



Invesco's Policy Statement on Global Corporate Governance and Proxy Voting

Effective January 2021

Contents

I. Introduction	2
A. Our Commitment to Environmental, Social and Governance Investment Stewardship and Proxy Voting	2
B. Applicability of Policy	2
II. Global Proxy Voting Operational Procedures	3
A. Proprietary Proxy Voting Platform	3
B. Oversight of Voting Operations	3
C. Disclosures and Record Keeping	4
D. Global Invesco Proxy Advisory Committee	4
E. Market and Operational Limitations	5
F. Securities Lending	5
G. Conflicts of Interest	5
H. Use of Third-Party Proxy Advisory Services	7
I. Review of Policy	7
III. Our Good Governance Principles	8
A. Transparency	8
B. Accountability	8
C. Board Composition	10
D. Long Term Stewardship of Capital	11
E. Environmental, Social and Governance Risk Oversight	12
F. Executive Compensation and Alignment	13

I. Introduction

Invesco Ltd. and its affiliated investment advisers (collectively, “Invesco”, the “Company”, “our” or “we”) has adopted and implemented this Policy Statement on Global Corporate Governance and Proxy Voting (“Policy”) which it believes describes policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure that proxies are voted in the best interests of its clients. This Policy is intended to help Invesco’s clients understand our commitment to responsible investing and proxy voting, as well as the good governance principles that inform our approach to engagement and voting at shareholder meetings.

A. Our Commitment to Environmental, Social and Governance Investment Stewardship and Proxy Voting

Our commitment to environmental, social and governance (ESG) principles is a core element of our ambition to be the most client centric asset manager. We aspire to incorporate ESG considerations into all of our investment capabilities in the context of financial materiality and in the best interest of our clients. Our Global ESG team functions as a center of excellence, providing specialist insights on research, engagement, voting, integration, tools, and client and product solutions with investment teams implementing ESG approaches appropriate to asset class and investment style. Much of our work is rooted in fundamental research and frequent dialogue with companies.

Invesco views proxy voting as an integral part of its investment management responsibilities. The proxy voting process at Invesco focuses on protecting clients’ rights and promoting governance structures and practices that reinforce the accountability of corporate management and boards of directors to shareholders. The voting decision lies with our portfolio managers and analysts with input and support from our Global ESG team and Proxy Operations functions. Our proprietary proxy voting platform (“PROXYintel”) facilitates implementation of voting decisions and rationales across global investment teams. Our good governance principles, governance structure and processes are designed to ensure that proxy votes are cast in accordance with clients’ best interests.

As a large active investor, Invesco is well placed to use our ESG expertise and beliefs to engage with portfolio companies in ways which drive corporate change that we believe will enhance shareholder value. We take our responsibility as active owners very seriously and see engagement as an opportunity to encourage continual improvement and ensure that our clients’ interests are represented and protected. Dialogue with portfolio companies is a core part of the investment process. Invesco may engage with investee companies to discuss environmental, social and governance issues throughout the year or on specific ballot items to be voted on.

Our passive strategies and certain other client accounts managed in accordance with fixed income, money market and index strategies (including exchange traded funds) will typically vote in line with the majority holder of the active-equity shares held by Invesco outside of those strategies. Invesco refers to this approach as “Majority Voting”. This process of Majority Voting ensures that our passive strategies benefit from the engagement and deep dialogue of our active investors, which Invesco believes benefits shareholders in passively-managed accounts. In the absence of overlap between the active and passive holders, the passive holders vote in line with our internally developed voting guidelines (as defined below). Portfolio managers and analysts for accounts employing Majority Voting retain full discretion to override Majority Voting and to vote the shares as they determine to be in the best interest of those accounts, absent certain types of conflicts of interest, which are discussed elsewhere in this Policy.

B. Applicability of Policy

Invesco may be granted by its clients the authority to vote the proxies of securities held in client portfolios. Invesco’s investment teams vote proxies on behalf of Invesco-sponsored funds and both fund and non-fund advisory clients that have explicitly granted Invesco authority in writing to vote proxies on their behalf. In the case of institutional or sub-advised clients, Invesco will vote the proxies in accordance with this Policy unless the client agreement specifies that the client retains the right to vote or has designated a named fiduciary to direct voting.

This Policy applies to all entities in Exhibit A. Due to regional or asset class specific considerations, there may be certain entities that have local proxy voting guidelines or policies

and procedures that differ from this Policy. In the event that local policies and the Global Policy differ, the local policy will apply. These entities are also listed in Exhibit A and include proxy voting guidelines specific to; Invesco Asset Management (Japan) Limited, Invesco Asset Management (India) Pvt. Ltd, Invesco Taiwan Ltd and Invesco Capital Markets, Inc. for Invesco Unit Investment Trusts. In Europe, we comply with the Shareholder Rights Directive and publish our disclosures and voting practices in this regard.

II. Global Proxy Voting Operational Procedures

Invesco's global proxy voting operational procedures are in place to implement the provisions of this Policy (the "Procedures"). At Invesco, proxy voting is conducted by our investment teams through PROXYintel. Our investment teams globally are supported by Invesco's centralized team of ESG professionals and proxy voting specialists. Invesco's Global ESG team oversees the proxy policy, operational procedures, inputs to analysis and research and leads the Global Invesco Proxy Advisory Committee ("Global IPAC"). Invesco's global proxy administration team is responsible for operational implementation including vote execution oversight.

Invesco aims to vote all proxies where we have been granted voting authority in accordance with this Policy as implemented by the Procedures. Our portfolio managers and analysts review voting items based on their individual merits and retain full discretion on vote execution conducted through our proprietary proxy voting platform. Invesco may supplement its internal research with information from independent third-parties, such as proxy advisory firms.

A. Proprietary Proxy Voting Platform

Invesco's proprietary proxy voting platform is supported by a dedicated team of internal proxy specialists. PROXYintel streamlines the proxy voting process by providing our investment teams globally with direct access to meeting information and proxies, external proxy research and ESG ratings, as well as related functions, such as management of conflicts of interest issues, significant votes, global reporting and record-keeping capabilities. Managing these processes internally, as opposed to relying on third parties, is designed to provide Invesco greater quality control, oversight and independence in the proxy administration process.

Historical proxy voting information is stored to build institutional knowledge across the Invesco complex with respect to individual companies and proxy issues. Certain investment teams also use PROXYintel to access third-party proxy research and ESG ratings.

Our proprietary systems facilitate internal control and oversight of the voting process. Invesco may choose to leverage this capability to automatically vote proxies based on its internally developed voting guidelines and in circumstances where Majority Voting applies.

B. Oversight of Voting Operations

Invesco's Proxy Governance and Voting Manager provides oversight of the proxy voting verification processes facilitated by a dedicated proxy administration team which include; (i) the monthly global vote audit review of votes cast containing documented rationales of conflicts of interest votes, market and operational limitations; (ii) the quarterly sampling of proxy votes cast to determine that (a) Invesco is voting consistently with this Policy and (b) third-party proxy advisory firms' methodologies in formulating the vote recommendation are consistent with their publicly disclosed guidelines; and (iii) quarterly review of rationales with the Global IPAC of occasions where a portfolio manager may take a position that may not be in accordance with Invesco's good governance principles and our internally developed voting guidelines.

To the extent material errors are identified in the proxy voting process, such errors are reviewed and reported to, as appropriate, the Global Head of ESG, Global Proxy Governance and Voting Manager, legal and compliance, the Global IPAC and relevant boards and clients, where applicable. Invesco's Global Head of ESG and Proxy Governance and Voting Manager provide proxy voting updates and reporting to the Global IPAC, various boards and clients. Invesco's proxy voting administration and operations are subject to periodic review by Internal Audit and Compliance groups.

C. Disclosures and Record Keeping

Unless otherwise required by local or regional requirements, Invesco maintains voting records in either electronic format or hard copy for at least 6 years. Invesco makes available its proxy voting records publicly in compliance with regulatory requirements and industry best practices in the regions below:

- In accordance with the US Securities and Exchange Commission regulations, Invesco will file a record of all proxy voting activity for the prior 12 months ending June 30th for each U.S. registered fund. That filing is made on or before August 31st of each year. Each year, the proxy voting records are made available on Invesco's website [here](#). Moreover, and to the extent applicable, the U.S. Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended ("ERISA"), including Department of Labor regulations and guidance thereunder, provide that the named fiduciary generally should be able to review not only the investment manager's voting procedure with respect to plan-owned stock, but also to review the actions taken in individual proxy voting situations. 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.
- In the UK and Europe, Invesco publicly discloses our proxy votes monthly in compliance with the UK Stewardship Code and for the European Shareholder Rights Directive annually [here](#).
- In Canada, Invesco publicly discloses our annual proxy votes each year [here](#) by August 31st, covering the 12-month period ending June 30th in compliance with the National Instrument 81-106 Investment Fund Continuous Disclosure.
- In Japan, Invesco publicly discloses our proxy votes annually in compliance with the Japan Stewardship Code.
- In India, Invesco publicly discloses our proxy votes quarterly in compliance with The Securities and Exchange Board of India ("SEBI") Circular on stewardship code for all mutual funds and all categories of Alternative Investment Funds in relation to their investment in listed equities. SEBI has implemented principles on voting for Mutual Funds through circulars dated March 15, 2010 and March 24, 2014, which prescribed detailed mandatory requirements for Mutual Funds in India to disclose their voting policies and actual voting by Mutual Funds on different resolutions of investee companies.
- In Hong Kong, Invesco Hong Kong Limited will provide proxy voting records upon request in compliance with the Securities and Futures Commission ("SFC") Principles of Responsible Ownership.
- In Taiwan, Invesco publicly discloses our proxy voting policy and proxy votes annually in compliance with Taiwan's Stewardship Principles for Institutional Investors.

D. Global Invesco Proxy Advisory Committee

Guided by its philosophy that investment teams should manage proxy voting, Invesco has created the Global IPAC. The Global IPAC is an investments-driven committee comprised of representatives from various investment management teams globally, Invesco's Global Head of ESG and chaired by its Global Proxy Governance and Voting Manager. The Global IPAC provides a forum for investment teams to monitor, understand and discuss key proxy issues and voting trends within the Invesco complex, to assist Invesco in meeting regulatory obligations, to review votes not aligned with our good governance principles and to consider conflicts of interest in the proxy voting process, all in accordance with this Policy.

In fulfilling its responsibilities, the Global IPAC meets as necessary, but no less than semi-annually, and has the following responsibilities and functions: (i) acts as a key liaison between the Global ESG team and local proxy voting practices to ensure compliance with this Policy; (ii)

provides insight on market trends as it relates to stewardship practices; (iii) monitors proxy votes that present potential conflicts of interest; (iv) the Conflict of Interest sub-committee will make voting decisions on submissions made by portfolio managers on conflict of interest issues to override the Policy; and (v) reviews and provides input, at least annually, on this Policy and related internal procedures and recommends any changes to the Policy based on, but not limited to, Invesco's experience, evolving industry practices, or developments in applicable laws or regulations.

In addition to the Global IPAC, for some clients, third parties (e.g., U.S. fund boards) provide oversight of the proxy voting process.

E. Market and Operational Limitations

In the great majority of instances, Invesco will vote proxies. However, in certain circumstances, Invesco may refrain from voting where the economic or other opportunity costs of voting exceeds any benefit to clients. Moreover, ERISA fiduciaries, in voting proxies or exercising other shareholder rights, must not subordinate the economic interests of plan participants and beneficiaries to unrelated objectives. These matters are left to the discretion of the relevant portfolio manager. Such circumstances could include, for example:

- In some countries the exercise of voting rights imposes temporary transfer restrictions on the related securities ("share blocking"). Invesco generally refrains from voting proxies in share blocking countries unless Invesco determines that the benefit to the client(s) of voting a specific proxy outweighs the client's temporary inability to sell the security.
- Some companies require a representative to attend meetings in person to vote a proxy, additional documentation or the disclosure of beneficial owner details to vote. Invesco may determine that the costs of sending a representative, signing a power-of-attorney or submitting additional disclosures outweigh the benefit of voting a particular proxy.
- Invesco may not receive proxy materials from the relevant fund or client custodian with sufficient time and information to make an informed independent voting decision.
- Invesco held shares on the record date but has sold them prior to the meeting date.

In some non-U.S. jurisdictions, although Invesco uses reasonable efforts to vote a proxy, proxies may not be accepted or rejected due to changes in the agenda for a shareholder meeting for which Invesco does not have sufficient notice, a proxy voting service may not be offered by the custodian in the local market or due to operational issues experienced by third-parties involved in the process or by the issuer or sub-custodian. In addition, despite the best efforts of Invesco and its proxy voting agent, there may be instances where our votes may not be received or properly tabulated by an issuer or the issuer's agent.

F. Securities Lending

Invesco's funds may occasionally participate in a securities lending program. In circumstances where shares are on loan, the voting rights of those shares are transferred to the borrower. If the security in question is on loan as part of a securities lending program, Invesco may determine that the benefit to the client of voting a particular proxy outweighs the benefits of securities lending. In those instances, Invesco may determine to recall securities that are on loan prior to the meeting record date, so that we will be entitled to vote those shares. There may be instances where Invesco may be unable to recall shares or may choose not to recall shares. The relevant portfolio manager will make these determinations.

G. Conflicts of Interest

There may be occasions where voting proxies may present a perceived or actual conflict of interest between Invesco, as investment manager, and one or more of Invesco's clients or vendors.

Firm-Level Conflicts of interest

A conflict of interest may exist if Invesco has a material business relationship with either the company soliciting a proxy or a third party that has a material interest in the outcome of a proxy vote or that is actively lobbying for a particular outcome of a proxy vote. Such relationships may include, among others, a client relationship, serving as a vendor whose products / services are material or significant to Invesco, serving as a distributor of Invesco's products, a significant research provider or broker to Invesco.

Invesco identifies potential conflicts of interest based on a variety of factors, including but not limited to the materiality of the relationship between the issuer or its affiliates to Invesco.

Invesco's proxy administration team maintains a list of all such issuers for which a conflict of interest exists ("Global Conflicts List"). Material firm-level conflicts of interests are identified by individuals and groups within Invesco globally based on criteria established by the proxy administration team. The Global Conflicts List is updated periodically by the proxy administration team so as to seek to ensure an updated view is available when conducting conflicts checks. Operating procedures and associated governance are designed to seek to ensure conflicts of interest are appropriately considered ahead of voting proxies. The Global IPAC Conflict of Interest Sub-committee maintains oversight of the process. Companies on the Global Conflicts List will be voted in line with the principles below as implemented by Invesco's internally developed voting guidelines. To the extent a portfolio manager disagrees with the Policy, our processes and procedures seek to ensure justification and rationales are fully documented and presented to the Global IPAC Sub-committee for a majority vote of its members.

As an additional safeguard, persons from Invesco's marketing, distribution and other customer-facing functions may not serve on the Global IPAC. For the avoidance of doubt, Invesco may not consider Invesco Ltd.'s pecuniary interest when voting proxies on behalf of clients. To avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest, Invesco will not vote proxies issued by Invesco Ltd. that may be held in client accounts.

Personal Conflicts of Interest

A conflict also may exist where an Invesco employee has a known personal or business relationship with other proponents of proxy proposals, participants in proxy contests, corporate directors, or candidates for directorships. Under Invesco's Global Code of Conduct, Invesco entities and individuals must act in the best interests of clients and must avoid any situation that gives rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

All Invesco personnel with proxy voting responsibilities are required to report any known personal or business conflicts of interest regarding proxy issues with which they are involved. In such instances, the individual(s) with the conflict will be excluded from the decision-making process relating to such issues.

Voting Fund of Funds

There may be conflicts that can arise from Invesco voting on matters when shares of Invesco-sponsored funds are held by other Invesco funds or entities. The scenarios below set out how Invesco votes in these instances.

- In the United States, as required by law, proportional voting applies.
 - Shares of an Invesco-sponsored fund held by other Invesco funds will be voted in the same proportion as the votes of external shareholders of the underlying fund, where required by law.
 - Shares of an unaffiliated registered fund held by one or more Invesco funds will be voted in the same proportion as the votes of external shareholders of the underlying fund where the thresholds are met as required by federal securities law or any exemption therefrom.
 - To the extent proportional voting is required by law, but not operationally possible, Invesco will not vote the shares.

- For US fund of funds where proportional voting is not required by law, Invesco will still apply proportional voting. In the event this is not operationally possible, Invesco will vote in line with our internally developed voting guidelines (as defined below).
- For non-US fund of funds Invesco will vote in line with our above-mentioned firm-level conflicts of interest process unless we have local policies in place as per Exhibit A.

H. Use of Third-Party Proxy Advisory Services

Invesco may supplement its internal research with information from independent third-parties, such as proxy advisory firms. Globally, Invesco leverages research from Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (“ISS”) and Glass Lewis (“GL”). Invesco generally retains full and independent discretion with respect to proxy voting decisions.

ISS and GL both provide research reports, including vote recommendations, to Invesco and its portfolio managers and analysts. Invesco retains ISS to provide recommendations based on Invesco’s internally developed custom guidelines. Updates to previously issued proxy research reports may be provided to incorporate newly available information or additional disclosure provided by the issuer regarding a matter to be voted on, or to correct factual errors which may result in the issuance of revised proxy vote recommendations. Invesco’s proxy administration team may periodically monitor for these research alerts issued by ISS and GL that are shared with our investment teams. There may be instances where these updates may not be provided in a timely manner ahead of the vote deadline.

Invesco also retains ISS to assist with services that include receipt of proxy ballots, vote execution through PROXYintel and vote disclosure in Canada, the UK and Europe to meet regulatory reporting obligations.

As part of its fiduciary obligation to clients, Invesco performs extensive initial and ongoing due diligence on the proxy advisory firms it engages globally. This includes reviews of information regarding the capabilities of their research staff, methodologies for formulating voting recommendations, the adequacy and quality of personnel and technology, as applicable, and internal controls, policies and procedures, including those relating to possible conflicts of interest.

The proxy advisory firms Invesco engages globally complete an annual due diligence questionnaire submitted by Invesco, and Invesco conducts annual due diligence meetings in part to discuss their responses to the questionnaire. In addition, Invesco monitors and communicates with these firms and monitors their compliance with Invesco’s performance and policy standards. ISS and GL disclose conflicts to Invesco through a review of their policies, procedures and practices regarding potential conflicts of interests (including inherent internal conflicts) as well as disclosure of the work ISS and GL perform for corporate issuers and the payments they receive from such issuers. Invesco conducts semi-annual roundtables with external proxy and governance experts and our Global IPAC 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 compliance function completes a review of the System and Organizational Controls (“SOC”) Reports for each proxy advisory firm to ensure the related controls operated effectively to provide reasonable assurance.

In addition to ISS and GL, Invesco may use regional third-party research providers to access regionally specific research.

I. Review of Policy

The Global IPAC and Invesco’s Global ESG team, proxy administration team, compliance and legal teams annually communicate and review this Policy and our internally developed voting guidelines to seek to ensure that they remain consistent with clients’ best interests, regulatory requirements, governance trends and industry best practices. At least annually, this Policy and our internally developed voting guidelines are reviewed by various groups within Invesco to ensure that they remain consistent with Invesco’s views on best practice in corporate governance and long-term investment stewardship.

III. Our Good Governance Principles

Invesco's good governance principles outline our views on best practice in corporate governance and long-term investment stewardship. These principles have been developed by our global investment teams in collaboration with the Global ESG team. The broad philosophy and guiding principles in this section inform our approach to investment stewardship and proxy voting. These principles are not intended to be exhaustive or prescriptive.

Our portfolio managers and analysts retain full discretion on vote execution except where otherwise specified in this Policy. The final voting decisions may incorporate the unique circumstances affecting companies, regional best practices and any dialogue we have had with company management. To the extent a portfolio manager chooses to vote a proxy in a way that is not aligned with the principles below, such manager's rationales are fully documented.

The following guiding principles apply to operating companies. We apply a separate approach to investment companies and unit investment trusts. Where appropriate, these guidelines are supplemented by additional internal guidance that considers regional variations in best practices, disclosure and region-specific voting items.

The following are high-level governance principles that Invesco endorses:

A. Transparency

Investors require accurate, timely and complete information in order to make informed investment decisions and effectively carry out their stewardship obligations. Invesco supports the highest standards in corporate transparency, including but not limited to the following areas:

Financial reporting: Company accounts and reporting must accurately reflect the underlying economic position of a company. Arrangements that may constitute an actual or perceived conflict with this objective should be avoided.

- We will generally vote against the incumbent audit committee chair, or nearest equivalent, where the non-audit fees paid to the independent auditor exceed audit fees for two consecutive years or other problematic accounting practices are identified such as fraud, misapplication of audit standards or persistent material weaknesses/deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting.
- We will generally not support the ratification of the independent auditor and/or ratification of their fees payable if non-audit fees exceed audit and audit related fees or there are significant auditing controversies or questions regarding the independence of the external auditor. We will consider an auditor's length of service as a company's independent auditor in applying this policy.

B. Accountability

Robust shareholder rights and strong board oversight help ensure that management adhere to the highest standards of ethical conduct, are held to account for poor performance and responsibly deliver value creation for stakeholders over the long-term. We therefore encourage companies to adopt governance features that ensure board and management accountability. In particular, we consider the following as key mechanisms for enhancing accountability to investors:

One share one vote: Voting rights are an important tool for investors to hold boards and management teams accountable. Unequal voting rights may limit the ability of investors to exercise their stewardship obligations.

- We generally do not support proposals that establish or perpetuate dual classes of voting shares, double voting rights or other means of differentiated voting or disproportionate board nomination rights.
- We generally support proposals to decommission differentiated voting rights.

- Where unequal voting rights are established, we expect these to be accompanied by reasonable safeguards to protect minority shareholders' interests.

Anti-takeover devices: Mechanisms designed to prevent or unduly delay takeover attempts may unduly limit the accountability of boards and management teams to shareholders.

- We generally will not support proposals to adopt antitakeover devices such as poison pills. Exceptions may be warranted at entities without significant operations and to preserve the value of net operating losses carried forward or where the applicability of the pill is limited in scope and duration.
- In addition, we will generally not support capital authorizations or amendments to corporate articles or bylaws at operating companies that may be utilized for antitakeover purposes, for example, the authorization of classes of shares of preferred stock with unspecified voting, dividend, conversion or other rights ("blank check" authorizations).

Shareholder rights: We support the rights of shareholders to hold boards and management teams accountable for company performance. We generally support best practice aligned proposals to enhance shareholder rights, including but not limited to the following:

- Adoption of proxy access rights
- Rights to call special meetings
- Rights to act by written consent
- Reduce supermajority vote requirements
- Remove antitakeover provisions
- Requirement that directors are elected by a majority vote

In addition, we oppose practices that limit shareholders' ability to express their views at a general meeting such as bundling unrelated proposals or several significant article or bylaw amendments into a single voting item. We will generally vote against these proposals unless we are satisfied that all the underlying components are aligned with our views on best practice.

Director Indemnification: Invesco recognizes that individuals may be reluctant to serve as corporate directors if they are personally liable for all related lawsuits and legal costs. As a result, reasonable limitations on directors' liability can benefit a company and its shareholders by helping to attract and retain qualified directors while preserving recourse for shareholders in the event of misconduct by directors. Accordingly, unless there is insufficient information to make a decision about the nature of the proposal, Invesco will generally support proposals to limit directors' liability and provide indemnification and/or exculpation, provided that the arrangements are reasonably limited in scope to directors acting in good faith and, in relation to criminal matters, limited in scope to directors having reasonable grounds for believing the conduct was lawful.

Responsiveness: Boards should respond to investor concerns in a timely fashion, including reasonable requests to engage with company representatives regarding such concerns, and address matters that receive significant voting dissent at general meetings of shareholders.

- We will generally vote against the lead independent director and/or the incumbent chair of the governance committee, or nearest equivalent, in cases where the board has not adequately responded to items receiving significant voting opposition from shareholders at an annual or extraordinary general meeting.
- We will generally vote against the lead independent director and/or incumbent chair of the governance committee, or nearest equivalent, where the board has not adequately responded to a shareholder proposal which has received significant support from shareholders.

- We will generally vote against the incumbent chair of the compensation committee if there are significant ongoing concerns with a company's compensation practices that have not been addressed by the committee or egregious concerns with the company's compensation practices for two years consecutively.
- In addition, we will generally vote against the incumbent compensation committee chair where there are ongoing concerns with a company's compensation practices and there is no opportunity to express dissatisfaction by voting against an advisory vote on executive compensation, remuneration report (or policy) or nearest equivalent.

C. Board Composition

Annual director elections: Board members should generally stand for election annually and individually.

- We will generally support proposals requesting that directors stand for election annually.
- We will generally vote against the incumbent governance committee chair or lead independent director if a company has a classified board structure that is not being phased out. This policy will not apply in regions where market practice is for directors to stand for election on a staggered basis or for boards that do not oversee significant commercial operations.
- When a board is presented for election as a slate (i.e., shareholders are unable to vote against individual nominees and must vote for or against the entire nominated slate of directors) and this approach is not aligned with local market practice, we will generally vote against the slate in cases where we otherwise would vote against an individual nominee.
- Where market practice is to elect directors as a slate we will generally support the nominated slate unless there are governance concerns with several of the individuals included on the slate or we have broad concerns with the composition of the board such as a lack independence.

Board size: We will generally defer to the board with respect to determining the optimal number of board members, provided that the proposed board size is sufficiently large to represent shareholder interests and sufficiently limited to remain effective.

Definition of independence: Invesco considers local market definitions of director independence but applies a proprietary standard for assessing director independence considering a director's status as a current or former employee of the business, any commercial or consulting relationships with the company, the level of shares beneficially owned or represented and familial relationships, among others.

Board and committee independence: The board of directors, board committees and regional equivalents should be sufficiently independent from management, substantial shareholders and conflicts of interest. We consider local market practices in this regard and in general we look for a balance across the board of directors. Above all, we like to see signs of robust challenge and discussion in the boardroom.

- We will generally vote against one or more non-independent directors when a board is less than majority independent, but we will take into account local market practice with regards to board independence in limited circumstances where this standard is not appropriate.
- We will generally vote against non-independent directors serving on the audit committee.
- We will generally vote against non-independent directors serving on the compensation committee.
- We will generally vote against non-independent directors serving on the nominating committee.

- In relation to the board, compensation committee and nominating committee we will consider the appropriateness of significant shareholder representation in applying this policy. This exception will generally not apply to the audit committee.

Separation of Chair and CEO roles: We believe that independent board leadership generally enhances management accountability to investors. Companies deviating from this best practice should provide a strong justification and establish safeguards to ensure that there is independent oversight of a board's activities (e.g., by appointing a lead or senior independent director with clearly defined powers and responsibilities).

- We will generally vote against the incumbent nominating committee chair where the board chair is not independent unless a lead independent or senior director is appointed.
- We will generally support shareholder proposals requesting that the board chair be an independent director.
- We will generally not vote against a CEO or executive serving as board chair solely on the basis of this issue, however, we may do so in instances where we have significant concerns regarding a company's corporate governance, capital allocation decisions and/or compensation practices.

Attendance and over boarding: Directors serving on the board should attend at least 75% of their board and committee meetings, where applicable. In addition, directors should not have excessive external board or managerial commitments that may interfere with their ability to execute the duties of a director.

- We will generally vote against directors who do not attend 75% of their meetings unless there are extenuating circumstances such as health matters or family emergencies.
- We will generally vote against directors who have more than four total mandates at public operating companies. We apply a lower threshold for directors with significant commitments such as executive positions and chairmanships.

Diversity: We encourage companies to continue to evolve diversity and inclusion practices. Boards should be comprised of directors with a variety of relevant skills and industry expertise together with a diverse profile of individuals of different genders, ethnicities, skills, tenures and backgrounds in order to provide robust challenge and debate. We consider diversity at the board level, within the executive management team and in the succession pipeline.

- We will generally vote against the incumbent nominating committee chair of a board where women constitute less than two board members or 25% of the board, whichever is lower, for two or more consecutive years, unless incremental improvements are being made to diversity practices.
- In addition, we will consider a company's performance on broader types of diversity which may include diversity of skills, non-executive director tenure, ethnicity or other factors where appropriate and reasonably determinable. We will generally vote against the incumbent nominating committee chair if there are multiple concerns on diversity issues.
- We generally believe that an individual board's nominating committee is best positioned to determine whether director term limits would be an appropriate measure to help achieve these goals and, if so, the nature of such limits. Invesco generally opposes proposals to limit the tenure of outside directors through mandatory retirement ages.

D. Long Term Stewardship of Capital

Capital allocation: Invesco expects companies to responsibly raise and deploy capital towards the long-term, sustainable success of the business. In addition, we expect capital allocation authorizations and decisions to be made with due regard to shareholder dilution, rights of shareholders to ratify significant corporate actions and pre-emptive rights, where applicable.

Share issuance and repurchase authorizations: We generally support authorizations to issue shares up to 20% of a company's issued share capital for general corporate purposes. Shares should not be issued at a substantial discount to the market price or be repurchased at a substantial premium to the market price.

Stock splits: We generally support management proposals to implement a forward or reverse stock split, provided that a reverse stock split is not being used to take a company private. In addition, we will generally support requests to increase a company's common stock authorization if requested in order to facilitate a stock split.

Increases in authorized share capital: We will generally support proposals to increase a company's number of authorized common and/or preferred shares, provided we have not identified concerns regarding a company's historical share issuance activity or the potential to use these authorizations for antitakeover purposes. We will consider the amount of the request in relation to the company's current authorized share capital, any proposed corporate transactions contingent on approval of these requests and the cumulative impact on a company's authorized share capital, for example, if a reverse stock split is concurrently submitted for shareholder consideration.

Mergers, acquisitions, proxy contests, disposals and other corporate transactions: Invesco's investment teams will review proposed corporate transactions including mergers, acquisitions, reorganizations, proxy contests, private placements, dissolutions and divestitures based on a proposal's individual investment merits. In addition, we broadly approach voting on other corporate transactions as follows:

- We will generally support proposals to approve different types of restructurings that provide the necessary financing to save the company from involuntary bankruptcy.
- We will generally support proposals to enact corporate name changes and other proposals related to corporate transactions that we believe are in shareholders' best interests.
- We will generally support reincorporation proposals, provided that management have provided a compelling rationale for the change in legal jurisdiction and provided further that the proposal will not significantly adversely impact shareholders' rights.
- With respect to contested director elections, we consider the following factors, among others, when evaluating the merits of each list of nominees: the long term performance of the company relative to its industry, management's track record, any relevant background information related to the contest, the qualifications of the respective lists of director nominees, the strategic merits of the approaches proposed by both sides including the likelihood that the proposed goals can be met, positions of stock ownership in the company.

E. Environmental, Social and Governance Risk Oversight

Director responsibility for risk oversight: The board of directors are ultimately responsible for overseeing management and ensuring that proper governance, oversight and control mechanisms are in place at the companies they oversee. Invesco may take voting action against director nominees in response to material governance or risk oversight failures that adversely affect shareholder value.

Invesco considers the adequacy of a company's response to material oversight failures when determining whether any voting action is warranted. In addition, Invesco will consider the responsibilities delegated to board subcommittees when determining if it is appropriate to hold certain director nominees accountable for these material failures.

Material governance or risk oversight failures at a company may include, without limitation:

- i. significant bribery, corruption or ethics violations;
- ii. events causing significant environmental degradation;
- iii. significant health and safety incidents; or

- iv. failure to ensure the protection of human rights.

Reporting of financially material ESG information: Companies should report on their environmental, social and governance opportunities and risks where material to their business operations.

- Where Invesco finds significant gaps in terms of management and disclosure of environmental, social and governance risk policies, we will generally vote against the annual reporting and accounts or an equivalent resolution.

Shareholder proposals addressing environmental and social risks: Invesco may support shareholder resolutions requesting that specific actions be taken to address environmental and social issues or mitigate exposure to material environmental and social risks, including reputational risk, related to these issues. When considering such proposals, we will consider a company's track record managing these risks, the efficacy of the proposal's request and whether the requested action is unduly burdensome.

- We generally do not support resolutions where insufficient information has been provided in advance of the vote or a lack of disclosure inhibits our ability to make fully informed voting decisions.
- We will generally support shareholder resolutions requesting that companies provide additional information on material environmental, social and governance risks facing their businesses, provided that such requests are not unduly burdensome or duplicative with a company's existing reporting. These may include but are not limited to the following: gender pay gap reporting requests, political contributions and lobbying disclosure, information on data security, privacy, and internet practices, and reporting on climate change risks.

Ratification of board and/or management acts: We will generally support proposals to ratify the actions of the board of directors, supervisory board and/or executive decision-making bodies, provided there are no material oversight failures as described above. When such oversight concerns are identified, we will consider a company's response to any issues raised and may vote against ratification proposals instead of, or in addition to, director nominees.

F. Executive Compensation and Alignment

Invesco supports compensation policies and equity incentive plans that promote alignment between management incentives and shareholders' long-term interests. We pay close attention to local market practice and may apply stricter or modified criteria where appropriate.

Advisory votes on executive compensation, remuneration policy and remuneration reports: We will generally not support compensation related proposals where more than one of the following is present:

- i. there is an unmitigated misalignment between executive pay and company performance for at least two consecutive years;
- ii. there are problematic compensation practices which may include among others incentivizing excessive risk taking or circumventing alignment between management and shareholders' interests via repricing of underwater options;
- iii. vesting periods for long term incentive awards are less than three years;
- iv. the company "front loads" equity awards;
- v. there are inadequate risk mitigating features in the program such as clawback provisions;
- vi. excessive, discretionary one-time equity grants are awarded to executives;
- vii. less than half of variable pay is linked to performance targets, except where prohibited by law.

Invesco will consider company reporting on pay ratios as part of our evaluation of compensation proposals, where relevant.

Equity plans: 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 which may include provisions to reprice options without shareholder approval, plans that include evergreen provisions or plans that provide for automatic accelerated vesting upon a change in control.

Employee stock purchase plans: We generally support 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 represents a reasonable discount from the market price.

Severance Arrangements: Invesco considers proposed severance arrangements (sometimes known as "golden parachute" arrangements) on a case-by-case basis due to the wide variety among their terms. Invesco acknowledges that in some cases such arrangements, if reasonable, may be in shareholders' best interests as a method of attracting and retaining high quality executive talent. We generally vote in favor of proposals requiring shareholder ratification of senior executives' severance agreements where the proposed terms and disclosure align with good market practice.

Exhibit A

Harbourview Asset Management Corporation
Invesco Advisers, Inc.
Invesco Asset Management (India) Pvt. Ltd*¹
Invesco Asset Management (Japan) Limited*¹
Invesco Asset Management (Schweiz) AG
Invesco Asset Management Deutschland GmbH
Invesco Asset Management Limited¹
Invesco Asset Management Singapore Ltd
Invesco Asset Management Spain
Invesco Australia Ltd
Invesco European RR L.P
Invesco Canada Ltd.¹
Invesco Capital Management LLC
Invesco Capital Markets, Inc.*¹
Invesco Hong Kong Limited
Invesco Investment Advisers LLC
Invesco Investment Management (Shanghai) Limited
Invesco Investment Management Limited
Invesco Loan Manager, LLC
Invesco Managed Accounts, LLC
Invesco Management S.A
Invesco Overseas Investment Fund Management (Shanghai) Limited
Invesco Pensions Limited
Invesco Private Capital, Inc.
Invesco Real Estate Management S.a.r.l.¹
Invesco RR Fund L.P.
Invesco Senior Secured Management, Inc.
Invesco Taiwan Ltd*¹
Invesco Trust Company
Oppenheimer Funds, Inc.
WL Ross & Co. LLC

* Invesco entities with specific proxy voting guidelines

¹ Invesco entities with specific conflicts of interest policies