To prevent stealth proxy contests;
- To provide a reasonable framework for shareholders to nominate directors by allowing shareholders to submit director nominations within a reasonable timeframe; and
- To provide all shareholders with information about potential nominees.

Features that may be considered problematic under ISS' evaluation include but are not limited to:

- For annual notice of meeting given not less than 50 days prior to the meeting date, the notification timeframe within the advance notice requirement should allow shareholders the ability to provide notice of director nominations at any time not less than 30 days prior to the shareholders' meeting. The notification timeframe should not be subject to any maximum notice period. If notice of annual meeting is given less than 50 days prior to the meeting date, a provision to require shareholder notice by close of business on the 10th day following first public announcement of the annual meeting is supportable. In the case of a special meeting, a requirement that a nominating shareholder must provide notice by close of business on the 15th day following first public announcement of the special shareholders' meeting is also acceptable;
- The board's inability to waive all sections of the advance notice provision under the policy or bylaw, in its sole discretion;
- A requirement that any nominating shareholder provide representation that the nominating shareholder be present at the meeting in person or by proxy at which his or her nominee is standing for election for the nomination to be accepted, notwithstanding the number of votes obtained by such nominee;
- A requirement that any proposed nominee deliver a written agreement wherein the proposed nominee acknowledges and agrees, in advance, to comply with all policies and guidelines of the company that are applicable to directors;
- Any provision that restricts the notification period to that established for the originally scheduled meeting in the event that the meeting has been adjourned or postponed;
- Any disclosure request within the advance notice requirement, or the company's ability to request additional disclosure of the nominating shareholder(s) or the shareholder nominee(s) that exceeds what is required in a dissident proxy circular or, goes beyond what is required under law or regulation;
- Stipulations within the provision that the corporation will not be obligated to include any information provided by dissident director nominees or nominating shareholders in any shareholder communications, including the proxy statement; and
- Any other feature or provision determined to have a negative impact on shareholders' interests and deemed outside the purview of the stated purpose of the advance notice requirement.

Background: As advance notice requirements continue to evolve, and their use is tested by market participants, Canadian institutional investors are voicing concerns about the specific provisions contained therein. Investors have cautioned with respect to the potential for certain provisions included within these requirements to be used to impede the ability of shareholders to nominate director candidates to the board of directors, a fundamental shareholder right under Canada's legal and regulatory framework.

A minimum 30-day shareholder notice period supports notice and access provisions and is in keeping with the stated purpose of advance notice requirements which is to prevent last minute or stealth proxy contests. Any

maximum threshold for shareholder notice is deemed unacceptable, and the removal of such is expected to facilitate timelier access to the proxy and afford shareholders more time to give complete and informed consideration to dissident concerns and director nominees.

Enhanced and discretionary requirements for additional information that is not then provided to shareholders, provisions that may prohibit nominations based on restricted notice periods for postponed or adjourned meetings and written confirmations from nominee directors in advance of joining the board are all examples of the types of provisions that have the potential to be misused and are outside the intended stated purpose of advance notice requirements.

Canadian court cases have provided a clear indication that these provisions are intended to protect shareholders, as well as management, from ambush and that they are not intended to exclude nominations given on ample notice or to buy time to allow management to develop a strategy to defeat dissident shareholders. As well, these rulings have shown that in the case of ambiguous provisions the result should weigh in favour of shareholder voting rights.

For more detail regarding ISS' policy on advance notice requirements, please see the latest version of our [Advance Notice Requirement FAQ](#).

Exclusive Forum Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on proposals to adopt an exclusive forum by-law or to amend by-laws to add an exclusive forum provision, taking the following into consideration:

- Jurisdiction of incorporation;
- Board rationale for adopting exclusive forum;
- Legal actions subject to the exclusive forum provision;
- Evidence of past harm as a result of shareholder legal action against the company originating outside of the jurisdiction of incorporation;
- Company corporate governance provisions and shareholder rights;
- Any other problematic provisions that raise concerns regarding shareholder rights.

Enhanced Shareholder Meeting Quorum for Contested Director Elections

General Recommendation: Vote against new by-laws or amended by-laws that would establish two different quorum levels which would result in implementing a higher quorum solely for those shareholder meetings where common share investors seek to replace the majority of current board members ("Enhanced Quorum").

Background: With Enhanced Quorum, the ability to hold a shareholders' meeting is subject to management's pre-determination that a contested election to replace a majority of directors is the singularly most important corporate issue, thus justifying a significantly higher shareholder (or proxy) presence before the meeting can commence. From a corporate governance perspective, this higher threshold appears to be inconsistent with the view that shareholder votes on any voting item should carry equal importance and should therefore be approved under the same quorum requirement for all items.

Companies have indicated in examples to date that Enhanced Quorum is not designed to block the potential consequence of a majority change in board memberships. In the absence of Enhanced Quorum being met, the

affected shareholder meeting will be adjourned for up to 65 days. Notwithstanding the equality of all voting issues, shareholders may question the benefits of a delayed shareholder meeting resulting from a 50 percent quorum requirement for the initial meeting.

Appointment of Additional Directors Between Annual Meetings

General Recommendation: Vote for these resolutions where:

- The company is incorporated under a statute (such as the *Canada Business Corporations Act*) that permits removal of directors by simple majority vote;
- The number of directors to be appointed between meetings does not exceed one-third of the number of directors appointed at the previous annual meeting; and
- Such appointments must be ratified by shareholders at the annual meeting immediately following the date of their appointment.

Article/By-law Amendments

General Recommendation: Vote for proposals to adopt or amend articles/by-laws unless the resulting document contains any of the following:

- The quorum for a meeting of shareholders is set below two persons holding 25 percent of the eligible vote (this may be reduced to no less than 10 percent in the case of a small company that can demonstrate, based on publicly disclosed voting results, that it is unable to achieve a higher quorum and where there is no controlling shareholder);
- The quorum for a meeting of directors is less than 50 percent of the number of directors;
- The chair of the board has a casting vote in the event of a deadlock at a meeting of directors;
- An alternate director provision that permits a director to appoint another person to serve as an alternate director to attend board or committee meetings in place of the duly elected director;
- An advance notice requirement that includes one or more provisions which could have a negative impact on shareholders' interests and which are deemed outside the purview of the stated purpose of the requirement;
- An exclusive forum provision without compelling rationale and without evidence of past harm due to shareholder legal proceedings outside of the jurisdiction of incorporation;
- Authority is granted to the board with regard to altering future capital authorizations or alteration of the capital structure without further shareholder approval; or
- Any other provisions that may adversely impact shareholders' rights or diminish independent effective board oversight.

In any event, proposals to adopt or amend articles or bylaws will generally be opposed if the complete article or by-law document is not included in the meeting materials for thorough review or referenced for ease of location on SEDAR.

General Recommendation: Vote for proposals to adopt or amend articles/by-laws if the proposed amendment is limited to only that which is required by regulation or will simplify share registration.

Background: Constatting documents such as articles and by-laws (in concert with the legislative framework provided by Canada's various BCAs) establish the rights of shareholders of a company and the procedures through

which the board of directors exercises its duties. Given this foundational role, these documents should reflect best practices within the Canadian market wherever possible.

- **Quorum Requirements:** The quorum requirement for meetings of shareholders should encourage wide-ranging participation from all shareholders. Shareholder meeting quorum requirements that allow only one shareholder to constitute quorum could allow a single significant or controlling shareholder to dominate meetings at the expense of minority shareholders. Quorum requirements with lower shareholding thresholds, such as five percent, could provide a significant shareholder or a small group of shareholders with the ability to pass resolutions that may be considered contentious or problematic by other shareholders. Likewise, quorum requirements for meetings of directors should ensure that at least half of shareholders' representatives are present before significant decisions are made. Directors' responsibilities include attending all meetings for which their presence is scheduled, and a company's core documents should reflect this duty.
- **Casting Vote for the Chair at Board Meetings:** While the chair is the appointed leader of the board, the authority granted to the chair by shareholders is no greater than that granted to any other director. Providing the chair with a casting or second vote in the event of a tie could result in a power structure which is not conducive to effective governance. Additionally, while boards are increasingly transitioning toward a governance structure involving a separate chair and CEO, many issuers still combine these roles or appoint a recent former CEO as board chair. In cases where the board is divided on an issue, it is inappropriate from the perspective of shareholders for an insider or affiliated outsider to have the final decision in contentious matters which could significantly affect shareholders' interests.
- **Alternate Directors:** A provision allowing for alternate directors, who have been neither elected by shareholders nor ratified by shareholders following board appointment, raises serious concerns regarding whether these individuals may be bound to serve in the best interests of shareholders. Furthermore, directors must be willing to earmark sufficient time and effort toward serving on a board once they have accepted the responsibility entrusted to them by shareholders. The appointment of unelected alternates is inconsistent with this duty.
- **Problematic Advance Notice Requirements:** A number of advance notice requirements have been included on ballots as amendments to company by-laws or articles. Any such requirements are deemed significant additions to the bylaw or articles and therefore are reviewed with respect to whether they negatively affect shareholders' ability to nominate directors to the board. See [ISS' policy on Advance Notice Requirements](#) for details.
- **Exclusive Forum:** There may be merit to the notion that judges based in a corporation's jurisdiction of incorporation are best suited to apply that jurisdiction's law to those companies. As well, given a corporation's typically strong presence in that province or jurisdiction, an exclusive forum provision may help to reduce the likelihood of high legal costs accrued through litigation outside of the jurisdiction of incorporation. It can be argued, however, that there is often more than one proper forum available to shareholder plaintiffs, and this proposal would curtail the right of shareholders to select any proper forum of their choosing. The proposed exclusive forum jurisdiction and the details of the extent and types of legal actions that would be subject to the exclusive forum by-law provide critical information to shareholders whose rights may be impacted. This information together with the board of directors' rationale in adopting an exclusive forum by-law will be key considerations in evaluating the acceptability of such a proposal. As well, the absence of a compelling company-specific history with regard to out-of-province/jurisdiction shareholder litigation is important in light of the limitation on shareholder litigation rights that this provision represents. More generally, a company's track record vis-à-vis corporate governance and shareholder rights should be examined to identify any other concerns when considering the acceptability of an exclusive forum by-law.
- **Blanket Authority for Share Capital Structure Alterations:** In recent years, some companies incorporated under the *Business Corporations Act* (British Columbia) ("BCBCA") have sought to amend their constating documents to provide the board with blanket authority to alter the company's share capital structure. These changes include the ability to increase the company's authorized capital and change restrictions on any class

of shares. Although permitted under the BCBCA, shareholders would be better served if changes which could affect shareholders' interests required shareholder approval.

- **Other Problematic Provisions:** Other proposals to alter the articles or by-laws will be approached on a case-by-case basis. Where a potential inclusion, deletion, or amendment is deemed contrary to shareholders' interests, ISS will generally, taking into consideration any other problematic factors or mitigating circumstances, recommend against such changes.

Cumulative Voting

General Recommendation: Where such a structure would not be detrimental to shareholder interests, generally vote for proposals to introduce cumulative voting.

Generally vote against proposals to eliminate cumulative voting.

Generally vote for proposals to restore or permit cumulative voting but exceptions may be made depending on the company's other governance provisions such as the adoption of a majority vote standard for the election of directors.

Confidential Voting

General Recommendation: Vote for shareholder proposals requesting that corporations adopt confidential voting, use independent vote tabulators, and use independent inspectors of election, as long as:

- The proposal includes a provision 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 will not agree, the confidential voting policy is waived for that particular vote.

Generally vote for management proposals to adopt confidential voting.

Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans)

As required by the TSX, the adoption of a shareholder rights plan must be ratified by shareholders within six months of adoption.

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on management proposals to ratify a shareholder rights plan (poison pill) taking into account whether it conforms to "new generation" rights plan best practice guidelines and its scope is limited to the following two specific purposes:

- To give the board more time to find an alternative value enhancing transaction; and
- To ensure the equal treatment of all shareholders.

Vote against plans that go beyond these purposes if:

- **The plan gives discretion to the board to either:**
 - Determine whether actions by shareholders constitute a change in control;
 - Amend material provisions without shareholder approval;
 - Interpret other provisions;
 - Redeem the rights or waive the plan's application without a shareholder vote; or
 - Prevent a bid from going to shareholders.
- **The plan has any of the following characteristics:**
 - Unacceptable key definitions;
 - Reference to Derivatives Contracts within the definition of Beneficial Owner;
 - Flip over provision;
 - Permitted bid minimum period greater than 105 days;
 - Maximum triggering threshold set at less than 20 percent of outstanding shares;
 - Does not permit partial bids;
 - Includes a Shareholder Endorsed Insider Bid (SEIB) provision;
 - Bidder must frequently update holdings;
 - Requirement for a shareholder meeting to approve a bid; and
 - Requirement that the bidder provide evidence of financing.
- **The plan does not:**
 - Include an exemption for a "permitted lock up agreement";
 - Include clear exemptions for money managers, pension funds, mutual funds, trustees, and custodians who are not making a takeover bid; and
 - Exclude reference to voting agreements among shareholders.

Background: The evolution of "new generation" shareholder rights plans in Canada has been the result of reshaping the early antitakeover provision known as a "poison pill" into a shareholder protection rights plan that serves only two legitimate purposes: (i) to increase the minimum time period during which a Permitted Bid may remain outstanding in order to give the board of directors of a target company sufficient time to find an alternative to a takeover bid that would increase shareholder value; and (ii) to ensure that all shareholders are treated equally in the event of a bid for their company.

Recent changes to take-over bid regulation under National Instrument 62-104 Take-Over Bids and Issuer Bids, have codified a number of key provisions that ISS has long required in order to support a shareholder rights plan. As well, new regulation has established a 105-day minimum bid deposit period, with board discretion to reduce this period in certain circumstances but in no event to less than 35 days.

Elimination of board discretion to interpret the key elements of the plan was critical to this evolution. Definitions of Acquiring Person, Beneficial Ownership, Affiliates, Associates and Acting Jointly or in Concert are the terms that set out the who, how, and when of a triggering event. These definitions in early poison pills contained repetitive, circular, and duplicative layering of similar terms which created confusion and made interpretation difficult. Directors were given broad discretion to interpret the terms of a rights plan to determine when it was triggered, or in other words, whether a takeover bid could proceed. This, in turn, created enough uncertainty for bidders or potential purchasers to effectively discourage non-board negotiated transactions. It can be seen how the early poison pill became synonymous with board and management entrenchment.

"New generation" rights plans have therefore been drafted to remove repetitive and duplicative elements along with language that gives the board discretion to interpret the terms of the plan. Also absent from "new generation" plans are references to similar definitions in regulation. Definitions found in various regulations often contain repetitive elements, but more importantly they cross-reference other definitions in regulation that are unacceptable to and not intended to serve the same purpose as those found in a "new generation" rights plan.

A number of other definitions are relevant to the key definitions mentioned above and are therefore equally scrutinized. Exemptions under the definition of Acquiring Person, for example, such as Exempt Acquisitions and Pro Rata Acquisitions, are sometimes inappropriately drafted to permit acquisitions that should trigger a rights plan. In order for an acquisition to be pro rata, the definition must ensure that a person may not, by any means, acquire a greater percentage of the shares outstanding than the percentage owned immediately prior to the acquisition. It should also be noted that "new generation" rights plans are premised on the acquisition of common shares and ownership at law or in equity. Therefore, references to the voting of securities (a.k.a. "voting pills") which may have a chilling effect on shareholder initiatives relating to the voting of shares on corporate governance matters, or the extension of beneficial ownership to encompass derivative securities that may result in deemed beneficial ownership of securities that a person has no right to acquire goes beyond the acceptable purpose of a rights plan.

Equally important to the acceptability of a shareholder rights plan is the treatment of institutional investors who have a fiduciary duty to carry out corporate governance activities in the best interests of the beneficial owners of the investments that they oversee. These institutional investors should not trigger a rights plan through their investment and corporate governance activities, including the voting of shares, for the accounts of others. The definition of Independent Shareholders should make absolutely clear these institutional investors acting in a fiduciary capacity for the accounts of others are independent for purposes of approving a takeover bid or other similar transaction, as well as approving future amendments to the rights plan.

Probably one of the most important and most contentious definitions in a shareholder rights plan is that of a Permitted Bid. ISS guidelines provide that an acceptable Permitted Bid definition must permit partial bids. Canadian takeover bid legislation is premised on the ability of shareholders to make the determination of the acceptability of any bid for their shares, partial or otherwise, provided that it complies with regulatory requirements. In the event that a partial bid is accepted by shareholders, regulation requires that their shares be taken up on a pro rata basis. Shareholders of a company may welcome the addition of a significant new shareholder for a number of reasons.

Also, unacceptable to the purpose of a rights plan is the inclusion of a "Shareholder Endorsed Insider Bid" (SEIB) provision which would allow an "Insider" and parties acting jointly or in concert with an Insider an additional less rigorous avenue to proceed with a take-over bid without triggering the rights plan, in addition to making a Permitted Bid or proceeding with board approval. The SEIB provision allows Insiders the ability to take advantage of a less stringent bid provision that is not offered to other bidders who must make a Permitted Bid or negotiate with the board for support.

Finally, a "new generation" rights plan must contain an exemption for lockup agreements and the definition of a permitted lockup agreement must strike the proper balance so as not to discourage either (i) the potential for a bidder to lock up a significant shareholder and thus give some comfort of a certain degree of success, or (ii) the potential for competitive bids offering a greater consideration and which would also necessitate a locked up person be able to withdraw the locked up shares from the first bid in order to support the higher competing bid.

New generation rights plans have been limited to achieving the two purposes identified here. The adoption of National Instrument 62-104 now ensures that a board has ample time to consider a take-over bid and to find a superior alternative transaction that maximizes shareholder value. However, "new generation" shareholder rights plans will continue to serve an important purpose because they ensure that shareholders are treated equally in a control transaction by precluding creeping acquisitions or the acquisition of a control block through private agreements between a few large shareholders.

Reincorporation Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on proposals to change a company's jurisdiction of incorporation taking into account:

- Financial and corporate governance concerns, including: the reasons for reincorporating, a comparison of the governance provisions, and a comparison of the jurisdictional laws.

Generally vote for reincorporation when:

- Positive financial factors outweigh negative governance implications; or
- Governance implications are positive.

Generally vote against reincorporation if business implications are secondary to negative governance implications.

Supermajority Vote Requirements

General Recommendation: Vote against proposals to require a supermajority shareholder vote at a level above that required by statute.

Vote for proposals to lower supermajority vote requirements.

4. Capital/Restructuring

Mergers and Corporate Restructurings

General Recommendation: For mergers and acquisitions, review and evaluate the merits and drawbacks of the proposed transaction, balancing the various and sometimes countervailing factors including:

Valuation: Is the value to be received by the target shareholders (or paid by the acquirer) reasonable? While the fairness opinion may provide an initial starting point for assessing valuation reasonableness, emphasis is placed on the offer premium, market reaction and strategic rationale.

Market Reaction: How has the market responded to the proposed deal? A negative market reaction should cause closer scrutiny of a deal.

Strategic Rationale: Does the deal make sense strategically? From where is value derived? Cost and revenue synergies should not be overly aggressive or optimistic, but reasonably achievable. Management should also have a favourable track record of successful integration of historical acquisitions.

Negotiations and Process: Were the terms of the transaction negotiated at arms-length? Was the process fair and equitable? A fair process helps to ensure the best price for shareholders. Significant negotiation “wins” can also signify the deal makers’ competency. The comprehensiveness of the sales process (e.g., full auction, partial auction, no auction) can also affect shareholder value.

Conflicts of Interest: Are insiders benefiting from the transaction disproportionately and inappropriately as compared to non-insider shareholders? As the result of potential conflicts, the directors and officers of the company may be more likely to vote to approve a merger than if they did not hold these interests. Consider whether these interests may have influenced these directors and officers to support or recommend the merger. The CIC figure presented in the “ISS Transaction Summary” section of this report is an aggregate figure that can in certain cases be a misleading indicator of the true value transfer from shareholders to insiders. Where such figure appears to be excessive, analyze the underlying assumptions to determine whether a potential conflict exists.

Governance: Will the combined company have a better or worse governance profile than the current governance profiles of the respective parties to the transaction? If the governance profile is to change for the worse, the burden is on the company to prove that other issues (such as valuation) outweigh any deterioration in governance.

Increases in Authorized Capital

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on proposals to increase the number of shares of common stock authorized for issuance. Generally vote for proposals to approve increased authorized capital if:

- A company's shares are in danger of being de-listed; or
- A company's ability to continue to operate as a going concern is uncertain.

Generally vote against proposals to approve unlimited capital authorization.

Background: Canadian jurisdictions generally, permit companies to have an unlimited authorized capital. ISS prefers to see companies with a fixed maximum limit on authorized capital, with at least 30 percent of the

authorized stock issued and outstanding. Limited capital structures protect against excessive dilution and can be increased when needed with shareholder approval.

Private Placement Issuances

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on private placement issuances taking into account:

- Whether other resolutions are bundled with the issuance;
- Whether the rationale for the private placement issuance is disclosed;
- Dilution to existing shareholders' position;
- Issuance that represents no more than 30 percent of the company's outstanding shares on a non-diluted basis is considered generally acceptable;
- Discount/premium in issuance price to the unaffected share price before the announcement of the private placement;
- Market reaction: The market's response to the proposed private placement since announcement; and
- Other applicable factors, including conflict of interest, change in control/management, evaluation of other alternatives.

Generally vote for the private placement issuance if it is expected that the company will file for bankruptcy if the transaction is not approved or the company's auditor/management has indicated that the company has going concern issues.

Background: The TSX requires shareholder approval for private placements:

- For an aggregate number of listed securities issuable greater than 25 percent of the number of securities of the issuer which are listed and outstanding, on a non-diluted basis, prior to the date of closing of the transaction if the price per security is less than the market price; or
- That during any six-month period are placed with insiders for listed securities or options, rights or other entitlements to listed securities greater than 10 percent of the number of the issuer's listed and outstanding securities, on a non-diluted basis, prior to the date of closing of the first private placement to an insider during the six-month period.

Allowable discounts for private placements not requiring shareholder approval are as follows:

Market Price	Maximum Discount
\$0.50 or less	25%
\$0.51 to \$2.00	20%
Above \$2.00	15%

The TSX will allow the price per listed security for a particular transaction to be less than that specified above provided that the listed issuer has received the approval of non-interested shareholders.

In instances where a company will file for bankruptcy if the transaction is not approved or where a company has going concern issues, the urgent need for financing will generally override the other criteria under examination. In instances where the transaction is required for other financing purposes, the other criteria will be examined on a case-by-case basis.

Blank Cheque Preferred Stock

General Recommendation: Vote against proposals to create unlimited blank cheque preferred shares or increase blank cheque preferred shares where:

- The shares carry unspecified rights, restrictions, and terms; or
- The company does not specify any specific purpose for the increase in such shares.

Generally vote for proposals to create a reasonably limited¹³ number of preferred shares where both of the following apply:

- The company has stated in writing and publicly disclosed that the shares will not be used for antitakeover purposes; and
- The voting, conversion, and other rights, restrictions, and terms of such stock where specified in the articles, are reasonable.

Dual-class Stock

General Recommendation: Vote against proposals to create a new class of common stock that will create a class of common shareholders with diminished voting rights.

The following is an exceptional set of circumstances under which ISS would generally support a dual class capital structure. Such a structure must meet all of the following criteria:

- It is required due to foreign ownership restrictions and financing is required to be done out of country¹⁴;
- It is not designed to preserve the voting power of an insider or significant shareholder;
- The subordinate class may elect some board nominees;
- There is a sunset provision; and
- There is a coattail provision that places a prohibition on any change in control transaction without approval of the subordinate class shareholders.

Escrow Agreements

General Recommendation: Vote against an amendment to an existing escrow agreement where the company is proposing to delete all performance-based release requirements in favour of time-driven release requirements.

Background: On going public, certain insiders of smaller issuers must place a portion of their shares in escrow. The primary objective of holding shares in escrow is to ensure that the key principals of a company continue their interest and involvement in the company for a reasonable period after public listing.

¹³ Institutional investors have indicated low tolerance for dilutive preferred share issuances. Therefore, if the authorized preferred shares may be assigned conversion rights or voting rights when issued, the authorization should be limited to no more than 20 percent of the outstanding common shares as of record date. If the preferred share authorization proposal prohibits the assignment of conversion, voting or any other right attached which could dilute or negatively impact the common shares or the rights of common shareholders when such preferred shares are issued, a maximum authorization limit of 50 percent of the outstanding common shares as of record date may be supported taking into account the stated purpose for the authorization and other details of the proposal.

¹⁴ The company has disclosed that it has requested to have its shares listed for trading on a non-Canadian stock exchange.

5. Compensation

Executive Pay Evaluation

Underlying all evaluations are five global principles that most investors expect corporations to adhere to in designing and administering executive and director compensation programs:

Maintain appropriate pay-for-performance alignment with emphasis on long-term shareholder value: This principle encompasses overall executive pay practices, which must be designed to attract, retain, and appropriately motivate the key employees who drive shareholder value creation over the long term. It will take into consideration, among other factors: the linkage between pay and performance; the mix between fixed and variable pay; performance goals; and equity-based plan costs;

Avoid arrangements that risk “pay for failure”: This principle addresses the use and appropriateness of long or indefinite contracts, excessive severance packages, and guaranteed compensation;

Maintain an independent and effective compensation committee: This principle promotes oversight of executive pay programs by directors with appropriate skills, knowledge, experience, and a sound process for compensation decision-making (e.g., including access to independent expertise and advice when needed);

Provide shareholders with clear, comprehensive compensation disclosures: This principle underscores the importance of informative and timely disclosures that enable shareholders to evaluate executive pay practices fully and fairly;

Avoid inappropriate pay to non-executive directors: This principle recognizes the interests of shareholders in ensuring that compensation to outside directors does not compromise their independence and ability to make appropriate judgments in overseeing managers’ pay and performance. At the market level, it may incorporate a variety of generally accepted best practices.

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

Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation (Say-on-Pay) Management Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on management proposals for an advisory shareholder vote on executive compensation (Management Say-on-Pay proposals or MSOPs).

Vote against MSOP proposals, withhold for compensation committee members (or, in rare cases where the full board is deemed responsible, all directors including the CEO), and/or against an equity-based incentive plan proposal if:

- There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);
- The company maintains significant problematic pay practices; or
- The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Primary Evaluation Factors for Executive Pay

Pay for Performance:

- Rationale for determining compensation (e.g., why certain elements and pay targets are used, how they are used in relation to the company's business strategy, and specific incentive plan goals, especially retrospective goals) and linkage of compensation to long-term performance;
- Evaluation of peer group benchmarking used to set target pay or award opportunities;
- Analysis of company performance and executive pay trends over time, taking into account ISS' Pay for Performance policy;
- Mix of fixed versus variable and performance versus non-performance-based pay.

Pay Practices:

- Assessment of compensation components included in the Problematic Pay Practices policy such as: perks, severance packages, employee loans, supplemental executive pension plans, internal pay disparity, and equity plan practices (including option backdating, repricing, option exchanges, or cancellations/surrenders and re-grants, etc.);
- Existence of measures that discourage excessive risk taking which include but are not limited to: clawbacks, holdbacks, stock ownership requirements, deferred compensation practices, etc.

Board Communications and Responsiveness:

- Clarity of disclosure (e.g., whether the company's Form 51-102F6 disclosure provides timely, accurate, complete and clear information about compensation practices in both tabular format and narrative discussion);
- Assessment of board's responsiveness to investor concerns on compensation issues (e.g., whether the company engaged with shareholders and/or responded to majority-supported shareholder proposals relating to executive pay).

Voting Alternatives

In general, the MSOP is the primary focus of voting on executive pay practices; dissatisfaction with compensation practices can be expressed by voting against an MSOP rather than withholding or voting against the compensation committee. If, however, there is no MSOP on the ballot, then the negative vote will apply to members of the compensation committee. In addition, in egregious cases or if the board fails to respond to concerns raised by a prior MSOP proposal, vote withhold or against compensation committee members (or, if the full board is deemed accountable, all directors). If the negative factors involve equity-based compensation, then vote against an equity-based plan proposal presented for shareholder approval.

Pay for Performance Evaluation

This policy will be applied at all S&P/TSX Composite Index Companies and for all MSOP resolutions.

On a case-by-case basis, ISS will evaluate the alignment of the CEO's total compensation with company performance over time, focusing particularly on companies that have underperformed their peers over a sustained period. From a shareholder's perspective, performance is predominantly gauged by the company's share price performance over time. Even when financial or operational measures are used as the basis for incentive awards,

the achievement related to these measures should ultimately translate into superior shareholder returns in the long term.

General Recommendation: Vote against MSOP proposals and/or vote withhold for compensation committee members (or, in rare cases where the full board is deemed responsible, all directors including the CEO) and/or against an equity-based incentive plan proposal if:

- There is significant long-term misalignment between CEO pay and company performance.

The determination of long-term pay for performance alignment is a two-step process: step one is a quantitative screen, which includes a relative and absolute analysis on pay for performance, and step two is a qualitative assessment of the CEO's pay and company performance. A pay for performance disconnect will be determined as follows:

Step I: Quantitative Screen

Relative:

- The Relative Degree of Alignment (RDA) is the difference between the company's annualized TSR rank and the CEO's annualized total pay rank within a peer group¹⁵, each measured over a three-year period or less if pay or performance data is unavailable for the full three years;
- The Financial Performance Assessment (FPA) is the ranking of CEO total pay and company financial performance within a peer group, each measured over a three-year period;
- Multiple of Median (MOM) is the total compensation in the last reported fiscal year relative to the median compensation of the peer group; and

Absolute:

- The CEO Pay-to-TSR Alignment (PTA) over the prior five fiscal years, i.e., the difference between absolute pay changes and absolute TSR changes during the prior five-year period (or less as company disclosure permits).

Step II: Qualitative Analysis

Companies identified by the methodology as having potential P4P misalignment will receive a qualitative assessment to determine the ultimate recommendation, considering a range of case-by-case factors which may include:

- The ratio of performance- to time-based equity grants and the overall mix of performance-based compensation relative to total compensation (considering whether the ratio is more than 50 percent);

¹⁵ The peer group is generally comprised of 11-24 companies using following criteria:

The GICS industry classification of the subject company;

The GICS industry classification of the company's disclosed pay benchmarking peers;

- Size constraints for revenue between 0.25X and 4X the subject company's size (or assets for certain financial companies) and market value utilizing four market cap "buckets" (micro, small, mid and large);
- The following order is used for GICS industry group peer selection (8-digit, 6-digit, 4-digit, or 2-digit) while pushing the subject company's size closer to the median of the peer group.
- Please refer to ISS' Canadian Compensation FAQ for further details.

In exceptional cases, peer groups may be determined on a customized basis.

standard time-vested stock options and restricted shares are not considered to be performance-based for this consideration;

- The quality of disclosure and appropriateness of the performance measure(s) and goal(s) utilized, so that shareholders can assess the rigor of the performance program. The use of non-GAAP financial metrics also makes it challenging for shareholders to ascertain the rigor of the program as shareholders often cannot tell the type of adjustments being made and if the adjustments were made consistently. Complete and transparent disclosure helps shareholders to better understand the company's pay for performance linkage;
- The trend in other financial metrics, such as growth in revenue, earnings, return measures such as ROE, ROA, ROIC, etc.;
- The use of discretionary out-of-plan payments or awards and the rationale provided as well as frequency of such payments or awards;
- The trend considering prior years' P4P concern;
- Extraordinary situation due to a new CEO in the last reported FY;¹⁶ and
- Any other factors deemed relevant.

Background: The two-part methodology is a combination of quantitative and qualitative factors that more effectively drive a case-by-case evaluation. Please refer to the latest version of the [Canadian Executive Compensation FAQ](#) for a more detailed discussion of ISS' quantitative pay-for-performance screen and peer group construction methodology.

Problematic Pay Practices

General Recommendation: Vote against MSOP resolutions and/or vote withhold for compensation committee members if the company has significant problematic compensation practices. Generally vote against equity plans if the plan is a vehicle for problematic compensation practices.

Generally vote based on the preponderance of problematic elements; however, certain adverse practices may warrant withhold or against votes on a stand-alone basis in particularly egregious cases. The following practices, while not an exhaustive list, are examples of problematic compensation practices that may warrant an against or withhold vote:

Poor disclosure practices:

- General omission of timely information necessary to understand the rationale for compensation setting process and outcomes, or omission of material contracts, agreements or shareholder disclosure documents;

New CEO with overly generous new hire package:

- Excessive "make whole" provisions;
- Any of the problematic pay practices listed in this policy;

Egregious employment contracts:

- Contracts containing multiyear guarantees for salary increases, bonuses, or equity compensation;

Employee Loans:

¹⁶ Note that the longer-term emphasis of the methodology alleviates concern about impact of CEO turnover. Thus, except in extenuating circumstances, a "new" CEO will not exempt the company from consideration under the methodology since the compensation committee is also accountable when a company is compelled to significantly "overpay" for new leadership due to prior poor performance.

- Interest free or low interest loans extended by the company to employees for the purpose of exercising options or acquiring equity to meet holding requirements or as compensation;

Excessive severance and/or change-in-control provisions:

- Inclusion of excessive change-in-control or severance payments, especially those with a multiple in excess of 2X cash pay (salary + bonus);
- Severance paid for a “performance termination” (i.e., due to the executive’s failure to perform job functions at the appropriate level);
- Employment or severance agreements that provide for modified single triggers, under which an executive may voluntarily leave following a change in control without cause and still receive the severance package;
- Perquisites for former executives such as car allowance, personal use of corporate aircraft, or other inappropriate arrangements;
- Change-in-control payouts without loss of job or substantial diminution of job duties (single-triggered);

Abnormally large bonus payouts without justifiable performance linkage or proper disclosure:

- Performance metrics that are changed, canceled, or replaced during the performance period without adequate explanation of the action and the link to performance;

Egregious pension/SERP (supplemental executive retirement plan) payouts:

- Inclusion of performance-based equity awards in the pension calculation;
- Inclusion of target (unearned) or excessive bonus amounts in the pension calculation;
- Addition of extra years of service credited without compelling rationale;
- No absolute limit on SERP annual pension benefits (any limit should be expressed as a dollar value);
- No reduction in benefits on a pro-rata basis in the case of early retirement;

Excessive perks:

- Overly generous cost and/or reimbursement of taxes for personal use of corporate aircraft, personal security systems maintenance and/or installation, car allowances, and/or other excessive arrangements relative to base salary;

Payment of dividends on performance awards:

- Performance award grants for which dividends are paid during the period before the performance criteria or goals have been achieved, and therefore not yet earned;

Problematic option granting practices:

- Backdating options (i.e. retroactively setting a stock option’s exercise price lower than the prevailing market value at the grant date);
- Springloading options (i.e. timing the grant of options to effectively guarantee an increase in share price shortly after the grant date);
- Cancellation and subsequent re-grant of options;

Internal Pay Disparity:

- Excessive differential between CEO total pay and that of next highest-paid named executive officer (NEO);

Absence of pay practices that discourage excessive risk taking:

- These provisions include but are not limited to: clawbacks, holdbacks, stock ownership requirements, deferred bonus and equity award compensation practices, etc.;
- Financial institutions will be expected to have adopted or at least addressed the provisions listed above in accordance with the Financial Stability Board’s (FSB) Compensation Practices and standards for financial companies;

Other excessive compensation payouts or problematic pay practices at the company.

Background: Shareholders are not generally permitted to vote on provisions such as change-in-control provisions or the ability of an issuer to extend loans to employees to exercise stock options, for example, when reviewing

equity-based compensation plan proposals. Nor do shareholders in Canada have the ability to approve employment agreements, severance agreements, or pensions; however, these types of provisions, agreements, and contractual obligations continue to raise shareholder concerns. Therefore, ISS will review disclosure related to the various components of executive compensation and may recommend withholding from the compensation committee or against an equity plan proposal if compensation practices are unacceptable from a corporate governance perspective.

Board Communications and Responsiveness

General Recommendation: Consider the following on a case-by-case basis when evaluating ballot items related to executive pay:

- Poor disclosure practices, including: insufficient disclosure to explain the pay setting process for the CEO and how CEO pay is linked to company performance and shareholder return; lack of disclosure of performance metrics and their impact on incentive payouts; no disclosure of rationale related to the use of board discretion when compensation is increased or performance criteria or metrics are changed resulting in greater amounts paid than that supported by previously established goals.
- Board's responsiveness to investor input and engagement on compensation issues, including:
 - Failure to respond to majority-supported shareholder proposals on executive pay topics;
 - Failure to respond to the company's previous say-on-pay proposal that received support of less than 80 percent of the votes cast taking into account the ownership structure of the company.

Examples of board response include but are not limited to: disclosure of engagement efforts regarding the issues that contributed to the low level of support, specific actions taken to address the issues that contributed to the low level of support, and more rationale on pay practices.

Externally-Managed Issuers (EMIs)

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on say-on-pay resolutions where provided, or on individual directors, committee members, or the entire board as appropriate, when an issuer is externally-managed and has provided minimal or no disclosure about their management services agreements and how senior management is compensated. Factors taken into consideration may include but are not limited to:

- The size and scope of the management services agreement;
- Executive compensation in comparison to issuer peers and/or similarly structured issuers;
- Overall performance;
- Related party transactions;
- Board and committee independence;
- Conflicts of interest and process for managing conflicts effectively;
- Disclosure and independence of the decision-making process involved in the selection of the management services provider;
- Risk mitigating factors included within the management services agreement such as fee recoupment mechanisms;
- Historical compensation concerns;
- Executives' responsibilities; and
- Other factors that may reasonably be deemed appropriate to assess an externally-managed issuer's governance framework.

Background: Externally-managed issuers (EMIs) typically pay fees to outside firms in exchange for management services. In most cases, some or all of the EMI's executives are directly employed and compensated by the external management firm.

EMIs typically do not disclose details of the management agreement in their proxy statements and only provide disclosure on the aggregate amount of fees paid to the manager, with minimal or incomplete compensation information.

Say-on-pay resolutions are voluntarily adopted in Canada. Additionally, all non-controlled TSX-listed issuers are required to adopt majority voting director resignation policies which could result in a director being required to resign from a board if he or she receives more 'withhold' than 'for' votes at the shareholders' meeting. Some investor respondents to ISS' 2015-16 ISS Global Policy Survey indicated that in cases where an externally managed company does not have a say-on-pay proposal (i.e., 'withhold' votes may be recommended for individual directors), factors other than disclosure should be considered, such as performance, compensation and expenses paid in relation to peers, board and committee independence, conflicts of interest, and pay-related issues. Policy outreach sessions conducted with Canadian institutional investors resulted in identical feedback.

Equity-Based Compensation Plans

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on equity-based compensation plans using an "equity plan scorecard" (EPSC) approach. Under this approach, certain features and practices related to the plan¹⁷ are assessed in combination, with positively-assessed factors potentially counterbalancing negatively-assessed factors and vice-versa. Factors are grouped into three pillars:

- **Plan Cost:** The total estimated cost of the company's equity plans relative to industry/market cap peers, measured by the company's estimated Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT) in relation to peers and considering both:
 - SVT based on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants, plus outstanding unvested/unexercised grants; and
 - SVT based only on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants.
- **Plan Features:**
 - Detailed disclosure regarding the treatment of outstanding awards under a change in control (CIC)
 - No financial assistance to plan participants for the exercise or settlement of awards;
 - Public disclosure of the full text of the plan document; and
 - Reasonable share dilution from equity plans relative to market best practices.
- **Grant Practices:**
 - Reasonable three-year average burn rate relative to market best practices;
 - Meaningful time vesting requirements for the CEO's most recent equity grants (three-year lookback);
 - The issuance of performance-based equity to the CEO;
 - A clawback provision applicable to equity awards; and
 - Post-exercise or post-settlement share-holding requirements (S&P/TSX Composite Index only).

Generally vote against the plan proposal if the combination of above factors, as determined by an overall score, indicates that the plan is not in shareholders' best interests.

¹⁷ In cases where certain historic grant data are unavailable (e.g. following an IPO or emergence from bankruptcy), Special Cases models will be applied which omit factors requiring these data.

Overriding Negative Factors: In addition, vote against the plan if any of the following unacceptable factors have been identified:

- Discretionary or insufficiently limited non-employee director participation;
- An amendment provision which fails to adequately restrict the company's ability to amend the plan without shareholder approval;
- A history of repricing stock options without shareholder approval (three-year look-back);
- The plan is a vehicle for problematic pay practices or a significant pay-for-performance disconnect under certain circumstances; or
- Any other plan features that are determined to have a significant negative impact on shareholder interests.

Background: As issues around cost transparency and best practices in equity-based compensation have evolved in recent years, ISS' Equity Plan Scorecard approach provides for a more nuanced consideration of equity plan proposals.

Feedback obtained through ongoing consultation with institutional investors indicates strong support for the scorecard approach, which incorporates the following key goals:

1. Consider a range of factors, both positive and negative, in determining vote recommendations;
2. Select factors based on institutional investors' concerns and preferences and on best practices within the Canadian market established through regulation, disclosure requirements, and best practice principles;
3. Establish factor thresholds and weightings which are cognizant of the Canadian governance landscape (separate scorecards for the S&P/TSX Composite Index and the broader TSX);
4. Ensure that key concerns addressed by policy continue to hold paramount importance (institution of overriding negative factors).

The EPSC policy for equity plan proposals provides a full-spectrum overview of plan cost, plan features, and historic grant practices. This allows shareholders greater insight into rising governance concerns, such as the implementation of risk-mitigating mechanisms, the strength of vesting provisions, and the use of performance-based equity, while also providing added assessments of longstanding concerns relating to equity plans such as burn rate and dilution. By assessing these factors in combination, the EPSC is designed to facilitate a more holistic approach to reviewing these plans. Plans will, however, continue to be subject to the scrutiny of overriding negative factors reflecting ISS' current policies regarding problematic non-employee director participation, insufficient plan amendment provisions, repricing without shareholder approval, and other egregious practices.

More information about the policy and weightings can be found in [ISS' Canada Equity Plan Scorecard FAQ](#).

Plan Cost

General Recommendation: Vote against equity plans if the cost is unreasonable.

Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT)

The cost of equity plans is expressed as Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT), which is measured using a binomial option pricing model that assesses the amount of shareholders' equity flowing out of the company to employees and directors. SVT is expressed as both a dollar amount and as a percentage of market value, and includes the new shares proposed, shares available under existing plans, and shares granted but unexercised (using two measures, in the case of plans subject to the Equity Plan Scorecard evaluation, as noted above). All award types are valued.

For omnibus plans, unless limitations are placed on the most expensive types of awards (for example, full value awards), the assumption is made that all awards to be granted will be the most expensive types.

SVT is assessed relative to a company-specific benchmark. The benchmark is determined as follows: The top quartile performers in each industry group (using the Global Industry Classification Standard: GICS) are identified. Benchmark SVT levels for each industry are established based on these top performers' historic SVT. Regression analyses are run on each industry group to identify the variables most strongly correlated to SVT. The benchmark industry SVT level is then adjusted upwards or downwards for the specific company by plugging the company-specific performance measures, size and cash compensation into the industry cap equations to arrive at the company's benchmark.¹⁸

Background: Section 613 of the TSX Company Manual requires shareholder approval for equity-based compensation arrangements under which securities listed on the TSX may be issued from treasury. Such approval is also required for equity-based plans that provide that awards issued may be settled either in treasury shares or cash. Cash only settled arrangements or those which are only funded by securities purchased on the secondary market are not subject to shareholder approval.

In addition, shareholder approval is also required for stock purchase plans using treasury shares where financial assistance or share matching is provided, security purchases from treasury where financial assistance is provided, and certain equity awards made outside of an equity plan.

Overriding Negative Factors

Plan Amendment Provisions

General Recommendation: Vote against the approval of proposed Amendment Procedures that do not require shareholder approval for the following types of amendments under any security-based compensation arrangement, whether or not such approval is required under current regulatory rules:

- Any increase in the number of shares reserved for issuance under a plan or plan maximum;
- Any reduction in exercise price or cancellation and reissue of options or other entitlements;
- Any amendment that extends the term of options beyond the original expiry;
- Amendments to eligible participants that may permit the introduction or reintroduction of non-employee directors on a discretionary basis or amendments that increase limits previously imposed on non-employee director participation;
- Any amendment which would permit options granted under the Plan to be transferable or assignable other than for normal estate settlement purposes; and
- Amendments to the plan amendment provisions.

To clarify application of the above criteria, all items will apply to all equity-based compensation arrangements under which treasury shares are reserved for grants of, for example: restricted stock, restricted share units, or deferred share units, except those items that specifically refer to option grants.

Background: In response to the rule changes affected by the TSX related to Part IV, Subsection 613 of the TSX Company Manual and Staff Notices #2004-0002, and #2006-0001 which came into effect in 2007, ISS has revised its policy with regard to Equity Compensation Plan Amendment Procedures. This policy addresses the removal by

¹⁸ For plans evaluated under the Equity Plan Scorecard policy, the company's SVT benchmark is considered along with other factors.

the TSX of previously established requirements for shareholder approval of certain types of amendments to Security-Based Compensation Arrangements of its listed issuers. For the purposes of the rule change, security-based compensation arrangements include: stock option plans for the benefit of employees, insiders and service providers; individual stock options granted to any of these specified parties outside of a plan; stock purchase plans where the issuer provides financial assistance or where the employee contribution is matched in whole or in part by an issuer funded contribution; stock appreciation rights involving the issuance of treasury shares; any other compensation or incentive mechanism involving the issuance or potential issuance of securities of the listed issuer; security purchases from treasury by an employee, insider or service provider which is financially assisted by the issuer in any manner. Issuers had until June 30, 2007, to adopt the proper Amendment Procedure in their Plans. After such date, issuers who have “general amendment” provisions in their Plans are no longer able to make any amendments to their Plans without security holder approval, including amendments considered to be of a “housekeeping” nature until they have put a shareholder approved detailed Plan Amendment Provision in place.

According to the TSX Guide to Security-Based Compensation Arrangements, the following amendments will continue to be subject to security holder approval according to TSX rules notwithstanding the amendment provisions included in the plan:

- Any increase in the number of shares reserved for issuance under a plan or plan maximum;
- Any reduction in exercise price of options or purchase price of other entitlements which benefits an insider;¹⁹
- Any amendment that extends the term of options or other entitlements beyond the original expiry and that benefits an insider of the issuer;
- Any amendment to remove or exceed the insider participation limits; and
- Amendments to an amending provision within a security-based compensation arrangement.

In addition, the TSX requires that the exercise price for any stock option granted under a security-based compensation arrangement or otherwise, must not be lower than the market price of the securities at the time the option is granted.

Any proposal to increase the maximum number of shares reserved under a plan requires specific shareholder approval for the increase even if the plan includes a shareholder-approved general amendment procedure permitting increases to such maximum numbers.

Sections 613(d) and (g) set out a list of disclosure requirements in respect of materials that must be provided to security holders in meeting materials issued prior to a meeting at which the approval of any security-based compensation arrangement is requested. The disclosure requirements include annual disclosure by listed issuers in their information circular or other annual disclosure document distributed to all security holders, the terms of any security-based compensation arrangement as well as any amendments that were adopted in the most recently completed fiscal year, including whether or not security holder approval was obtained for the amendment. Staff Notice #2005-0001 goes on to clarify that such disclosure must be as of the date of the information circular containing the relevant disclosure and that issuers must update disclosure for the most recently completed fiscal year end to include grants, exercises, amendments, etc. which may occur after the fiscal year-end is completed, but prior to the filing of the information circular.

ISS has reiterated the need for shareholder approval for the amendments that currently still require shareholder approval by the TSX due to the ability of the TSX to change or eliminate these requirements at any time in future which we believe would not be in the best interests of shareholders or consistent with institutional investor proxy voting guidelines. Note however that from a corporate governance viewpoint, ISS does not support re-pricing of

¹⁹ Security holder approval, excluding the votes of securities held by insiders benefiting from the amendment, is required for a reduction in the exercise price, purchase price, or an extension of the term of options or similar securities held by insiders. If an issuer cancels options or similar securities held by insiders and then reissues those securities under different terms, the TSX will consider this an amendment to those securities and will require security holder approval, unless the re-grant occurs at least 3 months after the related cancellation.

any outstanding options and does not limit this policy to only those options held by insiders. ISS has for many years recommended against any re-pricing of outstanding options. Our reasons are based on the original purpose of stock options as at-risk, incentive compensation that is meant to align the interests of option-holders with those of shareholders. The incentive value of stock options is diminished when the exercise price of out-of-the-money options can be adjusted downwards and is not supportable when shareholders must suffer the consequences of a downturn in share price.

Discretionary participation by non-employee directors in equity compensation plans is unacceptable from a corporate governance and accountability viewpoint because administrators of the plan should not have the unrestricted ability to issue awards to themselves. Directors who are able to grant themselves equity awards without limit could find their independence compromised. Therefore, the inclusion of non-employee directors in management equity-based compensation plans, must at a minimum be subject to shareholder-approved limits. Issuer discretion to change eligible participants may result in discretionary director participation. For clarification purposes, in keeping with ISS' policy regarding acceptable limits on non-employee director participation, if directors are included in an employee equity compensation plan according to a shareholder approved limit, then any amendment that would remove or increase such limit should be approved by shareholders.

The ability of plan participants to assign options by means of Option Transfer Programs or any other similar program which results in option holders receiving value for underwater options when shareholders must suffer the consequences of declining share prices does not align the interests of option holders with those of shareholders and removes the intended incentive to increase share price which was originally approved by shareholders.

Non-Employee Director (NED) Participation

Discretionary Participation

General Recommendation: Vote against a management equity compensation plan that permits discretionary NED participation.

Limited Participation

General Recommendation: Vote against an equity compensation plan proposal where the equity plan document does not specify an annual individual NED grant limit with a maximum value of (i) \$100,000 worth of stock options, or (ii) \$150,000 worth of shares.

The maximum annual individual NED limit should not exceed \$150,000 across all equity compensation plans in aggregate, of which no more than \$100,000 of value may comprise stock options. For further details, please refer to the [ISS Canadian Executive Compensation FAQ](#).

Background: Due to the continuing use of options in compensation plans in Canada, ISS has not opposed the use of options for outside directors *per se* but has tried to address potential governance concerns by ensuring a reasonable limit on grants to independent NEDs who are charged with overseeing not only a company's compensation scheme but also corporate governance and long-term sustainability. With regard to full value award plans, the directors who administer the plans should not participate in those same plans on a discretionary or excessive basis.

Repricing Options

Repricing History

General Recommendation: Vote against an equity-based compensation plan proposal if the plan expressly permits the repricing of options without shareholder approval and the company has repriced options within the past three years.

Other Compensation Proposals

Individual Grants

General Recommendation: Vote against individual equity grants to NEDs in the following circumstances:

- In conjunction with an equity compensation plan that is on the agenda at the shareholder meeting if voting against the underlying equity compensation plan; and
- Outside of an equity compensation plan if the director's annual grant would exceed the above individual director limit.

Shares taken in lieu of cash fees and a one-time initial equity grant upon a director joining the board will not be included in the maximum award limit.

Background: To address investor concerns related to discretionary or unreasonable NED participation in management equity compensation plans, ISS established an acceptable limit on grants to such directors who are not only charged with the administration of a company's compensation program but are also responsible and accountable for the company's overall corporate governance and long-term sustainability.

Canadian institutional investors do not generally support stock options as an appropriate form of equity compensation for NEDs, and, at a minimum, require that option grants to NEDs be substantially restricted. Based on the market practice, the maximum annual individual NED limit should not exceed \$150,000 across all equity compensation plans in aggregate, of which no more than \$100,000 of value may comprise stock options.

Please refer to the latest version of the ISS [Canadian Equity Plan Scorecard FAQ](#) for further details and discussion related to the NED limit policy.

Repricing Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote against proposals to reprice outstanding options. The following and any other adjustments that can be reasonably considered repricing will generally not be supported:

- reduction in exercise price or purchase price;
- extension of term for outstanding options, cancellation and reissuance of options; and
- substitution of options with other awards or cash.

Background: Security Based Compensation Arrangements § 613(i) of the TSX Company Manual requires security holder approval (excluding the votes of securities held directly or indirectly by insiders benefiting from the amendment) for a reduction in the exercise price or purchase price or an extension of the term of an award under a security-based compensation arrangement benefiting an insider of the issuer notwithstanding that the compensation plan may have been approved by security holders.

Canadian institutional investors have long opposed option repricing. Market deterioration is not an acceptable reason for companies to reprice stock options.

Although not required by TSX rules, ISS believes that any proposal to reduce the price of outstanding options, including those held by non-insiders, should be approved by shareholders before being implemented (see discussion under Plan Amendment Provisions).

The extension of option terms is also unacceptable. Options are not meant to be a no-risk proposition and may lose their incentive value if the term can be extended when the share price dips below the exercise price. Shareholders approve option grants on the basis that recipients have a finite period during which to increase shareholder value, typically five to ten years. As a company would not shorten the term of an option to rein in compensation during, for example, a commodities bull market run, it is not expected to extend the term during a market downturn when shareholders suffer a decrease in share value.

Employee Stock Purchase Plans (ESPPs, ESOPs)

General Recommendation: Vote for broadly based (preferably all employees of the company with the exclusion of individuals with 5 percent or more beneficial ownership of the company) employee stock purchase plans where the following apply:

- Reasonable limit on employee contribution (may be expressed as a fixed dollar amount or as a percentage of base salary excluding bonus, commissions and special compensation);
- Employer contribution of up to 25 percent of employee contribution and no purchase price discount or employer contribution of more than 25 percent of employee contribution and SVT cost of the company's equity plans is within the allowable cap for the company;
- Purchase price is at least 80 percent of fair market value with no employer contribution;
- Potential dilution together with all other equity-based plans is 10 percent of outstanding common shares or less; and
- The Plan Amendment Provision requires shareholder approval for amendments to:
 - The number of shares reserved for the plan;
 - The allowable purchase price discount;
 - The employer matching contribution amount.

Treasury funded ESPPs, as well as market purchase funded ESPPs requesting shareholder approval, will be considered to be incentive-based compensation if the employer match is greater than 25 percent of the employee contribution. In this case, the plan will be run through the ISS compensation model to assess the Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT) cost of the plan together with the company's other equity-based compensation plans.

Eligibility and administration are also key factors in determining the acceptability of an ESPP/ESOP plan.

Management Deferred Share Unit (DSU) Plans

General Recommendation: Vote for deferred compensation plans if:

- SVT cost of the plan does not exceed the company's allowable cap;
- If the SVT cost cannot be calculated, potential dilution together with all other equity-based compensation is 10 percent of the outstanding common shares or less;
- NED participation is acceptably limited or the plan explicitly states that NEDs may only receive DSUs in lieu of cash in a value for value exchange (please refer to Overriding Negative Factors/[NED Participation](#) above);
- The plan amendment provisions require shareholder approval for any amendment to:
 - Increase the number of shares reserved for issuance under the plan;
 - Change the eligible participants that may permit the introduction or reintroduction of non-employee directors on a discretionary basis or amendments that increase limits previously imposed on NED participation;
 - Amend the plan amendment provisions.

Background: Deferred compensation plans generally encourage share ownership in the company. These types of deferred compensation arrangements are usually designed to compensate executives and outside directors by granting share awards that are held for a period of time before payment or settlement thus aligning their interests with the long-term interests of shareholders, and by allowing them the opportunity to take all or a portion of their cash compensation in the form of deferred units.

Director Compensation

Non-Employee Director (NED) Deferred Share Unit (DSU) Plans

General Recommendation: Vote for a NED deferred compensation plan if DSUs may ONLY be granted in lieu of cash fees on a value for value basis (no discretionary or other grants are permitted).

General Recommendation: Vote for NED deferred compensation plans that permit discretionary grants (not ONLY in lieu of cash fees) if:

- Potential dilution together with all other equity-based compensation is 10 percent of the outstanding common shares or less; or if the plan includes a company matching or top-up provision, the SVT cost of the plan does not exceed the company's allowable cap;
- NED participation is acceptably limited (please refer to Overriding Negative Factors/[NED Participation](#) above);
- The plan amendment provisions require shareholder approval for any amendment to:
 - Increase the number of shares reserved for issuance under the plan;
 - Change the eligible participants that may permit the introduction or reintroduction of non-employee directors on a discretionary basis or amendments that increase limits previously imposed on NED participation;
 - Amend the plan amendment provisions.

In addition, ISS will consider other elements to assess whether a DSU plan is deemed to be overall beneficial to shareholders' interests when determining vote recommendations. Other elements of director compensation evaluated in conjunction with DSU plan proposals may include but are not limited to:

- Director stock ownership guidelines of a minimum of three times annual cash retainer;

- Vesting schedule or mandatory deferral period which requires that shares in payment of deferred units may not be paid out until the end of board service;
- The mix of remuneration between cash and equity; and
- Other forms of equity-based compensation, i.e. stock options, restricted stock.

Problematic Director Compensation Practices

General Recommendation: On a case-by-case basis, generally vote withhold for members of the committee responsible for director compensation (or, where no such committee has been identified, the board chair or full board) where director compensation practices which pose a risk of compromising a non-employee director's independence or which otherwise appear problematic from the perspective of shareholders have been identified, including:

- Excessive (relative to standard market practice) inducement grants issued upon the appointment or election of a new director to the board (consideration will be given to the form in which the compensation has been issued and the board's rationale for the inducement grant);
- Performance-based equity grants to non-employee directors which could pose a risk of aligning directors' interests away from those of shareholders and toward those of management; and
- Other significant problematic practices relating to director compensation.

Background: The issuance of excessive inducement grants to non-employee directors can create problematic incentives which may compromise an otherwise independent director's judgement or foster divergent incentives between those directors who have recently received such awards and those who have not. Similarly, the issuance of performance-based equity awards (e.g. performance share units or PSUs) to non-employee directors may increase the risk of misaligning directors' interests away from the interests of shareholders and align them more with those of management.

Shareholder Proposals on Compensation

General Recommendation: Vote on a case-by-case basis for shareholder proposals targeting executive and director pay, taking into account:

- The target company's performance, absolute and relative pay levels as well as the wording of the proposal itself.

Vote for shareholder proposals requesting that the exercise of some, but not all stock options be tied to the achievement of performance hurdles.

Shareholder Advisory Vote Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote for shareholder proposals requesting the adoption of a non-binding advisory shareholder vote to ratify the report of the compensation committee.

Vote against shareholder proposals requesting a binding vote on executive or director compensation as being overly prescriptive and which may lead to shareholder micro-management of compensation issues that are more appropriately within the purview of the compensation committee of the board of directors.

Background: Based on the experience of other global markets where advisory votes are permitted, the consensus view is that advisory votes serve as a catalyst for dialogue between investors and public issuers on questionable or contentious compensation practices and can lead to a higher level of board accountability, a stronger link between pay and performance, significantly improved disclosure, and in some cases a noticed deceleration in the rate of increase in executive compensation overall.

Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan (SERP) Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote against shareholder proposals requesting the exclusion of bonus amounts and extra service credits to determine SERP payouts, unless the company's SERP disclosure includes the following problematic pay practices:

- Inclusion of equity-based compensation in the pension calculation;
- Inclusion of excessive bonus amounts in the pension calculation;
- Addition of extra years' service credited in other than exceptional circumstances and without compelling rationale;
- No absolute limit on SERP annual pension benefits (ideally expressed in dollar terms);
- No reduction in benefits on a pro-rata basis in the case of early retirement.

In addition, consideration will also be given to the extent to which executive compensation is performance driven and "at risk," as well as whether bonus payouts can exceed 100 percent of base salary.

Background: The inclusion of incentive compensation amounts along with base pay as the basis for calculating supplemental pension benefits is generally viewed as an unacceptable market practice. Proposals that aim to limit excessive pension payments for executives are laudable. The inclusion of variable compensation or other enhancements under SERP provisions can significantly drive up the cost of such plans, a cost that is ultimately absorbed by the company and its shareholders.

Investor pressure to structure executive compensation so that the majority is "at risk" has driven down base salary and therefore it may be reasonable in certain cases to include short-term cash bonus amounts in the SERP calculation. Therefore, ISS will assess limits imposed on extra service credits and the overall mix of guaranteed (salary) and at risk (performance driven incentive compensation) executive compensation, as well as the size of potential cash bonus amounts, when determining vote recommendations on SERP shareholder proposals asking for elimination of these elements in SERP calculations. Given the conservative general market practice in this regard, support for such proposals should be limited to those companies that exceed standard market practice thus qualifying as problematic pay practices as outlined above.

6. Social/Environmental Issues

Global Approach – E&S Shareholder Proposals

ISS applies a common approach globally to evaluating social and environmental proposals which cover a wide range of topics, including consumer and product safety, environment and energy, labor standards and human rights, workplace and board diversity, and corporate political issues. While a variety of factors goes into each analysis, the overall principle guiding all vote recommendations focuses on how the proposal may enhance or protect shareholder value in either the short or long term.

General Recommendation: Generally vote case-by-case, examining primarily whether implementation of the proposal is likely to enhance or protect shareholder value. The following factors will be considered:

- If the issues presented in the proposal are being appropriately or effectively dealt with through legislation or government regulation;
- If the company has already responded in an appropriate and sufficient manner to the issue(s) raised in the proposal;
- Whether the proposal's request is unduly burdensome (scope or timeframe) or overly prescriptive;
- The company's approach compared with any industry standard practices for addressing the issue(s) raised by the proposal;
- Whether there are significant controversies, fines, penalties, or litigation associated with the company's practices related to the issue(s) raised in the proposal;
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether reasonable and sufficient information is currently available to shareholders from the company or from other publicly available sources; and
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether implementation would reveal proprietary or confidential information that could place the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Say on Climate (SoC) Management Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on management proposals that request shareholders to approve the company's climate transition action plan²⁰, taking into account the completeness and rigor of the plan. Information that will be considered where available includes the following:

- The extent to which the company's climate related disclosures are in line with TCFD recommendations and meet other market standards;
- Disclosure of its operational and supply chain GHG emissions (Scopes 1, 2, and 3);
- The completeness and rigor of company's short-, medium-, and long-term targets for reducing operational and supply chain GHG emissions (Scopes 1, 2, and 3 if relevant);
- Whether the company has sought and approved third-party approval that its targets are science-based;
- Whether the company has made a commitment to be "net zero" for operational and supply chain emissions (Scopes 1, 2, and 3) by 2050;
- Whether the company discloses a commitment to report on the implementation of its plan in subsequent years;
- Whether the company's climate data has received third-party assurance;

²⁰ Variations of this request also include climate transition related ambitions, or commitment to reporting on the implementation of a climate plan.

- Disclosure of how the company's lobbying activities and its capital expenditures align with company strategy;
- Whether there are specific industry decarbonization challenges; and
- The company's related commitment, disclosure, and performance compared to its industry peers.

Say on Climate (SoC) Shareholder Proposals

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on shareholder proposals that request the company to disclose a report providing its GHG emissions levels and reduction targets and/or its upcoming/approved climate transition action plan and provide shareholders the opportunity to express approval or disapproval of its GHG emissions reduction plan, taking into account information such as the following:

- The completeness and rigor of the company's climate-related disclosure;
- The company's actual GHG emissions performance;
- Whether the company has been the subject of recent, significant violations, fines, litigation, or controversy related to its GHG emissions; and
- Whether the proposal's request is unduly burdensome (scope or timeframe) or overly prescriptive.

We empower investors and companies to build for long-term and sustainable growth by providing high-quality data, analytics, and insight.

GET STARTED WITH ISS SOLUTIONS

Email sales@issgovernance.com or visit www.issgovernance.com for more information.

Founded in 1985, Institutional Shareholder Services group of companies (ISS) empowers investors and companies to build for long-term and sustainable growth by providing high-quality data, analytics and insight. ISS, which is majority owned by Deutsche Bourse Group, along with Genstar Capital and ISS management, is a leading provider of corporate governance and responsible investment solutions, market intelligence, fund services, and events and editorial content for institutional investors and corporations, globally. ISS' 2,600 employees operate worldwide across 29 global locations in 15 countries. Its approximately 3,400 clients include many of the world's leading institutional investors who rely on ISS' objective and impartial offerings, as well as public companies focused on ESG and governance risk mitigation as a shareholder value enhancing measure. Clients rely on ISS' expertise to help them make informed investment decisions. This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, and charts (collectively, the "Information") is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), its subsidiaries, or, in some cases third party suppliers.

The Information has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), or a promotion or recommendation of, any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy, and ISS does not endorse, approve, or otherwise express any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information.

ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY, AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by law, in no event shall ISS have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits), or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited.

© 2024 | Institutional Shareholder Services and/or its affiliates