



## Proxy Policy

Rev. February 20, 2025

## Table of Contents

<b>I. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Proxy Policy Statement .....</b>	<b>3</b>
A. Proxy Voting Guidelines .....	3
B. Limitations .....	4
C. Special Considerations.....	4
<b>III. Responsibility and Oversight.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>IV. Proxy Voting Procedures.....</b>	<b>5</b>
A. Materiality .....	6
B. Conflicts of Interest .....	6
C. Disclosure .....	6
D. Recordkeeping.....	6

## **I. Introduction**

Los Angeles Capital Management LLC (“Los Angeles Capital” or the “Firm”) has adopted and implemented policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure that proxies are voted in the best interest of clients, in accordance with U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) Rule 206(4) - 6 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the “Advisers Act”) and its obligations under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”). Los Angeles Capital provides investment advisory or sub-advisory services to various types of institutional clients. When clients give Los Angeles Capital the authority to vote proxies held in their client accounts such authority is specified in the advisory contract or other governing agreements.

## **II. Proxy Policy Statement**

Los Angeles Capital has retained Glass, Lewis & Co., LLC (“Glass Lewis”) an unaffiliated third-party, to act as an independent proxy voting agent. Glass Lewis provides proxy analysis, voting recommendations and administration, recordkeeping, and manages other operational and reporting matters of the proxy voting process. If at any time a material conflict arises in connection with the Firm voting proxies for a client account, it would be resolved in the best interest of the client.

When Los Angeles Capital is given proxy voting authority together with a client’s voting policy, the Firm oversees compliance with such policy. When the client elects to use the Firm’s standard proxy guidelines, the Firm will vote in accordance with the guidelines approved by the Firm’s Proxy Committee (“Committee”). The Committee has approved the use of Glass Lewis’ market-based U.S. and Global guidelines<sup>1</sup>, as may be modified from time to time (the “Firm’s Guidelines”). Clients with specific proxy voting goals may direct the Firm to apply a thematic set of proxy guidelines developed by Glass Lewis or provide the Firm with an alternative set of custom guidelines for use in voting proxies for the client’s account.

### **A. Proxy Voting Guidelines**

On an annual basis, the Committee reviews the Firm’s Guidelines. Members of the Committee also selectively review a sampling of the voting recommendations and the related proxy materials in determining whether to modify the approved Firm Guidelines.

Where the Firm has proxy voting authority, the Firm ultimately retains the right to cast each vote on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration the applicable proxy guidelines including any contractual obligations or the specific voting policy of the particular portfolio as well as all relevant facts and circumstances including information that might be gathered from sources beyond Glass Lewis. Management of issuers, as well as other interested parties, will sometimes release supplemental information to the proxy statement that relates to a pending proxy vote. Glass Lewis and the Firm will not always be able to consider such additional information depending on the timing of its release and voting deadlines.

In the event there is a disagreement with the Glass Lewis analysis as to a particular vote, the Committee will determine whether it is appropriate to vote contrary to the Glass Lewis recommendation *provided that* such decision is consistent with the approved guideline. In the rare circumstance that the Committee believes it is in the best interest of a client to vote contrary to an approved guideline, the Committee will seek client consent prior to placing a vote that is contrary to such approved guideline(s).

Los Angeles Capital recognizes that a client may issue specific directives regarding how particular proxy issues are to be voted for the client’s portfolio holdings. The Firm requires that the advisory or sub-advisory contract specify such instructions, including instructions as to how those votes will be managed, particularly where they differ from the Firm’s Guidelines.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.glasslewis.com/voting-policies-current/>

It is unlikely that serious conflicts of interest will arise in the context of the Firm's proxy voting because the Firm does not engage in other financial businesses such as brokerage or managing public companies, underwriting, or investment banking. Nevertheless, should a conflict of interest arise in connection with proxy voting or Glass Lewis, such conflict will be handled as described below under Section IV B, "Conflicts of Interest." As a matter of policy, the Firm and its employees are required to put the interests of clients ahead of their own.

## B. Limitations

In limited circumstances, the Firm may elect to abstain from voting or may be unable to vote a client's proxy. These circumstances include:

- Where the Firm concludes that the effect on shareholder's economic interests or the value of the portfolio holding is indeterminable or insignificant.
- Where the securities related to the vote participate in a **securities lending program** and are out on loan. In many cases, where a client directs the securities lending, Los Angeles Capital may not be aware when the security is out on loan and thus may not be able to recall the security before the record date, subject to the Special Considerations outlined below.
- Where the related securities are issued in a country that participates in **share blocking** because it is disruptive to the management of the portfolio.
- Where multiple global custodian accounts roll up into one **omnibus sub-custodian account**. In the specific markets where this may occur, the account managed by Los Angeles Capital is not registered individually. Therefore, if ballots are voted differently for the underlying accounts, the omnibus vote is considered split and is rejected.
- Where in the Firm's judgement the **unjustifiable costs**<sup>2</sup> or disadvantages of voting the proxy would exceed the anticipated benefit of voting (e.g., certain non-U.S. securities).
- Where a required **Power of Attorney** is not on file or it is not feasible to get one on file.
- Where a meeting involves an issuer or transaction with a relevant U.S. or non-U.S. **sanctioned entity or individual**.

## C. Special Considerations

Certain accounts may warrant specialized treatment in voting proxies. Contractual stipulations, individual client direction, and special guideline arrangements will dictate how voting will be done in these cases.

### Mutual Funds

Where the Firm votes proxies for a mutual fund that it sub-advises, unless otherwise directed and agreed with such fund and its adviser, the proxies typically will be voted in accordance with the Firm's proxy guidelines. Proxies of a mutual fund's portfolio companies may be voted in accordance with resolutions or other instructions from an authorized person of the fund.

### ERISA Accounts

The Department of Labor ("DOL") rules emphasize that a fiduciary's duties extend to management of shareholder rights including with respect to proxy voting. Responsibilities for voting ERISA accounts include: the duty of loyalty, prudence, compliance with the plan, as well as a duty to avoid prohibited transactions. The DOL rules

---

<sup>2</sup> The Department of Labor has indicated that such costs include, but are not limited to, expenditures related to developing proxy resolutions, proxy voting services and the analysis of the likely net effect of a particular issue on the economic value of the plan's investment. Fiduciaries must take into consideration whether the exercise of its rights to vote a proxy is expected to have an effect on the economic value of the plan's investment that will outweigh the costs of exercising such rights. With respect to proxies for shares of foreign corporations, a fiduciary, in deciding whether to purchase shares of a foreign corporation, *should consider whether any additional difficulty and expense in voting such shares is reflected in their market price.*

require voting with a focus on relevant risk-return factors and not voting in a manner that sacrifices investment returns or takes on risks that promote benefits or goals unrelated to the interests of participants and beneficiaries. Where the Firm has authority to vote proxies for an ERISA account, the Firm employs the Firm's Guidelines unless otherwise specifically directed by the ERISA plan fiduciary. Where the Firm has authority to vote proxies for a commingled fund that is an ERISA plan asset fund, the Firm employs the Firm's Guidelines.

### Securities Lending Program

Certain situations where Los Angeles Capital may recall securities on loan to vote proxies, if operationally feasible, include: (i) where Los Angeles Capital deems a holding materially significant, (ii) where Los Angeles Capital is directing the securities lending, or (iii) where a client has made arrangements with its custodian to permit standing instructions for the recall of securities out on loan and Los Angeles Capital has agreed to implement the standing instructions.

## **III. Responsibility and Oversight**

The Committee was established to provide oversight to the proxy voting process and is responsible for developing, implementing, and updating the Firm's proxy policy, reviewing approving, and/or formulating the Firm's Guidelines, selecting and overseeing the third-party proxy vendor, identifying any conflicts of interest, determining the votes for issues it elects to vote independently from, or that cannot be voted by, Glass Lewis, monitoring legislative and corporate governance developments surrounding proxy issues, and meeting to discuss any material issues regarding the proxy voting process. The Committee meets annually and as necessary to fulfill its obligations.

As part of the Committee's ongoing oversight of its third-party proxy vendor, the Committee considers (i) the adequacy and quality of the proxy vendor's staffing and personnel; (ii) the presence of conflicts and processes to address those conflicts; (iii) the robustness of the proxy vendor's policies and procedures for ensuring that its recommendations are based on current and accurate information; and (iv) any other appropriate considerations as to the nature and quality of the proxy vendor's services. In addition, Compliance conducts periodic reviews of ballots voted by the proxy vendor to ensure they are in line with proxy voting procedures.

In cases where the Committee votes a proxy ballot it may conduct research internally and/or use the resources of an independent research consultant or use information from any of the following sources: legislative materials, studies of corporate governance and other proxy voting issues, reports by issuers' management on pending proxy votes, and/or published analyses of shareholder and management proposals. In such voting circumstances, two votes from voting members of the Committee or one voting member of the Committee and an internal legal counsel are required.

Los Angeles Capital's Operations Department handles the day-to-day administration of the proxy voting process.

## **IV. Proxy Voting Procedures**

Glass Lewis provides for the timely execution of specified proxy votes on the Firm's behalf, which includes complete account set-up, vote execution, reporting, recordkeeping, and compliance with ERISA.

Los Angeles Capital's responsibility for voting proxies is generally determined by the obligations set forth under each client's Investment Management Agreement, Limited Partnership Agreement, Prospectus, Trust Agreement or other legal documentation governing the account. Voting ERISA client proxies is a fiduciary act of plan asset management that must be performed by the adviser or delegated to a sub-adviser unless the voting right is retained by a named fiduciary of the plan. If an advisory or sub-advisory contract or similar document states that Los Angeles Capital does not have the authority to vote client proxies, then voting is the responsibility of some other named fiduciary.

While Los Angeles Capital will accept direction from clients on specific proxy issues for their account, the Firm reserves the right to maintain its standard position on all other client accounts for which the Firm has proxy voting authority.

## **A. Materiality**

The Committee has designated certain materiality thresholds for situations in which the Committee may vote independently from Glass Lewis or may take separate actions in regard to securities lending limitations. Materiality thresholds are monitored daily and are escalated to the Committee for review.

## **B. Conflicts of Interest**

Los Angeles Capital attempts to minimize the risks of conflicts and reviews the Conflict of Interest Statement prepared by Glass Lewis on an annual basis.

If Glass Lewis identifies a potential conflict of interest between it and a publicly held company, it will disclose the relationship on the relevant proxy paper research report. In these situations, members of the Committee will review the proxy paper research report and vote the proxy in accordance with the Committee charter.

If an unforeseen conflict requires specialized treatment, alternate measures may be taken, up to and including having Glass Lewis refrain from writing a proxy paper research report and abstaining from making a voting recommendation on the company. In this scenario Glass Lewis would procure a substitute research report from an alternative qualified provider, and the Committee may be required to research and vote the proxy.

If the Committee identifies a potential material conflict of interest between Los Angeles Capital or an affiliated person of the Firm and the issuer whose ballot is being voted, the client whose account holds the shares of such issuer will be notified. If no directive on how to vote is issued by the client, the Committee will vote in such a way that, in the Committee's opinion, fairly addresses the conflict in the best interest of the client.

## **C. Disclosure**

Los Angeles Capital will provide clients with a copy of the Firm's current proxy policies and procedures upon request. In addition, clients may request, at any time, a copy of the Firm's voting records for their respective account(s) by making a formal request to Los Angeles Capital. Los Angeles Capital will make this information available to a client upon its request within a reasonable time. For further information, please contact a member of Operations at [operations@lacapm.com](mailto:operations@lacapm.com).

Los Angeles Capital generally will not disclose how it has voted or intends to vote on behalf of a client account except as required by applicable law but may disclose such information to a client regarding their portfolio who itself may decide or may be required to make public such voting information. Los Angeles Capital will not disclose past votes or share amounts voted except: (i) for a valid business purpose as determined in the discretion of the Chief Compliance Officer or Chief Legal Officer, (ii) to the respective client for such client's account, (iii) as required on Form N-PX related to Say-on-Pay votes, or (iv) as otherwise required by law.

## **D. Recordkeeping**

All proxy records pursuant to Section 204-2 of the Advisers Act are retained by either Glass Lewis or Los Angeles Capital. Glass Lewis retains (1) records of proxy statements received regarding client securities, and (2) records of each vote cast. Los Angeles Capital retains (1) copies of its proxy policies, procedures, and Firm Guidelines; (2) copies of any document created by Los Angeles Capital that was material to making a decision how to vote proxies on behalf of a client or that memorializes the basis for that decision; (3) each written client request for information on how the adviser voted proxies on behalf of the client; (4) a copy of any written response by Los

Angeles Capital to any (written or oral) client request for information on how the adviser voted proxies on behalf of the requesting client; and (5) regulatory filings related to proxy voting.

### ERISA Accounts

Los Angeles Capital's maintains access to proxy voting records (both procedures and actions taken in individual situations) to enable the named fiduciary to determine whether Los Angeles Capital is fulfilling its obligations. Such records may be maintained via Glass Lewis' electronic system. Retention may include: (1) issuer name and meeting; (2) issues voted on and record of the vote; (3) number of shares eligible to be voted on the record date; (4) number of shares voted; and (5) where appropriate, cost-benefit analyses.

### Duration

Proxy voting books and records will be maintained in an easily accessible place for at least five years from the end of the fiscal year during which the last entry was made on such records. For the first two years, the records are fully accessible in Los Angeles Capital's office and electronically.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK