



Canada

Proxy Voting Guidelines for TSX-Listed Companies

2016 Benchmark Policy Recommendations

Effective for Meetings on or After February 1, 2016

Published December 18, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ROUTINE/MISCELLANEOUS	4
AUDIT-RELATED	4
Financial Statements/Director and Auditor Reports	4
Ratification of Auditors	4
OTHER BUSINESS	4
2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS	5
VOTING ON DIRECTOR NOMINEES IN UNCONTESTED ELECTIONS	5
Fundamental Principles	5
TSX Listing Requirements	6
SLATE BALLOTS (BUNDLED DIRECTOR ELECTIONS)	6
2016 ISS Canadian Definition of Independence.....	7
Board Structure and Independence.....	9
Insiders on Key Committees	9
Audit Fee Disclosure	11
Excessive Non-Audit Fees	11
Persistent Problematic Audit Related Practices	11
Director Attendance	12
Overboarded Directors	12
Former CEO/CFO on Audit/Compensation Committee	13
Voting on Directors for Egregious Actions.....	14
Board Responsiveness	15
Unilateral Adoption of an Advance Notice Provision	15
Externally-Managed Issuers (EMIs).....	16
OTHER BOARD-RELATED PROPOSALS	17
Classification/Declassification of the Board	17
Independent Chair (Separate Chair/CEO).....	17
Majority of Independent Directors/Establishment of Committees.....	17
Majority Vote Standard for the Election of Directors.....	17
Proxy Access	18
Proxy Contests - Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections	18
3. SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS & DEFENSES	19
Advance Notice Requirements	19
Enhanced Shareholder Meeting Quorum for Contested Director Elections	20
Appointment of Additional Directors Between Annual Meetings.....	20
Article/By-law Amendments.....	21
Cumulative Voting	22
Confidential Voting	22
Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans)	23
Reincorporation Proposals	25
Supermajority Vote Requirements	25

4. CAPITAL/RESTRUCTURING	26
Mergers and Corporate Restructurings	26
Increases in Authorized Capital	26
Private Placement Issuances.....	27
Blank Cheque Preferred Stock	28
Dual-class Stock	28
Escrow Agreements	28
5. COMPENSATION	29
EXECUTIVE PAY EVALUATION	29
ADVISORY VOTE ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION (SAY-ON-PAY) MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS	30
Pay for Performance Evaluation	31
Problematic Pay Practices.....	33
Board Communications and Responsiveness	34
EQUITY-BASED COMPENSATION PLANS	35
Plan Cost	36
Overriding Negative Factors	37
Plan Amendment Provisions.....	37
Non-Employee Director (NED) Participation	39
Repricing Options	40
OTHER COMPENSATION PLANS.....	40
Employee Stock Purchase Plans (ESPPs, ESOPs)	41
Deferred Share Unit (DSU) Plans	42
SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS ON COMPENSATION	43
Shareholder Advisory Vote Proposals.....	43
Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan (SERP) Proposals.....	43
6. SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.....	45
Global Approach	45

1. ROUTINE/MISCELLANEOUS

Audit-Related

Financial Statements/Director and Auditor Reports

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

Ratification of Auditors



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

- › Non-audit related fees paid to the auditor exceed audit-related fees.

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

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

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

Other Business



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

2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Voting on Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections

Fundamental Principles

Four fundamental principles apply when determining votes on director nominees:

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

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

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

Board Capability: The skills, experience, and competencies of board members should be a priority in director selection, but consideration should also be given to a board candidate's ability to devote sufficient time and commitment to the increasing responsibilities of a public company director. Directors who are unable to attend board and committee meetings and/or who are overboarded (i.e., serving on too many boards) raise concern regarding the director's ability to effectively serve in shareholders' best interests.


TSX Listing Requirements

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

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

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

Slate Ballots (Bundled Director Elections)

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

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

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

¹ Controlled companies are exempt from this requirement.

2016 ISS Canadian Definition of Independence

1. Inside Director (I)

- 1.1. Employees of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
- 1.2. Non-employee officer of the company or its affiliatesⁱ if he/she is among the five most highly compensated.
- 1.3. Current interim CEO or any other current interim executive of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
- 1.4. Beneficial owner of company shares with more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting rights (this may be aggregated if voting power is distributed among more than one member of a group)ⁱⁱ.

2. Affiliated Outside Director (AO)

Former/Interim CEOⁱⁱⁱ

- 2.1. Former CEO of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the past five years^{iv} or of an acquired company within the past five years.
- 2.2. Former interim CEO of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the past five years^{iv} if the service was longer than 18 months or if the service was between 12 and 18 months and the compensation was high relative to that of the other directors or in line with a CEO's compensation^v at that time.
- 2.3. CEO of a former parent or predecessor firm at the time the company was sold or split off from the parent/predecessor within the past five years^{iv}.

Non-CEO Executivesⁱⁱⁱ

- 2.4. Former executive of the company, an affiliate, or a firm acquired within the past three years.
- 2.5. Former interim executive of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the past three years if the service was longer than 18 months or if the service was between 12 and 18 months, an assessment of the interim executive's terms of employment including compensation relative to other directors or in line with the top five NEOs at that time.
- 2.6. Executive of a former parent or predecessor firm at the time the company was sold or split off from parent/predecessor within the past three years.
- 2.7. Executive, former executive of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the last three years, general or limited partner of a joint venture or partnership with the company.

Relatives

- 2.8. Relative^{vi} of current executive officer^{vii} of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
- 2.9. Relative^{vi} of a person who has served as an executive officer of the company or its affiliatesⁱ within the last three years.

Transactional, Professional, Financial, and Charitable Relationships

- 2.10. Currently provides (or a relative^{vi} provides) professional services to the company, its affiliatesⁱ or to its officers.
- 2.11. Is (or a relative^{vi} is) a partner, controlling shareholder or an employee of, an organization that provides professional services to the company, to an affiliate of the company, or to an individual officer of the company or one of its affiliatesⁱ.
- 2.12. Currently employed by (or a relative^{vi} is employed by) a significant customer or supplier^{viii} of the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
- 2.13. Is (or a relative^{vi} is) a trustee, director or employee of a charitable or non-profit organization that receives material^{ix} grants or endowments from the company or its affiliatesⁱ.
- 2.14. Has, or is (or a relative^{vi} is) a partner, controlling shareholder or an employee of, an organization that has a transactional relationship with the company or its affiliatesⁱ, excluding investments in the company through a private placement.

Other Relationships

- 2.15. Has a contractual/guaranteed board seat and is party to a voting agreement to vote in line with management on proposals being brought to shareholders.
- 2.16. Founder^x of the company but not currently an employee.
- 2.17. Has any material relationship with the company or with any one or more members of management of the company.

Board Attestation

- 2.18. Board attestation that an outside director is not independent.

3. Independent Outside Director (IO)

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

Footnotes:

- i "Affiliate" includes a subsidiary, sibling company, or parent company. ISS uses 50 percent control ownership by the parent company as the standard for applying its affiliate designation.
- ii Under this definition, officers of an entity and/or its affiliates holding more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting rights will be considered insiders.
- iii When there is a former CEO or other officer of a capital pool company (CPC) or special purpose acquisition company (SPAC) serving on the board of an acquired company, ISS will generally classify such directors as independent unless determined otherwise taking into account the following factors: the applicable listing standards determination of such director's independence; any operating ties to the firm; and the existence of any other conflicting relationships or related party transactions.
- iv The determination of a former CEO's classification following the five year cooling-off period will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Factors taken into consideration may include but are not limited to: management/board turnover, current or recent involvement in the company, whether the former CEO is or has been Executive Chairman of the board or a company founder, length of service with the company, any related party transactions, consulting arrangements, and any other factors that may reasonably be deemed to affect the independence of the former CEO.
- v ISS will look at the terms of the interim CEO's compensation or employment contract to determine if it contains severance pay, long-term health and pension benefits or other such standard provisions typically contained in contracts of permanent, non-temporary CEOs. ISS will also consider if a formal search process was underway for a full-time CEO.
- vi Relative refers to immediate family members including spouse, parents, children, siblings, in-laws and anyone sharing the director's home.
- vii Executive Officer will include: the CEO or CFO of the entity; the president of the entity; a vice-president of the entity in charge of a principal business unit, division or function; an officer of the entity or any of its subsidiary entities who performs a policy making function in respect of the entity; any other individual who performs a policy-making function in respect of the entity; or any executive named in the Summary Compensation Table.
- viii If the company makes or receives annual payments exceeding the greater of \$200,000 or 5 percent of recipient's gross revenues (the recipient is the party receiving proceeds from the transaction).
- ix "Material" is defined as a standard of relationship (financial, personal or otherwise) that a reasonable person might conclude could potentially influence one's objectivity in the boardroom in a manner that would have a meaningful impact on an individual's ability to satisfy requisite fiduciary standards on behalf of shareholders.
- x The operating involvement of the Founder with the company will be considered. Little or no operating involvement may cause ISS to deem the Founder as an independent outsider.

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

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

Board Structure and Independence

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for any insider or affiliated outside director where:

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

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

Best practice as set out in [National Policy 58-201 - Corporate Governance Guidelines](#) recommends that the board should have:

- › A majority of independent directors (Section 3.10); and
- › A nominating committee and a compensation committee composed entirely of independent directors (Section 3.15).

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

Insiders on Key Committees

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for individual directors who:

- › Are insiders on the audit, compensation, or nominating committee.

Include cautionary language for all affiliated outside directors who sit on the audit, compensation, or nominating committee, to the effect that corporate governance best practices dictate that such committees should be comprised entirely of independent directors.

Rationale: In order to promote independent oversight of management, the board as a whole and its key board committees should meet minimum best practice expectations of no less than majority independence. Director elections are seen to be the single most important use of the shareholder franchise.

[National Instrument 52-110 - Audit Committees](#) sets out best practice with regard to the composition of the audit committee. The instrument requires that every reporting issuer (other than an investment fund, issuer of asset-backed securities, designated foreign issuer, SEC issuer, or issuers that are subsidiary entities as long as the subsidiary does not issue securities and the parent is subject to compliance with this instrument) must have an audit committee, that the committee must comprise a minimum of three members, and that every audit committee member must be independent.

Policy Considerations for Majority Owned Companies²

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

- › Individually elected directors;
- › The number of directors related to the controlling shareholder should not exceed the proportion of common shares controlled by the controlling shareholder. In no event, however, should the number of directors related to the controlling shareholder exceed two-thirds of the board;
- › In addition to the above, if the CEO is related to the controlling shareholder, no more than one-third of the board should be related to management (as distinct from the controlling shareholder);
- › If the CEO and chair roles are combined or the CEO is or is related to the controlling shareholder, then there should be an independent lead director and the board should have an effective and transparent process to deal with any conflicts of interest between the company, minority shareholders, and the controlling shareholder;
- › A majority of the audit and nominating committees should be either independent directors or related directors who are independent of management. All members of the compensation committee should be independent of management. If the CEO is related to the controlling shareholder, no more than one member of the compensation committee should be a related director;
- › Prompt disclosure of detailed vote results following each shareholder meeting; and
- › Adoption of a majority voting director resignation policy for uncontested elections OR public commitment to adopt a majority voting director resignation policy for uncontested elections if the controlling shareholder ceases to control 50 percent or more of the common shares.³

ISS will also consider the following:

- › The nominating committee's process to receive and discuss suggestions from shareholders for potential director nominees; and
- › If the CEO is related to the Controlling Shareholder, the board's process to evaluate the performance, leadership, compensation, and succession of management should be led by independent directors;

ISS will also take into consideration any other concerns related to the conduct of the subject director(s) and any controversy or questionable actions on the part of the subject director(s) that are deemed not to be in the best interests of all shareholders.

² A majority owned company is defined for the purpose of this policy as a company controlled by a shareholder or group of shareholders who together have an economic ownership interest under a single class common share capital structure that is commensurate with their voting entitlement of 50 percent or more of the outstanding common shares.

³ Effective June 30, 2014, TSX-listed issuers which are not majority controlled were required to adopt majority voting director resignation policies. Majority controlled companies which do not elect to voluntarily adopt a majority voting director resignation policy are required to disclose their rationale for not doing so.

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

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

This policy will not be considered at dual class companies having common shares with unequal voting or board representation rights.

Audit Fee Disclosure

General Recommendation: Vote withhold for the members of the audit committee as reported in the most recently filed public documents if:

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

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

Excessive Non-Audit Fees

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

- › Non-audit fees (Other Fees) paid to the external audit firm exceed audit and audit-related fees.

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

Persistent Problematic Audit Related Practices

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

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

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

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

Director Attendance



General Recommendation: Vote withhold for individual director nominees if:

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

The following should be taken into account:

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

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

Overboarded Directors



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

⁴ Key committees include audit, compensation and nominating committees.

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

- › Irrespective of whether the company has adopted a majority voting director resignation policy, the director is overboarded⁶ AND the individual director has attended less than 75 percent of his/her respective board and key⁴ committee meetings held within the past year without a valid reason for these absences.

Cautionary language will be included in ISS reports where directors are overboarded regardless of attendance.

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

Within the Canadian market, which is based on a "comply-or-explain" regulatory regime of recommended best practices, there are mixed investor views on the appropriateness of evaluating directors' ability to contribute based solely on the number of boards on which they serve. Feedback has indicated that overboarding in conjunction with other governance concerns, such as unacceptably low board and committee meeting attendance, may be a better indicator of a director's inability to commit the necessary time and attention to the increasing demands of a board seat and may also provide an opportunity for board renewal. There are also mixed views on the need to give the same degree of consideration toward service on TSXV-listed company boards as these start-up companies are, for several reasons, seen to require less time and effort from directors when compared to TSX reporting issuers. Given this feedback, a double-triggered overboarding policy is deemed appropriate for the Canadian market.

Policy Update: Commencing as of February 2017 meeting dates, ISS will change the definition of "overboarded" from more than 2 outside public company boards to more than 1 in the case of CEOs, and from more than 6 total public company boards to more than 4 in the case of non-CEOs. For meeting dates prior to February 2017, cautionary language will be included in ISS reports where directors would be deemed overboarded according to the updated policy.

Based on the results of the 2015-16 ISS Global Policy Survey, a plurality of investor responses indicate that four total board seats is an appropriate limit for directors who are not active CEOs, and that a total of two board seats (a CEO's "home board" plus one outside board) is an appropriate limit for directors who are active CEOs. ISS also obtained feedback in one-on-one discussions with institutional investors, the results of which indicate that a majority of those canvassed support maximum limits of four and two total board seats for non-CEO directors and CEO directors, respectively.

Former CEO/CFO on Audit/Compensation Committee



General Recommendation: Vote withhold for any director who has served as the CEO of the company within the past five years and is a member of the audit or compensation committee. Evaluate on a case-by-case basis whether

⁶ "Overboarded" is currently defined by ISS as: a CEO of a public company who sits on more than 2 outside public company boards in addition to the company of which he/she is CEO, OR the director is not a CEO of a public company and sits on more than 6 public company boards in total. Starting February 1, 2017, "overboarded" will be defined as: a CEO of a public company who sits on more than 1 outside public company board in addition to the company of which he/she is CEO, OR the director is not a CEO of a public company and sits on more than 4 public company boards in total.

support is warranted for any former CEO on the audit or compensation committee following a five year period⁷ after leaving this executive position.

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

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

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

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

Voting on Directors for Egregious Actions

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

- › Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight⁸ or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
- › Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
- › Egregious actions related to the director(s)' service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company.

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

⁷ The determination of a former CEO's classification following the five year cooling-off period will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Factors taken into consideration may include but are not limited to: management/board turnover, current or recent involvement in the company, whether the former CEO is or has been Executive Chairman of the board or a company founder, length of service, any related party transactions, consulting arrangements, and any other factors that may reasonably be deemed to affect the independence of the former CEO.

⁸ Examples of failure of risk oversight include, but are not limited to: bribery, large or serial fines or sanctions from regulatory bodies; significant adverse legal judgments or settlements; or hedging of company stock.

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

Board Responsiveness

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

► **General Recommendation:** Vote withhold for continuing individual directors, Nominating Committee⁹ members, or the continuing members of the entire board of directors if:

- › At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold votes of the votes cast under a majority voting director resignation policy and the Nominating Committee⁹ has not required that the director leave the board after 90 days, or has not provided another form of acceptable response to the shareholder vote which will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis;
- › At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold votes of the votes cast under a plurality voting standard and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the majority withheld vote; or
- › The board failed to act¹⁰ on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the votes cast (excluding abstentions) at the previous shareholder meeting.

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

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

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

Unilateral Adoption of an Advance Notice Provision

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

⁹ Or other board committee charged with the duties of a nominating committee as specified in the company's majority voting director resignation policy.

¹⁰ Responding to the shareholder proposal will generally mean either full implementation of the proposal or, if the matter requires a vote by shareholders, a management proposal on the next annual ballot to implement the proposal. Responses that involve less than full implementation will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

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

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

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

Externally-Managed Issuers (EMIs)

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

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

Rationale:

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

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

Say-on-pay resolutions are voluntarily adopted in Canada, and none of the currently identified Canadian EMIs had a say-on-pay resolution on ballot this past year. Additionally, all non-controlled TSX-listed issuers are required to adopt majority voting director resignation policies which could result in a director being required to resign from a

board if he or she receives more 'withhold' than 'for' votes at the shareholders' meeting. Some investor respondents to ISS' 2015-16 ISS Global Policy Survey indicated that in cases where an externally managed company does not have a say-on-pay proposal (i.e., 'withhold' votes may be recommended for individual directors), factors other than disclosure should be considered, such as performance, compensation and expenses paid in relation to peers, board and committee independence, conflicts of interest, and pay-related issues. Policy outreach sessions conducted with Canadian institutional investors resulted in identical feedback.

Other Board-Related Proposals

Classification/Declassification of the Board

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

Independent Chair (Separate Chair/CEO)

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

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

Best practice as set out in [National Policy 58-201 - Corporate Governance Guidelines](#) recommends that the chair of the board be an independent director or, where this is not appropriate, that an independent director should be appointed lead director.

Majority of Independent Directors/Establishment of Committees

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

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

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

- › The board's committees already meet that standard.

Majority Vote Standard for the Election of Directors

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

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

Proxy Access

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

Proxy Contests - Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections



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

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

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

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

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

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

Reimbursing Proxy Solicitation Expenses



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

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

3. SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS & DEFENSES

Advance Notice Requirements

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

- › To prevent stealth proxy contests;
- › To provide a reasonable framework for shareholders to nominate directors by allowing shareholders to submit director nominations within a reasonable timeframe; and
- › To provide all shareholders with sufficient information about potential nominees in order for them to make informed voting decisions on such nominees.

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

- › For annual notice of meeting given not less than 50 days prior to the meeting date, the notification timeframe within the advance notice requirement should allow shareholders the ability to provide notice of director nominations at any time not less than 30 days prior to the shareholders' meeting. The notification timeframe should not be subject to any maximum notice period. If notice of annual meeting is given less than 50 days prior to the meeting date, a provision to require shareholder notice by close of business on the 10th day following first public announcement of the annual meeting is supportable. In the case of a special meeting, a requirement that a nominating shareholder must provide notice by close of business on the 15th day following first public announcement of the special shareholders' meeting is also acceptable;
- › The board's inability to waive all sections of the advance notice provision under the policy or bylaw, in its sole discretion;
- › A requirement that any proposed nominee deliver a written agreement wherein the proposed nominee acknowledges and agrees, in advance, to comply with all policies and guidelines of the company that are applicable to directors;
- › Any provision that restricts the notification period to that established for the originally scheduled meeting in the event that the meeting has been adjourned or postponed;
- › Any additional disclosure requests within the advance notice requirement or the company's ability to require additional disclosure that exceeds that required within a dissident proxy circular or that goes beyond that necessary to determine director nominee qualifications, relevant experience, shareholding or voting interest in the company, or independence in the same manner as would be required and disclosed for management nominees; and in any event where there is no indication from the company that such additional disclosure, if requested and received, will be made publicly available to shareholders;
- › Stipulations within the provision that the corporation will not be obligated to include any information provided by dissident director nominees or nominating shareholders in any shareholder communications, including the proxy statement; and
- › Any other feature or provision determined to have a negative impact on shareholders' interests and deemed outside the purview of the stated purpose of the advance notice requirement.

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

A minimum 30-day shareholder notice period supports notice and access provisions and is in keeping with the stated purpose of advance notice requirements which is to prevent last minute or stealth proxy contests. Any maximum threshold for shareholder notice is deemed unacceptable, and the removal of such is expected to facilitate timelier access to the proxy and afford shareholders more time to give complete and informed consideration to dissident concerns and director nominees.

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

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

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

Enhanced Shareholder Meeting Quorum for Contested Director Elections

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

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

Companies have indicated in examples to date that Enhanced Quorum is not designed to block the potential consequence of a majority change in board memberships. In the absence of Enhanced Quorum being met, the affected shareholder meeting will be adjourned for up to 65 days. Notwithstanding the equality of all voting issues, shareholders may question the benefits of a delayed shareholder meeting resulting from a 50 percent quorum requirement for the initial meeting.

Appointment of Additional Directors Between Annual Meetings

▶ **General Recommendation:** Vote for these resolutions where:

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

Article/By-law Amendments

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

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

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

Rationale: Constatng documents such as articles and by-laws (in concert with the legislative framework provided by Canada's various BCAs) establish the rights of shareholders of a company and the procedures through which the board of directors exercises its duties. Given this foundational role, these documents should reflect best practices within the Canadian market wherever possible.

- › **Quorum Requirements:** The quorum requirement for meetings of shareholders should encourage wide-ranging participation from all shareholders. Shareholder meeting quorum requirements that allow only one shareholder to constitute quorum could allow a single significant or controlling shareholder to dominate meetings at the expense of minority shareholders. Quorum requirements with lower shareholding thresholds, such as five percent, could provide a significant shareholder or a small group of shareholders with the ability to pass resolutions that may be considered contentious or problematic by other shareholders. Likewise, quorum requirements for meetings of directors should ensure that at least half of shareholders' representatives are present before significant decisions are made. Directors' responsibilities include attending all meetings for which their presence is scheduled and a company's core documents should reflect this duty.
- › **Casting Vote for the Chair at Board Meetings:** While the chair is the appointed leader of the board, the authority granted to the chair by shareholders is no greater than that granted to any other director. Providing the chair with a casting or second vote in the event of a tie could result in a power structure which is not conducive to effective governance. Additionally, while boards are increasingly transitioning toward a governance structure involving a separate chair and CEO, many issuers still combine these roles or appoint a recent former CEO as board chair. In cases where the board is divided on an issue, it is inappropriate from the perspective of shareholders for an insider or affiliated outsider to have the final decision in contentious matters which could significantly affect shareholders' interests.

- › **Alternate Directors:** A provision allowing for alternate directors, who have been neither elected by shareholders nor ratified by shareholders following board appointment, raises serious concerns regarding whether these individuals may be bound to serve in the best interests of shareholders. Furthermore, directors must be willing to earmark sufficient time and effort toward serving on a board once they have accepted the responsibility entrusted to them by shareholders. The appointment of unelected alternates is inconsistent with this duty.
- › **Problematic Advance Notice Requirements:** A number of advance notice requirements have been included on ballots as amendments to company by-laws or articles. Any such requirements are deemed significant additions to the bylaw or articles and therefore are reviewed with respect to whether they negatively affect shareholders' ability to nominate directors to the board. See [ISS' policy on Advance Notice Requirements](#) for details.
- › **Blanket Authority for Share Capital Structure Alterations:** In recent years, some companies incorporated under the *Business Corporations Act* (British Columbia) ("BCBCA") have sought to amend their constating documents to provide the board with blanket authority to alter the company's share capital structure. These changes include the ability to increase the company's authorized capital and change restrictions on any class of shares. Although permitted under the BCBCA, shareholders would be better served if changes which could affect shareholders' interests required shareholder approval.
- › **Other Problematic Provisions:** Other proposals to alter the articles or by-laws will be approached on a case-by-case basis. Where a potential inclusion, deletion, or amendment is deemed contrary to shareholders' interests, ISS will generally, taking into consideration any other problematic factors or mitigating circumstances, recommend against such changes.

Cumulative Voting

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

Generally vote against proposals to eliminate cumulative voting.

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

Confidential Voting

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

- › The proposal includes a provision for proxy contests as follows: In the case of a contested election, management should be permitted to request that the dissident group honor its confidential voting policy. If the dissidents agree, the policy remains in place. If the dissidents will not agree, the confidential voting policy is waived for that particular vote.

Generally vote for management proposals to adopt confidential voting.

Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans)

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

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

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

Vote against plans that go beyond these purposes if:

- › **The plan gives discretion to the board to either:**
 - › Determine whether actions by shareholders constitute a change in control;
 - › Amend material provisions without shareholder approval;
 - › Interpret other provisions;
 - › Redeem the rights or waive the plan’s application without a shareholder vote; or
 - › Prevent a bid from going to shareholders.
- › **The plan has any of the following characteristics:**
 - › Unacceptable key definitions;
 - › Reference to Derivatives Contracts within the definition of Beneficial Owner;
 - › Flip over provision;
 - › Permitted bid minimum period greater than 60 days;
 - › Maximum triggering threshold set at less than 20 percent of outstanding shares;
 - › Does not permit partial bids;
 - › Includes a Shareholder Endorsed Insider Bid (SEIB) provision;
 - › Bidder must frequently update holdings;
 - › Requirement for a shareholder meeting to approve a bid; and
 - › Requirement that the bidder provide evidence of financing.
- › **The plan does not:**
 - › Include an exemption for a “permitted lock up agreement”;
 - › Include clear exemptions for money managers, pension funds, mutual funds, trustees, and custodians who are not making a takeover bid; and
 - › Exclude reference to voting agreements among shareholders.

Rationale: The evolution of “new generation” shareholder rights plans in Canada has been the result of reshaping the early antitakeover provision known as a “poison pill” into a shareholder protection rights plan that serves only two legitimate purposes: (i) to increase the minimum time period during which a Permitted Bid may remain outstanding to 60 days in order to give the board of directors of a target company sufficient time (over and above the current statutory 35 day limit) to find an alternative to a takeover bid that would increase shareholder value; and (ii) to ensure that all shareholders are treated equally in the event of a bid for their company.

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

New generation rights plans are limited to achieving the two purposes identified here. They ensure that shareholders are treated equally in a control transaction by precluding creeping acquisitions or the acquisition of a control block through private agreements between a few large shareholders; and they provide a reasonable time period to allow a corporation’s directors and management to develop an alternative to maximize shareholder value.

Reincorporation Proposals

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


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

Generally vote for reincorporation when:

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

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

Supermajority Vote Requirements

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

Vote for proposals to lower supermajority vote requirements.

4. CAPITAL/RESTRUCTURING

Mergers and Corporate Restructurings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Increases in Authorized Capital

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

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

Generally vote against proposals to approve unlimited capital authorization.

Rationale: Canadian jurisdictions generally, and most recently the *Business Corporations Act* (British Columbia), permit companies to have an unlimited authorized capital. ISS prefers to see companies with a fixed maximum limit on authorized capital, with at least 30 percent of the authorized stock issued and outstanding. Limited capital structures protect against excessive dilution and can be increased when needed with shareholder approval.

Private Placement Issuances

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

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

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

Rationale: The TSX requires shareholder approval for private placements:

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

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

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

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

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

Blank Cheque Preferred Stock

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

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

Generally vote for proposals to create a reasonably limited¹¹ number of preferred shares where both of the following apply:

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

Dual-class Stock

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

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

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

Escrow Agreements

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

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

¹¹ Institutional investors have indicated low tolerance for dilutive preferred share issuances. Therefore, if the authorized preferreds may be assigned conversion rights or voting rights when issued, the authorization should be limited to no more than 20 percent of the outstanding common shares as of record date. If the preferred share authorization proposal prohibits the assignment of conversion, voting or any other right attached which could dilute or negatively impact the common shares or the rights of common shareholders when such preferred shares are issued, a maximum authorization limit of 50 percent of the outstanding common shares as of record date may be supported taking into account the stated purpose for the authorization and other details of the proposal.

5. COMPENSATION

Executive Pay Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Primary Evaluation Factors for Executive Pay

Pay for Performance:

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

Pay Practices:

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

Board Communications and Responsiveness:

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

Voting Alternatives


In general, the MSOP is the primary focus of voting on executive pay practices; dissatisfaction with compensation practices can be expressed by voting against an MSOP rather than withholding or voting against the compensation committee. If, however, there is no MSOP on the ballot, then the negative vote will apply to members of the

compensation committee. In addition, in egregious cases or if the board fails to respond to concerns raised by a prior MSOP proposal, vote withhold or against compensation committee members (or, if the full board is deemed accountable, all directors). If the negative factors involve equity-based compensation, then vote against an equity-based plan proposal presented for shareholder approval.

Pay for Performance Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Step I: Quantitative Screen

Relative:

- a. The Relative Degree of Alignment (RDA) is the difference between the company's annualized TSR rank and the CEO's annualized total pay rank within a peer group¹², each measured over a three-year period or less if pay or performance data is unavailable for the full three years;
- b. Multiple of Median (MOM) is the total compensation in the last reported fiscal year relative to the median compensation of the peer group; and

¹² The peer group is generally comprised of 11-24 companies that meet the following criteria:

- › Revenue/assets between 0.25X and 4X the subject company's size;
- › In the closest GICS industry group (8-digit, 6-digit, 4-digit, or 2-digit) to the subject company's GICS category; and
- › Market Cap between 0.25X and 4X of the company's market cap expanded out to four market cap buckets (micro, small, mid, and large) as needed.

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

Absolute:

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

Step II: Qualitative Analysis

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

- › The ratio of performance- to time-based equity grants and the overall mix of performance-based compensation relative to total compensation (considering whether the ratio is more than 50 percent); standard time-vested stock options and restricted shares are not considered to be performance-based for this consideration;
- › The quality of disclosure and appropriateness of the performance measure(s) and goal(s) utilized, so that shareholders can assess the rigor of the performance program. The use of non-GAAP financial metrics also makes it challenging for shareholders to ascertain the rigor of the program as shareholders often cannot tell the type of adjustments being made and if the adjustments were made consistently. Complete and transparent disclosure helps shareholders to better understand the company's pay for performance linkage;
- › The trend in other financial metrics, such as growth in revenue, earnings, return measures such as ROE, ROA, ROIC, etc.;
- › The trend considering prior years' P4P concern;
- › Extraordinary situation due to a new CEO in the last reported FY;¹³ and
- › Any other factors deemed relevant.

¹³ Note that the longer-term emphasis of the new methodology alleviates concern about impact of CEO turnover. Thus, except in extenuating circumstances, a "new" CEO will not exempt the company from consideration under the methodology since the compensation committee is also accountable when a company is compelled to significantly "overpay" for new leadership due to prior poor performance.

Rationale: The two part methodology is a combination of quantitative and qualitative factors that more effectively drive a case-by-case evaluation and will improve the analysis of: longer term compensation versus company performance and weight the longer term factors accordingly; absolute CEO pay levels; and, circumstances under which there is a change in CEO during the most recent year. Please refer to the latest version of the Canadian Compensation Policy FAQ for a more detailed discussion of ISS' quantitative pay-for-performance screen and peer group construction methodology.

Problematic Pay Practices

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

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

Poor disclosure practices:

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

New CEO with overly generous new hire package:

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

Egregious employment contracts:

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

Employee Loans:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Excessive perks:

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

Payment of dividends on performance awards:

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

Problematic option granting practices:

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

Internal Pay Disparity:

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

Absence of pay practices that discourage excessive risk taking:

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

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

Rationale: Shareholders are not generally permitted to vote on provisions such as change-in-control provisions or the ability of an issuer to extend loans to employees to exercise stock options, for example, when reviewing equity based compensation plan proposals. Nor do shareholders in Canada have the ability to approve employment agreements, severance agreements, or pensions; however, these types of provisions, agreements, and contractual obligations continue to raise shareholder concerns. Therefore, ISS will review disclosure related to the various components of executive compensation and may recommend withholding from the compensation committee or against an equity plan proposal if compensation practices are unacceptable from a corporate governance perspective.

Board Communications and Responsiveness



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

- › Poor disclosure practices, including: insufficient disclosure to explain the pay setting process for the CEO and how CEO pay is linked to company performance and shareholder return; lack of disclosure of performance metrics and their impact on incentive payouts; no disclosure of rationale related to the use of board discretion when compensation is increased or performance criteria or metrics are changed resulting in greater amounts paid than that supported by previously established goals.
- › Board's responsiveness to investor input and engagement on compensation issues, including:
 - › Failure to respond to majority-supported shareholder proposals on executive pay topics;
 - › Failure to respond to concerns raised in connection with significant opposition to MSOP proposals;
 - › Failure to respond to the company's previous say-on-pay proposal that received support of less than 70 percent of the votes cast taking into account the ownership structure of the company.

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

Equity-Based Compensation Plans

► **General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on equity-based compensation plans using an "equity plan scorecard" (EPSC) approach. Under this approach, certain features and practices related to the plan¹⁴ are assessed in combination, with positively-assessed factors potentially counterbalancing negatively-assessed factors and vice-versa. Factors are grouped into three pillars:

- › **Plan Cost:** The total estimated cost of the company's equity plans relative to industry/market cap peers, measured by the company's estimated Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT) in relation to peers and considering both:
 - › SVT based on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants, plus outstanding unvested/unexercised grants; and
 - › SVT based only on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants.

- › **Plan Features:**
 - › Absence of problematic change-in-control (CIC) provisions, including:
 - › Single-trigger acceleration of award vesting in connection with a CIC; and;
 - › Settlement of performance-based equity at target or above in the event of a CIC-related acceleration of vesting regardless of performance.
 - › No financial assistance to plan participants for the exercise or settlement of awards;
 - › Public disclosure of the full text of the plan document; and
 - › Reasonable share dilution from equity plans relative to market best practices.

- › **Grant Practices:**
 - › Reasonable three-year average burn rate relative to market best practices;
 - › Meaningful time vesting requirements for the CEO's most recent equity grants (three-year lookback);
 - › The issuance of performance-based equity to the CEO;
 - › A clawback provision applicable to equity awards; and
 - › Post-exercise or post-settlement share-holding requirements (S&P/TSX Composite Index only).

Generally vote against the plan proposal if the combination of above factors, as determined by an overall score, indicates that the plan is not in shareholders' best interests. In addition, vote against the plan if any of the following unacceptable factors have been identified:

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

¹⁴ In cases where certain historic grant data are unavailable (e.g. following an IPO or emergence from bankruptcy), Special Cases models will be applied which omit factors requiring these data.

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

Feedback obtained through ongoing consultation with institutional investors since the 2013-2014 ISS policy cycle indicates strong support for the new approach, which incorporates the following key goals:

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

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

A scorecard approach will enable the evaluation of equity plan proposals in consideration of a range of best practices. More information about the policy and weightings can be found in [ISS' EPSC FAQ](#).

Plan Cost

Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT)

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

SVT is assessed relative to a company-specific benchmark. The benchmark is determined as follows: The top quartile performers in each industry group (using the Global Industry Classification Standard: GICS) are identified. Benchmark SVT levels for each industry are established based on these top performers' historic SVT. Regression analyses are run on each industry group to identify the variables most strongly correlated to SVT. The benchmark industry SVT level is then adjusted upwards or downwards for the specific company by plugging the company-specific performance measures, size and cash compensation into the industry cap equations to arrive at the company's benchmark.¹⁵

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

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

Overriding Negative Factors

Plan Amendment Provisions

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

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

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

Rationale: In response to the rule changes affected by the TSX related to Part IV, Subsection 613 of the TSX Company Manual and Staff Notices #2004-0002, and #2006-0001 which came into effect in 2007, ISS has revised its policy with regard to Equity Compensation Plan Amendment Procedures. This policy addresses the removal by the TSX of previously established requirements for shareholder approval of certain types of amendments to Security-Based Compensation Arrangements of its listed issuers. For the purposes of the rule change, security-

¹⁵ Under the Equity Plan Scorecard policy, the company's SVT benchmark is considered along with other factors.

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

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

- › Any increase in the number of shares reserved for issuance under a plan or plan maximum;
- › Any reduction in exercise price of options or other entitlements which benefits an insider;¹⁶
- › Any amendment that extends the term of options beyond the original expiry and that benefits an insider of the issuer;
- › Changes to insider participation limits which result in the security holder approval to be required on a disinterested basis; and
- › Amendment provisions granting additional powers to the board of directors to amend the plan or entitlements without security holder approval.

The TSX has further clarified that shareholder approval is required for any amendment to the Plan Amendment Provision.

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

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

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

¹⁶ Security holder approval, excluding the votes of securities held by insiders benefiting from the amendment, is required for a reduction in the exercise price, purchase price, or an extension of the term of options or similar securities held by insiders. If an issuer cancels options or similar securities held by insiders and then reissues those securities under different terms, the TSX will consider this an amendment to those securities and will require security holder approval, unless the re-grant occurs at least 3 months after the related cancellation. Staff Notice #2005-0001, Section 613 Security Based Compensation Arrangements, S.613(h)(iii) Amendments to Insider Securities.

containing the relevant disclosure and that issuers must update disclosure for the most recently completed fiscal year end to include grants, exercises, amendments, etc. which may occur after the fiscal year-end is completed, but prior to the filing of the information circular.


ISS has reiterated the need for shareholder approval for the amendments that currently still require shareholder approval by the TSX due to the ability of the TSX to change or eliminate these requirements at any time in future which we believe would not be in the best interests of shareholders or consistent with institutional investor proxy voting guidelines. Note however that from a corporate governance viewpoint, ISS does not support re-pricing of any outstanding options and does not limit this policy to only those options held by insiders. ISS has for many years recommended against any re-pricing of outstanding options. Our reasons are based on the original purpose of stock options as at-risk, incentive compensation that is meant to align the interests of option-holders with those of shareholders. The incentive value of stock options is diminished when the exercise price of out-of-the-money options can be adjusted downwards, and is not supportable when shareholders must suffer the consequences of a downturn in share price.

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


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

Non-Employee Director (NED) Participation

Discretionary Participation

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

Limited Participation

 **General Recommendation:** Vote against an equity compensation plan proposal where:

- › The NED aggregate share reserve under the plan exceeds 1 percent of the outstanding common shares; or
- › The equity plan document does not specify an annual individual NED grant limit with a maximum value of (i) \$100,000 worth of stock options, or (ii) \$150,000 worth of shares.

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

Rationale: Due to the continuing use of options in compensation plans in Canada, we have not opposed the use of options for outside directors *per se* but have tried to address potential governance concerns by ensuring a reasonable limit on grants to independent NEDs who are charged with overseeing not only a company's compensation scheme but also corporate governance and long-term sustainability.

Repricing Options

Repricing History

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

Other Compensation Plans

Individual Grants

- ▶ **General Recommendation:** Vote against individual equity grants to NEDs in the following circumstances:
 - › In conjunction with an equity compensation plan that is on the agenda at the shareholder meeting if voting against the underlying equity compensation plan; and
 - › Outside of an equity compensation plan if the director's annual grant would exceed the above individual director limit.

In addition, performance-based equity grants are not considered to be an appropriate form of director compensation.

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

Rationale: To address investor concerns related to discretionary or unreasonable NED participation in management equity compensation plans, ISS established an acceptable limit on grants to such directors who are not only charged with the administration of a company's compensation program but are also responsible and accountable for the company's overall corporate governance and long term sustainability. The established acceptable range for aggregate NED option grants is 0.25 percent to 1 percent of the outstanding shares. Within that range an individual annual director limit was established based on market practice.

Canadian institutional investors do not generally support stock options as an appropriate form of equity compensation for NEDs, and, at a minimum, require that option grants to NEDs be substantially restricted. ISS has maintained the previously established maximum limit on stock option grants to NEDs of \$100,000 per director per year. However, based on current market practice, an updated annual individual NED share-based (non-option) award limit of \$150,000 may be reasonable taking into consideration the increased demands on directors.

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

Repricing Proposals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dilution and Burn Rate Assessment

In cases where the cost of the plan cannot be calculated using the binomial model due to lack of historic data for a newly created or merged corporate entity, ISS will apply a dilution and burn rate analysis.

▶ **General Recommendation:** Vote against the proposed equity plan if:

- › Dilution under all company plans would be more than 10 percent of the outstanding shares on a non-diluted basis; or
- › The historic burn rate for all company plans has been more than 2 percent per year (generally averaged over most recent three-year period). If equity has been granted as part of the resolution subject to shareholder approval and the grants made exceed 2 percent of the outstanding shares a vote against is warranted.

Employee Stock Purchase Plans (ESPPs, ESOPs)

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

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

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

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

Deferred Share Unit (DSU) Plans



General Recommendation: Vote for deferred compensation plans if:

- › Potential dilution together with all other equity-based compensation is 10 percent of the outstanding common shares or less.

Other elements of director compensation evaluated in conjunction with DSU plan proposals include:

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

Rationale: Deferred compensation plans generally encourage a sense of ownership in the company. These types of deferred compensation arrangements are usually designed to compensate outside directors by allowing them the opportunity to take all or a portion of their annual retainer in the form of deferred units, the payment of which is postponed to some future time, typically retirement or termination of directorship and may be in cash and/or stock.

Although a DSU plan only requires shareholder approval if it reserves treasury shares, a number of companies continue to request shareholder approval for DSU plans funded by shares purchased in the open market. This type of plan will be evaluated on a qualitative basis in the same manner that ESPPs (see above) are evaluated. Eligibility and administration are key factors in determining the acceptability of such plans.

Treasury Funded Plans

Deferred share units awarded under any equity compensation plan where: i) the authorization of treasury shares for issuance is in payment of the DSUs; and ii) the DSU grants are not in-lieu of cash, would be evaluated by running the compensation model.

Shareholder Proposals on Compensation

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

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

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

Shareholder Advisory Vote Proposals

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

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

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

Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan (SERP) Proposals

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

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

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

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


Investor pressure to structure executive compensation so that the majority is "at risk" has driven down base salary and therefore it may be reasonable in certain cases to include short-term cash bonus amounts in the bonus calculation. Therefore, ISS will assess limits imposed on extra service credits and the overall mix of guaranteed

(salary) and at risk (performance driven incentive compensation) executive compensation, as well as the size of potential cash bonus amounts, when determining vote recommendations on SERP shareholder proposals asking for elimination of these elements in SERP calculations. Given the conservative general market practice in this regard, support for such proposals should be limited to those companies that exceed standard market practice thus qualifying as problematic pay practices as outlined above.

6. SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Global Approach

Issues covered under the policy include a wide range of topics, including consumer and product safety, environment and energy, labor standards and human rights, workplace and board diversity, and corporate political issues. While a variety of factors goes into each analysis, the overall principle guiding all vote recommendations focuses on how the proposal may enhance or protect shareholder value in either the short term or long term.

 **General Recommendation:** 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.

Rationale: This policy update codifies the overarching principles that are applied to all markets, globally, and clarifies the factors that ISS considers in its case-by-case evaluation of environmental and social shareholder proposals. In markets where shareholder proposals on specific environment and social issues are routinely or frequently observed on company ballots, ISS has more nuanced policies that stem from these principles to address those issues.

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.



The Global Leader In Corporate Governance

www.issgovernance.com