

# ATLANTA CAPITAL MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC

## PROXY VOTING POLICIES

### I. Introduction

Atlanta Capital Management Company, LLC (“ACM”) has adopted and implemented policies (and the procedures into which they are incorporated) that ACM believes are reasonably designed to ensure that proxies are voted in the best interest of clients, in accordance with its fiduciary duties and Rule 206(4)-6 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended. ACM’s authority to vote the proxies of its clients is established by their advisory contracts or similar documentation. Voting authority may be reserved explicitly by a client or assigned to another party by the governing account documents. These proxy policies (and the procedures into which they are incorporated) reflect the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) requirements governing advisers and the long-standing fiduciary standards and responsibilities for ERISA accounts set out in the Department of Labor Bulletin 94-2 C.F.R. 2509.94-2 (July 29, 1994).

### II. Overview

ACM manages its clients’ assets with the overriding goal of seeking to provide the greatest possible return to such clients consistent with governing laws and the investment policies of each client. In pursuing that goal, ACM seeks to exercise its clients’ rights as shareholders of voting securities to support sound corporate governance of the companies issuing those securities with the principle aim of maintaining or enhancing the companies’ economic value.

The exercise of shareholder rights is generally performed by casting votes by proxy at shareholder meetings on matters submitted to shareholders for approval (for example, the election of directors or the approval of a company’s stock option plans for directors, officers or employees). ACM is adopting the formal written guidelines<sup>1</sup> described in detail below and will utilize such guidelines in voting proxies on behalf of its clients. These guidelines are designed to promote accountability of a company’s management and Board of Directors to its shareholders and to align the interests of management with those of shareholders.

In seeking to ensure a level of consistency and rationality in the proxy voting process, the guidelines contained in these policies are designed to address the manner in which certain matters that arise regularly in proxies will generally be voted. No set of guidelines can anticipate all situations that may arise. In special cases, the Proxy Administrator (the person specifically charged with the responsibility to review and vote proxies on behalf of ACM’s clients) may seek insight from ACM’s portfolio managers and/or Management Committee on how a particular proxy proposal will impact the financial prospects of a company, and vote accordingly. The guidelines are just that: guidelines, rather than hard and fast rules, simply because corporate governance issues are so varied.

### III. ISS (formerly Risk Metrics Group)

---

<sup>1</sup> If specifically requested by an ACM client, ACM may apply the proxy voting guidelines of its affiliate Calvert Research and Management.

In order to facilitate the proxy voting process, ACM has retained ISS, an advisor that specializes in providing a variety of fiduciary-level services related to proxy voting. ISS provides the firm with in-depth proxy research, tracks and receives proxies on which clients are entitled to vote, compiles and provides client voting records, and performs other recordkeeping necessary for the appropriate management of a client account. Effective February 2012, ACM has delegated to ISS the authority to vote proxies for client accounts pursuant to guidelines adopted by ACM (or pursuant to special instruction by ACM).

Subject to the oversight of ACM, ISS shall establish and maintain adequate internal controls and policies in connection with the provision of proxy voting services to ACM, including methods to reasonably ensure that its analysis and recommendations are not influenced by a conflict of interest, and shall disclose such controls and policies to ACM when and as provided for herein. Unless otherwise specified, references herein to recommendations of ISS shall refer to those in which no conflict of interest has been identified. ACM is responsible for the ongoing oversight of ISS as contemplated by SEC Staff Legal Bulletin No. 20 (June 30, 2014) and interpretive guidance issued by the SEC in August 2019 regarding proxy voting responsibilities of investment advisers (Release Nos. IA-5325 and IC-33605). Such oversight currently may include one or more of the following and may change from time to time:

- periodic review of ISS' proxy voting platform and reporting capabilities (including recordkeeping);
- periodic review of a sample of ballots for accuracy and correct application of the guidelines;
- periodic meetings with ISS' client services team;
- periodic in-person and/or web-based due diligence meetings;
- receipt and review of annual certifications received from ISS;
- annual review of due diligence materials provided by ISS, including review of procedures and practices regarding potential conflicts of interests;
- periodic review of relevant changes to ISS' business; and/or
- periodic review of the following to the extent not included in due diligence materials provided by ISS: (i) ISS' staffing, personnel and/or technology; (ii) ISS' process for seeking timely input from issuers (*e.g.*, with respect to proxy voting policies, methodologies and peer group construction); (iii) ISS' process for use of third-party information; (iv) ISS' policies and procedures for obtaining current and accurate information relevant to matters in its research and on which it makes voting recommendations, and (v) ISS' business continuity program ("BCP") and any service/operational issues experienced due to the enacting of ISS' BCP.

#### **IV. Proxy Voting Guidelines**

The following guidelines relate to the types of proposals that are most frequently presented in proxy statements to shareholders. Absent unusual circumstances, ACM will utilize these guidelines when voting proxies on behalf of its clients.

##### **A. Election of Board of Directors**

ACM believes that a Board of Directors should primarily be independent, not have significant ties to management and consist of members who are all elected annually. In addition, ACM believes that important Board committees (*e.g.*, audit, nominating and compensation committees) should be entirely independent. In general,

- ACM will support the election of directors that result in a Board made up of a majority of independent directors.
- ACM will support the election of independent directors to serve on the audit, compensation, and/or nominating committees of a Board of Directors.
- ACM will hold all directors accountable for the actions of the Board's committees. For example, ACM will consider withholding votes for nominees who have recently approved compensation arrangements that ACM deems excessive or proposed equity-based compensation plans that unduly dilute the ownership interests of shareholders.
- ACM will support efforts to declassify existing Boards, and will vote against efforts by companies to adopt classified Board structures.
- ACM will vote against proposals for cumulative voting, confidential stockholder voting and the granting of pre-emptive rights.
- ACM will vote for proposals to require a majority for election of directors.

##### **B. Approval of Independent Auditors**

ACM believes that the relationship between the company and its auditors should be limited primarily to the audit engagement and closely allied audit-related and tax services, although non-audit services may be provided so long as they are consistent with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and, if required, have been approved by an independent audit committee. ACM will also consider the reputation of the auditor and any problems that may have arisen in the auditor's performance of services.

##### **C. Executive Compensation**

ACM believes that appropriately designed equity-based compensation plans, approved by shareholders, can be an effective way to align the interests of shareholders and the interests of management, employees, and directors. However, ACM is opposed to plans that substantially dilute shareholders' ownership interests in the company or have objectionable structural features.

- ACM will generally vote against plans where total potential dilution (including all equity-based plans) seems likely to exceed 15% of shares outstanding over ten years and extends longer than ten years.
- ACM will generally vote against plans if annual option grants exceed 2% of shares

- outstanding.
- ACM will vote for annual (1 year) “say on pay” cycles.
- ACM will support lock-ups for non-cash compensation as long as it does not extend post employment.

ACM will support proposals to require shareholder approval of golden parachutes. These total and annual dilution thresholds are guidelines, not ceilings, and when assessing a plan’s impact on client shareholdings ACM considers other factors such as specific industry practices, company and stock performance and management credibility. The Proxy Administrator may consult with the relevant analyst(s) or portfolio manager(s) or, if appropriate, members of senior management, to determine when or if it may be appropriate to exceed these guidelines.

- ACM will typically vote against plans that have any of the following structural features:
  - Ability to re-price underwater options without shareholder approval.
  - The unrestricted ability to issue options with an exercise price below the stock’s current market price.
  - Automatic share replenishment (“evergreen”) feature.
- ACM is supportive of measures intended to increase long-term stock ownership by executives. These may include:
  - Requiring senior executives to hold a minimum amount of stock in the company (frequently expressed as a certain multiple of the executive’s salary).
  - Using restricted stock grants instead of options.
  - Utilizing phased vesting periods or vesting tied to company specific milestones or stock performance.
- ACM will generally support the use of employee stock purchase plans to increase company stock ownership by employees, provided that shares purchased under the plan are acquired for no less than 85% of their market value.

In assessing a company’s executive compensation plan, ACM will weigh all components of the plan. For example, the grant of stock options to executives of a company in a particular year may appear excessive if that grant goes above 2% of the shares outstanding of the company. However, such grants may be appropriate if the senior management of the company has accepted significantly reduced cash compensation for the year in lieu of receiving a greater number of options.

#### **D. Corporate Structure Matters/Anti-Takeover Defenses**

As a general matter, ACM opposes anti-takeover measures and other proposals designed to limit the ability of shareholders to act on possible transactions. In general,

- Because a classified board structure prevents shareholders from electing a full slate of directors annually, ACM will typically vote against proposals to create classified boards and vote in favor of shareholder proposals to declassify a board.
- ACM will vote for proposals to subject shareholder rights plans (“poison pills”) to a shareholder vote.
- ACM will vote for shareholder proposals that seek to eliminate supermajority voting requirements and oppose proposals seeking to implement supermajority voting requirements.

- ACM will generally vote against proposals to authorize preferred stock whose voting, conversion, dividend and other rights are determined at the discretion of the Board of Directors when the stock is issued when used as an anti-takeover device. However, such “blank check” preferred stock may be issued for legitimate financing needs and ACM can vote for proposals to issue such preferred stock in those circumstances.
- ACM will vote for proposals to lower barriers to shareholder action (for example, limiting rights to call special meetings or act by written consent). ACM will support resolutions to call special meetings at  $\geq 25\%$  threshold.
- ACM will vote against proposals for a separate class of stock with disparate voting rights.
- ACM will consider on a case-by-case basis board-approved proposals regarding changes to a company’s capitalization, however ACM will generally vote in favor of proposals authorizing the issuance of additional common stock (except in the case of a merger, restructuring or other significant corporate event which will be handled on a case-by-case basis).

#### **E. State of Incorporation/Offshore Presence**

Under ordinary circumstances, ACM will not interfere with a choice to reincorporate or reorganize a company in a different jurisdiction, provided that management’s decision has been approved by a Board of Directors. ACM recognizes that there may be benefits to reincorporation (such as tax benefits and more developed business laws in the jurisdiction of reincorporation). Each proposal to reincorporate in offshore tax havens will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether such actions are in the best interests of the shareholders of the company including ACM’s clients.

#### **F. Environmental/Social Policy Issues**

ACM believes that “ordinary business matters” are primarily the responsibility of management and should be approved solely by the company’s Board of Directors. ACM recognizes that certain social and environmental issues raised in shareholder proposals are the subjects of vigorous public debate and many are the subject of legal statutes or regulation by federal and/or state agencies. ACM generally supports management on these types of proposals, though exceptions may be made in certain instances where ACM believes a proposal has substantial economic implications. ACM expects that the companies in which clients’ assets are invested will act as responsible corporate citizens.

#### **G. Circumstances under Which ACM Will Abstain From Voting**

ACM will seek to vote all proxies for clients who have delegated the responsibility to vote such proxies to ACM. Under certain circumstances, the costs to clients associated with voting such proxies would far outweigh the benefit derived from exercising the right to vote. In those circumstances, ACM will make a case-by-case determination on whether or not to vote such proxies. In the case of countries that require so-called “share blocking,” ACM may also abstain from voting. Additionally, where clients have implemented securities lending arrangements with outside parties to generate additional revenues, ACM will not be able to vote securities that are on loan. Finally, ACM may be required to abstain from voting on a particular proxy in a situation where a conflict exists between ACM and its client.

The policy for resolution of such conflicts is described below in Section VI.

#### **V. Recordkeeping**

ACM will maintain records relating to the proxies voted on behalf of its clients in accordance with Section 204-2 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended. Those records will include:

- A copy of ACM's proxy voting policies and procedures;
- Proxy statements received regarding client securities (if such proxies are available on the SEC's EDGAR system or a third party undertakes to promptly provide a copy of such documents to ACM, ACM does not need to retain a separate copy of the proxy statement);
- A record of each vote cast;
- A copy of any document created by ACM that was material to making a decision on how to vote a proxy for a client or that details the basis for such a decision; and
- Each written client request for proxy voting records and ACM's written response to any client request (whether written or oral) for such records.

All records described above will be maintained in an easily accessible place for six years and will be maintained in the offices of ACM for two years after they are created.

#### **VI. Identification and Resolution of Conflicts with Clients**

As fiduciary to its clients, ACM puts the interests of its clients ahead of its own. In order to ensure that relevant personnel of ACM are able to identify potential conflicts of interest, ACM will take the following steps:

- Quarterly, the Compliance Officer will seek information from the supervisor of each functional unit of ACM (marketing, operations, etc.) Each supervisor will be asked to provide a list of significant clients or prospective clients of ACM. For example, a supervisor would report the fact that ACM was in discussions with a corporate client considering management of the corporation's pension plan assets.
- The Compliance Officer will compile a list of the companies identified (the "Conflicted Companies") and provide that list to the Proxy Administrator.
- The Proxy Administrator will compare the list of Conflicted Companies with the names of companies for which he expects to receive or has received proxy statements (the "Proxy Companies"). If a Conflicted Company is also a Proxy Company, the Proxy Administrator will report that fact to the Compliance Officer and members of senior management of ACM.

The Compliance Officer and designated members of senior management will then determine if a conflict of interest exists between ACM and its client. If they determine that a conflict exists, they will take the following steps to seek to resolve such conflict prior to voting any proxies relating to these Conflicted Companies.

- If the Proxy Administrator expects to vote the proxy of the Conflicted Company strictly according to the guidelines contained in these Proxy Voting Policies (the "Policies"), he

- will (i) inform the designated members of senior management of that fact, (ii) vote the proxies and (iii) record the existence of the conflict and the resolution of the matter.
- If the Proxy Administrator intends to vote in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines contained herein or, if the issues raised by the proxy are not contemplated by these Policies, and the matters involved in such proxy could have a material economic impact on the client(s) involved, the Proxy Administrator will notify the Compliance Officer and will seek instruction on how the proxy should be voted from:
    - The client, in the case of an individual or corporate client;
    - The Board of Directors, or any committee thereof identified by the Board, in the case of a Fund; or
    - The adviser, in situations where the Adviser acts as a sub-adviser to such adviser.

ACM will provide all reasonable assistance to each party to enable such party to make an informed decision.

If the client or Board of Directors, as the case may be, fails to instruct the Proxy Administrator on how to vote the proxy, the Proxy Administrator will generally abstain from voting in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety. If however, the failure of ACM to vote its clients' proxies would have a material adverse economic impact on ACM's clients' securities holdings in the Conflicted Company, ACM may vote such proxies in order to protect its clients' interests. In either case, the Proxy Administrator will record the existence of the conflict and the resolution of the matter.

### **To Obtain Proxy Voting Information**

Clients may obtain information on any proxy voting activity taken on their behalf by contacting Proxy Support at (404) 876-9411. Requests may also be submitted in writing to Proxy Support, Atlanta Capital Management Company, LLC, 1075 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 2100, Atlanta, GA 30309.

Adopted as of June 6, 2003

Last revised: December 1, 2022