



Proxy Voting Report

Period: July 01, 2023 - September 30, 2023

Votes Cast	262	Number of meetings	24
For	225	With management	227
Withhold	1	Against management	35
Abstain	0		
Against	29		
Other	7		
Total	262	Total	262

In 16 (67%) out of 24 meetings we have cast one or more votes against management recommendation.

General Highlights

The role of financial institutions in addressing climate change

There is growing awareness among policymakers, investors, and in wider society that financial institutions need to reduce funding of activities that generate significant levels of greenhouse gas emissions. At the same time, they need to increase the financing of low-carbon solutions to facilitate the transition towards net zero emissions by 2050. This is echoed by the Paris Agreement, which explicitly recognizes the need to “make finance flows compatible with a pathway toward low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development”.

Moreover, the 2023 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report highlights the urgency of near-term climate action and the need for improved access to financial resources. It stated that “if climate goals are to be achieved, both adaptation and mitigation financing would need to increase many-fold”. Finance has become a critical enabler for climate action and financial institutions need to incorporate climate change risks into their decision making. In response to these trends, investors have been placing increasing focus on the prominent role that financial institutions can play within the net zero transition. This has been evidenced through numerous collaborative initiatives, and also during this year’s proxy season, as investors showed strong support for shareholder proposals requesting reports on transition planning at the annual general meetings (AGMs) of banks.

During the 2023 proxy season, financial institutions were met with a significantly high number of shareholder proposals requesting additional action and disclosures on their climate impacts. Investors increasingly demand financial institutions to show how they are supporting the transition to net zero, and one of the most frequent requests made by shareholders has been the introduction of an annual management proposal outlining the company’s climate strategy – the ‘Say on Climate’. The introduction of this allows shareholders to hold companies accountable for their transition plans and helps them incentivize companies to develop and deliver clear action plans for financing the climate transition.

In the same vein, shareholders have also been asking companies to adopt a time-bound phase-out policy for lending and underwriting of new fossil fuel exploration and development. This aims to further support capital reallocation towards more sustainable solutions in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. Lastly, another popular request made by shareholders concerns the adoption of science-based greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets, with the aim of pushing financial institutions to plan for and develop a clear path towards halving their financed emissions by 2030 and reaching net zero by 2050.

In line with growing shareholder expectations, several investor initiatives, such as the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC) Banks Working Group, have gained prominence over the last few years. The working group was formed in April 2021 following the publication of a set of investor expectations for the banking sector, covering topics such as alignment with the goals of the Paris Agreement, governance of climate risk, and disclosures. Ever since then, the IIGCC has worked with the Transition Pathway Initiative Global Climate Transition Centre (TPI Centre) to further develop and refine investor expectations for banks. Most recently, this collaboration has resulted in the publication of a Net Zero Standard for Banks, which will enable investors to clearly assess and engage with banks on their net zero transition plans.

Based on the expectations of the IIGCC, Robeco has also developed a climate change assessment framework for the financial sector. Using this framework, we assess banks on several indicators of how well they are managing the net zero transition, including their net zero commitment, disclosure of short, medium and

long-term emissions reduction targets, their decarbonization strategy and climate governance, among other things. The outcomes of this assessment are not only used in our engagement activities, but also in our voting approach at the AGMs of the financial institutions under scope.

A negative assessment informs a vote against management on an appropriate agenda item. Through this integrated approach, our aim is to promote sustainable business practices in the financial sector and to encourage management to create long-term value, by avoiding climate-related risks and seeking out the opportunities of low carbon, sustainable development.

Market Highlights

UK Audit and Corporate Governance Reform

Between May and September 2023, the UK's Financial Reporting Council (FRC) ran a much-awaited public consultation on an overhauled UK Corporate Governance Code (the Code). The consultation occurred amidst criticism that the government is delaying the far-reaching audit reform it pledged to roll out after the country was rocked by a series of high-profile scandals at retailer BHS, café and cake chain Patisserie Valerie and construction firm Carillion.

This criticism intensified after recent reports that the Audit Reform Bill would not be included in the King's Speech scheduled for November 2023. Despite the uncertainty surrounding the implementation of the audit reform, we believe that the proposed changes to the Code would strengthen the country's corporate governance regime. In our response to the consultation, we expressed our support for the amended Code, which would apply to accounting years commencing on or after 1 January 2025.

The background

The proposed changes were developed by the regulator to address the UK Government's June 2022 response to the White Paper "Restoring Trust in Audit and Corporate Governance". This response set out a package of measures to revamp the UK audit and corporate governance regime. Given that part of these measures were aimed at strengthening the Code, the FRC then issued a position paper highlighting how it would support the government in rolling out these reforms. In light of this background, the proposed changes are largely focused on internal controls, assurance and resilience.

In this article, we highlight some of the most material changes that would be introduced by the amended Code.

The changes

The UK government had previously requested the adoption of a requirement reminiscent of the US Sarbanes-Oxley Act for an explicit directors' statement about the effectiveness of the company's internal controls, including those over financial reporting, but also concerning wider operational and compliance risks and the basis for that assessment. Now, the FRC is proposing to implement this by requiring the board to make an annual declaration that the company's risk management and internal control systems have been effective throughout the reporting period in question. We welcome this addition, as it increases the accountability of the board over risk oversight.

Furthermore, all companies reporting against the Code would be required to produce an audit and assurance policy (AAP) on a "comply or explain" basis. The requirements of the AAP would be set out in regulations, but are expected to include, amongst others, details on the company's internal auditing and assurance arrangements, on its policy to tender the external audit services and whether the external assurance proposed will be limited or reasonable. We support this change as it would lead to comparable reporting and ultimately to more transparency and accountability. Nonetheless, we believe it is important that the policy is informative and not only describes principles and responsibilities, but also criteria that were tested by the audit committee, and the results of such review.

The revised Code also proposes to expand the audit committee's responsibilities. The key additions would be the duty to develop the AAP and a duty to monitor the integrity of narrative reporting, including sustainability reporting. Notably,

according to the revised Code, a company's annual report should describe the assurance of ESG metrics and other sustainability-related information. We view these changes as a step in the right direction yet consider that a major issue that still needs to be addressed is the harmonization of sustainability reporting standards.

Furthermore, the amended Code introduces a requirement for the board to report on "the company's climate ambitions and transition planning, in the context of its strategy, as well as the surrounding governance". We view this information as being key for investors, as it enables them to more accurately price climate-related risks.

Companies would also be required to list all significant director appointments in the annual report, with the board required to explain how each director has sufficient time to undertake their role effectively in light of their other commitments. In our view, the benefits of serving on multiple boards (e.g. broadened expertise and an enhanced network of contacts) can be diminished by excessive time commitments, to the extent that overboarded directors may become unable to adequately discharge their fiduciary duties. For this reason, we view it as crucial for the board to have adequate policies and practices in place to evaluate whether directors have sufficient time to dedicate to their duties.

In addition, the FRC also sought to strengthen the Code in the area of diversity and inclusion, proposing to incorporate a reference to inclusion and to give equal weight to all protected and non-protected characteristics. We support this amendment, as it promotes enhanced disclosure on diversity and inclusion, while also encouraging companies to consider diversity beyond gender and to shift their workplace culture in a meaningful way.

Finally, the Code aims to provide greater transparency around companies' malus and clawback arrangements. In particular, companies would be required to disclose whether such arrangements are in place, the minimum conditions in which these would apply, the minimum period for the arrangements and why the period is best suited to the organization, as well as whether the provisions were used in the last financial year. We view clawback policies as key to ensuring an adequate link between pay and performance, as well as sound accountability for the board and executives. As such, the added disclosure would enable us to better assess the risks embedded in a company's corporate governance.

Voting Highlights

Liberty Global plc - 07/13/2023 - United States

Proposal: Reincorporation to Bermuda.

Liberty Global plc, together with its subsidiaries, provides broadband internet, video, fixed-line telephony, and mobile communications services to residential and business customers.

In Q3 2023, Liberty Global held an Extraordinary General Meeting (EGM) where the company proposed to change its jurisdiction of incorporation to Bermuda.

The company stated that the main objective of the re-domiciliation would be to create shareholder value, by aligning the U.S. style corporate law of Bermuda with their listing on Nasdaq, and through the strategic use of financing, cross-border M&A and investments, share buybacks, self-tender offers, spin-offs and split-offs, which are easier to execute as a Bermudian company.

While considering the benefits of the proposal, we determined that these were associated with significant changes to the company's corporate governance, which would result in concerning losses of shareholder rights and protection mechanisms. More specifically, under Bermuda Law, the company would no longer be required to obtain shareholder approval to conduct share buybacks and self-tender offers, to enter into related party transactions, or to waive the application of pre-emptive rights on new equity issues, among others.

On balance, Robeco decided that the negative impacts on shareholder rights outweighed the benefits of the proposed re-domiciliation. Therefore, we did not support the change of jurisdiction and its related proposals.

McKesson Corporation - 07/21/2023 - United States

Proposal: Shareholder Proposal Regarding Severance Approval Policy.

McKesson Corporation provides healthcare services in the United States and internationally. It operates through four segments: U.S. Pharmaceutical, Prescription Technology Solutions (RxTS), Medical-Surgical Solutions, and International.

This year's Annual General Meeting (AGM) of McKesson Corporation included one shareholder proposal focused around the governance of the company's severance pay practices. The proposal requested that McKesson sought shareholder approval for severance payments valued at 2.99 times the sum of salary and short-term bonus.

Severance pay consists of compensation awarded to employees who part ways with a company, and if severance payments exceed a value threshold of 2.99 times base salary and bonus, companies can no longer deduct them as an expense. For this reason, it is important that shareholders are given the opportunity to approve high severance payments valued above this threshold, since these are not deductible.

As a result, and in line with our policy that focuses on responsible executive remuneration and improving accountability mechanisms, we decided to support the shareholder proposal, which received close to 11% support from shareholders that participated in the vote.

Electronic Arts, Inc. - 08/10/2023 - United States

Proposals: Remuneration Policy, Director Elections & Shareholder Proposal Regarding Severance Approval Policy.

Electronic Arts develops video games for a global player base.

The 2023 AGM agenda of Electronic Arts was dominated by governance topics that we commonly see reflected in the US market. We have voted Against the executive compensation plan on numerous successive occasions, as it has failed our remuneration assessment on the basis of its significant quantum and insufficient underlying structure, which we assess across multiple key dimensions. To escalate our repeated concerns, we voted for the second time Against the chair of the compensation committee this year, as we observed that the compensation plan continued to exhibit these features.

In addition, we voted For a shareholder proposal asking the company to instate a policy to seek shareholder approval of any senior severance packages that exceed a value of 2.99 times the employee's base salary and target annual bonus opportunity. Though the company had put in place a policy limiting cash severance payments to this level, it did not set a strict cap on severance payments in the form of equity. For this reason, we supported the proposal.

Disclaimer

Robeco Institutional Asset Management B.V. ('Robeco') distributes voting reports as a service to its clients and other interested parties. Robeco also uses these reports to demonstrate its compliance with the principles and best practices of the Tabaksblat Code which are relevant to Robeco. Although Robeco compiles these reports with utmost care on the basis of several internal and external sources which are deemed to be reliable, Robeco cannot guarantee the completeness, correctness or timeliness of this information. Nor can Robeco guarantee that the use of this information will lead to the right analyses, results and/or that this information is suitable for specific purposes. Robeco can therefore never be held responsible for issues such as, but not limited to, possible omissions, inaccuracies and/or changes made at a later stage. Without written prior consent from Robeco you are not allowed to use this report for any purpose other than the specific one for which it was compiled by Robeco.