

LOOMIS, SAYLES & COMPANY

PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

March 26, 2021



1. GENERAL

A. Introduction.

Loomis, Sayles & Company, L.P. (“Loomis Sayles”) will vote proxies of the securities held in its clients’ portfolios on behalf of each client that has delegated proxy voting authority to Loomis Sayles as investment adviser. Loomis Sayles has adopted and implemented these policies and procedures (“Proxy Voting Procedures”) to ensure that, where it has voting authority, proxy matters are handled in the best interests of clients, in accordance with Loomis Sayles’ fiduciary duty, and all applicable law and regulations. The Proxy Voting Procedures, as implemented by the Loomis Sayles Proxy Committee (as described below), are intended to support good corporate governance, including those corporate practices that address environmental and social issues (“ESG Matters”), in all cases with the objective of protecting shareholder interests and maximizing shareholder value.

Loomis Sayles uses the services of third parties (each a “Proxy Voting Service” and collectively the “Proxy Voting Services”), to provide research, analysis and voting recommendations and to administer the process of voting proxies for those clients for which Loomis Sayles has voting authority. Any reference in these Proxy Voting Procedures to a “Proxy Voting Service” is a reference either to the Proxy Voting Service that provides research, analysis and voting recommendations to Loomis Sayles or to the Proxy Voting Service that administers the process of voting proxies for Loomis Sayles or to both, as the context may require. Loomis Sayles will generally follow its express policy with input from the Proxy Voting Service that provides research, analysis and voting recommendations to Loomis Sayles unless the Proxy Committee determines that the client’s best interests are served by voting otherwise.

B. General Guidelines.

The following guidelines will apply when voting proxies on behalf of accounts for which Loomis Sayles has voting authority.

1. Client’s Best Interests. The Proxy Voting Procedures are designed and implemented in a way that is reasonably expected to ensure that proxy matters are conducted in the best interests of clients. When considering the best interests of clients, Loomis Sayles has determined that this means the best investment interest of its clients as shareholders of the issuer. To protect its clients’ best interests, Loomis Sayles has integrated the

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

consideration of ESG Matters into its investment process. The Proxy Voting Procedures are intended to reflect the impact of these factors in cases where they are material to the growth and sustainability of an issuer. Loomis Sayles has established its Proxy Voting Procedures to assist it in making its proxy voting decisions with a view toward enhancing the value of its clients' interests in an issuer over the period during which it expects its clients to hold their investments. Loomis Sayles will vote against proposals that it believes could adversely impact the current or future market value of the issuer's securities during the expected holding period. Loomis Sayles also believes that protecting the best interests of clients requires the consideration of potential material impacts of proxy proposals associated with ESG Matters.

For the avoidance of doubt, and notwithstanding any other provisions of these Proxy Voting Procedures, in all instances in which Loomis Sayles votes proxies on behalf of clients that are employee benefit plans subject to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended ("ERISA"), Loomis Sayles (a) will act solely in accordance with the economic interest of the plan and its participants and beneficiaries, and (b) will not subordinate the interests of the participants and beneficiaries in their retirement income or financial benefits under the plan to any non-pecuniary objective, or promote non-pecuniary benefits or goals unrelated to those financial interests of the plan's participants and beneficiaries.

- 2. Client Proxy Voting Policies.** Rather than delegating proxy voting authority to Loomis Sayles, a client may (a) retain the authority to vote proxies on securities in its account; (b) delegate voting authority to another party; or (c) instruct Loomis Sayles to vote proxies according to a policy that differs from the Proxy Voting Procedures. Loomis Sayles will honor any of these instructions if the instruction is agreed to in writing by Loomis Sayles in its investment management agreement with the client. If Loomis Sayles incurs additional costs or expenses in following any such instruction, it may request payment for such additional costs or expenses from the client.
- 3. Stated Policies.** In the interest of consistency in voting proxies on behalf of its clients where appropriate, Loomis Sayles has adopted policies that identify issues where Loomis Sayles will (a) generally vote in favor of a proposal; (b) generally vote against a proposal; (c) generally vote as recommended by the Proxy Voting Service; and (d) specifically consider its vote for or against a proposal. However, these policies are guidelines and each vote may be cast differently than the stated policy, taking into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances at the time of the vote. In certain cases where the

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service and the recommendation of the issuer's management are the same, the vote will generally be cast as recommended and will not be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Proxy Committee. In cases where the portfolio manager of an account that holds voting securities of an issuer or the analyst covering the issuer or its securities recommends a vote, the proposal(s) will be voted according to these recommendations after a review for any potential conflicts of interest is conducted and will not be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Proxy Committee. There may be situations where Loomis Sayles casts split votes despite the stated policies. For example, Loomis Sayles may cast a split vote when different clients may be invested in strategies with different investment objectives, or when different clients may have different economic interests in the outcome of a particular proposal. Loomis Sayles also may cast a split vote on a particular proposal when its investment teams have differing views regarding the impact of the proposal on their clients' investment interests.

4. Abstentions and Other Exceptions. Loomis Sayles' general policy is to vote rather than abstain from voting on issues presented, unless the Proxy Committee determines, pursuant to its best judgment, that the client's best interests require abstention. However, in the following circumstances Loomis Sayles may not vote a client's proxy:

- The Proxy Committee has concluded that voting would have no meaningful, identifiable economic benefit to the client as a shareholder, such as when the security is no longer held in the client's portfolio or when the value of the portfolio holding is insignificant.
- The Proxy Committee has concluded that the costs of or disadvantages resulting from voting outweigh the economic benefits of voting. For example, in some non-US jurisdictions, the sale of securities voted may be legally or practically prohibited or subject to some restrictions for some period of time, usually between the record and meeting dates ("share blocking"). Loomis Sayles believes that the loss of investment flexibility resulting from share blocking generally outweighs the benefit to be gained by voting. Information about share blocking is often incomplete or contradictory. Loomis Sayles relies on the client's custodian and on its Proxy Voting Service to identify share blocking jurisdictions. To the extent such information is wrong, Loomis Sayles could fail to vote shares that could have been voted without loss of investment flexibility, or could vote shares and then be prevented from engaging in a potentially beneficial portfolio transaction.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

- Administrative requirements for voting proxies in certain foreign jurisdictions (which may be imposed a single time or may be periodic), such as providing a power of attorney to the client's local sub-custodian, cannot be fulfilled due to timing of the requirement, or the costs required to fulfill the administrative requirements appear to outweigh the benefits to the client of voting the proxy.
- The client, as of the record date, has loaned the securities to which the proxy relates and Loomis Sayles has concluded that it is not in the best interest of the client to recall the loan or is unable to recall the loan in order to vote the securities¹.
- The client so directs Loomis Sayles.

The Proxy Committee will generally vote against, rather than abstain from voting on, ballot issues where the issuer does not provide sufficient information to make an informed decision. In addition, there may be instances where Loomis Sayles is not able to vote proxies on a client's behalf, such as when ballot delivery instructions have not been processed by a client's custodian, when the Proxy Voting Service has not received a ballot for a client's account (e.g., in cases where the client's shares have been loaned to a third party), when proxy materials are not available in English, and under other circumstances beyond Loomis Sayles' control.

5. Oversight. All issues presented for shareholder vote are subject to the oversight of the Proxy Committee, either directly or by application of this policy. All non-routine issues will generally be considered directly by the Proxy Committee and, when necessary, the investment professionals responsible for an account holding the security, and will be voted in the best investment interests of the client. All routine "for" and "against" issues will be voted according to this policy unless special factors require that they be considered by the Proxy Committee and, when necessary, the investment professionals responsible for an account holding the security.

6. Availability of Procedures. Loomis Sayles publishes these Proxy Voting Procedures, as updated from time to time, on its public website, www.loomissayles.com, and includes a

¹ Loomis Sayles does not engage in securities lending. However, some clients do opt to lend securities, availing themselves of their custodians' services.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

description of its Proxy Voting Procedures in Part 2A of its Form ADV. Upon request, Loomis Sayles also provides clients with a copy of its Proxy Voting Procedures.

7. **Disclosure of Vote.** Loomis Sayles makes certain disclosures regarding its voting of proxies in the aggregate (not specific as to clients) on its website, www.loomissayles.com. For mutual funds that it manages, Loomis Sayles is required by law to make certain disclosures regarding its voting of proxies annually. This information is also available on the Loomis Sayles website. Additionally, Loomis Sayles will, upon request by a client, provide information about how each proxy was voted with respect to the securities in that client's account. Loomis Sayles' policy is not to disclose a client's proxy voting records to third parties except as required by applicable law and regulations.

C. Proxy Committee.

1. **Proxy Committee.** Loomis Sayles has established a Proxy Committee. The Proxy Committee is composed of the Director of ESG, representatives of the Equity Research Department and the Legal and Compliance Department, and other employees of Loomis Sayles as needed. In the event that any member is unable to participate in a meeting of the Proxy Committee, he or she may designate another individual to act on his or her behalf. A vacancy in the Proxy Committee is filled by the prior member's successor in position at Loomis Sayles or a person of equivalent experience. Each portfolio manager of an account that holds voting securities of an issuer or the analyst covering the issuer or its securities may be an ad hoc member of the Proxy Committee in connection with voting proxies of that issuer. Voting determinations made by the Proxy Committee generally will be memorialized electronically (e.g., by email).
2. **Duties.** The Proxy Committee's specific responsibilities include the following:
 - a. developing, authorizing, implementing and updating the Proxy Voting Procedures, including:
 - (i) annually reviewing the Proxy Voting Procedures to ensure consistency with internal policies and regulatory agency policies, including determining the continuing adequacy of the Proxy Voting Procedures to confirm that they have been formulated reasonably and implemented effectively, including whether they continue to be reasonably designed to ensure that proxy votes are cast in clients' best interest,

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

- (ii) annually reviewing existing voting guidelines and developing of additional voting guidelines to assist in the review of proxy proposals, and
 - (iii) annually reviewing the proxy voting process and addressing any general issues that relate to proxy voting;
- b. overseeing the proxy voting process, including:
 - (i) overseeing the vote on proposals according to the predetermined policies in the voting guidelines,
 - (ii) directing the vote on proposals where there is reason not to vote according to the predetermined policies in the voting guidelines or where proposals require special consideration,
 - (iii) consulting with the portfolio managers and analysts for the accounts holding the security when necessary or appropriate, and
 - (iv) periodically sampling or engaging an outside party to sample proxy votes to ensure they comply with the Proxy Voting Procedures and are cast in accordance with the clients' best interests;
- c. engaging and overseeing third-party vendors that materially assist Loomis Sayles with respect to proxy voting, such as the Proxy Voting Services, including:
 - (i) determining and periodically reassessing whether, as relevant, the Proxy Voting Service has the capacity and competency to adequately analyze proxy issues by considering:
 - (a) the adequacy and quality of the Proxy Voting Service's staffing, personnel and technology,
 - (b) whether the Proxy Voting Service has adequately disclosed its methodologies in formulating voting recommendations, such that Loomis Sayles can understand the factors underlying the Proxy Voting Service's voting recommendations,
 - (c) the robustness of the Proxy Voting Service's policies and procedures regarding its ability to ensure that its recommendations are based on current, materially complete and accurate information, and
 - (d) the Proxy Voting Service's policies and procedures regarding how it identifies and addresses conflicts of interest, including whether the Proxy Voting Service's policies and procedures provide for adequate disclosure of its actual and potential conflicts of interest with respect to the services it provides to Loomis Sayles.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

- (ii) providing ongoing oversight of the Proxy Voting Services to ensure that proxies continue to be voted in the best interests of clients and in accordance with these Proxy Voting Procedures and the determinations and directions of the Proxy Committee,
 - (iii) receiving and reviewing updates from the Proxy Voting Services regarding relevant business changes or changes to the Proxy Voting Services' conflict policies and procedures, and
 - (iv) in the event that the Proxy Committee becomes aware that a recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service was based on a material factual error (including materially inaccurate or incomplete information): investigating the error, considering the nature of the error and the related recommendation, and determining whether the Proxy Voting Service has taken reasonable steps to reduce the likelihood of similar errors in the future; and
- d. further developing and/or modifying these Proxy Voting Procedures as otherwise appropriate or necessary.

3. Standards.

- a. When determining the vote of any proposal for which it has responsibility, the Proxy Committee shall vote in the client's best interests as described in section 1(B)(1) above. In the event a client believes that its other interests require a different vote, Loomis Sayles shall vote as the client instructs if the instructions are provided as required in section 1(B)(2) above.
- b. When determining the vote on any proposal, the Proxy Committee shall not consider any benefit to Loomis Sayles, any of its affiliates, any of its or their clients or service providers, other than benefits to the owner of the securities to be voted.
- c. If Loomis Sayles becomes aware of additional information relevant to the voting of a shareholder meeting after a vote has been entered but before the applicable voting deadline has passed, it will consider whether or not such information impacts the vote determination entered, and if necessary, use reasonable efforts to change the vote instruction.

D. Conflicts of Interest.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Loomis Sayles has established policies and procedures to ensure that proxy votes are voted in its clients' best interests and are not affected by any possible conflicts of interest. First, except in certain limited instances, Loomis Sayles votes in accordance with its pre-determined policies set forth in these Proxy Voting Procedures. Second, where these Proxy Voting Procedures allow for discretion, Loomis Sayles will generally consider the recommendations of the Proxy Voting Service in making its voting decisions. However, if the Proxy Committee determines that the Proxy Voting Service's recommendation is not in the best interests of the firm's clients, then the Proxy Committee may use its discretion to vote against the Proxy Voting Service's recommendation, but only after taking the following steps: (1) conducting a review for any material conflict of interest Loomis Sayles may have, and (2) if any material conflict is found to exist, excluding anyone at Loomis Sayles who is subject to that conflict of interest from participating in the voting decision in any way. However, if deemed necessary or appropriate by the Proxy Committee after full disclosure of any conflict, that person may provide information, opinions or recommendations on any proposal to the Proxy Committee. In such event, prior to directing any vote, the Proxy Committee will make reasonable efforts to obtain and consider information, opinions and recommendations from or about the opposing position.

E. Recordkeeping.

Loomis Sayles or the Proxy Voting Service will maintain records of proxies voted pursuant to Rule 204-2 under the Advisers Act. The records include: (1) a copy of its Proxy Voting Procedures; (2) proxy statements received regarding client securities; (3) a record of each vote cast; (4) a copy of any document created by Loomis Sayles that is material to making a decision how to vote proxies on behalf of a client or that memorializes the basis for that decision; and (5) each written client request for proxy voting records and Loomis Sayles' written response to any (written or oral) client request for such records.

Proxy voting books and records are maintained in an easily accessible place for a period of five years, the first two in an appropriate office of Loomis Sayles.

2. PROXY VOTING

A. Introduction

Loomis Sayles has established certain specific guidelines intended to achieve the objective of the Proxy Voting Procedures: to support good corporate governance, including ESG Matters, in all cases with the objective of protecting shareholder interests and maximizing shareholder value.

B. Board of Directors

Loomis Sayles believes that an issuer's independent, qualified board of directors is the foundation of good corporate governance. Loomis Sayles supports proxy proposals that reflect the prudent exercise of the board's obligation to provide leadership and guidance to management in fulfilling its obligations to its shareholders. As an example, it may be prudent not to disqualify a director from serving on a board if they participated in affiliated transactions if all measures of independence and good corporate governance were met.

Annual Election of Directors: Vote for proposals to repeal classified boards and to elect all directors annually.

Chairman and CEO are Separate Positions: Vote for proposals that require the positions of chairman and CEO to be held by different persons.

Director and Officer Indemnification and Liability Protection:

- A. Vote against proposals concerning director and officer indemnification and liability protection that limit or eliminate entirely director and officer liability for monetary damages for violating the duty of care, or that would expand coverage beyond legal expenses to acts such as gross negligence that are more serious violations of fiduciary obligations than mere carelessness.
- B. Vote for only those proposals that provide such expanded coverage in cases when a director's or officer's legal defense was unsuccessful if (i) the director or officer was found to have acted in good faith and in a manner that the director or officer reasonably believed was in the best interests of the company, and (ii) if the director's or officer's legal expenses only would be covered.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Director Nominees in Contested Elections: Votes in a contested election of directors or a “vote no” campaign must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors: (1) long-term financial performance of the issuer relative to its industry; management's track record; (2) background to the proxy contest; qualifications of director nominees (both slates); (3) evaluation of what each side is offering shareholders as well as the likelihood that the proposed objectives and goals can be met; and (4) stock ownership positions.

Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections:

- A. Vote for proposals involving routine matters such as election of directors, provided that at least two-thirds of the directors would be independent, as determined by the Proxy Voting Service, and affiliated or inside nominees do not serve on any key board committee, defined as the Audit, Compensation, Nominating and/or Governance Committees.
- B. Vote against nominees that are CFOs of the subject company. Generally, vote against nominees that the Proxy Voting Service has identified as not acting in the best interests of shareholders (e.g., due to over-boarding, risk management failures, a lack of diversity, etc.). Vote against nominees that have attended less than 75% of board and committee meetings, unless a reasonable cause (e.g., health or family emergency) for the absence is noted and accepted by the Proxy Voting Service and the board. Vote against affiliated or inside nominees who serve on a key board committee (as defined above). Vote against affiliated and inside nominees if less than two-thirds of the board would be independent. Vote against Governance or Nominating Committee members if both the following are true: a) there is no independent lead or presiding director; and b) the position of CEO and chairman are not held by separate individuals. Generally, vote against Audit Committee members if auditor ratification is not proposed, except in cases involving: (i) investment company board members, who are not required to submit auditor ratification for shareholder approval pursuant to Investment Company Act of 1940 rules; or (ii) any other issuer that is not required by law or regulation to submit a proposal ratifying the auditor selection. Vote against Compensation Committee members when Loomis Sayles or the Proxy Voting Service recommends a vote against the issuer's "say on pay" advisory vote.
- C. Generally, vote against all members of a board committee and not just the chairman or a representative thereof in situations where the Proxy Voting Service finds that the board committee has not acted in the best interests of shareholders.
- D. Vote as recommended by the Proxy Voting Service when directors are being elected as a slate and not individually.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

E. When electing directors for foreign-domiciled issuers, a recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed in lieu of the above stipulations.

Independent Audit, Compensation and Nominating and/or Governance Committees: Vote for proposals requesting that the board Audit, Compensation and/or Nominating and/or Governance Committees include independent directors exclusively.

Independent Board Chairman:

- A. Vote for shareholder proposals that generally request the board to adopt a policy requiring its chairman to be "independent" (based on some reasonable definition of that term) with respect to any issuer whose enterprise value is, according to the Proxy Voting Service, greater than or equal to \$10 billion.
- B. Vote such proposals on a case-by-case basis when, according to the Proxy Voting Service, the issuer's enterprise value is less than \$10 billion.

Multiple Directorships: Generally vote against a director nominee who serves as an executive officer of any public company while serving on more than two total public company boards and any other director nominee who serves on more than five total public company boards, unless a convincing argument to vote for that nominee is made by the Proxy Voting Service, in which case, the recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed.

Staggered Director Elections: Vote against proposals to classify or stagger the board.

Stock Ownership Requirements: Generally vote against shareholder proposals requiring directors to own a minimum amount of company stock in order to qualify as a director, or to remain on the board.

Term of Office: Vote against shareholder proposals to limit the tenure of outside directors.

C. Ratification of Auditor

Loomis Sayles generally supports proposals for the selection or ratification of independent auditors, subject to consideration of various factors such as independence and reasonableness of fees.

- A. Generally vote for proposals to ratify auditors.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

- B. Vote against ratification of auditors where an auditor has a financial interest in or association with the company, and is therefore not independent; or there is reason to believe that the independent auditor has rendered an opinion which is neither accurate nor indicative of the company's financial position.
- C. In general, if non-audit fees amount to 35% or more of total fees paid to a company's auditor we will vote against ratification and against the members of the Audit Committee unless the Proxy Voting Service states that the fees were disclosed and determined to be reasonable. In such instances, the recommendation of the Proxy Voting service will generally be followed.
- D. Vote against ratification of auditors and vote against members of the Audit Committee where it is known that an auditor has negotiated an alternative dispute resolution procedure.
- E. Vote against ratification of auditors if the Proxy Voting Service indicates that a vote for the ratification of auditors it is not in the best long term interest of shareholders.

D. Remuneration and Benefits

Loomis Sayles believes that an issuer's compensation and benefit plans must be designed to ensure the alignment of executives' and employees' interests with those of its shareholders.

401(k) Employee Benefit Plans: Vote for proposals to implement a 401(k) savings plan for employees.

Compensation Plans: Proposals with respect to compensation plans generally will be voted as recommended by the Proxy Voting Service.

Compensation in the Event of a Change in Control: Votes on proposals regarding executive compensation in the event of a change in control of the issuer will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Director Related Compensation: Vote for proposals that are required by and comply with applicable laws (domestic or foreign) or listing requirements governing the issuer. All other proposals relating to director compensation will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Employee Stock Ownership Plans ("ESOPs"): Vote for proposals that request shareholder approval in order to implement an ESOP or to increase authorized shares for existing ESOPs, except in cases when the number of shares allocated to the ESOP is "excessive" (i.e.,

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

generally greater than five percent of outstanding shares), in which case the recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed.

Golden Coffins: Review on a case-by-case basis all proposals relating to the obligation of an issuer to provide remuneration or awards to survivors of executives payable upon such executive's death.

Golden and Tin Parachutes:

- A. Vote for shareholder proposals to have golden (top management) and tin (all employees) parachutes submitted for shareholder ratification.
- B. Review on a case-by-case basis all proposals to ratify or cancel golden or tin parachutes.

OBRA (Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act)-Related Compensation Proposals:

- A. Vote for proposals to amend shareholder-approved plans to include administrative features or place a cap on the annual grants any one participant may receive to comply with the provisions of Section 162(m) of OBRA.
- B. Vote for amendments to add performance goals to existing compensation plans to comply with the provisions of Section 162(m) of OBRA.
- C. Vote for cash or cash-and-stock bonus plans to exempt the compensation from taxes under the provisions of Section 162(m) of OBRA.
- D. Votes on amendments to existing plans to increase shares reserved and to qualify the plan for favorable tax treatment under the provisions of Section 162(m) should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Shareholder Proposals to Limit Executive and Director Pay Including Executive Compensation Advisory Resolutions (“Say on Pay”):

- A. Generally, vote for shareholder proposals that seek additional disclosure of executive and director pay information.
- B. Review on a case-by-case basis (1) all shareholder proposals that seek to limit executive and director pay and (2) all advisory resolutions on executive pay other than shareholder resolutions to permit such advisory resolutions.
- C. Vote against proposals to link all executive or director variable compensation to performance goals.
- D. Vote for an annual review of executive compensation.
- E. Non-binding advisory votes on executive compensation will be voted as recommended by the Proxy Voting Service.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

F. For foreign domiciled issuers where a non-binding advisory vote on executive compensation is proposed concurrently with a binding vote on executive compensation, and the recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service is the same for each proposal, a vote will be entered as recommended by the Proxy Voting Service.

Share Retention by Executives: Generally vote against shareholder proposals requiring executives to retain shares of the issuer for fixed periods unless the board and the Proxy Voting Service recommend voting in favor of the proposal.

Stock Option Plans: A recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed using the following as a guide:

- A. Vote against stock option plans which expressly permit repricing of underwater options.
- B. Vote against proposals to make all stock options performance based.
- C. Vote against stock option plans that could result in an earnings dilution above the company specific cap considered by the Proxy Voting Service.
- D. Vote for proposals that request expensing of stock options.

E. Capital Structure Management Issues

Adjustments to Par Value of Common Stock: Vote for management proposals to reduce the par value of common stock.

Authority to Issue Shares: Vote for proposals by boards to authorize the issuance of shares (with or without preemptive rights) to the extent the size of the proposed issuance in proportion to the issuer's issued ordinary share capital is consistent with industry standards and the recommendations of the issuer's board and the Proxy Voting Service are in agreement. Proposals that do not meet the above criteria will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Blank Check Preferred Authorization:

- A. Vote for proposals to create blank check preferred stock in cases when the company expressly states that the stock will not be used as a takeover defense or carry superior voting rights, and expressly states conversion, dividend, distribution and other rights.
- B. Vote for shareholder proposals to have blank check preferred stock placements, other than those shares issued for the purpose of raising capital or making acquisitions in the normal course of business, submitted for shareholder ratification.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

C. Review proposals to increase the number of authorized blank check preferred shares on a case-by-case basis.

Common Stock Authorization: Vote against proposed common stock authorizations that increase the existing authorization by more than 100% unless a clear need for the excess shares is presented by the company. A recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed.

Greenshoe Options (French issuers only): Vote for proposals by boards of French issuers in favor of greenshoe options that grant the issuer the flexibility to increase an over-subscribed securities issuance by up to 15% so long as such increase takes place on the same terms and within thirty days of the initial issuance, provided that the recommendation of the issuer's board and the Proxy Voting Service are in agreement. Proposals that do not meet the above criteria will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Reverse Stock Splits: Vote for management proposals to reduce the number of outstanding shares available through a reverse stock split.

Share Cancellation Programs: Vote for management proposals to reduce share capital by means of cancelling outstanding shares held in the issuer's treasury.

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

Stock Distributions, Splits and Dividends: Generally vote for management proposals to increase common share authorization, provided that the increase in authorized shares following the split or dividend is not greater than 100 percent of existing authorized shares.

F. Mergers, Asset Sales and Other Special Transactions

Proposals for transactions that have the potential to affect the ownership interests and/or voting rights of the issuer's shareholders, such as mergers, asset sales and corporate or debt restructuring, will be considered on a case-by-case basis, based on (1) whether the best economic result is being created for shareholders, (2) what changes in corporate governance will occur, (3) what impact they will have on shareholder rights, (4) whether the proposed transaction has strategic merit for the issuer, and (5) other factors as noted in each section below, if any.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Asset Sales: Votes on asset sales will be determined on a case-by-case basis after considering the impact on the balance sheet/working capital, value received for the asset, and potential elimination of inefficiencies.

Conversion of Debt Instruments: Votes on the conversion of debt instruments will be considered on a case-by-case basis after the recommendation of the relevant Loomis Sayles equity or fixed income analyst is obtained.

Corporate Restructuring: Votes on corporate restructuring proposals, including minority squeeze-outs, leveraged buyouts, spin-offs, liquidations, and asset sales will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Debt Restructurings: Review on a case-by-case basis proposals to increase common and/or preferred shares and to issue shares as part of a debt-restructuring plan. Consider the following issues:

- A. Dilution - How much will ownership interest of existing shareholders be reduced, and how extreme will dilution to any future earnings be?
- B. Change in Control - Will the transaction result in a change in control of the company?
- C. Bankruptcy – Loomis Sayles’ Corporate Actions Department is responsible for consents related to bankruptcies and debt holder consents related to restructurings.
- D. Potential Conflicts of Interest – For example, clients may own securities at different levels of the capital structure; in such cases, Loomis Sayles will exercise voting or consent rights for each such client based on that client’s best interests, which may differ from the interests of other clients.

Delisting a Security: Proposals to delist a security from an exchange will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Fair Price Provisions:

- A. Vote for fair price proposals, as long as the shareholder vote requirement embedded in the provision is no more than a majority of disinterested shares.
- B. Vote for shareholder proposals to lower the shareholder vote requirement in existing fair price provisions.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Greenmail:

- A. Vote for proposals to adopt anti-greenmail charter or bylaw amendments or otherwise restrict a company's ability to make greenmail payments.
- B. Review anti-greenmail proposals on a case-by-case basis when they are bundled with other charter or bylaw amendments.
- C. Vote for proposals to eliminate an anti-greenmail bylaw if the recommendations of management and the Proxy Voting Service are in agreement. If they are not in agreement, review and vote such proposals on a case-by-case basis.

Liquidations: Proposals on liquidations will be voted on a case-by-case basis after reviewing relevant factors including but not necessarily limited to management's efforts to pursue other alternatives, the appraisal value of assets, and the compensation plan for executives managing the liquidation.

Mergers and Acquisitions: Votes on mergers and acquisitions should be considered on a case-by-case basis, generally taking into account relevant factors including but not necessarily limited to: anticipated financial and operating benefits; offer price (cost vs. premium); prospects of the combined companies; how the deal was negotiated; golden parachutes; financial benefits to current management; and changes in corporate governance and their impact on shareholder rights.

Poison Pills:

- A. Vote for shareholder proposals that ask a company to submit its poison pill for shareholder ratification.
- B. Review on a case-by-case basis shareholder proposals to redeem a company's poison pill.
- C. Review on a case-by-case basis management proposals to ratify a poison pill.

Reincorporation Provisions: Proposals to change a company's domicile will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Right to Adjourn: Vote for the right to adjourn in conjunction with a vote for a merger or acquisition or other proposal, and vote against the right to adjourn in conjunction with a vote against a merger or acquisition or other proposal.

Spin-offs: Votes on spin-offs will be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on relevant factors including but not necessarily limited to the tax and regulatory advantages, planned use of sale proceeds, market focus, and managerial incentives.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Tender Offer Defenses: Proposals concerning tender offer defenses will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

G. Shareholder Rights

Loomis Sayles believes that issuers have a fundamental obligation to protect the rights of their shareholders. Pursuant to its fiduciary duty to vote shares in the best interests of its clients, Loomis Sayles considers proposals relating to shareholder rights based on whether and how they affect and protect those rights.

Appraisal Rights: Vote for proposals to restore, or provide shareholders with, rights of appraisal.

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

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

Counting Abstentions: Votes on proposals regarding counting abstentions when calculating vote proposal outcomes will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Cumulative Voting: Vote for proposals to permit cumulative voting, except where the issuer already has in place a policy of majority voting.

Equal Access: Vote for shareholder proposals that would allow significant company shareholders equal access to management's proxy material in order to evaluate and propose

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

voting recommendations on proxy proposals and director nominees, and in order to nominate their own candidates to the board.

Exclusive Forum Provisions: Vote against proposals mandating an exclusive forum for any shareholder lawsuits. Vote against the members of the issuer's Governance Committee in the event of a proposal mandating an exclusive forum without shareholder approval.

Independent Proxy: Vote for proposals to elect an independent proxy to serve as a voting proxy at shareholder meetings.

Majority Voting: Vote for proposals to permit majority rather than plurality or cumulative voting for the election of directors/trustees.

Preemptive Rights: Votes with respect to preemptive rights generally will be voted as recommended by the Proxy Voting Service subject to the Common Stock Authorization requirements above.

Proxy Access: A recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed with regard to proposals intended to grant shareholders the right to place nominees for director on the issuer's proxy ballot ("Proxy Access"). Vote for such proposals when they require the nominating shareholder(s) to hold, in aggregate, at least 3% of the voting shares of the issuer for at least three years, and be allowed to nominate up to 25% of the nominees. All other proposals relating to Proxy Access will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Shareholder Ability to Alter the Size of the Board:

- A. Vote for proposals that seek to fix the size of the board.
- B. Vote against proposals that give management the ability to alter the size of the board without shareholder approval.

Shareholder Ability to Remove Directors:

- A. Vote against proposals that provide that directors may be removed only for cause.
- B. Vote against proposals that provide that only continuing directors may elect replacements to fill board vacancies.
- C. Vote for proposals to restore shareholder ability to remove directors with or without cause and proposals that permit shareholders to elect directors to fill board vacancies.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Shareholder Advisory Committees: Proposals to establish a shareholder advisory committee will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Shareholder Rights Regarding Special Meetings:

- A. Vote for proposals that set a threshold of 10% of the outstanding voting stock as a minimum percentage allowable to call a special meeting of shareholders. Vote against proposals that increase or decrease the threshold from 10%.
- B. Vote against proposals to restrict or prohibit shareholder ability to call special meetings.

Supermajority Shareholder Voting Requirements: Vote for all proposals to replace supermajority shareholder voting requirements with simple majority shareholder voting requirements, subject to applicable laws and regulations. Vote against management proposals to require a supermajority shareholder vote to approve charter and bylaw amendments.

Unequal Voting Rights:

- A. Vote against dual class exchange offers and dual class recapitalizations.
- B. Vote on a case-by-case basis on proposals to eliminate an existing dual class voting structure.

Written Consent: Vote for proposals regarding the right to act by written consent when the Proxy Voting Service recommends a vote for the proposal. Proposals regarding the right to act by written consent where the Proxy Voting Service recommends a vote against will be sent to the Proxy Committee for determination. Generally vote against proposals to restrict or prohibit shareholder ability to take action by written consent.

H. Environmental and Social Matters

Loomis Sayles has a fiduciary duty to act in the best interests of its clients.

Loomis Sayles believes good corporate governance, including those practices that address ESG Matters, is essential to the effective management of a company's financial, litigation and reputation risk, the maximization of its long-term economic performance and sustainability, and the protection of its shareholders' best interests, including the maximization of shareholder value.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Proposals on environmental and social matters cover a wide range of issues, including environmental and energy practices and their impacts, labor matters, diversity and human rights. These proposals may be voted as recommended by the Proxy Voting Service or may, in the determination of the Proxy Committee, be reviewed on a case-by-case basis if the Proxy Committee believes that a particular proposal (i) could have a material impact on an industry or the growth and sustainability of an issuer; (ii) is appropriate for the issuer and the cost to implement would not be excessive; (iii) is appropriate for the issuer in light of various factors such as reputational damage or litigation risk; or (iv) is otherwise appropriate for the issuer.

Loomis Sayles will consider whether such proposals are likely to enhance the value of the client's investments after taking into account the costs involved, pursuant to its fiduciary duty to its clients.

I. General Corporate Governance

Loomis Sayles has a fiduciary duty to its clients with regard to proxy voting matters, including routine proposals that do not present controversial issues. The impact of proxy proposals on its clients' rights as shareholders must be evaluated along with their potential economic benefits.

Changing Corporate Name: Vote for management proposals to change the corporate name.

Charitable and Political Contributions and Lobbying Expenditures: Votes on proposals regarding charitable contributions, political contributions, and lobbying expenditures, should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Proposals of UK issuers concerning political contributions will be voted for if the issuer states that (a) it does not intend to make any political donations or incur any expenditures in respect to any political party in the EU; and (b) the proposal is submitted to ensure that the issuer does not inadvertently breach the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 and sections 366 and 367 of the Companies Act 2006.

Delivery of Electronic Proxy Materials: Vote for proposals to allow electronic delivery of proxy materials to shareholders.

Disclosure of Prior Government Service: Review on a case-by-case basis all proposals to disclose a list of employees previously employed in a governmental capacity.

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

Non-Material Miscellaneous Bookkeeping Proposals: A recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed regarding miscellaneous bookkeeping proposals of a non-material nature.

Reimbursement of Proxy Contest Defenses: Generally, proposals concerning all proxy contest defense cost reimbursements should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Reimbursement of Proxy Solicitation Expenses: Proposals to provide reimbursement for dissidents waging a proxy contest should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

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

Technical Amendments to By-Laws: A recommendation of the Proxy Voting Service will generally be followed regarding technical or housekeeping amendments to by-laws or articles designed to bring the by-laws or articles into line with current regulations and/or laws.

Transaction of Other Business: Vote against proposals asking for authority to transact open-ended other business without any information provided by the issuer at the time of voting.

Transition Manager Ballots: Any ballot received by Loomis Sayles for a security that was held for a client by a Transition Manager prior to Loomis Sayles' management of the client's holdings will be considered on a case-by case basis by the Proxy Committee (without the input of any Loomis Sayles analyst or portfolio manager) if such security is no longer held in the client's account with Loomis Sayles.

J. Investment Company Matters

Election of Investment Company Trustees: Vote for nominees who oversee fewer than 60 investment company portfolios. Vote against nominees who oversee 60 or more investment company portfolios that invest in substantially different asset classes (e.g., if the applicable portfolios include both fixed income funds and equity funds). Vote on a case-by-case basis

Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures

for or against nominees who oversee 60 or more investment company portfolios that invest in substantially similar asset classes (e.g., if the applicable portfolios include only fixed income funds or only equity funds). These policies will be followed with respect to funds advised by Loomis Sayles and its affiliates, as well as funds for which Loomis Sayles acts as subadviser and other third parties.

Mutual Fund Distribution Agreements: Votes on mutual fund distribution agreements should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Investment Company Fundamental Investment Restrictions: Votes on amendments to an investment company's fundamental investment restrictions should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Investment Company Investment Advisory Agreements: Votes on investment company investment advisory agreements should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.



PROXY VOTING POLICY

NS Partners Ltd

April 2023

NS Partners Ltd is authorized and regulated by the UK Financial Conduct Authority. FRN: 141667.
Registered in England and Wales Number 1880176

PROXY VOTING POLICY

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS	2
III. BOARD OF DIRECTORS	3
IV. CORPORATE STRUCTURE	3
V. EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION	4
VI. DIRECTOR REMUNERATION	4
VII. AUDIT FUNCTION	4
VIII. RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT	4
IX. PROXY VOTING RECORDS	5

PROXY VOTING POLICY

I. Introduction

NS Partners have a fiduciary duty to vote proxies both in a timely manner and in the best interest of clients. The central tenet of our proxy voting policy is that good corporate governance enhances long-term shareholder value. NS Partners utilizes the proxy research and voting services of Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS) to help assess and vote proxies in accordance with our custom voting policy. Taking into account NS Partners' custom guidelines, ISS prepares voting recommendations for all proposals on which we are entitled to vote. NS Partners uses these recommendations as a guide; however, certain situations will warrant additional review. Where there is a recommendation to vote against management, we reach out to the company to gain a better understanding of the issue at hand. As a result of this engagement and our assessment of the relevant information, NS Partners may choose to vote contrary to the ISS recommendation. The policy that follows is not meant to be exhaustive due to the variety of proxy voting issues NS Partners may be required to consider and we may depart from these guidelines to avoid voting decisions that we believe may be contrary to our clients' best interest.

While NS Partners takes its voting responsibilities very seriously and uses its best efforts to exercise these rights in all cases, there may be situations when it may be impractical or impossible for NS Partners to vote. Such circumstances include a limited number of international markets where share blocking applies or when securities are on loan to a third party. Due to the liquidity and administrative challenges, NS Partners will typically not vote in these situations. NS Partners may deviate from this approach if the situation warrants.

II. Shareholder Rights

General guidelines: NS Partners will generally vote in favour of proposals that improve corporate governance practices and give shareholders a greater voice in the affairs of the company and, conversely, oppose measures that seek to limit those rights. NS Partners believe that shareholders with meaningful ownership should have the right to call a special meeting and will generally vote against proposals restricting this right. Regarding proxy access, NS Partners will generally support giving shareholders the right to nominate directors, provided nominations reflect a reasonable level of stock ownership and the nominees are well qualified and prepared to act in the interests of all shareholders. Additionally, NS Partners will generally oppose advance notice bylaws that impose unreasonable conditions on shareholders who wish to nominate directors to the board. NS Partners will generally vote against proposals that give management the authority to adjourn or extend a meeting unless compelling reasons are provided. NS Partners will review proxy contests on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration the long-term company performance, background to the contested election, nominee qualifications and other relevant factors.

Voting standard: NS Partners believe that shareholders should have the right to vote in proportion to their ownership and therefore support the principal of one-share, one-vote. Accordingly, NS Partners will generally vote against the authorization or issue of shares that do not have full and equal voting rights, against proposals that support or perpetuate dual share class structures and for proposals to eliminate dual share class structures. NS Partners prefer that companies adopt a majority voting for individual directors in uncontested elections. NS Partners will generally oppose supermajority voting requirements if they are in attempt to diminish the rights of minority shareholders.

Anti-takeover measures: NS Partners believe measures that impede takeovers or entrench management not only infringe on the rights of shareholders but may also have a detrimental effect on the value of the company. Accordingly, NS Partners will analyse such proposals on a case-by-case basis. NS Partners will generally oppose proposals that entrench management or excessively dilute shareholder ownership, regardless of whether they are advanced by management or shareholders. Conversely, NS Partners will generally support proposals that restrict or otherwise eliminate anti-takeover measures that have already been adopted by corporate issuers.

PROXY VOTING POLICY

III. Board of Directors

General guidelines: NS Partners believe that directors have a duty to shareholders, and we may withhold votes for directors that fail to act on key issues.

Staggered boards: NS Partners oppose staggered boards as it is our belief that they can entrench existing management and unduly deter takeovers. Therefore, NS Partners will generally vote for proposals to declassify the board of directors.

Independence: NS Partners believe in the importance of an independent board of directors and consider a board to be sufficiently independent when greater than fifty percent of directors are independent. In Japan, this threshold is lowered to one third, which NS Partners believe to be sufficient at present, however this will be revisited as corporate governance reform progresses in the Japanese market. If the proposed board does not meet our independence criteria, NS Partners will generally vote against all non-independent candidates, except for the CEO, as this position is by nature non-independent and in most situations voting against a CEO could be unnecessarily disruptive. While NS Partners support insiders as board members as we feel they provide valuable knowledge and insight to the company, we believe that insider representation should largely reflect level of ownership or control, and therefore we may refrain from voting against certain non-independent candidates or vote against insiders if the number of insiders serving on a board is excessive. Furthermore, NS Partners believe that key committees (Audit, Compensation, Nomination and Governance) should be purely independent and will typically vote against non-independent directors serving on these committees.

Separation of Chair and CEO: NS Partners believe that the responsibilities of the CEO and board Chair are fundamentally different and should thus be filled by different individuals. Therefore, NS Partners will support proposals to separate the roles of CEO and Chair and will consider voting against the Chair of the Nomination Committee when the roles are combined, and a lead independent director has not been established.

Gender diversity: NS Partners believe that board diversity has positive, long-term implications for a company's performance, and therefore, will generally vote against the chair of the Nomination Committee if a board lacks female representation.

Attendance: NS Partners will typically vote against directors who have attended less than 75% of the board meetings held within a given year without a valid reason for these absences.

Tenure: NS Partners oppose age and term limits for individual directors and prefer to see board renewal occur through an annual evaluation process which assesses the effectiveness of the board its committees and individual directors. If the average tenure of the board exceeds 10 years, NS Partners may vote against the longest-serving member of the board, other than the CEO.

Overboarding: NS Partners will generally vote against directors who are over boarded. We consider a director over boarded if he/she: i) sits on more than a total of five public company boards; or ii) is a CEO and sits on more than a total of two public company boards.

IV. Corporate Structure

General guidelines: Changes in a company's charter, articles of incorporation or by-laws are often technical and administrative in nature. Absent a compelling reason to the contrary, NS Partners will most often vote in accordance with the company's management on such proposals. However, NS Partners will review and analyze on a case-by-case basis any non-routine proposals that are likely to affect the structure and operation of the company or have a material economic effect on the company.

PROXY VOTING POLICY

Mergers & acquisitions: NS Partners will review proposed mergers and acquisitions transactions on a case-by-case basis considering them based on their strategic rationale, valuation, long-term interest, and impact on shareholders rights.

Share issuance: NS Partners oppose increases in authorized common stock where there is evidence that the shares will be used to implement a poison pill or other anti-takeover devices, or if the issuance of new shares could excessively dilute the value of the outstanding shares.

Buybacks: NS Partners will consider share buyback proposals on a case-by-case basis taking into account the impact on long-term shareholder value, the level of disclosure, whether there is evidence that the buyback is being carried out to reward company insiders, and other relevant factors.

V. Executive Remuneration

General guidelines: NS Partners believe that robust executive remuneration guidelines are vital to the functioning of public companies and are a key expression of good corporate governance. While NS Partners are mindful of the complexity of this subject and the varying practices across markets, industries and capitalizations, the following principles guide our voting on matters of executive remuneration. NS Partners will consider factors such as company performance, pay-for-performance alignment, and level of disclosure when voting on proposals related to compensation. Additionally, NS Partners will consider metrics such as CEO base pay, overall CEO compensation, the multiple of annual CEO remuneration to median remuneration of all other employees, the multiple of annual CEO remuneration to the median of all other senior executives, dilution, and the annual burn rate. Should NS Partners have concerns regarding any of these metrics we may vote against an advisory vote on executive compensation and may also consider voting against the chair and members of the Compensation Committee.

VI. Director Remuneration

General guidelines: NS Partners believe that that pay for non-executive directors should be structured in such a way that ensures independence, objectivity, and alignment with shareholders' interests. Non-executive directors should not receive performance-based pay such as performance stock units (PSUs) or stock options, as this can encourage excessive risk-taking and impair objectivity. Instead, NS Partners prefer non-executive directors receive compensation in the form of cash or alternatively restricted stock units (RSUs) or deferred stock units (DSUs), which have the same economic interest as shares, and therefore directly align the interests of directors with those of shareholders.

VII. Audit Function

General guidelines: NS Partners believes that the company remains in the best position to select and auditor and will generally support management's recommendation. However, NS Partners recognize there may be inherent conflicts of interest arising when a company's auditor provides substantial non-audit related services for the company. Therefore, NS Partners may vote against the appointment of an auditor if the fees for non-audit related services are disproportionate to the total audit fees paid by the company or there are other reasons to question the independence of the company's auditors.

VIII. Responsible Investment

General guidelines: As a signatory of the UN-backed Principles for Responsible Investment NS Partners takes into account environmental and social implications in our proxy voting. Specific proposals related to Environmental and Social issues will be reviewed and analyzed on a case-by-case basis, however NS Partners will generally vote in favour of shareholder proposals that seek to improve disclosure of environmental risks

PROXY VOTING POLICY

and will also generally vote in favour of shareholder proposals to improve transparency regarding social issues provided it is in the best interest of shareholders.

NS Partners recognizes that climate change poses both risks and opportunities for companies. As supporters of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), we encourage companies to strengthen governance oversight of climate change, adopt cost-effective GHG emissions reduction measures, and provide transparency and comprehensive climate-related disclosures. NS Partners will vote on a case-by-case basis, but generally supports climate-related proposals seeking increased disclosure of climate-related risks.

IX. Proxy Voting Records

NS Partners provides a summary of its proxy voting record to its clients on a quarterly basis. Additional information is available to our clients on request.