

# Morgan Stanley Investment Management Equity Proxy Voting Policy and Procedures

MARCH 14, 2024

## I. GENERAL PROXY VOTING GUIDELINES

Morgan Stanley Investment Management (“MSIM”) and its affiliates<sup>1</sup> will vote proxies in a prudent and diligent manner and in the best interests of clients in accordance with their fiduciary duties, including beneficiaries of and participants in a client’s benefit plan(s) for which MSIM manages assets, consistent with the objective of maximizing long-term investment returns (“Client Proxy Standard”) and this Policy.<sup>2</sup>

MSIM has a decentralized approach towards investment management, consisting of independent investment teams. Accordingly, this Policy serves as guidance for MSIM investment teams addressing a broad range of issues, and general voting parameters on proposals that arise most frequently.

MSIM investment teams endeavor to integrate this Policy with their investment goals and client expectations, using their vote to encourage portfolio companies to enhance long-term shareholder value and to provide a high standard of transparency such that equity markets can value corporate assets appropriately.

As such, MSIM investment teams seek to follow the Client Proxy Standard for each client. At times, this may result in split votes, for example when different vehicles/products and clients have varying economic interests and / or priorities reflected in their mandates with respect to the outcome of a particular voting matter.

**VOTING PROXIES FOR CERTAIN NON-U.S. COMPANIES** - Voting proxies of companies located in some jurisdictions may involve several problems that can restrict or prevent the ability to vote such proxies or entail significant costs. These problems include, but are not limited to: (i) proxy statements and

ballots being written in a language other than English; (ii) untimely and/or inadequate notice of shareholder meetings; (iii) restrictions on the ability of holders outside the issuer’s jurisdiction of organization to exercise votes; (iv) requirements to vote proxies in person; (v) the imposition of restrictions on the sale of the securities for a period of time in proximity to the shareholder meeting; and (vi) requirements to provide local agents with power of attorney to facilitate our voting instructions. As a result, we vote clients’ non-U.S. proxies on a best efforts basis only, after weighing the costs and benefits of voting such proxies, consistent with the Client Proxy Standard. Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”) has been retained to provide assistance in connection with voting non-U.S. proxies.

**SECURITIES LENDING** - MS Funds or any other investment vehicle sponsored, managed or advised by an MSIM affiliate may participate in a securities lending program through a third party provider. The voting rights for shares that are out on loan are transferred to the borrower and therefore, the lender (i.e., an MS Fund or another investment vehicle sponsored, managed or advised by an MSIM affiliate) is not entitled to vote the lent shares at the company meeting.

However, in certain circumstances a portfolio manager may seek to recall shares for the purposes of voting. In this event, the handling of such recall requests would be on a best efforts basis.

### A. ROUTINE MATTERS

We generally support routine management proposals. The following are examples of routine management proposals:

- Approval of financial statements and auditor reports if delivered with an unqualified auditor’s opinion.

<sup>1</sup> The MSIM entities covered by this Equity Proxy Voting Policy and Procedures (the “Policy”) currently include the following: Morgan Stanley AIP GP LP, Morgan Stanley Investment Management Inc., Morgan Stanley Investment Management Limited, Morgan Stanley Investment Management Company, Morgan Stanley Saudi Arabia, MSIM Fund Management (Ireland) Limited, Morgan Stanley Asia Limited, Morgan Stanley Investment Management (Japan) Co. Limited, Morgan Stanley Investment Management Private Limited, Morgan Stanley Eaton Vance CLO Manager LLC, Morgan Stanley Eaton Vance CLO CM LLC and FundLogic SAS (each an “MSIM Affiliate” and collectively referred to as the “MSIM Affiliates” or as “we” below).

<sup>2</sup> This Policy does not apply to MSIM’s authority to exercise certain decision-making rights associated with investments in loans and other fixed-income instruments (collectively, “Fixed Income Instruments”). Instead, MSIM’s Policy for Exercising Consents Related to Fixed Income Instruments applies to MSIM’s exercise of discretionary authority or other investment management services, to the extent MSIM has been granted authority to exercise consents for an account with respect to any Fixed Income Instruments held therein.

- General updating/corrective amendments to the charter, articles of association or bylaws, unless we believe that such amendments would diminish shareholder rights.

Most proposals related to the conduct of the annual meeting, with the following exceptions. We generally oppose proposals that relate to “the transaction of such other business which may come before the meeting,” and open-ended requests for adjournment. However, where management specifically states the reason for requesting an adjournment and the requested adjournment would facilitate passage of a proposal that would otherwise be supported under this Policy (i.e., an uncontested corporate transaction), the adjournment request will be supported. We do not support proposals that allow companies to call a special meeting with a short (generally two weeks or less) time frame for review. We generally support shareholder proposals advocating confidential voting procedures and independent tabulation of voting results.

MSIM is supportive of the use of technology to conduct virtual shareholder meetings in parallel with physical meetings, for increased investor participation. However, adoption of a ‘virtual-only’ approach would restrict meaningful exchange between the company and shareholders. Therefore, MSIM is generally not supportive of proposals seeking authority to conduct virtual-only shareholder meetings.

## B. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**1. ELECTION OF DIRECTORS:** Votes on board nominees can involve balancing a variety of considerations. In vote decisions, we may take into consideration whether the company has a majority voting policy in place that we believe makes the director vote more meaningful. In the absence of a proxy contest, we generally support the board’s nominees for director except as follows:

- We consider withholding support from or voting against a nominee if we believe a direct conflict exists between the interests of the nominee and the public shareholders, including failure to meet fiduciary standards of care and/or loyalty. We may oppose directors where we conclude that actions of directors are unlawful, unethical or negligent. We consider opposing individual board members or an entire slate if we believe the board is entrenched and/or dealing inadequately with performance problems; if we believe the board is acting with insufficient independence between the board and management; or if we believe the board has not been sufficiently forthcoming with information on key governance or other matters we believe could be financially material.
- We consider withholding support from or voting against interested directors if the company’s board does not meet market standards for director independence, or if otherwise we believe board independence is insufficient. We refer to prevalent market standards as promulgated by a stock exchange or other authority within a given market (e.g., New York Stock Exchange or Nasdaq rules

for most U.S. companies, and The Combined Code on Corporate Governance in the United Kingdom). Thus, for an NYSE company with no controlling shareholder, we would expect that at a minimum a majority of directors should be independent as defined by NYSE. Where we view market standards as inadequate, we may withhold votes based on stronger independence standards. Market standards notwithstanding, we generally do not view long board tenure alone as a basis to classify a director as non-independent.

- At a company with a shareholder or group that controls the company by virtue of a majority economic interest in the company, we have a reduced expectation for board independence, although we believe the presence of independent directors can be helpful, particularly in staffing the audit committee, and at times we may withhold support from or vote against a nominee on the view the board or its committees are not sufficiently independent. However, in markets where board independence is not the norm, we consider factors including whether a board of a controlled company includes independent members who can be expected to look out for interests of minority holders.
  - We consider withholding support from or voting against a nominee if he or she is affiliated with a major shareholder that has representation on a board disproportionate to its economic interest.
- Depending on market standards, we consider withholding support from or voting against a nominee who is interested and who is standing for election as a member of the company’s compensation/remuneration, nominating/governance or audit committee.
  - We consider withholding support from or voting against nominees if the term for which they are nominated is excessive. We consider this issue on a market-specific basis.
  - We consider withholding support from or voting against nominees if in our view there has been insufficient board renewal (turnover), particularly in the context of extended poor company performance. Also, if the board has failed to consider diversity, including but not limited to, gender and ethnicity, in its board composition.
  - We consider withholding support from or voting against a nominee standing for election if the board has not taken action to implement generally accepted governance practices for which there is a “bright line” test. For example, in the context of the U.S. market, failure to eliminate a dead hand or slow hand poison pill would be seen as a basis for opposing one or more incumbent nominees.
  - In markets that encourage designated audit committee financial experts, we consider voting against members of an audit committee if no members are designated as such. We also consider voting against the audit

committee members if the company has faced financial reporting issues and/or does not put the auditor up for ratification by shareholders.

- h. We believe investors should have the ability to vote on individual nominees, and may abstain or vote against a slate of nominees where we are not given the opportunity to vote on individual nominees.
  - i. We consider withholding support from or voting against a nominee who has failed to attend at least 75% of the nominee's board and board committee meetings within a given year without a reasonable excuse. We also consider opposing nominees if the company does not meet market standards for disclosure on attendance.
  - j. We consider withholding support from or voting against a nominee who appears overcommitted, particularly through service on an excessive number of boards. Market expectations are incorporated into this analysis; for U.S. boards, we generally oppose election of a nominee who serves on more than four public company boards (excluding investment companies), or public company CEOs that serve on more than two outside boards given level of time commitment required in their primary job.
  - k. We consider withholding support from or voting against a nominee where we believe executive remuneration practices are poor, particularly if the company does not offer shareholders a separate "say-on-pay" advisory vote on pay.
- 2. DISCHARGE OF DIRECTORS' DUTIES:** In markets where an annual discharge of directors' responsibility is a routine agenda item, we generally support such discharge. However, we may vote against discharge or abstain from voting where there are serious findings of fraud or other unethical behavior for which the individual bears responsibility. The annual discharge of responsibility represents shareholder approval of disclosed actions taken by the board during the year and may make future shareholder action against the board difficult to pursue.
- 3. BOARD INDEPENDENCE:** We generally support U.S. shareholder proposals requiring that a certain percentage (up to 66⅔%) of the company's board members be independent directors, and promoting all-independent audit, compensation and nominating/governance committees.
- 4. BOARD DIVERSITY:** We believe that board diversity is a potentially financially material issue. As such we generally support shareholder proposals urging diversity of board membership with respect to gender, race or other factors where we believe the board has failed to take these factors into account. We will also consider not supporting the re-election of the nomination committee and / or chair (or other resolutions when the nomination chair is not up for re-election) where we perceive limited progress in gender diversity, with the expectation where feasible and with

consideration of any idiosyncrasies of individual markets, that female directors represent not less than a third of the board, unless there is evidence that the company has made significant progress in this area. In markets where information on director ethnicity is available, and it is legal to obtain it, and where it is relevant, we will generally also consider not supporting the re-election of the nomination committee chair (or other resolutions when the nomination chair is not up for re-election) if the board lacks ethnic diversity and has not outlined a credible diversity strategy.

- 5. MAJORITY VOTING:** We generally support proposals requesting or requiring majority voting policies in election of directors, so long as there is a carve-out for plurality voting in the case of contested elections.
- 6. PROXY ACCESS:** We consider proposals on procedures for inclusion of shareholder nominees and to have those nominees included in the company's proxy statement and on the company's proxy ballot on a case-by-case basis. Considerations include ownership thresholds, holding periods, the number of directors that shareholders may nominate and any restrictions on forming a group.
- 7. REIMBURSEMENT FOR DISSIDENT NOMINEES:** We generally support well-crafted U.S. shareholder proposals that would provide for reimbursement of dissident nominees elected to a board, as the cost to shareholders in electing such nominees can be factored into the voting decision on those nominees.
- 8. PROPOSALS TO ELECT DIRECTORS MORE FREQUENTLY:** In the U.S. public company context, we usually support shareholder and management proposals to elect all directors annually (to "declassify" the board), although we make an exception to this policy where we believe that long-term shareholder value may be harmed by this change given particular circumstances at the company at the time of the vote on such proposal. As indicated above, outside the United States we generally support greater accountability to shareholders that comes through more frequent director elections, but recognize that many markets embrace longer term lengths, sometimes for valid reasons given other aspects of the legal context in electing boards.
- 9. CUMULATIVE VOTING:** We generally support proposals to eliminate cumulative voting in the U.S. market context. (Cumulative voting provides that shareholders may concentrate their votes for one or a handful of candidates, a system that can enable a minority bloc to place representation on a board.) U.S. proposals to establish cumulative voting in the election of directors generally will not be supported.
- 10. SEPARATION OF CHAIRMAN AND CEO POSITIONS:** We vote on shareholder proposals to separate the Chairman and CEO positions and/or to appoint an independent Chairman based in part on prevailing practice in particular markets, since the context for such a practice varies. In many non-U.S. markets, we view separation of the roles as a market standard practice, and support division of the

roles in that context. In the United States, we consider such proposals on a case-by-case basis, considering, among other things, the existing board leadership structure, company performance, and any evidence of entrenchment or perceived risk that power is overly concentrated in a single individual.

**11. DIRECTOR RETIREMENT AGE AND TERM LIMITS:** Proposals setting or recommending director retirement ages or director term limits are voted on a case-by-case basis that includes consideration of company performance, the rate of board renewal, evidence of effective individual director evaluation processes, and any indications of entrenchment.

**12. PROPOSALS TO LIMIT DIRECTORS' LIABILITY AND/OR BROADEN INDEMNIFICATION OF OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS:** Generally, we will support such proposals provided that an individual is eligible only if he or she has not acted in bad faith, with gross negligence or with reckless disregard of their duties.

### C. STATUTORY AUDITOR BOARDS

The statutory auditor board, which is separate from the main board of directors, plays a role in corporate governance in several markets. These boards are elected by shareholders to provide assurance on compliance with legal and accounting standards and the company's articles of association. We generally vote for statutory auditor nominees if they meet independence standards. In markets that require disclosure on attendance by internal statutory auditors, however, we consider voting against nominees for these positions who failed to attend at least 75% of meetings in the previous year. We also consider opposing nominees if the company does not meet market standards for disclosure on attendance.

### D. CORPORATE TRANSACTIONS AND PROXY FIGHTS

We examine proposals relating to mergers, acquisitions and other special corporate transactions (i.e., takeovers, spin-offs, sales of assets, reorganizations, restructurings and recapitalizations) on a case-by-case basis in the interests of each fund or other account. Proposals for mergers or other significant transactions that are friendly and approved by the Research Providers usually are supported if there is no portfolio manager objection. We also analyze proxy contests on a case-by-case basis.

### E. CHANGES IN CAPITAL STRUCTURE

1. We generally support the following:

- Management and shareholder proposals aimed at eliminating unequal voting rights, assuming fair economic treatment of classes of shares we hold.
- U.S. management proposals to increase the authorization of existing classes of common stock (or securities convertible into common stock) if: (i) a clear business purpose is stated that we can support and the number of shares requested is reasonable in relation to the purpose for which authorization is requested; and/or (ii) the authorization does

not exceed 100% of shares currently authorized and at least 30% of the total new authorization will be outstanding. (We consider proposals that do not meet these criteria on a case-by-case basis.)

- U.S. management proposals to create a new class of preferred stock or for issuances of preferred stock up to 50% of issued capital, unless we have concerns about use of the authority for anti-takeover purposes.
  - Proposals in non-U.S. markets that in our view appropriately limit potential dilution of existing shareholders. A major consideration is whether existing shareholders would have preemptive rights for any issuance under a proposal for standing share issuance authority. We generally consider market-specific guidance in making these decisions; for example, in the U.K. market we usually follow Association of British Insurers' ("ABI") guidance, although company-specific factors may be considered and for example, may sometimes lead us to voting against share authorization proposals even if they meet ABI guidance.
  - Management proposals to authorize share repurchase plans, except in some cases in which we believe there are insufficient protections against use of an authorization for anti-takeover purposes.
  - Management proposals to reduce the number of authorized shares of common or preferred stock, or to eliminate classes of preferred stock.
  - Management proposals to effect stock splits.
  - Management proposals to effect reverse stock splits if management proportionately reduces the authorized share amount set forth in the corporate charter. Reverse stock splits that do not adjust proportionately to the authorized share amount generally will be approved if the resulting increase in authorized shares coincides with the proxy guidelines set forth above for common stock increases.
  - Management dividend payout proposals, except where we perceive company payouts to shareholders as inadequate.
2. We generally oppose the following (notwithstanding management support):
- Proposals to add classes of stock that would substantially dilute the voting interests of existing shareholders.
  - Proposals to increase the authorized or issued number of shares of existing classes of stock that are unreasonably dilutive, particularly if there are no preemptive rights for existing shareholders. However, depending on market practices, we consider voting for proposals giving general authorization for issuance of shares not subject to pre-emptive rights if the authority is limited.
  - Proposals that authorize share issuance at a discount to market rates, except where authority for such issuance is de minimis, or if there is a special situation that we believe justifies such authorization (as may be the case, for example, at a company under severe stress and risk of bankruptcy).

- Proposals relating to changes in capitalization by 100% or more.

We consider on a case-by-case basis shareholder proposals to increase dividend payout ratios, in light of market practice and perceived market weaknesses, as well as individual company payout history and current circumstances. For example, currently we perceive low payouts to shareholders as a concern at some Japanese companies, but may deem a low payout ratio as appropriate for a growth company making good use of its cash, notwithstanding the broader market concern.

## F. TAKEOVER DEFENSES AND SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS

- 1. SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS PLANS:** We generally support proposals to require shareholder approval or ratification of shareholder rights plans (poison pills). In voting on rights plans or similar takeover defenses, we consider on a case-by-case basis whether the company has demonstrated a need for the defense in the context of promoting long-term share value; whether provisions of the defense are in line with generally accepted governance principles in the market (and specifically the presence of an adequate qualified offer provision that would exempt offers meeting certain conditions from the pill); and the specific context if the proposal is made in the midst of a takeover bid or contest for control.
- 2. SUPERMAJORITY VOTING REQUIREMENTS:** We generally oppose requirements for supermajority votes to amend the charter or bylaws, unless the provisions protect minority shareholders where there is a large shareholder. In line with this view, in the absence of a large shareholder we support reasonable shareholder proposals to limit such supermajority voting requirements. Also, we oppose provisions that do not allow shareholders any right to amend the charter of bylaws.
- 3. SHAREHOLDERS RIGHT TO CALL A SPECIAL MEETING:** We consider proposals to enhance a shareholder's rights to call meetings on a case-by-case basis. At large-cap U.S. companies, we generally support efforts to establish the right of holders of 10% or more of shares to call special meetings, unless the board or state law has set a policy or law establishing such rights at a threshold that we believe to be acceptable.
- 4. WRITTEN CONSENT RIGHTS:** In the U.S. context, we examine proposals for shareholder written consent rights on a case-by-case basis.
- 5. REINCORPORATION:** We consider management and shareholder proposals to reincorporate to a different jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis. We oppose such proposals if we believe the main purpose is to take advantage of laws or judicial precedents that reduce shareholder rights.
- 6. ANTI-GREENMAIL PROVISIONS:** Proposals relating to the adoption of anti-greenmail provisions will be supported,

provided that the proposal: (i) defines greenmail; (ii) prohibits buyback offers to large block holders (holders of at least 1% of the outstanding shares and in certain cases, a greater amount) not made to all shareholders or not approved by disinterested shareholders; and (iii) contains no anti-takeover measures or other provisions restricting the rights of shareholders.

- 7. BUNDLED PROPOSALS:** We may consider opposing or abstaining on proposals if disparate issues are "bundled" and presented for a single vote.

## G. AUDITORS

We generally support management proposals for selection or ratification of independent auditors. However, we may consider opposing such proposals with reference to incumbent audit firms if the company has suffered from serious accounting irregularities and we believe rotation of the audit firm is appropriate, or if fees paid to the auditor for non-audit-related services are excessive. Generally, to determine if non-audit fees are excessive, a 50% test will be applied (i.e., non-audit-related fees should be less than 50% of the total fees paid to the auditor). We generally vote against proposals to indemnify auditors.

## H. EXECUTIVE AND DIRECTOR REMUNERATION

- We generally support the following:
  - Proposals for employee equity compensation plans and other employee ownership plans, provided that our research does not indicate that approval of the plan would be against shareholder interest. Such approval may be against shareholder interest if it authorizes excessive dilution and shareholder cost, particularly in the context of high usage ("run rate") of equity compensation in the recent past; or if there are objectionable plan design and provisions.
  - Proposals relating to fees to outside directors, provided the amounts are not excessive relative to other companies in the country or industry, and provided that the structure is appropriate within the market context. While stock-based compensation to outside directors is positive if moderate and appropriately structured, we are wary of significant stock option awards or other performance-based awards for outside directors, as well as provisions that could result in significant forfeiture of value on a director's decision to resign from a board (such forfeiture can undercut director independence).
  - Proposals for employee stock purchase plans that permit discounts, but only for grants that are part of a broad-based employee plan, including all non-executive employees, and only if the discounts are limited to a reasonable market standard or less.
  - Proposals for the establishment of employee retirement and severance plans, provided that our research does not indicate that approval of the plan would be against shareholder interest.

2. We generally oppose retirement plans and bonuses for non-executive directors and independent statutory auditors.
3. In the U.S. context, we generally vote against shareholder proposals requiring shareholder approval of all severance agreements, but we generally support proposals that require shareholder approval for agreements in excess of three times the annual compensation (salary and bonus) or proposals that require companies to adopt a provision requiring an executive to receive accelerated vesting of equity awards if there is a change of control and the executive is terminated. We generally oppose shareholder proposals that would establish arbitrary caps on pay. We consider on a case-by-case basis shareholder proposals that seek to limit Supplemental Executive Retirement Plans (SERPs), but support such shareholder proposals where we consider SERPs excessive.
4. Shareholder proposals advocating stronger and/or particular pay-for-performance models will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, with consideration of the merits of the individual proposal within the context of the particular company and its labor markets, and the company's current and past practices. While we generally support emphasis on long-term components of senior executive pay and strong linkage of pay to performance, we consider factors including whether a proposal may be overly prescriptive, and the impact of the proposal, if implemented as written, on recruitment and retention.
5. We generally support proposals advocating reasonable senior executive and director stock ownership guidelines and holding requirements for shares gained in executive equity compensation programs.
6. We generally support shareholder proposals for reasonable "claw-back" provisions that provide for company recovery of senior executive bonuses to the extent they were based on achieving financial benchmarks that were not actually met in light of subsequent restatements.
7. Management proposals effectively to re-price stock options are considered on a case-by-case basis. Considerations include the company's reasons and justifications for a re-pricing, the company's competitive position, whether senior executives and outside directors are excluded, potential cost to shareholders, whether the re-pricing or share exchange is on a value-for-value basis, and whether vesting requirements are extended.
8. Say-on-Pay: We consider proposals relating to an advisory vote on remuneration on a case-by-case basis. Considerations include a review of the relationship between executive remuneration and performance based on operating trends and total shareholder return over multiple performance periods. In addition, we review remuneration structures and potential poor pay practices, including relative magnitude of pay, discretionary bonus awards, tax gross ups, change-in-control features, internal pay equity and peer group construction. As long-term investors, we support remuneration policies that align with long-term shareholder returns.

## I. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Shareholders in the United States and certain other markets submit proposals encouraging changes in company disclosure and practices related to particular social and environmental matters. Relevant social and environmental issues, including principal adverse sustainability impacts, may influence long-term risk and return. Consequently, investment teams may consider how to vote on proposals related to social and environmental issues on a case-by-case basis by determining the extent to which they believe the social and environmental issues identified in the proposal could impact shareholder value. In reviewing proposals on such issues, investment teams may consider the financial materiality, including the company's exposure to the risk or opportunity, the management of such issues and a company's current disclosures. In assessing and prioritizing proposals, we carefully reflect on the potential financial materiality of the issues as well as the sector and geography in which the company operates. We also consider the explanation companies provide where they may depart from best practice to assess the adequacy and appropriateness of measures that are in place. Investment teams may seek to balance concerns on reputational, operational, litigation and other risks that lie behind a proposal against costs of implementation, while considering appropriate shareholder and management prerogatives. Investment teams may abstain from voting on proposals that do not have a readily determinable financial impact on shareholder value and may oppose proposals that intrude excessively on management prerogatives and/or board discretion. Investment teams may generally vote against proposals requesting reports or actions they believe are duplicative, related to matters not considered by the investment team to be financially material to the business, or that would impose unnecessary or excessive costs. We consider proposals on these sustainability risks, opportunities and impacts on a case-by-case basis but generally support proposals that seek to enhance useful disclosure. We focus on understanding the company's business and commercial context and recognise that there is no one size fits all that can apply to all companies.

### ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:

We generally support proposals that, if implemented, would enhance useful disclosure on climate, biodiversity, and other environmental risks, such as disclosures aligned with SASB (Sustainability Accounting Standards Board) and the TCFD (Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures) for companies for which such issues may be financially material. We also generally support proposals that aim to ensure companies communicate credibly on their commitments to manage reputational risks. As such, we generally support proposals that aim to encourage companies to use independently verified Science Based Targets to ensure emissions are in line with the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, which should ultimately help companies who seek to manage long-term climate-related risks do so in a way that remains credible. We generally will support reasonable proposals to reduce negative environmental

impacts and ameliorate a company's overall environmental footprint, including any threats to biodiversity in ecologically sensitive areas. We generally will also support proposals asking companies to report on their environmental practices, policies and impacts, including environmental damage and health risks resulting from operations, and the impact of environmental liabilities on shareholder value.

#### **SOCIAL ISSUES:**

We generally support proposals that, if implemented, would enhance useful disclosure on employee and board diversity, including gender, race, and other factors, for companies where such issues could be considered by the investment teams as financially material. We consider proposals on other social issues on a case-by-case basis but generally support proposals that:

- Seek to enhance useful disclosure or improvements on material issues such as human rights risks, supply chain management, workplace safety, human capital management and pay equity in line with local rules.
- Encourage policies to eliminate gender-based violence and other forms of harassment from the workplace.
- Seek disclosure of relevant diversity policies and meaningful workforce diversity data, including EEO-1 data.

We consider proposals on other social issues on a case-by-case basis but generally support proposals that: Seek to enhance transparency through disclosures on supply chain management, particularly in cases where this is a financially material risk.

We may consider withholding support where we have material concerns in relation to a company's involvement/remediation of a breach of global conventions such as UN Global Compact Principles on Human Rights, Labour Standards, Environment and Business Malpractice.

#### **J. FUNDS OF FUNDS**

Certain MS Funds advised by an MSIM Affiliate invest only in other MS Funds. If an underlying fund has a shareholder meeting, in order to avoid any potential conflict of interest, such proposals will be voted in the same proportion as the votes of the other shareholders of the underlying fund, unless otherwise determined by the Proxy Review Committee. In markets where proportional voting is not available we will not vote at the meeting, unless otherwise determined by the Proxy Review Committee. Other MS Funds invest in unaffiliated funds. If an unaffiliated underlying fund has a shareholder meeting and the MS Fund owns more than 25% of the voting shares of the underlying fund, the MS Fund will vote its shares in the unaffiliated underlying fund in the same proportion as the votes of the other shareholders of the underlying fund to the extent possible.

#### **VOTING CONDITIONS TRIGGERED UNDER RULE 12D1-4**

Rule 12d1-4 sets forth the conditions under which a registered fund ("acquiring fund") may invest in excess of the statutory limits of Section 12(d)(1) of the 1940 Act (for example by

owning more than 3% of the total outstanding voting stock) in another registered fund ("acquired fund"). In the event that a Morgan Stanley "acquiring fund" invests in an "acquired fund" in reliance on Rule 12d1-4 under the 1940 Act, and the MS Fund and its "advisory group" (as defined in Rule 12d1-4) hold more than (i) 25% of the total outstanding voting stock of a particular open-end fund (including ETFs) or (ii) 10% of the total outstanding voting stock of a particular closed-end fund, the Morgan Stanley "acquiring fund" and its "advisory group" will be required to vote all shares of the open- or closed-end fund held by the fund and its "advisory group" in the same proportion as the votes of the other shareholders of the open- or closed-end fund.

Because MSIM and Eaton Vance are generally considered part of the same "advisory group," an Eaton Vance "acquiring fund" that is required to comply with the voting conditions set forth in Rule 12d1-4 could potentially implicate voting conditions for a MS Fund invested in the same open- or closed-end fund as the Eaton Vance "acquiring fund." The Committee will be notified by Compliance if the conditions are triggered for a particular open- or closed-end fund holding in an MS Fund. In the event that the voting conditions in Rule 12d1-4 are triggered, please refer to the Morgan Stanley Funds Fund of Funds Investment Policy for specific information on Rule 12d1-4 voting requirements and exceptions.

## **II. ADMINISTRATION OF THE POLICY**

The MSIM Proxy Review Committee (the "Committee") has overall responsibility for the Policy. The Committee consists of investment professionals who represent the different investment disciplines and geographic locations of MSIM, and is chaired by the director of the Global Stewardship Team ("GST"). Because proxy voting is an investment responsibility and may affect shareholder value, and because of their knowledge of companies and markets as well as their understanding of their clients' objectives, portfolio managers and other members of investment staff play a key role in proxy voting, individual investment teams are responsible for determining decisions on proxy votes and may, where relevant, consult the GST. The GST administers and implements the Policy, as well as monitoring services provided by the proxy advisory firms, third-party proxy engagements and other research providers used in the proxy voting process. As noted below, certain ETFs will follow Calvert's Proxy Voting Policy and Procedures, which is administered by Calvert's Proxy Voting and Engagement Department and overseen by Calvert's Proxy Voting and Engagement Committee. The GST periodically monitors Calvert's proxy voting with respect to securities held by the ETFs.

The GST Director is responsible for identifying issues that require Committee deliberation or ratification. The GST, working with advice of investment teams, is responsible for voting on routine items and on matters that can be addressed in line with these Policy guidelines. The GST has responsibility for voting case-by-case where guidelines and precedent provide adequate guidance.

The Committee may periodically review and may amend, as necessary, the Policy and establish and direct voting positions consistent with the Client Proxy Standard following consultation and approval from the investment teams.

GST and members of the Committee may take into account Research Providers' recommendations and research as well as any other relevant information they may request or receive, including portfolio manager and/or analyst comments and research, as applicable. Generally, proxies related to securities held in client accounts that are managed pursuant to quantitative, index or index-like strategies ("Index Strategies") will be voted in the same manner as those held in actively managed accounts, unless economic interests or investment guidelines of the accounts differ. Because accounts managed using Index Strategies are passively managed accounts, research from portfolio managers and/or analysts related to securities held in these accounts may not be available. If the affected securities are held only in accounts that are managed pursuant to Index Strategies, and the proxy relates to a matter that is not described in this Policy, the GST will consider all available information from the Research Providers, and to the extent that the holdings are significant, from the portfolio managers and/or analysts.

#### A. COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

The Committee meets at least quarterly, and reviews and considers changes to the Policy at least annually. The Committee will review developing issues, as appropriate, as requested by the GST.

#### B. MATERIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

In addition to the procedures discussed above, if the GST Director determines that an issue raises a material conflict of interest, the GST Director may request a special committee ("Special Committee") to review, and recommend a course of action with respect to, the conflict(s) in question.

A potential material conflict of interest could exist in the following situations, among others:

1. The issuer soliciting the vote is a client of MSIM or an affiliate of MSIM and the vote is on a matter that materially affects the issuer.
2. The proxy relates to Morgan Stanley common stock or any other security issued by Morgan Stanley or its affiliates except if echo voting is used, as with MS Funds, as described herein.
3. Morgan Stanley has a material pecuniary interest in the matter submitted for a vote (e.g., acting as a financial advisor to a party to a merger or acquisition for which Morgan Stanley will be paid a success fee if completed).
4. One of Morgan Stanley's independent directors or one of MS Funds' directors also serves on the board of directors or is a nominee for election to the board of directors of a company held by an MS Fund or affiliate.

If the GST Director determines that an issue raises a potential material conflict of interest, depending on the facts and circumstances, the issue will be addressed as follows:

1. If the matter relates to a topic that is discussed in this Policy, the proposal will be voted as per the Policy.
2. If the matter is not discussed in this Policy or the Policy indicates that the issue is to be decided case-by-case, the proposal will be voted in a manner consistent with the Research Providers, provided that all the Research Providers consulted have the same recommendation, no portfolio manager objects to that vote, and the vote is consistent with MSIM's Client Proxy Standard.
3. If the Research Providers' recommendations differ, the GST Director will refer the matter to a Special Committee to vote on the proposal, as appropriate.

Any Special Committee shall be comprised of the GST Director, and at least two portfolio managers (preferably members of the Committee), as approved by the Committee. The GST Director may request non-voting participation by MSIM's General Counsel or his/her designee and the Chief Compliance Officer or his/her designee. In addition to the research provided by Research Providers, the Special Committee may request analysis from MSIM Affiliate investment professionals and outside sources to the extent it deems appropriate.

#### C. PROXY VOTING REPORTING

The GST will document in writing all Committee and Special Committee decisions and actions, which documentation will be maintained by the GST for a period of at least six years. To the extent these decisions relate to a security held by an MS Fund, the GST will report the decisions to each applicable Board of Trustees/Directors of those MS Funds (the "Board") at each Board's next regularly scheduled Board meeting. The report will contain information concerning decisions made during the most recently ended calendar quarter immediately preceding the Board meeting.

In addition, to the extent that Committee and Special Committee decisions and actions relate to a security held by other pooled investment vehicles, the GST will report the decisions to the relevant governing board of the pooled investment vehicle. MSIM will promptly provide a copy of this Policy to any client requesting it.

MSIM will also, upon client request, promptly provide a report indicating how each proxy was voted with respect to securities held in that client's account.

MSIM's Legal Department, in conjunction with GST and GST IT for MS Fund reporting and with the AIP investment team for AIP Closed-End 40 Act Fund reporting, is responsible for filing an annual Form N-PX on behalf of each MS Fund and AIP Closed-End 40 Act Fund for which such filing is required, indicating how all proxies were voted with respect to each such fund's holdings.

Also, MSIM maintains voting records of individual agenda items a company meetings in a searchable database on its website on a rolling 12-month basis.

In addition, ISS provides vote execution, reporting and recordkeeping services to MSIM.

#### D. RETENTION AND OVERSIGHT OF PROXY ADVISORY FIRMS

ISS and Glass Lewis (together with other proxy research providers as we may retain from time to time, the “Research Providers”) are independent advisers that specialize in providing a variety of fiduciary-level proxy-related services to institutional investment managers, plan sponsors, custodians, consultants, and other institutional investors. The services provided include in-depth research, global issuer analysis, record retention, ballot processing and voting recommendations.

To facilitate proxy voting MSIM has retained Research Providers to provide company level reports that summarize key data elements contained within an issuer’s proxy statement. Although we are aware of the voting recommendations included in the Research Providers’ company level reports, these recommendations are not an input into our vote nor is any potential vote prepopulated based on a Research Provider’s research. MSIM votes all proxies based on its own proxy voting policies, consultation with the investment teams, and in the best interests of each client. In addition to research, MSIM retains ISS to provide vote execution, reporting, and recordkeeping services.

As part of MSIM’s ongoing oversight of the Research Providers, MSIM performs periodic due diligence on the Research Providers. Topics of the reviews include, but are not limited to, conflicts of interest, methodologies for developing their policies and vote recommendations, and resources.

### III. RECORDKEEPING

Records are retained in accordance with Morgan Stanley’s **Global Information Management Policy**, which establishes general Firm-wide standards and procedures regarding the retention, handling, and destruction of official books and records and other information of legal or operational significance. The **Global Information Management Policy** incorporates Morgan Stanley’s **Master Retention Schedule**, which lists various record classes and associated retention periods on a global basis.

### IV. RETENTION AND OVERSIGHT OF OUTSOURCED PROXY VOTING

Certain MSIM exchange-traded funds (“ETFs”) will follow Calvert Research and Management’s (“Calvert”) Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures and the Global Proxy Voting Guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the Calvert Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures. MSIM’s oversight of Calvert’s proxy voting engagement is ongoing pursuant to the 40 Act Fund Service Provider and Vendor Oversight Policy.

### V. POLICY STATEMENT

The Policy, with respect to securities held in the accounts of clients applies to those MSIM entities that provide discretionary investment management services and for which an MSIM entity has authority to vote proxies. For purposes of this Policy, clients shall include: Morgan Stanley U.S. registered investment companies, other Morgan Stanley pooled investment vehicles, and MSIM separately managed accounts (including accounts for Employee Retirement Income Security (“ERISA”) clients and ERISA-equivalent clients). This Policy is reviewed and updated as necessary to address new and evolving proxy voting issues and standards.

Each MSIM Affiliate will use its best efforts to vote proxies as part of its authority to manage, acquire and dispose of account assets.

- With respect to the U.S. registered investment companies sponsored, managed or advised by any MSIM Affiliate (the “MS Funds”), each MSIM Affiliate will vote proxies under this Policy pursuant to authority granted under its applicable investment advisory agreement or, in the absence of such authority, as authorized by the Board of Directors/ Trustees of the MS Funds.
- For other pooled investment vehicles (e.g., UCITS), each MSIM Affiliate will vote proxies under this Policy pursuant to authority granted under its applicable investment advisory agreement or, in the absence of such authority, as authorized by the relevant governing board.
- For separately managed accounts (including ERISA and ERISA-equivalent clients), each MSIM Affiliate will vote proxies under this Policy pursuant to authority granted under the applicable investment advisory agreement or investment management agreement. Where an MSIM Affiliate has the authority to vote proxies on behalf of ERISA and ERISA-equivalent clients, the MSIM Affiliate must do so in accordance with its fiduciary duties under ERISA (and the Internal Revenue Code).
- In certain situations, a client or its fiduciary may reserve the authority to vote proxies for itself or an outside party or may provide an MSIM Affiliate with a statement of proxy voting policy. The MSIM Affiliate will comply with the client’s policy.
- Certain ETFs will follow Calvert’s Global Proxy Voting Guidelines set forth in Appendix A of Calvert’s Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures and the proxy voting guidelines discussed below do not apply to such ETFs. See Appendix A of Calvert’s Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures for a general discussion of the proxy voting guidelines to which these ETFs will be subject.

An MSIM Affiliate will not vote proxies unless the investment management agreement, investment advisory agreement or other authority explicitly authorizes the MSIM Affiliate to vote proxies.

In addition to voting proxies of portfolio companies, MSIM routinely engages with, or, in some cases, may engage a third

party to engage with, the management or board of companies in which we invest on a range of environmental, social and governance issues. Governance is a window into or proxy for management and board quality. MSIM engages with companies where we have larger positions, voting issues are material or where we believe we can make a positive impact on the governance structure. MSIM's engagement process, through private communication with companies, allows us to understand the governance structures at investee companies and better inform our voting decisions. In certain situations, a client or its fiduciary may provide an MSIM Affiliate with a proxy voting policy. In these situations, the MSIM Affiliate will comply with the client's policy.

## APPENDIX A

Appendix A applies to the following accounts managed by Morgan Stanley AIP GP LP (i) closed-end funds registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended; (ii) discretionary separate accounts; (iii) unregistered funds; and (iv) non-discretionary accounts offered in connection with AIP's Custom Advisory Portfolio Solutions service. Generally, AIP will follow the guidelines set forth in Section II of MSIM's Proxy Voting Policy and Procedures. To the extent that such guidelines do not provide specific direction, or AIP determines that consistent with the Client Proxy Standard, the guidelines should not be followed, the Proxy Review Committee has delegated the voting authority to vote securities held by accounts managed by AIP to the Fund of Hedge Funds investment team, the Private Markets investment team or the Portfolio Solutions team of AIP. A summary of decisions made by the applicable investment teams will be made available to the Proxy Review Committee for its information at the next scheduled meeting of the Proxy Review Committee.

In certain cases, AIP may determine to abstain from determining (or recommending) how a proxy should be voted (and therefore abstain from voting such proxy or recommending how such proxy should be voted), such as where the expected cost of giving due consideration to the proxy does not justify the potential benefits to the affected account(s) that might result from adopting or rejecting (as the case may be) the measure in question.

## WAIVER OF VOTING RIGHTS

For regulatory reasons, AIP may either 1) invest in a class of securities of an underlying fund (the "Fund") that does not provide for voting rights; or 2) waive 100% of its voting rights with respect to the following:

1. Any rights with respect to the removal or replacement of a director, general partner, managing member or other person acting in a similar capacity for or on behalf of the Fund (each individually a "Designated Person," and collectively, the "Designated Persons"), which may include, but are not limited to, voting on the election or removal of a Designated Person in the event of such Designated Person's death, disability, insolvency, bankruptcy, incapacity, or other event requiring a vote of interest holders of the Fund to remove or replace a Designated Person; and
2. Any rights in connection with a determination to renew, dissolve, liquidate, or otherwise terminate or continue the Fund, which may include, but are not limited to, voting on the renewal, dissolution, liquidation, termination or continuance of the Fund upon the occurrence of an event described in the Fund's organizational documents; provided, however, that, if the Fund's organizational documents require the consent of the Fund's general partner or manager, as the case may be, for any such termination or continuation of the Fund to be effective, then AIP may exercise its voting rights with respect to such matter.