

Best Practice Principles for Providers of Shareholder Voting Research & Analysis

Compliance Statement

May 2023
EOS at Federated Hermes

Contents

Introduction	3
<hr/>	
Principle One: Service Quality	4
Approach	4
Employee qualifications and training	4
Research methodology and policy	5
Principles	5
Translation from principles to market-specific policies and final voting recommendations	8
Escalation process	9
Quality	9
Client customisation	10
Policy development cycle	10
Feedback management and complaints	10
Timeliness	11
Client and supplier understanding	11
Client disclosure facilitation	12
<hr/>	
Principle Two: Conflicts-of-Interest Management	13
Potential conflicts of interest	13
Recording and escalation	14
Conflicts of interest approach in practice	15
<hr/>	
Principle Three: Communications Policy	16
Dialogue with issuers, shareholder proponents and other stakeholders	16
Dialogue with media and the public	16
<hr/>	

Introduction

EOS at Federated Hermes is delighted to provide its updated compliance statement in respect of the Best Practice Principles for Providers of Shareholder Voting Research & Analysis (the Principles), in support of its aims to establish standards for service providers in the industry and in line with the requirements of the amended EU Shareholder Rights Directive as transposed into UK law.

EOS helps long-term institutional investors around the world to meet their fiduciary responsibilities and become more active owners of public companies.

EOS provides a platform for like-minded investors to pool resources, creating a powerful force for positive change. We work on behalf of long-term global investors who entrust us with the stewardship of approximately £1.14tn / \$1.34tn / €1.30tn of assets (as at 31st December 2022) invested in over 18,000 companies worldwide. EOS at Federated Hermes is a subsidiary of Federated Hermes Limited but does not itself manage investments.

Our diverse and multilingual team of engagement and voting specialists monitors the investments of our clients in companies and intervenes where necessary with the aim of improving long-term performance and sustainability. Our team comprises experienced professionals who have the expertise, language skills and cultural knowledge to deliver real beneficial change at the companies its clients invest in.

Our activities are based on the premise that companies with informed and involved shareholders are more likely to achieve superior long-term performance than those without. Our services support the promotion of long-term corporate value, instead of the short-term financial focus common in financial markets.

For some of our clients, we provide voting recommendations as part of our services. EOS' voting recommendation services are provided in conjunction with Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), itself a founding signatory of the Principles.

In this compliance statement, we explain our approach to delivering our service and how we comply with the Principles. As we deliver our voting recommendation service in collaboration with ISS, this document may be read in conjunction with ISS' own compliance statement under the Principles.

Principle One: Service Quality

Approach

EOS' approach is aimed at achieving beneficial change at companies with the ultimate aim of protecting long-term shareholder value.

During 2022, EOS delivered voting recommendations covering 13,814 shareholder meetings, involving over 134,188 resolutions. Our voting recommendation service operates as an add-on to our engagement service which is our primary offering. We do not offer voting recommendations as a standalone service.

As a client of ISS ourselves, we do not seek to independently replicate the full range of research it conducts on our behalf. EOS leverages and builds upon ISS research and infrastructure (including the ISS ProxyExchange platform), seeking to add value primarily through selective escalation of the most important or difficult voting decisions, engagement with companies and operating voting policies and approaches that more closely align to our clients' views than ISS' benchmark policy.

The recommendations our clients receive are, in the first instance, based on ISS' research administered through either EOS' relevant voting guidelines and/or those of our clients. We seek to intelligently deploy our engagers to add insight and value to a specific subset of these meetings, by considering the voting approach in light of the engagement undertaken. This is done through consideration of materiality of holdings and the nature of the issues under consideration.

Meetings for companies identified in the EOS engagement programme are assigned to their designated engagement owner, to ensure each meeting is covered by the best-suited person with the deepest knowledge of the relevant company. The EOS engagement programme is a universe of companies (approximately 300-400) identified for focused engagement on an ongoing basis on a range of ESG, financial and strategic issues. It is selected based on factors including the aggregate size of clients' holdings and the materiality of ESG risks and opportunities. Meetings for companies that do not form part of the EOS engagement programme are assigned to engagement professionals with country expertise.

The engagement professionals are aided by reference to company materials such as annual reports, proxy statements, the ISS benchmark research, as well as EOS engagement and voting history (as recorded on our proprietary engagement management system). EOS proprietary data on the engagement management system may include, for example, insights gained from company engagement as to progress against various targets or planned developments which may inform EOS' view on a particular vote. EOS also draws on other sources such as collaborative engagement networks, national and international media, as well as a number of external research providers.

EOS provides voting recommendations to clients, but clients retain full discretion over their final voting decision at all

times. Clients are encouraged and empowered to contact EOS for further background on voting recommendations.

Employee qualifications and training

EOS undertakes a skills gap analysis of the wider team with reference to the thematic and sectoral issues we cover, to ensure we have the right mix of professionals who can best represent EOS and our clients' views in our stewardship services. We have intentionally built a diverse team of experienced and international voting and engagement professionals who have the expertise, language skills and cultural knowledge to work to deliver real beneficial change at companies.

Our engagement team currently includes 28 full-time employees, supported by 4 full-time employees in the EOS voting and engagement support team (VEST). EOS does not regularly employ part-time, seasonal employees (although it may occasionally do so, for example, to cover staff absences due to parental leave) as its voting service is an extension of its year-round engagement service, which is permanently resourced.

Staff workload during vote season is closely monitored with caps set on the number of votes that any individual engager can review (a maximum of ten per day, although this cap is rarely, if ever, reached) and mechanisms to re-distribute votes as needed. As noted elsewhere, EOS leverages research reports produced by ISS so the task for engagers is to assess the research, engage with issuers as appropriate and finalise voting recommendations to clients. The time required per vote can therefore vary greatly depending on the issues identified. This requires a dynamic approach to workload monitoring rather than a set model based on average time to write research reports for each vote.

The EOS team, which is 52% female and 48% male (as at 31 March 2023), draws on a number of skill sets, with our senior engagers coming from a range of backgrounds including, but not limited to, corporate law, portfolio management, international development banking, climate change, investment research, corporate social responsibility, and management consulting.

The combination of our ability to engage in the local language and an understanding of local culture and business practice are critical to the success of our engagement work. Within our team we have nationals from 16 countries and fluency in 14 languages. The team's skills, experience, languages, connections and cultural understanding equip them with the gravitas and credibility to access and maintain constructive relationships with company boards. The depth and breadth of this resource reflects our philosophy that stewardship activities require an integrated and skilled approach. Intervention at senior management and board director level should be carried out by individuals with the right skills, experience and credibility.

Our engagement professionals collaborate in teams covering themes, sectors and regions. This ensures we have experts who can educate the wider team on developments and best practice in their respective areas. Each engager is responsible for engagement, voting recommendations and ESG analysis, focussing on the combination of regions, sectors and themes to which they have been appointed.

Our team is primarily based in the UK and the US – London staff cover engagement in Europe, Asia and Emerging Markets and our Pittsburgh and New York staff cover engagement in North America. Our professionals travel to undertake engagements in person where possible at company headquarters. We also have a number of senior advisers who provide us with additional resource and expertise specific to some local markets.

As previously noted, our engagement professionals are generally on permanent/long-term contracts rather than brought in as a temporary resource for the voting season. Each engagement professional who joins the team goes through a training and onboarding process which involves formal training sessions and educational modules, as well as shadowing more experienced colleagues to ensure sufficient understanding of the voting policies in the markets involved. Senior engagement professionals dedicate a significant portion of their time to handle escalated votes and discuss market developments.

Engagers retain a portion of their personal objectives dedicated to training and development throughout their time at EOS. Such training might relate to the content of a particular ESG topic, provided by peers or external experts; be focused on the delivery of best practice stewardship, such as training on particular tools/resources, or the development of key skills; or other aspects of personal and professional development.

Research methodology and policy

EOS offers voting recommendations for company meetings on behalf of its proxy voting clients in line with agreed contracts (service agreements). The service agreement with each client will detail whether recommendations are based on the EOS voting guidelines or a custom client policy.

EOS' global proxy voting guidelines¹ (Global guidelines) inform our recommendations to proxy voting clients. These explicitly reference environmental, social and governance (ESG) factors and aim to harness voting rights as an asset to be deployed in support of achieving engagement outcomes.

Our Guidelines are informed by a hierarchy of external and internally-developed global and regional best practice guidelines; principally:

- EOS Global Corporate Governance Principles²

¹ [fheos-corporate-global-voting-guidelines-2022.pdf \(hermes-investment.com\)](#)

² [eos-global-corporate-governance-principles-2023.pdf \(hermes-investment.com\)](#)

³ [eos-europe-australia-public-vote-guidelines-2023.pdf \(hermes-investment.com\)](#)


⁴ [eos-north-america-public-vote-guidelines-2023.pdf \(hermes-investment.com\)](#)

⁵ Corporate Governance Principles for South-East Asian countries (ASEAN), Brazil, China & Hong Kong, India, Japan, Mexico, North America, South Africa, South Korea and Taiwan can be found under the section 'Regional vote policies and corporate governance principles': [EOS library | Federated Hermes Limited \(hermes-investment.com\)](#)

⁶ [EOS Engagement Plan 2023-2025 \(hermes-investment.com\)](#)

- EOS Regional vote policies: Europe and Australia³, North America⁴
- EOS Market Corporate Governance Principles for Asia and Global Emerging Markets⁵: The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Brazil, China & Hong Kong, India, Japan, Mexico, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan (NB these documents will transition into Regional vote policies from 2024)

Figure 1 EOS Public Vote Policy documentation (2023)



These documents set out our fundamental expectations of companies in which our clients invest, including regarding business strategy, communications, financial structure, governance and the management of social and environmental risks.

They articulate the EOS house position on key ESG issues and are informed by relevant external local market standards such as best practice national corporate governance codes, as well as international sources such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Principles for Corporate Governance, as well as the collective views of our clients, which are expressed more fully in our annually-refreshed EOS Engagement Plan⁶.

Our Global guidelines do not seek to repeat all of the expectations articulated in the EOS Regional vote policies, Global or Market Corporate Governance Principles, or EOS Engagement Plan, but rather outline how these expectations translate into specific voting policies on issues put to shareholder votes at annual meetings.

Given the significant variation across markets, the Global guidelines do not seek to provide an exhaustive list of EOS' policies on all voting matters but rather sets out our broad position on a number of key topics with global applicability.

EOS Global Proxy Voting Guidelines

Principles

- 1 No abstention:** EOS aims to recommend voting either in favour or against a resolution and only to abstain in exceptional circumstances such as where our vote is conflicted, a resolution is to be withdrawn, or there is insufficient information upon which to base a decision.
- 2 Support for management:** EOS seeks to be supportive of boards and to recommend votes in favour of proposals unless there is a good reason not to do so in accordance with its voting policies, global or regional governance standards or otherwise to protect long-term shareholder interests.
- 3 Consistency of voting:** To provide companies with clear guidance of our expectations, EOS seeks to take a consistent position on issues and reflect this in our voting recommendations, in accordance with our stated policies and guidelines. However, recognising the limitations of any policy to anticipate all potential scenarios, EOS reserves the right to use our discretion when recommending votes and to recommend in line with the outcome which EOS believes will best serve our clients' long-term interests, taking into account market and company-specific circumstances and our engagement with companies, where relevant.
- 4 Engagement:** For a defined set of high priority companies (watchlist companies) we will endeavour to engage prior to recommending voting against a resolution if there is a reasonable prospect that this will either generate further information to enable a better quality of voting decision or to change the approach taken by the company. We will also seek to inform such companies of any recommended votes against management, together with the reasons why. For non-watchlist companies, we will inform companies on a best efforts basis.

Board and directors

- 1 Board independence:** We expect boards to meet minimum standards of independence to be able to hold management to account and may recommend voting against the election of directors whose appointment would cause independence to fall below these standards, and/or against the chair of the board where we have serious concerns. We set minimum standards at a market level but, as a general guide, we expect at least half of the board directors to be independent in companies with a dispersed ownership structure, and at least one third to be independent in controlled companies. In judging a director's independence, our considerations include, but are not limited to, length of tenure, concurrent service with other board members, whether they represent a significant shareholder, and whether they have any direct, material relationship with the company, other directors or its executives, including receiving any remuneration beyond director fees. Our expectations may exceed the minimum standards set by regulation or best practice codes in some markets.
- 2 Board committees:** Where separate committees are established to oversee remuneration, audit, nomination and other topics, we may recommend voting against chairs

or members where we have concerns about independence, skills, the director's attendance or ability to commit to the role, or the matters overseen by the committee.

- 3 Board diversity:** In recognition of the value that diversity of thought, skills and attributes brings to board oversight we will consider recommending voting against relevant directors, including the chair, where we consider board diversity – in terms of gender, ethnicity, age, functional and geographic experience, tenure, and other characteristics – to be below minimum thresholds. Some thresholds, such as gender or ethnic diversity, are defined at a market level; others, such as skills and experience, are more globally consistent. Our expectations may exceed the minimum standards set by regulation or best practice codes in some markets.
- 4 Director election:** We will generally recommend supporting the election of directors unless there are specific concerns relating to issues such as board independence and composition; a director's skills, experience or suitability for the role; a director's attendance or ability to commit time to the role; or governance or other failures which a director has oversight of or involvement in – at this or another company.
- 5 Director attendance:** We may recommend voting against directors who miss a substantial number of meetings – as a guideline, 25% or more – without sufficient explanation.
- 6 Director commitments:** We will consider recommending voting against a director who appears over-committed to other duties, with the guideline of having no more than five directorships. When considering this issue, we take into account a number of factors, including the size and complexity of roles, with certain industries such as banking (due to its business model and regulatory complexity) and multi-site operating companies such as international mining (due to the need for site visits) requiring more time commitment. As a broad guideline, we consider a chair role equivalent to two non-executive directorships and an executive role equivalent to four non-executive directorships. A chair should not hold another executive role and an executive should hold no more than one non-executive role, except for cases where serving as a shareholder representative on boards is an explicit part of an executive's responsibilities. At complex companies, committee chair roles, in particular the chair of the audit and risk committee, may be considered more burdensome than a typical non-executive directorship. A significant post at a civil society organisation or in public life would normally also count as equivalent to a directorship, whether executive, non-executive or a chair role.

Remuneration

We set market-specific voting policies on remuneration with reference to our Remuneration Principles⁷, and according to local market practice. Our broad guidelines are:

- 7 Alignment to long-term value:** We will consider opposing incentive arrangements that do not align to the creation of long-term value for shareholders and other stakeholders including, for example, those which disproportionately focus on short-term growth of share price or total shareholder returns.

⁷ <https://www.hermes-investment.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/remuneration-principles-clarifying-expectations.pdf>

- 8 Executive shareholdings:** We support executive management making material, long-term investment in the company's shares and may oppose remuneration proposals and reports where shareholding requirements or actual executive shareholdings are insufficient. As a general guideline, we support the aim that executives hold at least 500% of salary in shares and no less than 200%, with varying minimum thresholds based on regional pay practices.
- 9 Complexity:** We will consider voting against overly complex incentive arrangements which are difficult for investors and others to readily understand. An important factor in assessing complexity is the number of different components that comprise the whole remuneration package.
- 10 Variable to fixed pay:** We will consider voting against proposed incentive schemes or pay awards where we consider the ratio of variable pay relative to fixed pay to be too high, as part of our long-term desire to see simpler pay schemes, based on majority fixed pay and long-term share ownership. We set varying maximum thresholds for variable pay to reflect regional pay practices.
- 11 Justification for high pay:** We will consider voting against pay proposals which appear excessive in the context of wider industry pay practices or where executive pay is raised significantly above inflation or that of the workforce average without a convincing justification.
- 12 Discretion:** We expect boards and remuneration committees to apply discretion to ensure pay outcomes are aligned with performance and the wider experience of shareholders and may oppose remuneration reports and the election of relevant directors where this is not the case.
- 13 Disclosure:** We will generally recommend voting against remuneration reporting where disclosure is insufficient to understand the approach to incentive arrangements and how pay outcomes have been achieved, or where disclosure otherwise falls below expected market practice.
- 17 Differential voting rights:** We will generally recommend voting against the authorisation of stock with differential voting rights if the issuance of such stock would adversely affect the voting rights of existing shareholders.
- 18 Anti-takeover proposals:** We will generally recommend voting against anti-takeover proposals or other 'poison pill' arrangements including the authority to grant shares which may be used in such a manner.
- 19 Poll voting:** We will generally support proposals to adopt mandatory voting by poll and full disclosure of voting outcomes, together with proposals to adopt confidential voting and independent vote tabulation practices.
- 20 Authorities to allot shares:** We will generally recommend voting against unusual or excessive authorities to increase issued share capital.
- 21 Rights issues:** We generally support rights issues, provided that shareholder approval is obtained for any rights issue for any significant amount of capital (greater than 10% of share capital).
- 22 Market purchase of ordinary shares (share buybacks):** We will generally support proposals for a general authority to buy back shares provided these meet local governance standards. We may not support this authority where it exceeds a period of 18 months, where the potential effect of the buyback programme on executive remuneration is not made sufficiently clear, or where we oppose the strategy for long-term capital allocation.
- 23 Bundled resolutions:** We will generally recommend voting against a resolution relating to capital decisions, where the resolution has bundled more than one decision into a single resolution, denying investors the opportunity to make separate voting decisions on separate issues.
- 24 Virtual/electronic general meetings:** We will generally recommend voting against proposals allowing for the conveying of virtual-only shareholder meetings, unless such arrangements a temporary solution in response to restrictions on in-person gatherings. We may accept meetings to be convened in a 'hybrid' format – where shareholders have the option to join the meeting via an online platform or to join in person, provided all shareholder rights are protected or enhanced.

Audit

- 14 Ratification of external auditors:** We will generally oppose the ratification of external auditors and/or the payment of audit fees where we have concerns, including those relating to audit quality or independence, or controversies involving the audit partner or firm.

Protection of shareholder rights

- 15 Limitation of shareholder rights:** We will generally recommend voting against any limitation on shareholder rights or the transfer of authority from shareholders to directors and only support proposals which enhance shareholder rights or maximise shareholder value.
- 16 Related-party transactions:** We will generally only support related-party transactions (RPTs) which are made on terms equivalent to those that would prevail in an arm's length transaction, together with good supporting evidence. We expect RPTs to be overseen and reviewed by independent board directors with annual disclosure of significant RPTs.

Commercial transactions

- 25 Commercial transactions:** When considering our voting recommendation on a commercial transaction, we consider a range of factors in the context of seeking to protect and promote long-term, sustainable value. These include: consistency with strategy; risks and opportunities (the key risks and opportunities and the extent to which these appear to have been managed); and conflicts of interest. The underlying expectation is that due process is followed, with information made available to all shareholders.

Shareholder resolutions

- 26 Shareholder resolutions:** We support the selective use of shareholder resolutions as a useful tool for communicating investor concerns and priorities or the assertion of shareholder rights, and as a supplement to or escalation

of direct engagement with companies. We consider such resolutions on a case-by-case basis. When considering whether or not to support resolutions, we consider factors which help ensure that the proposal promotes long-term shareholders' interests, including: what the company is already doing or has committed to do; the nature and motivations of the filers, if known; and what potential impacts – positive and negative – the proposal could have on the company if implemented.

Climate change

27 Climate change: We will consider recommending voting against the chair, and other relevant directors or resolutions, at companies where we consider a company's response to the risks and opportunities presented by climate change to be materially misaligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement. Our assessment is informed by a range of indicators, including the Transition Pathway Initiative assessment and the Climate Action 100+ Benchmark.

28 Climate transition plans: On votes on climate transition plans, we will assess proposals against key criteria of (i) alignment to the Paris Goals and achieving 1.5C; (ii) the quality of the plan to deliver this; and (iii) the commitment of the company to achieving its stated goals.

Human rights


29 Human rights: Where we have significant concerns about a company's actions relating to human rights, we will consider voting against relevant directors, the discharge of management or other relevant resolutions. Our assessment is informed by a range of indicators, such as a failure to comply with legislation or internationally-recognised guidance (such as the UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights), or evidence that a company has caused or contributed to egregious, adverse human rights impacts or controversies and has failed to provide appropriate remedy.

Translation from principles to market-specific policies and final voting recommendations

Our Global Vote Guidelines and Regional vote policies are translated into resolution-specific guidelines for each market, these are shared with ISS, so it can conduct the initial research. We indicate in this guidance, in exhaustive detail for each applicable market and each proposal type, which voting recommendations we are expecting ISS' interpretation of our policy to output, as well as the accompanying rationales where this involves voting recommendations that go against management. We may also indicate under which circumstances we would expect a proposal to be brought to

our attention by means of a "refer". In such cases ISS' research will not provide an initial voting recommendation, and EOS engagement professionals will resolve the recommendation.


Figure 2 EOS Public and Internal Vote Policy Documentation



As we highlighted previously, our approach is to focus engagement resource on those meetings of greatest interest and materiality to its clients. Each year a list is compiled of the highest priority companies for which our engagers will manually review each agenda item before making vote recommendations. These are known as watchlist companies, comprising our engagement programme companies plus companies of particular interest/sensitivity or where our clients represent significant holdings (in absolute terms or as a percentage of the company's voting rights). The voting watchlist represents a majority of our voting clients' assets by value.

In principle, non-watchlist companies have their voting recommendations issued as per ISS' research conducted in line with EOS' (or the client's) policy guidelines without further manual intervention on the part of EOS, except for meetings with a refer recommendation as detailed above.

The following flow chart explains how this works in practice:



We review ISS’ timeliness, platform availability and other key indicators against our Service Level Agreement. EOS personnel liaise with their counterparts at ISS on a regular basis, informally and formally to conduct oversight, including a formal service review each year.

EOS maintains records of conversations it has had with companies, including material engagement objectives and company progress against this, and other stakeholders in our proprietary engagement management system. Notes pertaining to these conversations are provided to clients. Clients also retain the ability to access ISS benchmark research and the EOS policy research conducted by ISS, to assess these inputs and sources.

Clients are alerted via email of the voting recommendations, plus further updates which may be prompted by material factual errors or revisions to research, analysis or voting recommendations after research publication, including where engagement has caused us to revise a voting recommendation.

Escalation process

EOS operates an escalation process that ensures high-impact votes receive the appropriate attention and scrutiny.

Our process is for assigned engagement professionals to, in the first instance, escalate to a discussion with a senior engager if they are uncertain about the voting

recommendation. If unresolved, the recommendation is escalated to a discussion with an EOS director, especially where a voting recommendation is either potentially controversial or difficult to make. Colleagues are encouraged to escalate votes in these circumstances.

Input from issuers is sought as part of engagers’ decision-making process regarding votes on the EOS watchlist and this input is therefore included for consideration in escalation discussions. Issuers may often disagree with EOS’ vote recommendations and/or underlying policy positions, which EOS considers to be inevitable given the range of views that exist on different issues. Issuers can however make formal complaints should they believe proper process has not been followed (see section on Feedback management and complaints).

Quality

In addition to escalation, client feedback and post-season reviews, additional measures are in place to support the quality of voting recommendations. A daily process prioritises meetings which are due to be researched and assigns the meeting to the most appropriate professional. The process also picks up meetings that are approaching their deadlines to enable timely escalation and resolution. We further ensure that workloads are appropriately balanced so that each meeting receives the right amount of attention and engagement professionals are not overburdened. Engagement professionals receive an end-of-day overview of

their recommendations, to review the proposals supported and opposed, as well as the accompanying rationales. This enables recommendations to be corrected on the same day they were input, prior to distribution to clients.

Our voting process was assured annually by our external auditors under the AAF 01/06 standard and the results published in the Federated Hermes Limited Report on Internal Controls. The AAF 01/06 standard was replaced in 2020 with the new AAF 01/20 standard which no longer included the requirement to perform assurance over voting controls to ensure that all client ballots have a recommendation instruction submitted prior to the deadline where possible, and the recording of all instances with operational risk where a late recommendation is submitted as a result of these processes failing. However, with effect from 1 January 2023, we are reintroducing the external audit assurance over our voting controls and will annually published the results in the Federated Hermes Limited Report on Internal Controls.

Each day where an overdue vote is flagged, we consider this a control measure. The votes are tracked through to resolution by the EOS VEST team. This ensures we promptly make a vote recommendation and then alert clients manually via email as the automated alerts are not necessarily going to reach the clients before the ultimate vote deadlines on the ISS platform.

Should the control fail, an error and breach form is required to be completed and sent to the operational risk team when it is established that EOS is responsible for the late vote. If errors occur which lead to a late and subsequently rejected vote, VEST investigates and will employ process changes if necessary and/or work with the engagement team members to educate and prevent reoccurrence. For a few randomly selected days throughout the year, the auditors will ask us to show evidence that we have followed the process.

Additionally, we review the voting recommendation outcomes each year to determine what tweaks to the policies or voting approach might be required. From 2022, an additional quality control process was piloted: ex-post 'spot checks' of individual engagers' vote recommendations to ensure proper process was followed and to confirm that final recommendations were either in-line with the EOS policy or justified where they deviated (for example, on the basis of insights received through company engagement). This process will be scaled up from 2024 to a rate of one vote per engager, per quarter, and is intended to complement ex-ante escalation process which identifies potentially controversial or nuanced votes for further discussion and scrutiny, before final recommendations are made.

Due to our downstream position from ISS in the voting recommendation process cycle, we benefit from ISS' quality control processes on the information it has received, and the research provided to us. Occasionally we may spot errors or inconsistencies in ISS-provided research and/or the application of our policy which we raise with our designated

contact to be resolved. Inaccuracies in ISS' initial research or further updates to publicly available information may lead to EOS and its clients receiving revised research from ISS and for EOS to revise its recommendations. Clients are informed where new recommendations are issued. As our engagement professionals make their recommendations, they will further triangulate where necessary using their contacts with companies, company materials and other sources to help ensure the accuracy of information received.

Client customisation

Most EOS clients subscribe to the EOS voting guidelines as they value a like-minded and cost-effective approach to stewardship and agree with our methodology, expertise and track record. We offer a range of solutions that enable clients to further tailor our voting services to their needs.

We encourage clients to make full use of the alerting and reporting functionality of our voting platform to ensure they stay apprised of votes that are of interest and make it as easy as possible for clients to instruct votes that differ from our initial recommendations. Certain clients have defined bespoke client policies. These are operated at an additional cost (which may depend on the complexity and scope of the deviations requested). Clients who subscribe to a custom policy still have access to the standard EOS voting recommendations as well as our engagement insights. All clients of our voting recommendation service also have access to the ISS benchmark voting recommendations and associated research.

Policy development cycle

The primary policy development cycle for EOS voting guidelines is an annual process and runs in conjunction with the policy review process at ISS which informs its benchmark research. EOS considers changes made at ISS in view of resolution-level data for past voting seasons to consider what additional changes are warranted. This includes integrating feedback from clients and evolving best practice in each market. A further input is provided by our Engagement Plan which identifies thematic priorities for engagement, which can often be boosted by enhanced vigilance and potential escalation through our voting recommendations. EOS completes its major policy changes before the main voting season in each market. Once changes are applied, the policy is monitored to ensure it is having the desired effect and adjusted further where appropriate.

Feedback management and complaints Clients

EOS' client advisory board and client advisory council provide regular feedback on our performance and are an opportunity for clients to raise any concerns about our service. In addition to these mechanisms, clients are prompted to provide feedback each quarter and are offered the opportunity to

participate in engagement meetings (including those around a vote) where appropriate. We encourage clients to exchange thoughts with us about individual votes as we find this helps us to feed into our thinking and foster alignment with client interests. Clients' ability to connect with our engagement professionals about individual companies is a key differentiator of our service offering.

While we aim to offer the best service possible, we do recognise that there may be occasions where we will receive a complaint. We are committed to resolving complaints through a robust, documented procedure.

Issuers

As noted elsewhere, EOS engagers will seek to engage with issuers on the voting watchlist to inform them of any concerns and likely recommendations against management and will consider their views in reaching a final decision, including invoking the internal escalation process as needed. As part of this process, engagers will seek to clarify relevant facts and correct any potential factual errors. Issuers may often disagree with EOS' vote recommendations and/or underlying policy position, which EOS considers to be inevitable given the range of views held on different issues. EOS does seek to understand issuers' views both in vote season and through its ongoing engagement activities and such insights are factored in to its policy review cycle and updates to its Engagement Plan as appropriate.

Issuers are able to make a formal complaint where they believe that proper process has not been followed regarding voting recommendations. This should be directed via the same process as for clients (see following section: Complaints Process).

Further, issuers who wish to make a complaint about any signatory of the BPPG on the basis that they believe the signatory has breached one or more of the best practice principles may do so, following the BPPG complaints process. More information can be found here: [Complaints & Feedback | Best Practice Principles for Shareholder Voting Research \(bppgrp.info\)](#). Should issuers be dissatisfied and wish to escalate concerns further, they may directly contact the Independent Oversight Committee of the BBPG by emailing oversightchair@bppgrp.info.

Complaints process

All formal complaints should in the first instance be made in writing to the Chief Compliance Officer at Sixth Floor, 150 Cheapside, London EC2V 6ET.

The complaints handling procedure is applicable to all entities within Federated Hermes Limited, including associated undertakings and joint venture arrangements where Federated Hermes Limited has a controlling interest and to all members of staff across Federated Hermes Limited.

Principles:

The general principles governing the firm's policy are:

- **Complaint awareness:** Requirement to provide appropriate information to inform all clients of our complaint handling process.
- **Complaint handling:** Requirement to provide a written acknowledgement to the complainant within five working days of receiving their complaint and to seek to attempt to resolve all complaints within eight weeks of receipt.
- **Root cause analysis:** Business areas with complaint handling responsibility must have processes to carry out effective root cause analysis.

Timeliness

Our process aims to provide voting recommendations at the earliest possible opportunity once all the relevant materials (including the provisional EOS voting guideline recommendations published by ISS) are made available and relevant engagement has taken place. Recommendations should be issued no later than one working day prior to our earliest client cut-off. In some cases, we are unable to do so, primarily due to the availability of source information and research. On average, our recommendations are available 8 days prior to the cut-off. We make reasonable efforts to chase up outstanding research and challenge conservative deadlines set by custodians. We encourage engagement professionals to contact companies in good time. We issue client alerts to promptly notify clients of recommendations. From time to time, companies will contact us with feedback regarding our voting recommendation which we pass on to the relevant engagement professional to consider. Where time allows, this may trigger additional engagement or a revised voting recommendation which is then relayed to clients promptly.

Client and supplier understanding

EOS seeks always to act in its clients' best interests. Accordingly, EOS takes all reasonable steps to identify conflicts of interest and maintain and operate arrangements to minimise the possibility of such conflicts giving rise to a material risk of damage to the interests of our clients. To this end we have established a conflicts of interest approach which is detailed further under the section addressing Principle Two.

The service agreement between EOS and each client clarifies responsibilities and limitations of our service, including reliance on external parties and the constraints on timeliness indicated above. There are further limitations to our service such as:

Share blocking process

We apply a precautionary principle to ballots involving share blocking. To avoid affecting our clients' ability to trade, we ask each client to nominate an authorised person to approve such votes before the cut-off date. Once a vote is authorised, the underlying shares may be blocked and remain unavailable for trading until after the meeting date.

Special requirements and Powers of Attorney

We support clients by passing on special requirements without undue delay where we are made aware of them. Our clients are responsible for ensuring valid powers of attorney are in place, and an annual reminder is provided to clients.

Bondholder meetings and private/unlisted companies

Bondholder meetings and meetings of private/unlisted companies are not within the scope of our voting recommendation service. Where we are made aware of such events, we bring these to the attention of our clients as a prompt for them to instruct these events.

Client disclosure facilitation

We recognise that institutional investors may be subject to disclosure requirements of the use of our services. We support clients, upon their request, with disclosure relating to their discharge of stewardship responsibilities. Many voting clients will disclose their voting behaviour on their own website, and we provide vote disclosure files for this purpose as standard at no extra cost. We further assist PRI signatory clients with inputs they can use to support their own reporting.

Principle Two: Conflicts-of-Interest Management⁸

EOS seeks always to act in its clients' best interests. Accordingly, the firm takes all reasonable steps to identify actual or potential conflicts of interest and maintain and operate arrangements to minimise the possibility of such conflicts giving rise to a material risk of damage to the interests of our clients. We are proud to have a strong culture of responsibility and we aspire both to maintain and further foster this client-focussed culture.

EOS does not offer consultancy services to issuers which may be subject to our engagement or voting recommendations. Our clients are like-minded long-term investors which encourages alignment of EOS' interests with its clients. When onboarding prospects, we consider this alignment and we will not conduct business with clients whose values and philosophy are fundamentally at odds with our guiding purpose.

Federated Hermes has a policy regarding its Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, which is part of the mandatory Compliance induction process and annual refresher training. This policy covers various aspects of conduct including managing conflicts of interest and applies to all employees across the group, including at EOS.

Further, the Federated Hermes Pledge expresses the commitment of each member of staff to always put the interests of our clients and their beneficiaries first and in so doing manage conflicts of interest fairly between all affected parties. We also seek to align with international good practice on managing and reporting conflicts of interest.

Across the firm we take all reasonable steps to identify conflicts of interest between: Federated Hermes, including its managers, employees and appointed representatives or any person with a relevant direct or indirect link to them, and our clients as a body; or any one client of Federated Hermes and the client body.

Potential conflicts of interest Employee share trading

Federated Hermes Limited has a personal account dealing policy that covers personal trading within the firm.

Compliance approval is required for all relevant trades. All employees must seek pre-clearance through the Compliance Platform. All reportable instruments must be held for a minimum of 60 days. Employees also provide an initial holdings report within seven days of joining, an annual holdings report and must submit a contract note within seven days of a trade approval through the Compliance Platform. Transactions in Federated Hermes, Inc. stocks on margin, short selling, short-term basis of less than six months and during the 'blackout' period are not permitted.

Ownership

One potential conflict which has been identified for the group relates to our ownership structure. EOS is owned by Federated Hermes Limited which in turn is owned by Federated Hermes Inc.. We have internal procedures to regulate the processes and restrict the flow of information among, and within, business units so that activities are carried out with the appropriate level of independence.

From 2023, EOS policy is not to provide vote recommendations for any publicly-listed investment trusts or funds owned by Federated Hermes Inc. or Federated Hermes Inc. itself, but rather to pass through the ISS benchmark recommendations to clients, to avoid any potential conflicts.

Clients and prospects

EOS provides services not only to Federated Hermes, but also to other institutional investors, including pension funds sponsored by corporations, governments and other organisations, as well as fund manager clients. These services include voting and engagement with companies in which Federated Hermes' clients are equity shareholders and/or bond investors.

As a result, the following real or perceived conflicts may arise:

- We may provide voting recommendations pertaining to a company which is the sponsor of one of our pension fund clients or is a company within the same group as one of our clients or prospects
- We may provide voting recommendation with respect to a corporate transaction, the outcome of which would benefit one client or prospect more than another
- We may engage with and provide voting recommendations relating to a company in which certain clients or prospects are equity holders and others are bond holders
- We may hold meetings with companies for the dual purpose of delivering both our fund management and stewardship services
- We may otherwise act on behalf of clients who have differing interests in the outcome of our activities

Where we provide voting recommendations relating to sponsors of, or in the same group as our clients, we are careful to protect and pursue the interests of all of our clients by seeking to enhance or protect the long-term value of the companies concerned. In the first instance, we make clear to all pension fund clients with corporate sponsors that we will treat their sponsoring parent or associated companies in the same way as any other company. In addition, we ensure that in such situations the relevant client relationship director or manager within Federated Hermes Limited including EOS, is not making the voting recommendation to clients. This same approach would hold true with respect to any engagement with a company with whom we, our owners or our clients, have a strong commercial relationship, including suppliers.

⁸ This section draws on the Stewardship Conflicts of Interest Policy from the international business of Federated Hermes which is published on our website: <https://www.hermes-investment.com/policies-and-disclosures/>

We are a relatively small firm, and engagers are exposed to clients on a frequent basis. It is not practicable for us to fully segregate our voting recommendation service from the client servicing function, and engagers will generally be aware of the identity of our clients and their sponsors (who may be subjects of our voting recommendation). We do make efforts to avoid inadvertent influence or bias from sponsoring companies by following our standard engagement and voting protocols – including escalating manual votes relating to sponsoring companies, and only communicating voting recommendations to the client once they are final.

EOS has a robust process in place to identify actual or potential conflicts of interests and business relationships that may influence the preparation of our research, advice or voting recommendations. In such instances we provide clients with a client alert detailing the relationship as well as steps taken to eliminate, mitigate or manage the actual/potential conflicts of interests at the same time as delivering the voting recommendation. Clients may further be provided with a copy of the research provided by a non-conflicted proxy advisor, to aid transparency.

We would acknowledge situations where we become aware that one of our clients is a shareholder proponent or a party to a proxy contest and seek to inform clients with an alert.

Voting recommendations are made and provided by our stewardship team in line with client-agreed policies. We have well-established publicly disclosed voting principles and based upon these and the judgements reached through engagement with individual companies we provide voting recommendations to our stewardship voting clients.

There may be occasions where one of our clients seeks to influence the voting advice we give to other institutional clients. In such circumstances there would be director-level involvement and an objective judgement reached based upon what we believe to be in the best long-term interest of our clients as a body. All clients retain full discretion over their final voting decision. Clients, and internal investment teams, may at times have different immediate interests in the outcome of certain corporate activities, most notably, in the result of a takeover bid involving two public companies.

When making our recommendations on such transactions, we consider a range of factors in the context of seeking to protect and promote long-term, sustainable value. These include: consistency with strategy; risks and opportunities (the key risks and opportunities and the extent to which these appear to have been managed); conflicts of interest; and price. We may make different recommendations to holders on each side of the transaction depending on what we believe best serves their long-term interests. There may also be instances where certain clients have holdings on both sides of the transaction and may have conflicting interests.

In assessing price, we will draw on analysis from the EOS team and other external sources, and seek independent input from a Federated Hermes investment team colleague with expertise in analysing company value if needed. Input from investment team colleagues will be considered alongside other inputs with EOS retaining discretion over the final recommendation, in line with the long-term interests of EOS clients. Where concerns about price are raised by a Federated Hermes investment team rather than an external source or from EOS' engagement or analysis, based on their insights into one or more of the companies involved, and the concern appears to be biased or unrealistic, we will seek additional inputs. We make clear to our clients that we will at times seek input from investment team colleagues as one of several inputs and will communicate to clients where this has been done for a particular transaction. As with all voting recommendations, clients retain the final decision on voting. On the rare occasion that the investment team and EOS disagree on the appropriate voting action, the matter is logged and escalated as described in the next section.

Our policies seek to avoid any potential conflicts for individual Federated Hermes staff members arising from engagements with companies in which they have personal investments or some material personal relationship with a relevant individual. When any staff member recognises a potential conflict of interest with a company in which they are engaging, he or she must raise this with their line manager. Where a staff member has a significant personal connection with a company – such as having been employed by the company within the last 24 months, or being related to an employee of the company in a position of influence – he or she is required to make this known and is not permitted to be involved in any relevant stewardship activities, including making voting recommendations.

Conflicts of interest EOS does not have

EOS does not offer consultancy services to issuers which may be subject to our engagement or voting recommendations.

EOS does not provide voting recommendations to its clients on Federated Hermes Inc. or any listed investment trusts, funds or other entities within the group to its clients.

Recording and escalation

We maintain a register of instances of conflicts or potential conflicts as they arise. In those limited circumstances where a conflict over our approach to voting recommendations (aside from that directed by client-specific policies) arises which is not able to be resolved, an EOS director in the manner set out above will escalate it to an escalation group which reports to an independent sub-committee of the board of Federated Hermes Limited. The escalation group comprises the heads of investment, responsibility, client relations, compliance and EOS. The group is guided in reaching its decisions by our

mission to deliver long-term holistic returns, our published Responsible Ownership Principles, voting policies and other appropriate industry-endorsed guidance. If there is no majority view of the group, then the CEO of Federated Hermes Limited will make a final decision. All such instances would be documented and reported to the Risk, Compliance and Financial Crime Committee (RCFE) - a sub-committee of the Senior Management Team. It is expected that votes cast by the investment teams of Federated Hermes Limited would be consistent with the voting recommendations we provide to EOS' voting service clients other than in limited circumstances.

We review the Stewardship Conflicts of Interest Policy⁹ annually to ensure it adequately reflects the types of conflicts that may arise so that we can ensure that they are appropriately managed and as far as is possible, mitigated. The Policy is publicly available on our website.

Conflicts of interest approach in practice

Our policy on conflicts may be best understood by considering its impact in practice. Our EOS conflicts of interest register contains a description of stewardship conflicts, what mitigation procedure and controls were put in place, whether it was then reported to the escalation group if necessary and any follow-up actions and conclusions. It is reviewed by senior management on a regular basis. The following are conflicts which we identified and managed in 2021 and 2022:

Voting recommendation difference with an investment team

EOS' initial voting recommendation for a company was against the remuneration report due to a notable increase in pay for the CEO, in excess of EOS' typical policy limits. The relevant investment team of Federated Hermes Limited indicated that it would prefer to support the increase. The company was not included in EOS' active engagement

programme and so the company and its CEO were better known to the investment team, which had conducted deeper analysis on and engagement with the company on the basis of its holding. The investment team argued that the increase was justified on the basis of performance. The decision was escalated first to an EOS director, then to the EOS head of stewardship, and finally to the escalation group. After reviewing the arguments and relevant data, the decision was taken to support the pay increase to the CEO.

Potential conflict due to client sponsor

EOS gave vote recommendations for the agenda items at the 2022 AGM of a banking group. EOS has a number of clients within the group (e.g. a pension fund and wealth management arm) and so the vote recommendations were escalated to an EOS director and then to the Head of Responsibility who chairs the escalation group. It was noted that engagers did not believe they had been influenced by the clients, who had not contacted them about the vote and had already voted their own ballots (abstaining on all items).

⁹ <https://www.hermes-investment.com/policies-and-disclosures/>

Principle Three: Communications Policy

Dialogue with issuers, shareholder proponents and other stakeholders

EOS actively seeks dialogue with issuers, shareholder proponents and other stakeholders – this is a key feature of our approach. We communicate the outcomes of these dialogues to clients through our client reporting portal, EOSi, as well as through our regular alerting and reporting.

We do not proactively furnish all issuers with our voting recommendations ahead of the meeting. Our team is not resourced to be able to commit to this and voting recommendations are primarily provided for the benefit of our clients. Where we vote or recommend voting against or abstaining on management resolutions or support shareholder resolutions opposed by management, we normally contact companies within our engagement programme or in which our clients have a significant stake (watchlist companies), before the meeting. Any resultant dialogue helps us to take a fully informed view and can lead us to change our intended vote or voting recommendation. If in our final recommendations we oppose management recommendations on any matter, we will endeavour to inform these companies of our reasons, and we are reviewing options to expand our communication with issuers around the vote even further, aligning with evolving regulatory requirements in the markets where we operate. A quarter in arrears, voting recommendations are made public through the library page of our website.

Stewardship activities are exercised with the aim of influencing the company's behaviour. However, these activities are not carried out with the intention to obtain non-public information, nor is information obtained intended to manipulate the market.

In the case that material non-public information is obtained through stewardship activities, our compliance department is informed and an information barrier is created for insiders until the information is publicly disseminated. During the application of the information barrier, stewardship professionals are not allowed to act upon or share the non-public material information. The EOS proprietary engagement management system, requires that engagement professionals certify that they have either not received any inside information whilst conducting each engagement interaction or that they have received inside information and followed the applicable compliance procedure.

Dialogue with media and the public

We generally prefer not to take a public route when seeking change at companies. In our experience, working constructively with boards and management in private is most effective in achieving positive change.

However, on some occasions, when we think it is helpful, we may use the media and other public forums to drive change. If we speak to the media, our comments should come as no surprise to the company because we have either already made the same points to the company or our position on major issues is well-known through the principles and policies we have publicly set out. This activity is subject to our corporate communications policy and designated engagement professionals receive targeted training to manage media contact, including managing risks including those related to defamation, market abuse, and material non-public information. Our policy is to provide our voting recommendations to clients before disseminating recommendations to a wider audience in the rare cases where we would seek to publish these ahead of a meeting.

Appendix: Changes to EOS practices and disclosures vs. 2022

For reference, this table summarises changes to EOS practices and/or disclosures since its previous BPP compliance statement (March 2022) and the rationale for these, including whether/how these relate to feedback provided by the BPP Oversight Committee on its previous statement.

Change	Rationale
<p>Updates to EOS' public vote documentation (page 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Transitioning from Corporate Governance Principles for c.22 markets to Regional vote policies for Europe and Australia and North America, with equivalent Regional vote policies for Asia and global emerging markets planned for 2024. ● Corresponding creation of Global Corporate Governance Principles to expand on governance expectations beyond those with direct implications (as in Regional vote policies). 	<p>Changes intended to clarify and improve public documentation, in particular, to provide more specific information on vote guidelines for issuers.</p>
<p>Updates to EOS Global Proxy Voting Guidelines (page 6).</p>	<p>Small changes following annual policy review process.</p>
<p>Additional quality control 'spot check' of votes to move from pilot (2023) to established process (2024) (page 10).</p>	<p>Improvement identified by EOS' ongoing internal reviews and audit recommendations.</p>
<p>EOS changed its policy on providing vote recommendations on its parent company Federated Hermes Inc. any listed entities within the group (page 13) and now does not provide voting recommendations, but passes through ISS benchmark research to clients.</p> <p>Previously, EOS provided vote recommendations to clients but with processes in place to avoid conflicts of interest: a senior engager provided vote recommendations as they would for any entity, without regard to the relationship and with escalation to confirm no undue influence.</p>	<p>Although no conflicts were assessed to have occurred, this policy was reviewed and updated as part of continually seeking higher standards of governance.</p>
<p>More descriptive disclosure included on various points, including regarding the nature of the qualitative data on EOS' proprietary engagement management system (page 9) and the conflicts which EOS is not subject to (page 14).</p>	<p>Suggested in feedback by the BPP oversight committee.</p>
<p>Conflicts of interest in practice: new examples provided from 2021 and 2022 (page 15).</p>	<p>Providing up to date disclosures and following feedback from the BPP oversight committee that examples in previous statement were outdated.</p>

Federated Hermes

Federated Hermes is a global leader in active, responsible investing.

Guided by our conviction that responsible investing is the best way to create long-term wealth, we provide specialised capabilities across equity, fixed income and private markets, multi-asset and liquidity management strategies, and world-leading stewardship.

Our goals are to help people invest and retire better, to help clients achieve better risk-adjusted returns and, where possible, to contribute to positive outcomes that benefit the wider world.

All activities previously carried out by Hermes Investment Management are now undertaken by Federated Hermes Limited (or one of its subsidiaries). We still offer the same distinct investment propositions and pioneering responsible investment and stewardship services for which we are renowned – in addition to important strategies from the entire group.

Our investment and stewardship capabilities:

- **Active equities:** global and regional
- **Fixed income:** across regions, sectors and the yield curve
- **Liquidity:** solutions driven by four decades of experience
- **Private markets:** real estate, infrastructure, private equity and debt
- **Stewardship:** corporate engagement, proxy voting, policy advocacy

Why EOS?

EOS enables institutional shareholders around the world to meet their fiduciary responsibilities and become active owners of their assets. EOS is based on the premise that companies with informed and involved investors are more likely to achieve superior long-term performance than those without.

For more information, visit www.hermes-investment.com or connect with us on social media:



For professional investors only. Hermes Equity Ownership Services ("EOS") does not carry out any regulated activities. This document is for information purposes only. It pays no regard to any specific investment objectives, financial situation or particular needs of any specific recipient. EOS and Hermes Stewardship North America Inc. ("HSNA") do not provide investment advice and no action should be taken or omitted to be taken in reliance upon information in this document. Any opinions expressed may change. This document may include a list of clients. Please note that inclusion on this list should not be construed as an endorsement of EOS' or HSNA's services. EOS has its registered office at Sixth Floor, 150 Cheapside, London EC2V 6ET. HSNA's principal office is at 1001 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222-3779. Telephone calls will be recorded for training and monitoring purposes. EOS001147 0015208 06/22