



## PROXY VOTING GUIDELINES

<b>Applicable to</b>	All Advisory Clients, including the Invesco Funds
<b>Risk Addressed by the Guidelines</b>	Breach of fiduciary duty to client under Investment Advisers Act of 1940 by placing Invesco's interests ahead of client's best interests in voting proxies
<b>Relevant Law and Other Sources</b>	U.S. Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended
<b>Last</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised <b>by Compliance for Accuracy</b>	April 19, 2016
<b>Guideline Owner</b>	U.S. Compliance and Legal
<b>Policy Approver</b>	Invesco Advisers, Inc., Invesco Funds Board
<b>Approved/Adopted Date</b>	May 3-4, 2016

The following guidelines apply to all institutional and retail funds and accounts that have explicitly authorized Invesco Advisers, Inc. ("Invesco") to vote proxies associated with securities held on their behalf (collectively, "Clients").

### A. INTRODUCTION

---

Invesco Ltd. ("IVZ"), the ultimate parent company of Invesco, has adopted a global policy statement on corporate governance and proxy voting (the "Invesco Global Proxy Policy"). The policy describes IVZ's views on governance matters and the proxy administration and governance approach. Invesco votes proxies by using the framework and procedures set forth in the Invesco Global Proxy Policy, while maintaining the Invesco-specific guidelines described below.

### B. PROXY VOTING OVERSIGHT: THE MUTUAL FUNDS' BOARD OF TRUSTEES

---

In addition to the Global Invesco Proxy Advisory Committee, the Invesco mutual funds' board of trustees provides oversight of the proxy process through quarterly reporting and an annual in-person presentation by Invesco's Global Head of Proxy Governance and Responsible Investment.

## **C. USE OF THIRD PARTY PROXY ADVISORY SERVICES**

---

Invesco has direct access to third-party proxy advisory analyses and recommendations (currently provided by Glass Lewis (“GL”) and Institutional Shareholder Services, Inc. (“ISS”)), among other research tools, and uses the information gleaned from those sources to make independent voting decisions.

Invesco’s proxy administration team performs extensive initial and ongoing due diligence on the proxy advisory firms that it engages. When deemed appropriate, representatives from the proxy advisory firms are asked to deliver updates directly to the mutual funds’ board of trustees. Invesco conducts semi-annual, in-person policy roundtables with key heads of research from ISS and GL to ensure transparency, dialogue and engagement with the firms. These meetings provide Invesco with an opportunity to assess the firms’ capabilities, conflicts of interest and service levels, as well as provide investment professionals with direct insight into the advisory firms’ stances on key governance and proxy topics and their policy framework/methodologies. Invesco’s proxy administration team also reviews the annual SSAE 16 reports for, and the periodic proxy guideline updates published by, each proxy advisory firm to ensure that their guidelines remain consistent with Invesco’s policies and procedures. Furthermore, each proxy advisory firm completes an annual due diligence questionnaire submitted by Invesco, and Invesco conducts on-site due diligence at each firm, in part to discuss their responses to the questionnaire.

If Invesco becomes aware of any material inaccuracies in the information provided by ISS or GL, Invesco’s proxy administration team will investigate the matter to determine the cause, evaluate the adequacy of the proxy advisory firm’s control structure and assess the efficacy of the measures instituted to prevent further errors.

ISS and GL provide updates to previously issued proxy reports when necessary to incorporate newly available information or to correct factual errors. ISS also has a Feedback Review Board, which provides a mechanism for stakeholders to communicate with ISS about issues related to proxy voting and policy formulation, research, and the accuracy of data contained in ISS reports.

## **D. PROXY VOTING GUIDELINES**

---

The following guidelines describe Invesco’s general positions on various common proxy issues. The guidelines are not intended to be exhaustive or prescriptive. Invesco’s proxy process is investor-driven, and each portfolio manager retains ultimate discretion to vote proxies in the manner that he or she deems to be the most appropriate, consistent with the proxy voting principles and philosophy discussed in the Invesco Global Proxy Policy. Individual proxy votes therefore will differ from these guidelines from time to time.

### **I. Corporate Governance**

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

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 generally 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.

***Director performance***

Invesco generally withholds votes from directors who exhibit a lack of accountability to shareholders, either through their level of attendance at meetings or by adopting or approving 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 generally votes in favor of proposals to elect directors by a majority vote.

***Staggered Boards/Annual Election of Directors***

Invesco generally supports proposals to elect each director annually rather than electing directors to staggered multi-year terms because annual elections increase a board's level of accountability to its shareholders.

***Supermajority voting requirements***

Unless required by law in the state of incorporation, Invesco generally votes against actions that would impose any supermajority voting requirement, and generally supports actions to dismantle existing supermajority requirements.

***Responsiveness of Directors***

Invesco generally withholds votes for 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 generally 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.

### ***Proxy access***

Invesco generally supports shareholders' nominations of directors in the proxy statement and ballot because it increases the accountability of the board to shareholders. Invesco will generally consider the proposed minimum period of ownership (e.g., three years), minimum ownership percentage (e.g., three percent), limitations on a proponent's ability to aggregate holdings with other shareholders and the maximum percentage of directors who can be nominated when determining how to vote on proxy access proposals.

### ***Shareholder access***

On business matters with potential financial consequences, Invesco generally 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. Furthermore, 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.

### ***Exclusive Forum***

Invesco generally supports proposals that would designate a specific jurisdiction in company bylaws as the exclusive venue for certain types of shareholder lawsuits in order to reduce costs arising out of multijurisdictional litigation.

## **II. Compensation and Incentives**

Invesco believes properly constructed compensation plans that include equity ownership are effective in creating incentives that induce management and employees of companies to create greater shareholder wealth. Invesco generally supports equity compensation plans that promote the proper alignment of incentives with shareholders' long-term interests, and generally 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 the Client's investment.

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

### ***Executive compensation***

Invesco evaluates executive compensation plans 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. Invesco views the election of 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 generally 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***

Invesco generally 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 automatically to replenish shares without shareholder approval.

### ***Employee stock-purchase plans***

Invesco generally 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, Invesco generally opposes proposals requiring such agreements to be ratified by shareholders in advance of their adoption. Given the vast differences that may occur in these agreements, some severance agreements are evaluated on an individual basis.

## **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 Client'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. 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 and the votes for these types of corporate actions are generally determined 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 potentially create conflicts of interests among directors, management and shareholders. Except under special issuer-specific circumstances, Invesco generally 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 generally supports shareholder proposals directing companies to subject their anti-takeover provisions to a shareholder vote.

## **VI. Environmental, Social and Corporate Responsibility Issues**

Invesco believes that a company's response to environmental, social and corporate responsibility issues and the risks attendant to them can have a significant effect on its long-term shareholder value. Invesco recognizes that to manage a corporation effectively, directors and management must consider not only the interest of shareholders, but also the interests of employees, customers, suppliers and creditors, among others. While Invesco generally affords management discretion with respect to the operation of a company's business, Invesco will evaluate such proposals on a case-by-case basis and will vote proposals relating to these issues in a manner intended to maximize long-term shareholder value.

## **VII. Routine Business Matters**

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

### **D. EXCEPTIONS**

---

#### **Client Maintains Right to Vote Proxies**

In the case of institutional or sub-advised Clients, Invesco will vote the proxies in accordance with these guidelines and the Invesco Global Proxy Policy, unless the Client retains in writing the right to vote or the named fiduciary of a Client (e.g., the plan sponsor of an ERISA Client) retains in writing the right to direct the plan trustee or a third party to vote proxies.

#### **Voting for Certain Investment Strategies**

For cash sweep investment vehicles selected by a Client but for which Invesco has proxy voting authority over the account and where no other Client holds the same securities, Invesco will vote proxies based on ISS recommendations.

#### **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.

## **F. POLICIES AND VOTE DISCLOSURE**

---

A copy of these guidelines, the Invesco Global Proxy Policy and the voting record of each Invesco Retail Fund are available on Invesco's web site, [www.invesco.com](http://www.invesco.com). In accordance with Securities and Exchange Commission regulations, all Invesco 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. In the case of institutional and sub-advised Clients, Clients may contact their client service representative to request information about how Invesco voted proxies on their behalf. Absent specific contractual guidelines, such requests may be made on a semi-annual basis.