


Proxy voting policy for Canadian portfolio companies

Effective January 2026

Vanguard Portfolio Management, LLC

Vanguard Fiduciary Trust Company

Vanguard Global Advisers, LLC



Contents

- 3** Introduction
- 4** Pillar I: Board composition and effectiveness
- 7** Pillar II: Board oversight of strategy and risk
- 10** Pillar III: Executive pay
- 14** Pillar IV: Shareholder rights

Introduction

This proxy voting policy (the Policy) describes general positions on proxy proposals that may be subject to a shareholder vote at Canadian-domiciled companies and is aligned with governance practices believed to support long-term shareholder returns. The Policy has been adopted by the boards (or relevant governing bodies) of funds and portfolios managed by certain Vanguard-affiliated entities including U.S.-domiciled mutual funds and ETFs advised by Vanguard Portfolio Management, LLC (VPM), as well as the boards of Vanguard Fiduciary Trust Company and Vanguard Global Advisers, LLC in connection with their management of certain equity index and quantitative equity funds and portfolios (together with the U.S.-domiciled mutual funds and ETFs advised by VPM, the "Funds"). The adoption of this Policy is anchored in the belief that effective corporate governance practices support long-term investment returns.

It is important to note that proposals—whether submitted by company management or other shareholders—often require a facts-and-circumstances analysis based on an expansive set of factors. While the Policy may recommend a particular voting decision, all proposals are voted case by case as determined in the best interests of each Fund consistent with its investment objective. The Policy is applied over an extended period of time; as such, if a company's board is not responsive to voting results on certain matters, support may be withheld for those and other matters in the future.

As a baseline, the Policy looks for companies to abide by the relevant governance frameworks (e.g., listing standards, governance codes, laws, regulations, etc.) of the market(s) in which they are listed. While the Policy is informed by such frameworks, final voting decisions may differ from the application of those frameworks due to the investment stewardship team's independent research, analysis, and engagement. In addition, this Policy and its application to specific voting matters are predicated on the relevant Funds' acquisition and ownership of securities in the ordinary course of business, without the intent of influencing company strategy or changing the control of the issuer. These Funds will not nominate directors, solicit or participate in the solicitation of proxies, or submit shareholder proposals at portfolio companies. The application of this Policy to specific voting matters will also adhere to any passivity requirements to which the Funds and/or The Vanguard Group, Inc., and any of its subsidiaries (collectively, Vanguard) may be subject.

Pillar I: Board composition and effectiveness

The Funds believe that in order to maximize the long-term return of shareholders' investments in each company, the individuals who serve as board directors to represent the interests of all shareholders should be appropriately independent, experienced, committed, capable, and diverse. Diversity of thought, background, and experiences meaningfully contribute to the ability of boards to serve as effective, engaged stewards of shareholders' interests. The evaluation of portfolio company boards will be informed by relevant market-specific governance frameworks (e.g., listing standards, governance codes, laws, regulations, etc.).

Board and key committee independence¹

In order to appropriately represent shareholder interests in the oversight of company management, a majority of directors of a noncontrolled company should be independent, as should all of the members of the board's key committees (audit, compensation, and nominating/governance or their equivalents).

A director's independence will generally be determined based on a company's disclosure in the context of relevant market-specific governance frameworks (e.g., listing standards, governance codes, laws, regulations, etc.) supplemented by independent research and/or engagement.

In cases where a noncontrolled company does not maintain a majority independent board, votes against members of the nominating committee and all nonindependent members of that board may be recommended. In cases where a noncontrolled company board is not majority independent over multiple years, votes may be recommended against the entire board. In cases where any of the key committees of a noncontrolled company are not entirely independent, votes may be recommended against (a) the nonindependent members of that committee, and (b) all of the members of the board's nominating committee. (In the absence of an explicit nominating committee, votes will generally be recommended against those directors responsible for nominating and/or appointing directors; this may include the entire board.)

At controlled companies, support will generally be recommended for a nonindependent director on a compensation committee or a nominating and governance committee, so long as the relevant committee is majority independent.

In both instances, if nominating committee members are not up for election in a given year, votes against any other relevant board member(s) may be recommended.

Independent board leadership

The Funds believe that shareholders' interests are best served by board leadership that is independent of company management. While this may take the form of an independent chair of the board or a lead independent director (with sufficiently robust authority and responsibilities), the Funds generally believe that determining the appropriate independent board leadership structure should be within the purview of the board. Certain shareholder proposals seek to require that companies not permit the same person to serve as both CEO and chair of the board of directors. Proponents believe that separation of these duties will create a more independent board.

¹ Certain exchange-listing standards and regulatory provisions may apply more limited (or no) independence requirements to the boards of controlled companies (i.e., those in which a majority voting interest is held by company insiders or affiliates). While the guideline on majority independence with respect to the entire board will not apply in these cases, the majority of key committee members should be independent.

Given the Funds' belief that this matter should be within the purview of a company's board, votes will generally be recommended against shareholder proposals to separate the CEO and chair roles. Votes for such proposals may be recommended if there are significant concerns regarding the independence or effectiveness of the board at the company in question.

Board composition

The Funds believe that boards should be fit for purpose by reflecting sufficient breadth of skills, experiences, and perspectives resulting in cognitive diversity that enables effective, independent oversight on behalf of all shareholders. The appropriate mix of skills, experiences, and perspectives is unique to each board and should reflect expertise related to the company's strategy and material risks from a variety of vantage points.

To this end, the Funds believe that companies should produce fulsome disclosure of a board's process for building, assessing, and maintaining an effective board well suited to supporting the company's strategy, long-term performance, and shareholder returns. Such fulsome disclosure may include the range of skills, background, and experience that each board member provides and their alignment with the company's strategy (often presented as a skills matrix). Such disclosure may also cover the board's process for evaluating the composition and effectiveness of their board on a regular basis, the identification of gaps and opportunities to be addressed through board refreshment and evolution, and a robust nomination (and renomination) process to ensure the right mix of skills, experiences, and perspectives in the future.

A board's composition should comply with requirements set by relevant market-specific governance frameworks (e.g., listing standards, governance codes, laws, regulations, etc.) and be consistent with market norms in the markets in which the company is listed. To the extent that a board's composition is inconsistent with such requirements or differs from prevailing market norms, the board's rationale for such differences (and any anticipated actions) should be explained in the company's public disclosures.

Votes against the nomination/governance committee chair may be recommended if, based on research and/or engagement, a company's board composition and/or related disclosure is inconsistent with relevant market-specific governance frameworks or market norms.

Director capacity and commitments

Directors' responsibilities are complex and time-consuming. Therefore, shareholders seek to understand whether the number of directorship positions held by a director makes it challenging for that director to dedicate the requisite time and attention to effectively fulfill their responsibilities at each company (sometimes referred to as being "overboarded"). While no two boards are identical and time commitments for directorships may vary, the Funds believe that limitations on the number of board positions held by individual directors may be appropriate, absent compelling evidence to the contrary.

Votes may generally be recommended against any director who is a public company executive and sits on more than two public company boards. In this instance, votes will typically be recommended against the nominee at each company where they serve as a nonexecutive director, but not at the company where they serve as an executive.

Similarly, votes may also generally be recommended against any director who serves on more than four public company boards. In such cases, votes will typically be recommended against the director at each company except the one (if any) where they serve as board chair or lead independent director.

In certain instances, support will be considered for a director who would otherwise be considered overboarded under the standards above, taking into account relevant market-specific governance frameworks or company-specific facts and circumstances.

The Funds believe that portfolio companies should adopt good governance practices regarding director commitments, including a policy regarding director capacity and commitments and disclosure of the board's oversight of the implementation of that policy. Helpful disclosure includes a discussion of the company's policy (e.g., what limits are in place) and, if a nominee for director exceeds the policy, any considerations and rationale for the director's nomination. Additionally, it is good practice to include disclosure of how the board developed its policy and how frequently it is reviewed to ensure it remains appropriate.

Director attendance

Votes will generally be recommended against directors who attended less than 75% of board or committee meetings (in the aggregate) in the previous year unless an extenuating circumstance is disclosed, or they have served on the board for less than one year.

Director accountability

Directors are generally nominated by boards and elected by shareholders to represent their interests. If there are instances in which the board has failed to adequately consider actions approved by a majority of shareholders, unilaterally taken action against shareholder interests, or, based on independent analysis, failed in its oversight role, votes against those directors deemed responsible (generally based on their functional or committee-level responsibilities) may be recommended. Such conditions will generally not apply to a director who has served less than one year on the board and/or applicable committee but in such instances may apply to another relevant director in their place.

Contested director elections

Contested director elections will be analyzed case by case. The analysis of proxy contests focuses on three key areas:

- *The case for change at the target company.*
 - How has the company performed relative to its peers?
 - How effectively has the current board overseen the company's strategy and execution?
 - How does the dissident's case strengthen the target company's long-term shareholder returns?
- *The quality of company governance.*
 - How effectively has the company's governance structure supported shareholder rights consistent with market norms?
 - Has the board been sufficiently accessible and responsive to shareholder input in the past?
- *The quality of the company's and dissident's board nominees.*
 - Is the incumbent board (and/or the company's nominees) sufficiently independent, capable, and effective to serve long-term shareholder interests?
 - Having made a compelling case for change, do the dissident's nominees appear better aligned with long-term shareholder interests relative to the company's nominees?

Pillar II: Board oversight of strategy and risk

Boards are responsible for effective oversight and governance of their companies' most relevant and material risks and for governance of their companies' long-term strategy. Boards should take a thorough, integrated, thoughtful approach to identifying, quantifying, mitigating, and disclosing risks that have the potential to affect shareholder returns over the long term. Boards should communicate their approach to risk oversight to shareholders through their normal course of business.

Capitalization

- *Increase in authorized common stock.* Increases in authorized common stock will generally be supported if the proposed increase represents potential dilution less than or equal to 100%. Increases of more than 100% dilution may be supported if the increase is to be used for a stock split.
- *Reverse stock split.* Reverse splits of outstanding shares will generally be supported if the number of shares authorized is proportionately reduced and the difference in reduction results in dilution equal to or less than 100%. Regardless of the level of dilution, reverse splits will generally be supported if necessary for the company to remain listed on its current exchange.
- *Decrease in outstanding shares to reduce costs.* Proposals to reduce outstanding shares to reduce costs will generally be supported if the level at which affected investors are cashed out is not material.
- *Amendment of authorized common stock/ preferred stock.* Proposals to create, amend, or issue common or preferred stock will generally be supported unless the rights of the issuance are materially different from the rights of current shareholders (i.e., differential voting rights) or they include a blank-check provision. Proposals to create such stock will generally be opposed if the accompanying disclosure does not include a statement affirming that the new issuance will not be used for anti-takeover purposes.
- *Tracking stock.* Issuance of tracking stock as a dividend to current shareholders will generally be supported. Proposals to offer tracking stock through an initial public offering will be supported case by case based on the proposed use of the proceeds, as will proposals calling for the elimination of tracking stock.

Mergers, acquisitions, and financial transactions

Transactions are assessed based on the likelihood that they will preserve or create long-term returns for shareholders. All mergers, acquisitions, and financial transactions will be considered case by case based on a governance-centric evaluation focused on four key areas:

- *Valuation*
 - Does the consideration provided in the transaction appear consistent with other similar transactions (adjusting for size, sector, scope, etc.)?
- *Rationale*
 - Has the board sufficiently articulated how this transaction is aligned with the company's long-term shareholder returns?

- *Board oversight of the deal process*
 - Has the board provided sufficient evidence of the rigor of the evaluation process? This could include disclosures such as an independent valuation report or fairness opinion, a discussion of the board's process for evaluating alternative opportunities, management incentives, or other relevant disclosures.
 - How did the board manage any potential conflicts of interest among the parties to the transaction?
- *The surviving entity's governance profile*
 - Are shareholders' interests sufficiently protected in any surviving entities (in noncash transactions)?

Bankruptcy proceedings

All proposals related to bankruptcy proceedings will be evaluated case by case. When evaluating proposals to restructure or liquidate a firm, factors such as the financial prospects of the firm, alternative options, and management incentives will be considered.

Environmental/social proposals

Each proposal will be evaluated on its merits and in the context that a company's board has responsibility for providing effective oversight of strategy and risk management. This oversight includes material sector- and company-specific risks and opportunities that have the potential to affect long-term shareholder returns.

While each proposal will be assessed on its merits and in the context of a company's public disclosures, vote analysis will also consider these proposals relative to market norms or widely accepted frameworks.

Support may be recommended for a shareholder proposal that:

- Addresses a shortcoming in the company's current disclosure relative to market norms or to widely accepted investor-oriented frameworks (e.g., the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB));
- Reflects an industry-specific, financial materiality-driven approach; and
- Is not overly prescriptive, such as by dictating company strategy or day-to-day operations, time frame, cost, or other matters.

Each of the Funds adopting this policy is a passive investor whose role is not to dictate company strategy or interfere with a company's day-to-day management. Fulsome disclosure of material risks to long-term shareholder returns by companies is beneficial to the public markets to inform the company's valuation. Clear, comparable, consistent, and accurate disclosure enables shareholders to understand the strength of a board's risk oversight. Furthermore, shareholders typically do not have sufficient information about specific business strategies to propose specific operational targets or environmental or social policies for a company, which is a responsibility that resides with management and the board. As such, support is more likely for proposals seeking disclosure of such risks where material and/or for the company's policies and practices to manage such risks over time.

Independent auditors

Ratification of management's proposed independent auditor. Support will generally be recommended for annual submission of auditor appointment for shareholder approval. Votes will generally be recommended for the independent audit committee's auditor selection absent material misstatement of financials (or other significant concerns about the integrity of the company's financial statements) or the payment of excessive fees to the independent auditor beyond audit and audit-related services in prior years. The ratification of independent auditors will be evaluated case by case when there is a material misstatement of financials or other significant concern about the integrity of the company's financial statements. Votes may be recommended against ratification when taxes and all other fees exceed the audit and audit-related fees, unless the company's disclosure makes clear that the non-audit fees are for services that do not impair auditor independence.

Rotations of auditing firms. Proposals mandating independent auditor rotation will be considered case by case.

Requirement for a shareholder vote. Shareholder proposals that require companies to submit ratification of independent auditors to a shareholder vote will generally be supported.

Pillar III: Executive pay

Compensation policies linked to long-term relative performance are fundamental drivers of sustainable, long-term returns for a company's investors. Providing effective disclosure of compensation policies, their alignment with company performance, and their outcomes is crucial to giving shareholders confidence in the link between executives' incentives and rewards and the creation of long-term returns for shareholders.

Advisory votes on executive compensation (Say on Pay)

Considerations when evaluating executive pay fall into three broad categories:

- *Alignment of pay and performance.* Company disclosure should include evidence of clear alignment between pay outcomes and company performance. This is mainly assessed through alignment of incentive targets with strategy set by the company and analysis of three-year total shareholder return and realized pay over the same period versus a relevant set of peer companies. If there are concerns that pay and performance are not aligned, votes against a pay-related proposal may be considered.
- *Compensation plan structure.* Plan structures should be aligned with the company's stated long-term strategy and should support pay-for-performance alignment. Where a plan includes structural issues that have led to, or could in the future lead to, pay-for-performance misalignment, votes against a pay-related proposal may be considered. For compensation structures that are not typical of a market, companies should consider specific disclosure demonstrating how the structure supports long-term returns for shareholders.
- *Governance of compensation plans.* Boards should articulate a clear philosophy on executive pay, utilize robust processes to evaluate and evolve executive pay plans, and implement executive pay plans responsive to shareholder feedback over time. Boards should also explain these matters to shareholders via company disclosures. Where pay-related proposals consistently receive low support, boards should demonstrate consideration of shareholder concerns.

Executive compensation proposals (including Say on Pay, compensation reports, and compensation policies) will be evaluated case by case. Support is more likely for proposals and plans aligned with long-term shareholder returns. Those that reflect improvements in compensation practices in the interests of long-term shareholder returns may be supported, even if the proposals are not perfectly aligned with all these guidelines.

Without being prescriptive as to the exact structure of a compensation plan, structures and processes that can reasonably be expected to align pay and performance over time are more likely to be supported. Such structures may include a meaningful portion of equity vesting on performance criteria, strategically aligned performance metrics set to rigorous goals, and clear disclosure of the program and outcomes enabling shareholders to understand the connection to long-term shareholder returns, among other factors. When compensation committees choose to include nonfinancial metrics (such as environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics), they should have the same rigor, disclosure, and alignment with key strategic goals, material risks, and shareholder returns as other metrics.

The following situations are among those that raise a higher level of concern related to a compensation plan:

- Pay outcomes are significantly higher than those of peers but total shareholder return is well below that of peers.
- The long-term plan makes up less than 50% of total pay.
- The long-term plan has a performance period of less than three years.
- Plan targets are reset or retested, or are not rigorous.
- The target for total pay is set above the peer-group median.

The following situations are among those that raise warning signs, or a moderate level of concern:

- The company's disclosed peer group used to benchmark pay is not comparably aligned with the company in size or sector.
- The plan uses absolute metrics only.
- The plan allows for positive discretion only.
- The company uses one-time (e.g., retention) awards.
- The disclosure related to plan structure or payout is limited.

Where these warning signs exist, elements of strong compensation governance, such as board responsiveness and disclosure that includes data, rationale, and alternatives considered, can sometimes act to mitigate these concerns.

Say on Pay frequency

Votes will generally be recommended for annual Say on Pay frequency (as opposed to a vote every two or three years).

Additional executive pay matters

Severance packages/golden parachutes. Proposals to approve severance packages (or "golden parachutes") will generally be supported unless they are excessive or unreasonable (i.e., cash severance payments that total more than 2.99 times salary plus targeted bonus and/or have single-trigger cash or equity payments). New or renewed severance agreements that provide excessive or unreasonable severance should be submitted to shareholders for approval. If a company's current severance arrangements are deemed excessive or unreasonable, shareholder proposals requiring that future golden parachutes be put to a vote, provided that ratification after the fact is permitted, may be supported. Proposals to approve Say on Severance will generally be supported unless they are excessive or unreasonable.

Shareholder proposals on pay for superior performance. Shareholder proposals that call for companies to set standards that require pay for superior performance will generally not be supported, particularly when the proposal calls for specific performance standards.

Adopting, amending, and/or adding shares to equity compensation plans

Compensation plan proposals will be considered case by case. A plan or proposal will be evaluated in the context of several factors to determine whether it balances the interests of employees and the company's other shareholders.

These factors include the industry in which a company operates, market capitalization, and competitors for talent. Support is more likely for a proposal in circumstances that include the following:

- Senior executives must hold a minimum amount of company stock (frequently expressed as a multiple of salary).
- Stock acquired through equity awards must be held for a certain period.
- The program includes performance-vesting awards, indexed options, or other performance-linked grants.
- Concentration of equity grants to senior executives is limited.
- Stock-based compensation is clearly used as a substitute for cash in delivering market-competitive total pay.

Votes against a proposal are more likely in circumstances that include the following:

- Total potential dilution (including all stock-based plans) exceeds 20% of shares outstanding.
- Annual equity grants have exceeded 4% of shares outstanding.
- The plan permits repricing or replacement of options without shareholder approval.
- The plan provides for the issuance of reload options.
- The plan contains an automatic share replenishment ("evergreen") feature.

Additional employee compensation matters

Repricing or replacing underwater options. Support is more likely for proposals to reprice or exchange stock options that meet the following three considerations:

- *Value neutrality.* An exchange/repricing proposal should be value-neutral.
- *Exclusion of executive and director participation.* Executives and directors should not participate in an exchange or repricing. If they do, the board should clearly state why the program is necessary to retain and provide incentives to executives and directors for the benefit of long-term shareholder returns.
- *Additional vesting requirements.* New shares granted in an exchange should vest no earlier than the vesting date of the shares for which they were exchanged, and preferably later.

Granting stock options. Management proposals to grant one-time stock options may be opposed if dilution limits are exceeded. Other proposals will be evaluated case by case.

Adopting deferred compensation plan. Proposals to adopt a deferred compensation plan will generally be supported unless the plan includes discounts.

Adopting or adding shares to an employee stock purchase plan. Proposals to adopt or add shares to employee stock purchase plans will generally be supported unless they allow employees to purchase shares at a price less than 85% of fair market value.

Amending a 401(k) or registered retirement savings plan (RRSP) to allow excess benefits. Proposals to amend a 401(k) plan or RRSP to allow for excess benefits will generally be supported.

Nonemployee director compensation

Proposals to adopt or amend nonexecutive director equity compensation plans, including stock award plans, will be evaluated case by case. Considerations include potential dilution, the size of the plan relative to employee equity compensation plans, annual grants made to nonemployee directors, and total director compensation relative to market norms.

Nonemployee director equity compensation plans that allow for repricing, those that contain an evergreen feature (automatic renewal), and nonemployee director pensions will generally be opposed.

All other proposals for nonemployee director compensation will be considered case by case.

Pillar IV: Shareholder rights

The Funds believe that companies should adopt governance practices to ensure that boards and management serve in the best interests of the shareholders they represent. Such governance practices safeguard and support foundational rights for shareholders. Proposals on many of the following matters may be submitted by either company management or shareholders; proposals—irrespective of the proponent—that seek approval for governance structures that safeguard shareholder rights will generally be supported (and those that do not will generally be opposed) as described below.

Board structure and director elections

The Funds believe that each company's board is generally best positioned to fill director vacancies (subject to shareholder ratification at the next annual meeting) and to set the board's size, tenure, and other structural provisions, so long as any such provision does not serve as an anti-takeover measure.

Classified ("staggered") boards. Votes will generally be recommended for proposals to declassify a current board and against proposals to create a classified board.

Cumulative voting. Votes will generally be recommended for management proposals to eliminate cumulative voting and against management or shareholder proposals to adopt cumulative voting.

Majority voting. If the company has plurality voting, votes will generally be recommended for shareholder proposals that require a majority vote for election of directors. Votes will also generally be recommended for management proposals to implement majority voting for election of directors. Votes may be recommended against shareholder proposals that require a majority vote for election of directors if the company has a director resignation policy under which a nominee who fails to get a majority of votes is required to resign.

Approval to fill board vacancies without shareholder approval. Votes will generally be recommended for management proposals to allow the directors to fill vacancies on the board if the company requires a majority vote for the election of directors and the board is not classified. Votes will generally be recommended against management proposals to allow directors to fill vacancies on a classified board.

Board authority to set board size. Votes will generally be recommended for management proposals to set the board at a specific size or designate a reasonable range to provide flexibility. However, the anti-takeover effects of such proposals will be considered, particularly in the context of a hostile takeover offer or board contest. Votes will generally be recommended against management proposals to give the board the authority to set the size of the board without shareholder approval at a future time.

Term limits for outside directors. Votes will generally be recommended for management proposals to limit terms of outside directors and against shareholder proposals to limit such terms.

Shareholder access

Management and shareholder proposals to adopt proxy access will be considered case by case. Generally, votes will be recommended for proposals permitting a shareholder or a group of shareholders (which should not be limited to fewer than 20) representing ownership and holdings thresholds of at least 3% of a company's outstanding shares for three years to nominate up to 20% of the seats on the board. Any cap on the number of shareholders that can aggregate to satisfy the 3% outstanding share threshold should not be lower than 20.

Shareholder proposals that have differing thresholds will be considered if the company has not adopted any proxy access provision and does not intend to do so.

Additional share classes

The Funds believe that the alignment of voting and economic interests is a foundation of good governance. As such, companies issuing, or proposing to issue, more than one class of stock with different classes carrying different voting rights should bear in mind many investors' "one-share, one-vote" philosophy, while not hindering public capital formation in the equity markets. Furthermore, a newly public, dual-class company should consider adopting a sunset provision that would move the company toward a one-share, one-vote structure over time.

Proposals relating to the introduction of additional share classes with differential voting rights and proposals relating to the elimination of dual-class share structures with differential voting rights will be evaluated case by case.

Defensive structures

All situations involving defensive structures are reviewed holistically and on a case-by-case basis as facts and circumstances vary widely across issuers and over time.

Shareholder rights plans/poison pills. Votes will generally be recommended against the adoption of poison pill proposals and for shareholder proposals to rescind poison pills, unless company-specific circumstances require that the board and management be provided reasonable time and protection in order to guide the company's strategy without excessive short-term distractions. This analysis would typically require engagements with both the company and the acquirer/activist to understand the proposal.

- Structures and practices that are short-term in nature (typically terms of one year or less) will generally be supported.
- Shareholder ratification of such plans at the next practicable annual meeting and at each subsequent annual meeting while the plan is in place are preferred. In cases where this is not the practice, a shareholder proposal to adopt such practice may be supported.
- Votes will generally be recommended for net operating loss (NOL) poison pills and proposals to amend securities transfer restrictions that are intended to preserve net operating losses that would be lost as a result of a change in control, as long as the NOLs exist, and the provision sets forth a five-year sunset provision.

Consideration of other stakeholder interests. Management proposals to expand or clarify the authority of the board of directors to consider factors outside the interests of shareholders will be evaluated case by case.

Other anti-takeover provisions. In general, votes will be recommended for proposals to create anti-greenmail provisions and eliminate fair price provisions. Votes may be recommended for shareholder proposals to opt out of anti-takeover provisions in provinces/jurisdictions where that is allowed.

Voting requirements

Absent regulatory requirements, the Funds believe that material matters subject to shareholder approval should require support from no more than a majority of the company's shares outstanding. As such, votes will generally be recommended against proposals to adopt supermajority vote requirements and for proposals to reduce or eliminate such requirements.

Special meetings

If a company does not provide shareholders the right to call a special meeting, votes will generally be recommended for management proposals to establish that right. Votes will also generally be recommended for shareholder proposals to establish this right, as long as the ownership threshold for shareholders to have the right to call a special meeting is not below 10% of current shares outstanding.

If a company already provides shareholders the right to call a special meeting at a threshold of 25% or lower, votes will generally be recommended:

- Against management proposals to increase the ownership threshold above 25%.
- Against shareholder proposals to lower the ownership threshold below the current threshold.

Advance notice of shareholder proposals

Votes will generally be recommended for management proposals to adopt advance notice requirements if the provision provides for notice of a minimum of 30 days before the meeting date and a submission window of at least 30 days prior to the deadline, and reasonable disclosure and ownership requirements that are not overly restrictive or burdensome for shareholders.

Bylaws amendment procedures

Votes will generally be recommended against management proposals that give the board the exclusive authority to amend the bylaws.

Change of company name

Votes will generally be recommended for proposals to change the corporate name unless evidence shows that the change would hurt shareholder returns.

Reincorporation

Management proposals to reincorporate to another domicile will be evaluated case by case based on the relative costs and benefits to both the company and shareholders. Considerations include the reasons for the relocation and the differences in regulation, governance, shareholder rights, and potential benefits.

Votes will generally be recommended against shareholder proposals to reincorporate from one domicile to another.

Exclusive forum/exclusive jurisdiction

Management proposals to adopt an exclusive forum provision will be evaluated case by case. Considerations include the reasons for the proposal, regulations, governance, and shareholder rights available in the applicable jurisdiction, and the breadth of the application of the bylaw.

Shareholder meeting rules and procedures

Quorum requirements. Votes will generally be recommended against proposals that would decrease quorum requirements for shareholder meetings below a majority of the shares outstanding unless there are compelling arguments to support such a decrease.

Other such matters that may come before the meeting. Votes will generally be recommended against proposals to approve other such matters that may come before the meeting.

Adjournment of meeting to solicit more votes. In general, votes will be recommended for proposals to adjourn the meeting if the proposals in question are being supported and against if the proposals in question are being opposed.

Bundled proposals. Bundled management proposals will be evaluated case by case.

Change in date, time, or location of annual general meeting. Votes will generally be recommended for management proposals to change the date, time, or location of the annual meeting if the proposed changes are reasonable.

Hybrid/virtual meetings. Votes will generally be recommended for proposals seeking permission to conduct "hybrid" meetings (in which shareholders can attend a meeting of the company in person or elect to participate online). Proposals to conduct "virtual-only" meetings (held entirely through online participation with no corresponding in-person meeting) may be supported. Virtual meetings should be designed by a company so as not to curtail shareholder rights—e.g., by limiting the ability for shareholders to ask questions.

Vanguard[®]

© 2026 The Vanguard Group, Inc.
All rights reserved.

5085566 012026