



An MSCI Brand

Transparency. Inclusiveness. Global Expertise.

2014 Hong Kong Proxy Voting Guidelines

December 19, 2013

Institutional Shareholder Services Inc.

Copyright © 2013 by ISS

www.issgovernance.com

ISS' 2014 Hong Kong Proxy Voting Guidelines

Effective for Meetings on or after Feb. 1, 2014

Published December 19, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	3
OPERATIONAL ITEMS	4
Approval of Financial Statements and Statutory Reports	4
Dividend Distribution.....	4
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	5
Election of Directors	5
Director Tenure	6
Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections.....	6
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	7
Election of Supervisors	7
REMUNERATION	8
Director Fees	8
Compensation Plans	8
AUDIT	9
SHARE ISSUANCE REQUESTS.....	10
General Issuance Mandate.....	10
Share Repurchase Plans (Repurchase Mandate).....	10
Reissuance of Shares Repurchased (Share Reissuance Mandate)	11
RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTIONS	12
Group Finance Companies.....	12
CAPITAL.....	13
Debt Issuance Requests.....	13
Pledging of Assets for Debt	14
Increase in Borrowing Powers.....	14
Loan Guarantee Requests	14
MERGERS & ACQUISITIONS	16
SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	17
DISCLOSURE/DISCLAIMER	18

Overview

Hong Kong companies are required to present the summary of their financial reports within four months after the end of the financial year. Public companies must hold their annual general meeting (AGM) within a period of 15 months from the last convened AGM. The following resolutions are commonly seen at a shareholder meeting:

- Approval of financial statements and statutory reports;
- Dividend distribution;
- Election of directors;
- Approval of remuneration of directors;
- Election of supervisors;
- Auditor appointment and approval of auditor remuneration;
- Capital raising request
- Compensation proposals.

Other items that may be submitted for shareholder approval include:

- Related-party transactions;
- Amendments to articles of associations;
- Debt issuance requests;
- Provision of guarantees;
- Mergers and acquisition.

Policies in this document are presented in the order that generally appears on the ballot.

Operational Items

Approval of Financial Statements and Statutory Reports

Vote for approval of financial statements and director and auditor reports, unless:

- There are concerns about the accounts presented or audit procedures used; or
- The company is not responsive to shareholder questions about specific items that should be publicly disclosed.

Dividend Distribution

Vote for approval of the allocation of income, unless:

- The dividend payout ratio has been consistently below 30 percent without adequate explanation; or
- The payout is excessive given the company's financial position

Board of Directors

The SEHK listing rules now require that at least three independent non-executive directors be appointed to boards of listed companies or at least one-third of the board be independent, whichever is higher. Companies are likewise required to form audit committees composed entirely of non-executive directors, a majority of whom, including the chairman, must be independent. The committee must have at least one independent director with appropriate professional qualifications or accounting or related financial management expertise. The establishment of a remuneration committee is also required in Hong Kong, and the committee must be majority independent, including the chairman. Insiders are allowed to serve on the remuneration committee so long as the committee is majority independent. Companies listed in Hong Kong must also establish a nomination committee, or explain the reasons of noncompliance. The nomination committee must comprise a majority of independent directors, and must be chaired by either an independent director or the chairman of the board.

Election of Directors

ISS typically recommends a vote for the re/election of directors, unless:

- The nominee is classified by the company as independent, but fails to meet the ISS criteria for independence;
- The nominee has been a partner of the company's auditor within the last three years, and serves on the audit committee;
- The nominee has attended less than 75 percent of board and key committee meetings over the most recent fiscal year, without a satisfactory explanation. Acceptable reasons for director absences are generally limited to the following:
 - Medical issues/illness;
 - Family emergencies;
 - The director has served on the board for less than a year; and
 - Missing only one meeting (when the total of all meetings is three or fewer).
- The nominee is an executive director serving on the remuneration committee or nomination committee, and the committee is not majority independent;
- The nominee is an executive director serving on the audit committee;
- The nominee sits on a total of more than six public company boards (ISS will accept a commitment by an overboarded director to step down from one or more boards at the next annual meeting of the company or companies in question, if that will bring the total number of boards to no more than six); or
- Any non-independent director nominees where the board is less than one-third independent under ISS classification of directors.

In making these recommendations, ISS generally will not recommend against the election of a CEO, managing director, executive chairman, or founder who is integral to the company.

Generally vote against all members of the audit committee up for reelection if:

- The non-audit fees paid to the auditor are excessive; or
- The company did not disclose the audit fees and/or non-audit fees in the latest fiscal year.

Under extraordinary circumstances, vote against or withhold from individual directors, members of a committee, or the entire board, due to:

- Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight, or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
- Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
- Egregious actions related to a 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.

Director Tenure

Under ISS' Classification of Directors, an independent non-executive director shall be considered non-independent if such director serves as a director for more than 9 years, and the company fails to disclose the reasons why such director should still be considered independent, or where such reasons raise concerns regarding the director's true level of independence.

Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections

Vote case-by-case on the election of directors in contested elections, including election of shareholder nominees or the dismissal of incumbent directors. For shareholder nominees, ISS places the persuasive burden on the nominee or the proposing shareholder to prove that they are better suited to serve on the board than management's nominees. Serious consideration of shareholder nominees will be given only if there are clear and compelling reasons for the nominee to join the board. These nominees must also demonstrate a clear ability to contribute positively to board deliberations; some nominees may have hidden or narrow agendas and may unnecessarily contribute to divisiveness among directors.

The major decision factors are:

- Company performance relative to its peers;
- Strategy of the incumbents versus the dissidents;
- Independence of directors/nominees;
- Experience and skills of board candidates;
- Governance profile of the company;
- Evidence of management entrenchment;
- Responsiveness to shareholders;
- Whether a takeover offer has been rebuffed.

When analyzing proxy contests/ shareholder nominees, ISS focuses on two central questions: (1) Have the dissidents proved that board change is warranted? and (2) if so, are the dissident board nominees likely to effect positive change (i.e., maximize long-term shareholder value)?

It is not, however, uncommon in China and Hong Kong for a major shareholder to propose shareholder nominees. While these candidates are technically shareholder nominees, they are usually presented with consent of and often at the request of management. ISS treats the election of these shareholder nominees as uncontested director elections unless there is an indication of director contest.

Board of Supervisors

Company Law of PRC requires that companies incorporated in China establish a supervisory board, and that this board consists of at least three members, with no less than one-third representing mass employees. These employee representatives are elected by employees and are not subject to shareholder approval in general meetings. Directors and senior executives are prohibited from serving as supervisors.

These supervisory boards are charged with overseeing company finances and supervising the conduct of directors and senior executives, with supervisors typically nominated by major shareholders of the company.

Election of Supervisors

ISS generally recommends voting for such candidates unless:

- He or she is a senior executive or director of the company;
- He or she has been a partner of the company's auditor within the last three years; or
- There are concerns about the performance or conduct of an individual candidate.

Remuneration

Director Fees

ISS generally supports resolutions regarding directors' fees unless they are excessive relative to fees paid by other companies of similar size.

Compensation Plans

ISS will recommend voting against an option scheme if:

- The maximum dilution level for the scheme exceeds ISS guidelines of 5 percent of issued capital for a mature company and 10 percent for a growth company. However, ISS will support plans at mature companies with dilution levels up to 10 percent if the plan includes other positive features such as challenging performance criteria and meaningful vesting periods as these features partially offset dilution concerns by reducing the likelihood that options will become exercisable unless there is a clear improvement in shareholder value; or
- Directors eligible to receive options under the scheme are involved in the administration of the scheme and the administrator has the discretion over their awards¹.

¹ Equity awards granted or taken in lieu of cash fees generally would not be considered discretionary awards.

Audit

An auditor who has been removed from office has the right to attend the AGM and to make statements to members at the AGM immediately following removal. Auditors can require subsidiaries of holding companies to provide detailed information regarding their operations – an important point in Hong Kong, because holding companies are becoming the favored corporate structure for Hong Kong conglomerates.

The right of auditors to attend AGMs following removal from office is an important safeguard for shareholders because it forces the company to justify its actions. Therefore, companies usually provide reasons for changes of auditors, and opposing the reappointment of auditors would only take place in extreme circumstances.

The practice of auditors providing non-audit services to companies is problematic. While large auditors may have effective internal barriers to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest, an auditor's ability to remain objective becomes questionable when fees paid to the auditor for non-audit services, such as management consulting, general bookkeeping, and special situation audits, exceed the standard annual audit fees. While some compensation for non-audit services is customary, the importance of maintaining the independence of the auditor is paramount. If fees from non-audit services become significant without any clear safeguards against conflicts of interest, ISS recommends opposing the auditor's reappointment.

With regard to the proposals to (re)appoint auditors, ISS will recommend supporting the appointment of auditors and authorizing the board to fix their remuneration, unless:

- There are serious concerns about the accounts presented or the audit procedures used;
- The auditor is being changed without explanation; *or*
- The non-audit fees exceed the total fees paid to the external auditor in the latest fiscal year without satisfactory explanation.

Whilst ISS will consider the nature and scope of non-audit fees when assessing their magnitude, where non-audit fees have constituted more than 50 percent of total auditor compensation during the most recent fiscal year, ISS will ordinarily not recommend support for the reappointment of the audit firm. ISS will make an exception to this policy if the excessive non-audit fees are related to special projects or due to unusual circumstance, and are not recurring in nature and are unlikely to create conflicts of interest. An example of acceptable "non-audit" fees would be fees for a special audit in connection with an IPO.

Share Issuance Requests

General Issuance Mandate

Hong Kong companies routinely seek shareholder approval to authorize their boards to:

- Issue shares up to 20 percent of existing capital without preemptive rights (General Issuance Mandate);
- Repurchase shares of up to 10 percent of issued capital (Repurchase Mandate); *and*
- Reissue repurchased shares by extending the General Issuance Mandate to include the number of shares repurchased (Share Reissuance Mandate).

This section deals with the General Issuance Mandate, while the other two mandates are discussed below. The interrelationship between the three items is, however, extremely important because the Share Reissuance Mandate extends the board's authority to issue shares without preemptive rights from 20 percent to 30 percent, assuming a 20 percent request has been made under the General Issuance Mandate.

Hong Kong companies routinely ask shareholders to grant the board of directors a "general mandate to issue shares" without preemptive rights, at least once every year. This mandate, pursuant to the Listing Rules, allows companies to issue shares of up to 20 percent of issued capital without preemptive rights at a discount to market prices of up to 20 percent (or more under special circumstances). This is a routine item on AGM agendas, but companies can also seek to renew (or 'refresh') the share issuance amount at an EGM later in the year. The authority is limited to one year or the next general meeting, as revoked or renewed by shareholders.

In recent years, many institutional investors have voted against all requests to issue shares without preemptive rights in Hong Kong as this mandate is subject to abuse by companies that could issue shares at steep discounts, potentially to related parties, and renew the share issuance amount several times within a period of one year. A small number of Hong Kong companies have, recently, made mandate requests smaller than the 20 percent maximum that the Listing Rules allow.

Taking account of the views of a wide range of institutional investors with investments in Hong Kong companies, ISS will now recommend a vote supporting the General Issuance Mandate for companies that:

- Limit the aggregate issuance request – that is, for the General Issuance Mandate and the Share Reissuance Mandate combined – to 10 percent or less of the existing issued share capital (rather than the maximum 20 percent + 10 percent that the Listing Rules permit companies to request);
- Limit the discount to 10 percent of the market price of shares (rather than the maximum 20 percent permitted by the Listing Rules); and
- Have no history of renewing the General Issuance Mandate several times within a period of one year.

Share Repurchase Plans (Repurchase Mandate)

The Hong Kong Code on Share Repurchases, enacted in 1991, made stock repurchases legal under specific guidelines. Companies usually request the authority under the title "General Mandate to Repurchase Shares," and the authority lasts for one year or until the next shareholder meeting. Repurchase programs are limited to 10 percent of the company's outstanding capital on the date the authority is granted. In addition, the funds to make the repurchases should be obtained from reserves established or authorized for this purpose. Companies are allowed to purchase ordinary shares or warrants on the open market through brokers, but purchases cannot knowingly be made from specific individuals or shareholders. Repurchased shares must be destroyed and removed from the company's issued capital. In some cases, however, the company seeks separate authority to reissue the shares repurchased over and above the General Issuance Mandate (see "Share Reissuance Mandate," below).

There are several other aspects of the authority designed to protect shareholders' interests. As with the General Issuance Mandate, most companies use the exact wording from the official text of an amendment when making requests for such authorizations or when amending their articles to allow use of the authority and establishing reserves for that purpose.

Reissuance of Shares Repurchased (Share Reissuance Mandate)

Companies may request board authorization to reissue any shares repurchased during the year under the Repurchase Mandate without limiting the General Issuance Mandate. This is known as the Share Reissuance Mandate. This authority is limited to shares repurchased in a given year and is thus limited to the maximum 10 percent allowed under the Repurchase Mandate. It is valid for one year. The Share Reissuance Mandate extends the board's authority to issue shares without preemptive rights from 20 percent to 30 percent, assuming a 20 percent request has been made under the General Issuance Mandate.

The Share Reissuance Mandate gives the board power to issue shares on the same terms and conditions (for example, in relation to discount to market price) as exist under the General Issuance Mandate.

ISS will recommend a vote supporting the Share Reissuance Mandate only if:

- The aggregate issuance request – that is, for the General Issuance Mandate and the Share Reissuance Mandate combined – is limited to 10 percent or less of the existing issued share capital (rather than the maximum 20 percent + 10 percent that the Listing Rules permit companies to request);
- The General Issuance Mandate request limits the discount to 10 percent of the market price of shares (rather than the maximum 20 percent permitted by the Listing Rules); and
- The company has no history of renewing the General Issuance Mandate several times within a period of one year if it has recommended For the General Issuance Mandate.

Related-Party Transactions

ISS assesses related-party transactions on a case-by-case basis. However, all analyses are conducted from the point of view of long-term shareholder value for the company's existing shareholders.

As with many Asian markets, two types of related-party transactions are commonly seen in Hong Kong – the non-recurring transaction and the recurring service provision agreement. Commonly seen related-party transactions include (but are not limited to):

- Transactions involving the sale or purchase of goods;
- Transactions involving the sale or purchase of property and/or assets;
- Transactions involving the lease of property and/or assets;
- Transactions involving the provision or receipt of services or leases;
- Transactions involving the transfer of intangible items (e.g., research and development, trademarks, license agreements);
- Transactions involving the provision, receipt, or guarantee of financial services (including loans and deposit services);
- Transactions involving the assumption of financial/operating obligations;
- Transactions that include the subscription for debt/equity issuances; and
- Transactions that involve the establishment of joint-venture entities.

Group Finance Companies

It is not uncommon for large Chinese companies listed in Hong Kong to establish group finance companies (GFC) as an internal agent to accept deposits from, and make loans to, group companies. Shareholder approval is typically required when the company makes deposits to, obtains loans from, and/or receives other forms of financial services from a GFC.

Given that these GFCs may engage in intragroup lending, and that any default in the payment of loans awarded by finance companies to other members of the group may expose the company's deposited funds to further risks, ISS will recommend that shareholders vote against requests to deposit monies with a GFC.

Capital

Debt Issuance Requests

Vote non-convertible debt issuance requests on a case-by-case basis, with or without preemptive rights.

Vote for the creation/issuance of convertible debt instruments as long as the maximum number of common shares that could be issued upon conversion meets ISS' guidelines on equity-issuance requests.

Vote for proposals to restructure existing debt arrangements unless the terms of the restructuring would adversely affect the rights of shareholders.

In evaluating debt-related proposals, the following factors will be considered:

- Rationale/use of proceeds: Why does the company need additional capital? How will that capital be used?
- Terms of the debts: Are the debt instruments convertible into equity? What are the interest rate and maturity dates? Any call or put options? Often these terms will not be determined until the time of issuance of debt instruments (or when the actual loan agreement is signed). The terms of the debts would generally be determined by the market conditions, and lack of disclosure concerning these terms should not be a cause for significant concern so long as the debt is not convertible into equity.
- Size: At a minimum, the size of the debt issuance/potential borrowing should be disclosed.
- The company's financial position: What is the company's current leverage and how does that compare to its peers?
- The risk of non-approval: What might happen if the proposal is not approved? Are there any alternative sources of funding? Could the company continue to fund its operations? Would it hinder the company's ability to realize opportunities?

A distinction will be made between a specific debt issuance or pledging of assets, and authority to issue or increase debt; as in the case of specific equity issuances and requests for authority to issue equity. For specific debt issuances or pledging of assets, while the above factors will be examined, in general a vote for these proposals will be warranted if:

- The size of the debt being requested is disclosed;
- A credible reason for the need for additional funding is provided;
- Details regarding the assets to be pledged are disclosed (for specific asset pledge proposals); and
- There are no significant causes for shareholder concern regarding the terms and conditions of the debt.

So long as the proposal meets the above conditions, a vote for will be warranted even if the company has a high level of debt or the proposed issuance could result in a large increase in debt. A vote against will be warranted only in extremely egregious cases or where the company fails to provide sufficient information to enable a meaningful shareholder review.

Where a general authority to issue debt or pledge assets is requested, in addition to the above criteria, we will oppose such a proposal if it could result in a potentially excessive increase in debt. A potential increase in debt may be considered excessive when:

- The proposed maximum amount is more than twice the company's total debt;
- It could result in the company's debt-to-equity ratio exceeding 300 percent (for non-financial companies); and
- The maximum hypothetical debt-to-equity ratio is more than three times the industry and/or market norm.

When the above conditions are met, the proposed increase in debt may be considered excessive and thus the proposal may warrant an against vote. If we do not have data regarding the normal level of debt in that particular industry or market, only the company-specific information will be considered.

Pledging of Assets for Debt

Vote for proposals to approve the specific pledging of assets for debt if:

- The size of the debt being requested is disclosed;
- A credible reason for the need for additional funding is provided;
- Details regarding the assets to be pledged are disclosed; and
- There are no significant causes for shareholder concern regarding the terms and conditions of the debt.

For proposals seeking a general authority to pledge assets for debt, the specific assets to be pledged need not be disclosed. However, in such cases, the authority should be limited such that it would not result in an excessive increase in debt. If the proposal grants excessive authority to the board or management, a vote against will be recommended.

In certain countries, shareholder approval is required when a company needs to secure a debt issuance with its assets. In many cases, this is a routine request and is a formality under the relevant law. When reviewing such proposals, ISS takes into account the terms of the proposed debt issuance, the company's overall debt level, and the company's justification for the pledging of assets.

ISS will issue vote recommendations against specific requests to pledge an asset in cases where no information regarding the size of the debt to be raised is disclosed, no credible explanation for the need of funding is provided, no details regarding the assets to be pledged are disclosed, or in extreme cases where shareholders' rights and economic interests could be negatively affected. When the board is requesting a general authority to pledge assets, the details regarding the assets to be pledged need not be disclosed; however, ISS will oppose such a proposal if it would grant the board excessive authority.

Increase in Borrowing Powers

Vote for proposals to approve increases in a company's borrowing powers if:

- The size of the debt being requested is disclosed;
- A credible reason for the need for additional funding is provided;
- The potential increase in debt is not excessive; and
- There are no significant causes for shareholder concern regarding the terms and conditions of the debt.

In some countries, companies are required to seek shareholder approval for increases in their aggregate borrowing power authorities. The aggregate limit on the board's ability to borrow money is often fixed in a company's articles, and shareholder approval to change this limit is therefore legally required. ISS' analysis of borrowing power increase requests takes into account management's stated need for the increase, the size of the increase, and the company's current gearing level. Large increases in borrowing powers can sometimes result in dangerously high debt-to-equity ratios that could harm shareholder value. If no information regarding the limit on the borrowing power is disclosed, no credible explanation for the need of funding is provided, or an increase is excessive considering the company's debt level as well as normal levels of debt in its industry or market, ISS recommends opposing the request.

Loan Guarantee Requests

Chinese companies listed in Hong Kong often provide loan guarantees for subsidiaries, affiliates, and related parties.

Such requests will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Generally vote against the provision of a guarantee where:

- The identity of the entity receiving the guarantee is not disclosed;
- The guarantee is being provided to a director, executive, parent company, or affiliated entities where the company has no direct or indirect equity ownership; or

- The guarantee is provided to an entity in which the company's ownership stake is less than 75 percent; and such guarantee is not proportionate to the company's equity stake or other parties have not provided a counter guarantee.

When the proposed guarantee does not fall into the above criteria, vote for such request provided that there are no significant concerns regarding the entity receiving the guarantee, the relationship between the listed company and the entity receiving the guarantee, the purpose of the guarantee, or the terms of the guarantee agreement. Examples of such concerns include a previous default by the entity receiving the guarantee or a sub-investment grade credit rating.

Mergers & Acquisitions

ISS evaluates any merger or acquisition on case-by-case bases, taking into consideration of following factors:

- Valuation - Is the value to be received by the target shareholders (or paid by the acquirer) reasonable? If a fairness opinion has been prepared, it provides an initial starting point for assessing valuation reasonableness, but ISS also places emphasis on the offer premium, market reaction, and strategic rationale.
- Market reaction - How has the market responded to the proposed deal? A negative market reaction will cause ISS to scrutinize a deal more closely.
- Strategic rationale - Does the deal make sense strategically? From where is the value derived? Cost and revenue synergies should not be overly aggressive or optimistic, but reasonably achievable. Management should also have a favorable 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.
- 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. ISS will consider whether these interests may have influenced these directors and officers to support or recommend the merger.
- Governance - Will the combined company have a better or worse governance profile than the respective 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.

Social/Environmental Issues

Issues covered under the policy include a wide range of topics, including consumer and product safety, environment and energy, labor covered 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 term or long term.

Generally vote case-by-case, taking into consideration whether implementation of the proposal is likely to enhance or protect shareholder value, and in addition the following will be considered:

- If the issues presented in the proposal are more 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, timeframe, or cost) or overly prescriptive;
- The company's approach compared with any industry standard practices for addressing the issue(s) raised by the proposal;
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not 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 or not implementation would reveal proprietary or confidential information that could place the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Disclosure/Disclaimer

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.