Corporate Governance & Voting Guidelines

1. Introduction

Bedfordshire Pension Fund (BPF) believes that companies operating to higher standards of corporate governance along with environmental and social best practice have greater potential to protect and enhance investment returns. As an active owner BPF will exercise its voting rights at company meetings, and, through membership of the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF), engage with companies on environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues and. When used together, voting and engagement can give greater results.

An investment in a company not only brings rights but also responsibilities. The shareholders role is to appoint the directors and auditors and to be assured that appropriate governance structures are in place. Good governance is about ensuring that a company’s policies and practices are robust and effective. It defines the extent to which a company operates responsibly in relation to its customers, shareholders, employees, and the wider community. Corporate governance goes hand-in-hand with responsible investment and stewardship.

Upon transitioning assets to Border to Coast Pensions Partnership (Border to Coast), the implementation of the voting will be done through the Partnership, as the direct owners of the assets. However, BPF, as both a shareholder and a client of Border to Coast, will continue to monitor the voting policy and guidelines to ensure that they are aligned with those of BPF and reflect current best practice.
2. Voting procedure

These broad guidelines should be read in conjunction with the Responsible Investment Policy. They provide the framework within which the voting guidelines are administered and assessed. A degree of flexibility will be required when interpreting the guidelines to reflect specific company and meeting circumstances, which are flagged by the voting system as requiring consideration on a case-by-case basis.

BPF discloses its voting activity as part of its regular quarterly reporting, which is available on the BPF website (http://www.bedspensionfund.org/fund_information/responsible_investment.aspx).

BPF will support incumbent management wherever possible but recognises that the neglect of corporate governance and corporate responsibility issues could lead to reduced shareholder returns.

It will vote For, Abstain or Oppose on the following basis:

- BPF will support management that acts in the long-term interests of all shareholders, where a resolution is aligned with these guidelines and considered to be in line with best practice.
- BPF will abstain when a resolution fails the best practice test but is not considered to be serious enough to vote against.
- BPF will vote against a resolution where corporate behaviour falls short of best practice or these guidelines, or where the directors have failed to provide sufficient information to support the proposal.

3. Voting Guidelines

Company Boards

The composition and effectiveness of the board is crucial to determining corporate performance, as it oversees the running of a company by its managers and is accountable to shareholders. Company behaviour has implications for shareholders and other stakeholders.

Composition and independence

The board should have a balance of executive and non-executive directors so that no individual or small group of individuals can control the board’s decision making. They should possess a suitable range of skills, experience and knowledge in order to ensure the company can meet its objectives. Boards do not need to be of a standard size: different companies need different board structures and no simple model can be adopted by all companies.
The board of large companies, excluding the Chair, should consist of a majority of independent nonexecutive directors. As they have a fiduciary duty to represent and act in the best interests of shareholders and to be objective and impartial when considering company matters, they must be able to demonstrate their independence. Non-executive directors who have been on the board for over nine years have been associated with the company for long enough to be presumed to have a close relationship with the business or fellow directors. The company should therefore, have a policy on tenure which is referenced in its annual report and accounts. There should be sufficient disclosure of biographical details so that shareholders can make informed decisions. There are a number of factors which could affect independence, which includes but is not restricted to:-

- Representing a significant shareholder.
- Served on the board for over nine years.
- Has had a material business relationship with the company in the last three years.
- Has been a former employee within the last five years.
- Family relationships with directors, senior employees or advisors.
- Cross directorships with other board members.

Leadership

The role of the Chairman (he or she) is distinct from that of other board members and should be seen as such. The Chairman should be independent upon appointment and should not have previously been the CEO. The Chairman should also take the lead in communicating with shareholders and the media. However, the Chairman should not be responsible for the day to day management of the business: that responsibility rests with the Chief Executive.

The role of Chair and CEO should not be combined as different skills and experience are required. There should be a distinct separation of duties to ensure that no one director has unfettered decision making power. Any company intending to combine these roles must justify its position and satisfy shareholders in advance as to how the dangers inherent in such a combination are to be avoided; best practice advocates a separation of the roles.
Non-executive Directors

The role of non-executive directors is to challenge and scrutinise the performance of management in relation to company strategy and performance. In order to do this effectively they need to be independent; free from connections and situations which could impact their judgement. They must commit sufficient time to their role to be able to carry out their responsibilities. A senior independent non-executive director should be appointed to act as liaison between the other nonexecutives, the Chairman and other directors where necessary.

Diversity

Board members should be recruited from as broad a range of backgrounds and experiences as possible. A diversity of directors will improve the representation and accountability of boards, bringing new dimensions to board discussions and decision making. Companies should broaden the search to recruit non-executives to include open advertising and the process for board appointments should be transparent. Companies should consider candidates from all racial and religious backgrounds and look to increase the level of female representation on boards in line with best practice; a diversity policy should also be disclosed in the Annual Report.

Succession planning

BPF expects the board to disclose its policy on succession planning, the factors considered and where decision-making responsibilities lie. A succession policy should form part of the terms of reference for a formal nomination committee, comprised solely of independent directors and headed by the Chairman except when it is appointing the Chairman’s successor. External advisors may also be employed.

Directors' availability and attendance

It is important that directors have sufficient time to devote to the company’s affairs; therefore full time executives should not hold more than one non-executive position in a FTSE 100 company nor the chairmanship of such a company. With regard to nonexecutive directors, there can be no hard and fast rule on the number of positions that are acceptable: much depends upon the nature of the post and the capabilities of the individual. Shareholders need to be assured that no individual director has taken on too many positions. Full disclosure should be made in the annual report of directors’ other commitments and attendance records at formal board and committee meetings.
Re-election

In order for a board to be successful it needs to ensure that it is suitably diverse with a range of skills, experience and knowledge. There is a requirement for non-executive directors to be independent in order to appropriately challenge management. In order to achieve this, boards need to be regularly refreshed; therefore all directors should be subject to re-election annually.

Directors’ remuneration

Shareholders at UK companies have two votes in relation to pay; the annual advisory vote on remuneration implementation which is non-binding, and the triennial vote on forward looking pay policy which is binding. If a company does not receive a majority of shareholder support for the pay policy, it is required to table a resolution with a revised policy at the next annual meeting.

Research shows that the link between executive pay and company performance is negligible. Excessive rewards for poor performance are not in the best interests of a company or its shareholders. Remuneration levels should be sufficient to attract, motivate and retain quality management but should not be excessive compared to salary levels within the organisation and with peer group companies. There is a clear conflict of interest when directors set their own remuneration in terms of their duty to the company, accountability to shareholders and their own self-interest. It is therefore essential that there is a wholly independent remuneration committee.

Remuneration has serious implications for corporate performance in terms of providing the right incentives to senior management, in setting performance targets, and its effect on the morale and motivation of employees. Corporate reputation is also at risk. Remuneration policy should be sensitive to pay and employee conditions elsewhere in the company, especially when determining annual salary increases.

In order to ensure accountability there should be a full and transparent disclosure of directors’ remuneration with the policy published in the annual report and accounts. The valuation of benefits received during the year, including share options, other conditional awards and pension benefits, should be provided.

• Annual bonus

Bonuses should reflect individual and corporate performance targets which are sufficiently challenging, ambitious and linked to performance over the longer-term.
• **Long-term incentives**

Remuneration policies have over time become more and more complex making them difficult for shareholders to adequately assess. BPF therefore encourages companies to simplify remuneration policies.

Performance-related remuneration schemes should be created in such a way to reward performance that has made a significant contribution to shareholder value. The introduction of incentive schemes to all employees within a firm is encouraged and supported as this helps all employees understand the concept of shareholder value. However, poorly structured schemes can result in senior management receiving unmerited rewards for substandard performance. This is unacceptable and could adversely affect the motivation of other employees.

Incentives are linked to performance over the longer-term in order to create shareholder value. Performance should therefore be measured over a period in line with the company’s strategy; this should be at least three years but preferably longer. Employee incentive plans should include both financial and non-financial metrics and targets that are sufficiently ambitious and challenging. Remuneration should be specifically linked to stated business objectives and performance indicators should be fully disclosed in the annual report.

The performance basis of all such incentive schemes under which benefits are potentially payable should be clearly set out each year, together with the actual performance achieved against the same targets.

**Directors’ contracts**

Directors’ service contracts are also a fundamental part of corporate governance considerations. Therefore all executive directors are expected to have contracts that are based upon no more than twelve months salary. Retirement benefit policies of directors will also be scrutinised. The main terms of the directors’ contracts including notice periods on both sides, and any loans or third party contractual arrangements such as the provision of housing or removal expenses, should be declared within the annual report.

**Corporate reporting**

Companies are expected to report regularly to shareholders in an integrated manner that allows them to understand the company’s strategic objectives. Companies should be as transparent as possible in disclosures within the Report and Accounts. As well as reporting financial performance, companies should provide additional information on ESG issues that also reflect the directors’ stewardship of the company. These could include, for example, information on a company’s human capital management policies, its charitable and community initiatives and on its impact on the environment in which it operates.
Every annual report (other than those for investment trusts) should include an environmental section, which identifies key quantitative data relating to energy and water consumption, emissions and waste etc., explains any contentious issues and outlines reporting and evaluation criteria. It is important that the risk areas reported upon should not be limited to financial risks. BPF will encourage companies to report and disclose in line with the Financial Stability Board’s Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) recommendations.

Audit

The audit process must be objective, rigorous and independent if it is to provide assurance to users of accounts, and maintain the confidence of the capital markets. The audit committee should consist of at least three members who are all independent non-executive directors. Any material links between the audit firm and the client need to be highlighted, with the audit committee report being the most appropriate place for such disclosures. FTSE 350 companies should tender the external audit contract at least every ten years. If an auditor has been in place for more than ten fiscal years, their appointment will not be supported. Where an auditor has resigned, an explanation should be given. If the accounts have been qualified or there has been noncompliance with legal or regulatory requirements, this should be drawn to shareholders’ attention in the main body of the annual report. If the appropriate disclosures are not made, the re-appointment of the audit firm will not be supported.

Non-Audit Fees

There is concern over the potential conflict of interest between audit and non-audit work when conducted by the same firm for a client. Companies must therefore make a full disclosure where such a conflict arises. There can be legitimate reasons for employing the same firm to do both types of work, but these need to be identified. As a rule, the reappointment of auditors will not be supported where non-audit fees are considerably in excess of audit fees in the year under review, and on a three year aggregate basis, unless sufficient explanation is given in the accounts.

Political donations

There are concerns over the reputational risks and democratic implications of companies becoming involved in funding political processes, both at home and abroad. It is therefore prudent to oppose all political donations.

Shareholder rights

As a shareowner, BPF is entitled to certain shareholder rights in the companies in which it invests (Companies Act 2006). Boards are expected to protect such ownership rights.
• **Dividends**

Shareholders should have the chance to approve a company’s dividend policy and this is considered best practice. The resolution should be separate from the resolution to receive the report and accounts. Failure to seek approval would elicit opposition to other resolutions as appropriate.

• **Voting rights**

Voting at company meetings is the main way which shareholders can influence a company’s governance arrangements and its behaviour. Shareholders should have voting rights in equal proportion to their economic interest in a company (one share, one vote). Dual share structures which have differential voting rights are disadvantageous to many shareholders and should be abolished. BPF will not support measures or proposals which will dilute or restrict its rights.

• **Authority to issue shares**

Companies have the right to issue new shares in order to raise capital but are required by law to seek shareholders’ authority. Such issuances should be limited to what is necessary to sustain the company and not be in excess of relevant market norms.

• **Disapplication of Pre-emption Rights**

BPF supports the pre-emption rights principle and considers it acceptable that directors have authority to allot shares on this basis. Resolutions seeking the authority to issue shares with and without pre-emption rights should be separate and should specify the amounts involved, the time periods covered and whether there is any intention to utilise the authority.

**Share Repurchases**

BPF does not necessarily oppose a company re-purchasing its own shares but it recognises the effect such buy backs might have on incentive schemes where earnings per share measures are a condition of the scheme. The impact of such measures should be reported on. It is important that the directors provide a full justification to demonstrate that a share repurchase is the best use of company resources, including setting out the criteria for calculating the buyback price to ensure that it benefits long-term shareholders.

**Memorandum and Articles of Association**

Proposals to change a company’s memorandum and articles of association should be supported if they are in the interests of BPF, presented as separate resolutions for each change, and the reasons for each change provided.
Mergers and acquisitions

BPF will normally support management if the terms of the deal will create rather than destroy shareholder value and makes sense strategically. Each individual case will be considered on its merits. Seldom will compliance with corporate governance best practice be the sole determinant when evaluating the merits of merger and acquisition activity, but full information must be provided to shareholders on governance issues when they are asked to approve such transactions. Recommendations regarding takeovers should be approved by the full board.

Articles of Association and adopting the report and accounts

It is unlikely that BPF will oppose a vote to adopt the report and accounts simply because it objects to them per se; however there may be occasion when it might vote against them to lodge dissatisfaction with other points raised within this policy statement. Although it is a blunt tool to use, it can be an effective one especially if the appropriate Chair or senior director is not standing for election.

If proposals to adopt new articles or amend existing articles might result in shareholders’ interests being adversely affected, BPF will oppose the changes.

Investment trusts

BPF acknowledges that issues faced by the boards of investment companies are often different to those of other listed companies. The same corporate governance guidelines do not necessarily apply to them; for example, investment companies can operate with smaller boards and should not necessarily be required to report on such matters as environmental issues. However, the conventions applying to audit, board composition and director independence do apply.

The election of any representative of an incumbent investment manager onto the board of a trust managed or advised by that manager will not be supported. Independence of the board from the investment manager is key, therefore management contracts should not exceed one year and should be reviewed every year. In broad terms, the same requirements for independence, diversity and competence apply to boards of investment trusts as they do to any other quoted companies.

BPF may oppose the adoption of the report and accounts of an investment trust where there is no commitment that the trust exercises its own votes, and there is no explanation of the voting policy.
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