



## I.2. PROXY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES – RETAIL

<b>Applicable to</b>	Retail Accounts
<b>Risk Addressed by Policy</b>	breach of fiduciary duty to client under Investment Advisers Act of 1940 by placing Invesco personal interests ahead of client best economic interests in voting proxies
<b>Relevant Law and Other Sources</b>	Investment Advisers Act of 1940
<b>Last Tested Date</b>	
<b>Policy/Procedure Owner</b>	Advisory Compliance
<b>Policy Approver</b>	Fund Board
<b>Approved/Adopted Date</b>	January 1, 2010

The following policies and procedures apply to certain funds and other accounts managed by Invesco Advisers, Inc. ("Invesco").

### A. POLICY STATEMENT

#### Introduction

#### Our Belief

The Invesco Funds Boards of Trustees and Invesco's investment professionals expect a high standard of corporate governance from the companies in our portfolios so that Invesco may fulfill its fiduciary obligation to our fund shareholders and other account holders. Well governed companies are characterized by a primary focus on the interests of shareholders, accountable boards of directors, ample transparency in financial disclosure, performance-driven cultures and appropriate consideration of all stakeholders. Invesco believes well governed companies create greater shareholder wealth over the long term than poorly governed companies, so we endeavor to vote in a manner that increases the value of our investments and fosters good governance within our portfolio companies.

In determining how to vote proxy issues, Invesco considers the probable business consequences of each issue and votes in a manner designed to protect and enhance fund shareholders' and other account holders' interests. Our voting decisions are intended to enhance each company's total shareholder value over Invesco's typical investment horizon.

Proxy voting is an integral part of Invesco's investment process. We believe that the right to vote proxies should be managed with the same care as all other elements of the investment process. The objective of Invesco's proxy-voting activity is to promote good governance and advance the economic interests of our clients. At no time will Invesco exercise its voting power to advance its own

commercial interests, to pursue a social or political cause that is unrelated to our clients' economic interests, or to favor a particular client or business relationship to the detriment of others.

## **B. OPERATING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBLE PARTIES**

---

### **Proxy administration**

The Invesco Retail Proxy Committee (the "Proxy Committee") consists of members representing Invesco's Investments, Legal and Compliance departments. Invesco's Proxy Voting Guidelines (the "Guidelines") are revised annually by the Proxy Committee, and are approved by the Invesco Funds Boards of Trustees. The Proxy Committee implements the Guidelines and oversees proxy voting.

The Proxy Committee has retained outside experts to assist with the analysis and voting of proxy issues. In addition to the advice offered by these experts, Invesco uses information gathered from our own research, company managements, Invesco's portfolio managers and outside shareholder groups to reach our voting decisions.

Generally speaking, Invesco's investment-research process leads us to invest in companies led by management teams we believe have the ability to conceive and execute strategies to outperform their competitors. We select companies for investment based in large part on our assessment of their management teams' ability to create shareholder wealth. Therefore, in formulating our proxy-voting decisions, Invesco gives proper consideration to the recommendations of a company's Board of Directors.

---

### **Important principles underlying the Invesco Proxy Voting Guidelines**

#### **I. Accountability**

Management teams of companies are accountable to their boards of directors, and directors of publicly held companies are accountable to their shareholders. Invesco endeavors to vote the proxies of its portfolio companies in a manner that will reinforce the notion of a board's accountability to its shareholders. Consequently, Invesco votes against any actions that would impair the rights of shareholders or would reduce shareholders' influence over the board or over management.

The following are specific voting issues that illustrate how Invesco applies this principle of accountability.

- *Elections of directors.* In uncontested director elections for companies that do not have a controlling shareholder, Invesco votes in favor of slates if they are comprised of at least a majority of independent directors and if the boards' key committees are fully independent. Key committees include the Audit, Compensation and Governance or Nominating Committees. Invesco's standard of independence excludes directors who, in addition to the directorship, have any material business or family relationships with the companies they serve.

Contested director elections are evaluated on a case-by-case basis and are decided within the context of Invesco's investment thesis on a company.

- *Director performance.* Invesco withholds votes from directors who exhibit a lack of accountability to shareholders, either through their level of attendance at meetings or by enacting egregious corporate-governance or other policies. In cases of material financial restatements, accounting fraud, habitually late filings, adopting shareholder rights plan ("poison pills") without shareholder approval, or other areas of poor performance, Invesco may withhold votes from some or all of a company's directors. In situations where directors' performance is a concern, Invesco may also support shareholder proposals to take corrective actions such as so-called "clawback" provisions.
- *Auditors and Audit Committee members.* Invesco believes a company's Audit Committee has a high degree of responsibility to shareholders in matters of financial disclosure, integrity of the financial statements and effectiveness of a company's internal controls. Independence, experience and financial expertise are critical elements of a well-functioning Audit Committee. When electing directors who are members of a company's Audit Committee, or when ratifying a company's auditors, Invesco considers the past performance of the Committee and holds its members accountable for the quality of the company's financial statements and reports.
- *Majority standard in director elections.* The right to elect directors is the single most important mechanism shareholders have to promote accountability. Invesco supports the nascent effort to reform the U.S. convention of electing directors, and votes in favor of proposals to elect directors by a majority vote.
- *Classified boards.* Invesco supports proposals to elect directors annually instead of electing them to staggered multi-year terms because annual elections increase a board's level of accountability to its shareholders.
- *Supermajority voting requirements.* Unless proscribed by law in the state of incorporation, Invesco votes against actions that would impose any supermajority voting requirement, and supports actions to dismantle existing supermajority requirements.
- *Responsiveness.* Invesco withholds votes from directors who do not adequately respond to shareholder proposals that were approved by a majority of votes cast the prior year.
- *Cumulative voting.* The practice of cumulative voting can enable minority shareholders to have representation on a company's board. Invesco supports proposals to institute the practice of cumulative voting at companies whose overall corporate-governance standards indicate a particular need to protect the interests of minority shareholders.

- *Shareholder access.* On business matters with potential financial consequences, Invesco votes in favor of proposals that would increase shareholders' opportunities to express their views to boards of directors, proposals that would lower barriers to shareholder action and proposals to promote the adoption of generally accepted best practices in corporate governance.

## **II. Incentives**

Invesco believes properly constructed compensation plans that include equity ownership are effective in creating incentives that induce managements and employees of our portfolio companies to create greater shareholder wealth. Invesco supports equity compensation plans that promote the proper alignment of incentives, and votes against plans that are overly dilutive to existing shareholders, plans that contain objectionable structural features, and plans that appear likely to reduce the value of an account's investment.

Following are specific voting issues that illustrate how Invesco evaluates incentive plans.

- *Executive compensation.* Invesco evaluates compensation plans for executives within the context of the company's performance under the executives' tenure. Invesco believes independent compensation committees are best positioned to craft executive-compensation plans that are suitable for their company-specific circumstances. We view the election of those independent compensation committee members as the appropriate mechanism for shareholders to express their approval or disapproval of a company's compensation practices. Therefore, Invesco generally does not support shareholder proposals to limit or eliminate certain forms of executive compensation. In the interest of reinforcing the notion of a compensation committee's accountability to shareholders, Invesco supports proposals requesting that companies subject each year's compensation record to an advisory shareholder vote, or so-called "say on pay" proposals.
- *Equity-based compensation plans.* When voting to approve or reject equity-based compensation plans, Invesco compares the total estimated cost of the plans, including stock options and restricted stock, against a carefully selected peer group and uses multiple performance metrics that help us determine whether the incentive structures in place are creating genuine shareholder wealth. Regardless of a plan's estimated cost relative to its peer group, Invesco votes against plans that contain structural features that would impair the alignment of incentives between shareholders and management. Such features include the ability to reprice or reload options without shareholder approval, the ability to issue options below the stock's current market price, or the ability to automatically replenish shares without shareholder approval.

- *Employee stock-purchase plans.* Invesco supports employee stock-purchase plans that are reasonably designed to provide proper incentives to a broad base of employees, provided that the price at which employees may acquire stock is at most a 15 percent discount from the market price.
- *Severance agreements.* Invesco generally votes in favor of proposals requiring advisory shareholder ratification of executives' severance agreements. However, we oppose proposals requiring such agreements to be ratified by shareholders in advance of their adoption.

### **III. Capitalization**

Examples of management proposals related to a company's capital structure include authorizing or issuing additional equity capital, repurchasing outstanding stock, or enacting a stock split or reverse stock split. On requests for additional capital stock, Invesco analyzes the company's stated reasons for the request. Except where the request could adversely affect the fund's ownership stake or voting rights, Invesco generally supports a board's decisions on its needs for additional capital stock. Some capitalization proposals require a case-by-case analysis within the context of Invesco's investment thesis on a company. Examples of such proposals include authorizing common or preferred stock with special voting rights, or issuing additional stock in connection with an acquisition.

### **IV. Mergers, Acquisitions and Other Corporate Actions**

Issuers occasionally require shareholder approval to engage in certain corporate actions such as mergers, acquisitions, name changes, dissolutions, reorganizations, divestitures and reincorporations. Invesco analyzes these proposals within the context of our investment thesis on the company, and determines its vote on a case-by-case basis.

### **V. Anti-Takeover Measures**

Practices designed to protect a company from unsolicited bids can adversely affect shareholder value and voting rights, and they create conflicts of interests among directors, management and shareholders. Except under special issuer-specific circumstances, Invesco votes to reduce or eliminate such measures. These measures include adopting or renewing "poison pills", requiring supermajority voting on certain corporate actions, classifying the election of directors instead of electing each director to an annual term, or creating separate classes of common or preferred stock with special voting rights. Invesco generally votes against management proposals to impose these types of measures, and generally votes for shareholder proposals designed to reduce such measures. Invesco supports shareholder proposals directing companies to subject their anti-takeover provisions to a shareholder vote.

### **VI. Shareholder Proposals on Corporate Governance**

Invesco generally votes for shareholder proposals that are designed to protect shareholder rights if a company's corporate-governance standards indicate that such additional protections are warranted.

## **VII. Shareholder Proposals on Social Responsibility**

The potential costs and economic benefits of shareholder proposals seeking to amend a company's practices for social reasons are difficult to assess. Analyzing the costs and economic benefits of these proposals is highly subjective and does not fit readily within our framework of voting to create greater shareholder wealth over Invesco's typical investment horizon. Therefore, Invesco abstains from voting on shareholder proposals deemed to be of a purely social, political or moral nature.

## **VIII. Routine Business Matters**

Routine business matters rarely have a potentially material effect on the economic prospects of fund holdings, so we generally support the board's discretion on these items. However, Invesco votes against proposals where there is insufficient information to make a decision about the nature of the proposal. Similarly, Invesco votes against proposals to conduct other unidentified business at shareholder meetings.

---

### **Summary**

These Guidelines provide an important framework for making proxy-voting decisions, and should give fund shareholders and other account holders insight into the factors driving Invesco's decisions. The Guidelines cannot address all potential proxy issues, however. Decisions on specific issues must be made within the context of these Guidelines and within the context of the investment thesis of the funds and other accounts that own the company's stock. Where a different investment thesis is held by portfolio managers who may hold stocks in common, Invesco may vote the shares held on a fund-by-fund or account-by-account basis.

---

### **Exceptions**

In certain circumstances, Invesco may refrain from voting where the economic cost of voting a company's proxy exceeds any anticipated benefits of that proxy proposal.

#### **Share-lending programs**

One reason that some portion of Invesco's position in a particular security might not be voted is the securities lending program. When securities are out on loan and earning fees for the lending fund, they are transferred into the borrower's name. Any proxies during the period of the loan are voted by the borrower. The lending fund would have to terminate the loan to vote the company's proxy, an action that is not generally in the best economic interest of fund shareholders. However, whenever Invesco determines that the benefit to shareholders or other account holders of voting a particular proxy outweighs the revenue lost by terminating the loan, we recall the securities for the purpose of voting the fund's full position.

#### **"Share-blocking"**

Another example of a situation where Invesco may be unable to vote is in countries where the exercise of voting rights requires the fund to submit to short-term trading restrictions, a practice known as "share-blocking." Invesco generally

refrains from voting proxies in share-blocking countries unless the portfolio manager determines that the benefit to fund shareholders and other account holders of voting a specific proxy outweighs the fund's or other account's temporary inability to sell the security.

### **International constraints**

An additional concern that sometimes precludes our voting non-U.S. proxies is our inability to receive proxy materials with enough time and enough information to make a voting decision. In the great majority of instances, however, we are able to vote non-U.S. proxies successfully. It is important to note that Invesco makes voting decisions for non-U.S. issuers using these Guidelines as our framework, but also takes into account the corporate-governance standards, regulatory environment and generally accepted best practices of the local market.

### **Exceptions to these Guidelines**

Invesco retains the flexibility to accommodate company-specific situations where strictly adhering to the Guidelines would lead to a vote that the Proxy Committee deems not to be in the best interest of the funds' shareholders and other account holders. In these situations, the Proxy Committee will vote the proxy in the manner deemed to be in the best interest of the funds' shareholders and other account holders, and will promptly inform the funds' Boards of Trustees of such vote and the circumstances surrounding it.

---

## **Resolving potential conflicts of interest**

A potential conflict of interest arises when Invesco votes a proxy for an issuer with which it also maintains a material business relationship. Examples could include issuers that are distributors of Invesco's products, or issuers that employ Invesco to manage portions of their retirement plans or treasury accounts. Invesco reviews each proxy proposal to assess the extent, if any, to which there may be a material conflict between the interests of the fund shareholders or other account holders and Invesco.

Invesco takes reasonable measures to determine whether a potential conflict may exist. A potential conflict is deemed to exist only if one or more of the Proxy Committee members actually knew or should have known of the potential conflict.

If a material potential conflict is deemed to exist, Invesco may resolve the potential conflict in one of the following ways: (1) if the proposal that gives rise to the potential conflict is specifically addressed by the Guidelines, Invesco may vote the proxy in accordance with the predetermined Guidelines; (2) Invesco may engage an independent third party to determine how the proxy should be voted; or (3) Invesco may establish an ethical wall or other informational barrier between the persons involved in the potential conflict and the persons making the proxy-voting decision in order to insulate the potential conflict from the decision makers.

Because the Guidelines are pre-determined and crafted to be in the best economic interest of shareholders and other account holders, applying the Guidelines to vote client proxies should, in most instances, adequately resolve any potential conflict of

interest. As an additional safeguard against potential conflicts, persons from Invesco's marketing, distribution and other customer-facing functions are precluded from becoming members of the Proxy Committee.

On a quarterly basis, the Invesco Funds Boards of Trustees review a report from Invesco's Internal Compliance Controls Committee. The report contains a list of all known material business relationships that Invesco maintains with publicly traded issuers. That list is cross-referenced with the list of proxies voted over the period. If there are any instances where Invesco's voting pattern on the proxies of its material business partners is inconsistent with its voting pattern on all other issuers, they are brought before the Trustees and explained by the Chairman of the Proxy Committee.

*Personal conflicts of interest.* If any member of the Proxy Committee has a personal conflict of interest with respect to a company or an issue presented for voting, that Proxy Committee member will inform the Proxy Committee of such conflict and will abstain from voting on that company or issue.

*Funds of funds.* Some Invesco Funds offering diversified asset allocation within one investment vehicle own shares in other Invesco Funds. A potential conflict of interest could arise if an underlying Invesco Fund has a shareholder meeting with any proxy issues to be voted on, because Invesco's asset-allocation funds or target-maturity funds may be large shareholders of the underlying fund. In order to avoid any potential for a conflict, the asset-allocation funds and target maturity funds vote their shares in the same proportion as the votes of the external shareholders of the underlying fund.

### **C. RECORDKEEPING**

Records are maintained in accordance with Invesco's Recordkeeping Policy.

---

### **Policies and Vote Disclosure**

A copy of these Guidelines and the voting record of each Invesco Fund are available on our web site, [www.invesco.com](http://www.invesco.com). In accordance with Securities and Exchange Commission regulations, all funds file a record of all proxy-voting activity for the prior 12 months ending June 30th. That filing is made on or before August 31st of each year.