

## Proxy Voting Guidelines

---

February 2019

The Janus Proxy Voting Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) below summarize Janus Capital Management LLC’s (“Janus”) positions on various issues of concern to investors and are intended to provide a general indication of how portfolio securities may be voted on proposals dealing with particular issues. The Guidelines, together with the Janus Proxy Voting Procedures (the “Procedures”), will be used for voting proxies on behalf of all Janus clients (including mutual funds) for which Janus has voting authority, except with respect to the Participating Affiliate Funds listed in Schedule 1 hereto and as otherwise noted below. Proxy votes for such Participating Affiliate Funds will be made in accordance with the Proxy Policies and Procedures attached as Annex A to the Procedures. Subject to specific provisions in a client’s account documentation related to exception voting, Janus only accepts direction from a client to vote proxies for that client’s account pursuant to: 1) the Guidelines; 2) the Benchmark Policy recommendations of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (“ISS”) (the “Proxy Voting Service”); or 3) upon request by a client as set forth in a client’s investment management agreement, the ISS Taft-Hartley voting guidelines (“Taft-Hartley Guidelines”). Perkins Investment Management LLC has adopted the Guidelines.

Janus has retained the services of the Proxy Voting Service, an industry expert in proxy issues and corporate governance matters. The Proxy Voting Service provides Janus with in-depth analysis and recommendations on complex proxy issues. While Janus attempts to apply the following Guidelines to proxy proposals, Janus reserves the right to use the Proxy Voting Service’s expertise and recommendations on a variety of proxy voting issues, including foreign issuer proxies and proposals that may not otherwise be addressed by the Guidelines. The Proxy Voting Service is instructed to vote all proxies relating to portfolio securities in accordance with these Guidelines, except as otherwise instructed by Janus. The Proxy Voting Service, may not, in all instances, have or provide research, analysis and recommendations on proxy issues. For example, the Proxy Voting Service may not provide such analysis and research for privately held companies. In such instances, the Proxy Administrator shall refer such proxy proposal to the portfolio manager.

The Guidelines are not exhaustive and do not include all potential voting issues. Because proxy issues and the circumstances of individual companies are so varied, there may be instances when Janus may not vote in strict adherence to the Guidelines. In addition, Janus portfolio managers, assistant portfolio managers, and analysts covering specific companies are responsible for monitoring significant corporate developments, including proxy proposals submitted to shareholders and notifying the Proxy Administrator in Denver Operations Control of circumstances where the interests of Janus’ clients may warrant a vote contrary to the Guidelines. In such instances, the portfolio manager, assistant portfolio manager or analyst will submit a written rationale to the Proxy Administrator. The Proxy Voting Committee periodically reviews rationales provided to determine: i) whether the rationales appear reasonable; and ii) whether any business relationship with the issuer of the proxy could have created a conflict of interest influencing the votes (see Procedures for additional Conflicts of Interest details).

In many foreign markets, shareholders who vote proxies for shares of a foreign issuer are not able to trade in that company’s stock within a given period of time on or around the shareholder meeting date. This practice is known as “share blocking.” In countries where share blocking is practiced, Janus will only vote proxies if the portfolio manager or assistant portfolio manager determines that the shareholder benefit of voting the proxies outweighs the risk of not being able to sell the securities. In addition, international issuers may be subject to corporate

**Janus Henderson Investors**

151 Detroit Street, Denver, CO 80206

T (303) 336 4000

[janushenderson.com](http://janushenderson.com)

## Proxy Voting Procedures

---

February 2019

The following represents the Proxy Voting Procedures (“Procedures”) for Janus Capital Management LLC (“Janus”) with respect to the voting of proxies on behalf of all clients, including mutual funds and exchange-traded funds (“ETFs”), except for those funds listed on Schedule 1 hereto (the “Participating Affiliate Funds”), advised by Janus, for which Janus has voting responsibility and the keeping of records relating to proxy voting. Perkins Investment Management LLC (“Perkins”) has adopted the Procedures.

Each of the Participating Affiliate Funds shall follow the procedures attached as Annex A.

**General Policy:** Janus seeks to vote proxies in the best interest of its clients. Janus will not accept direction as to how to vote individual proxies for which it has voting responsibility from any other person or organization (other than the research and information provided by the Proxy Voting Service (as hereinafter defined)). Subject to specific provisions in a client’s account documentation related to exception voting, Janus only accepts direction from a client to vote proxies for that client’s account pursuant to: 1) the Janus Capital Management LLC Proxy Voting Guidelines (“Guidelines”); 2) the Benchmark Policy recommendations of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (“ISS”) (the “Proxy Voting Service”); or 3) upon request by a client as set forth in a client’s investment management agreement, the ISS Taft-Hartley voting guidelines (“Taft-Hartley Guidelines”).

**ERISA Plan Policy:** On behalf of client accounts subject to ERISA, Janus seeks to discharge its fiduciary duty by voting proxies solely in the best interest of the participants and beneficiaries of such plans. Janus recognizes that the exercise of voting rights on securities held by ERISA plans for which Janus has voting responsibility is a fiduciary duty that must be exercised with care, skill, prudence and diligence. In voting proxies for ERISA accounts, Janus will exercise its fiduciary responsibility to vote all proxies for shares for which it has investment discretion as investment manager unless the power to vote such shares has been retained by the appointing fiduciary as set forth in the documents in which the named fiduciary has appointed Janus as investment manager.

**Proxy Voting Committee:** The Janus Proxy Voting Committee (the “Committee”) develops Janus’ positions on all major corporate issues, creates guidelines and oversees the voting process. The Committee is comprised of a representative of the Office of the Treasurer, Denver Operations Control, Risk Compliance, and one or more portfolio management representatives (or their respective designees) who provide input on behalf of the portfolio management team. Internal legal counsel serves as a consultant to the Committee and is a non-voting member. A quorum is required for all Committee meetings. In formulating proxy voting recommendations, the Committee analyzes proxy proposals from the Proxy Voting Service from the prior year, and evaluates whether those proposals would adversely or beneficially affect clients’ interests. The Committee also reviews policy rationale provided by the Proxy Voting Service related to voting recommendations for the upcoming proxy season. Once the Committee establishes its recommendations and revises the Guidelines, they are distributed to Janus’ portfolio managers<sup>1</sup> for review and implementation. While the Committee sets the Guidelines and serves as a resource for Janus portfolio management, it does not have proxy voting authority for any proprietary or non-proprietary mutual fund, ETF, or

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to portfolio managers include assistant portfolio managers.

any investment advisory client. The portfolio managers are responsible for proxy votes on securities they own in the portfolios they manage. Most portfolio managers vote consistently with the Guidelines. However, a portfolio manager may choose to vote contrary to the Guidelines. When portfolio managers cast votes which are contrary to the Guidelines, the manager is required to document the reasons in writing for the Committee. In many cases, a security may be held by multiple portfolio managers. Portfolio managers are not required to cast consistent votes. Annually the Janus Funds Board of Trustees, or a committee thereof, will review Janus' proxy voting process, policies and voting records.

**Securities Operations Group:** Denver Operations Control is responsible for administering the proxy voting process as set forth in these procedures, the Guidelines, and as applicable, the Taft-Hartley Guidelines. The Proxy Administrator in Denver Operations Control works with the Proxy Voting Service and is responsible for ensuring that all meeting notices are reviewed against the Guidelines, and as applicable, the Taft-Hartley Guidelines, and proxy matters are communicated to the portfolio managers and analysts for consideration pursuant to the Guidelines.

**Voting and Use of Proxy Voting Service:** Janus has engaged an independent proxy voting service, ISS, to assist in the voting of proxies. The Proxy Voting Service is responsible for coordinating with the clients' custodians to ensure that all proxy materials received by the custodians relating to the clients' portfolio securities are processed in a timely fashion. In addition, the Proxy Voting Service is responsible for maintaining copies of all proxy statements received by issuers and to promptly provide such materials to Janus upon request.

To the extent applicable, the Proxy Voting Service will process all proxy votes in accordance with the Guidelines. Portfolio managers may decide to vote their proxies consistent with the Guidelines in all cases and instruct the Proxy Administrator to vote all proxies accordingly pursuant to account-specific procedures approved by the Committee. He or she may also request to review all vote recommendations prior to the meeting cut-off date, or may choose to review only those votes to be cast against management. Notwithstanding the above, with respect to clients who have instructed Janus to vote proxies in accordance with the Taft-Hartley Guidelines, the Proxy Voting Service will process all proxy votes in strict accordance with the Taft-Hartley Guidelines. In all cases, the portfolio managers receive a monthly report summarizing all proxy votes in his or her client accounts. The Proxy Administrator is responsible for maintaining this documentation.

The Proxy Voting Service will refer proxy questions to the Proxy Administrator for instructions under circumstances where: (1) the application of the Guidelines is unclear; (2) the proxy question relates to a company and/or issue in which the Proxy Voting Services does not have research, analysis and/or a recommendation available, or (3) the Guidelines call for Janus portfolio manager input. The Proxy Administrator solicits feedback from the Portfolio Manager or the Committee as required. Janus also utilizes research services relating to proxy questions provided by the Proxy Voting Service. In the event a portfolio manager is unable to provide input on a proxy item referred to him or her, Janus will abstain from voting the proxy item.

**Procedures for Proxy Issues Outside the Guidelines:** In situations where the Proxy Voting Service refers a proxy question to the Proxy Administrator, the Proxy Administrator will consult with the portfolio manager regarding how the shares will be voted. The Proxy Administrator will refer such questions, through a written request, to the portfolio manager(s) who hold(s) the security for a voting recommendation. The Proxy Administrator may also refer such questions, through a written request to any member of the Committee, but the Committee cannot direct the Proxy Administrator how to vote. If the proxy issue raises a conflict of interest (see Conflict of Interest discussion

**Janus Henderson Investors**

151 Detroit Street, Denver, CO 80206

T (303) 336 4000

[janushenderson.com](http://janushenderson.com)

below), the portfolio manager will document how the proxy should be voted and the rationale for such recommendation. If the portfolio manager has had any contact with persons outside of Janus (excluding routine communications with issuers and proxy solicitors) regarding the proxy issue, the portfolio manager will disclose that contact to the Committee. In such cases, the Committee will review the portfolio manager's voting recommendation. If the Committee believes a conflict exists and that the portfolio manager's voting recommendation is not in the best interests of the clients, the Committee will refer the issue to the appropriate Chief Investment Officer(s) (or the Director of Research in his/her absence) to determine how to vote.

**Procedures for Voting Janus "Fund of Funds":** Janus advises certain portfolios or "fund of funds" that invest in other Janus funds. From time to time, a fund of funds may be required to vote proxies for the underlying Janus funds in which it is invested. Accordingly, if an underlying Janus fund submits a matter to a vote of its shareholders, votes for and against such matters on behalf of the owner fund of funds will be cast in the same proportion as the votes of the other shareholders in the underlying fund (also known as "echo-voting"). In addition, Janus advises certain funds of funds that invest in unaffiliated ETFs. The Janus funds may enter into a written participation agreement with an underlying ETF in accordance with an exemptive order obtained by the ETF that allows a Janus fund to own shares of the ETF in excess of what is generally permitted by the 1940 Act. Participation agreements generally require funds whose ownership of the underlying ETF exceeds a certain percentage to agree to "echo-vote" shares of the ETF. Accordingly, if an underlying ETF submits a matter to a vote of its shareholders, votes for and against such matters on behalf of a Janus fund will be echo-voted to the extent required by a participation agreement.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The Committee is responsible for monitoring and resolving possible material conflicts with respect to proxy voting. Because the Guidelines are pre-determined and designed to be in the best interests of shareholders, application of the Guidelines to vote client proxies should, in most cases, adequately address any possible conflicts of interest. On a quarterly basis, the Committee reviews records of votes that were cast inconsistently with the Guidelines and the related rationale for such votes. Additionally, and in instances where a portfolio manager has discretion to vote differently than the Guidelines and proposes to vote a proxy inconsistent with the Guidelines and a potential conflict of interest is identified, the Committee will review the proxy votes to determine whether the portfolio manager's voting rationale appears reasonable and no material conflict exists. Similarly, the Taft-Hartley Guidelines are pre-determined, so application of the Taft-Hartley Guidelines to vote client proxies should, in most cases, adequately address any possible conflicts of interest. In the unusual circumstance that the Proxy Voting Service seeks direction on any matter, the matter shall be handled in accordance with the **Procedures for Proxy Issues Outside the Guidelines** set forth above, and reviewed by the Committee.

A conflict of interest may exist, for example, if Janus has a business relationship with (or is actively soliciting business from) either the company soliciting the proxy or a third party that has a material interest in the outcome of a proxy vote or that is actively lobbying for a particular outcome of a proxy vote. In addition, any portfolio manager with knowledge of a personal conflict of interest (e.g., a family member in a company's management) relating to a particular referral item shall disclose that conflict to the Committee and may be required to recuse himself or herself from the proxy voting process. Issues raising possible conflicts of interest are referred by the Proxy Administrator to the Committee for resolution. If the Committee does not agree that the portfolio manager's rationale is reasonable, the Committee will refer the matter to the appropriate Chief Investment Officer(s) (or the Director of Research) to vote the proxy.

If a matter is referred to the Chief Investment Officer(s) (or the Director of Research) the decision made and basis for the decision will be documented by the Committee.

**Janus Henderson Investors**

151 Detroit Street, Denver, CO 80206

T (303) 336 4000

[janushenderson.com](http://janushenderson.com)

**Reporting and Record Retention:** Upon request, on an annual basis, Janus will provide its non-investment company clients with the proxy voting record for that client's account.

On an annual basis, Janus will provide its proxy voting record for each proprietary mutual fund or ETF for the one-year period ending on June 30<sup>th</sup> on Janus' website at [www.janus.com/proxyvoting](http://www.janus.com/proxyvoting). Such voting record, on Form N-PX, is also available on the SEC's website at <http://www.sec.gov>. A complete copy of Janus Capital's proxy voting policies and procedures, including specific guidelines, is available at [www.janus.com/proxyvoting](http://www.janus.com/proxyvoting).

Janus retains proxy statements received regarding client securities, records of votes cast on behalf of clients, records of client requests for proxy voting information and all documents prepared by Janus regarding votes cast in contradiction to the Janus Guidelines. In addition, any document prepared by Janus that is material to a proxy voting decision such as the Guidelines, Proxy Voting Committee materials and other internal research relating to voting decisions will be kept. Proxy statements received from issuers are either available on the SEC's EDGAR database or are kept by a third party voting service and are available on request. All proxy voting materials and supporting documentation are retained for a minimum of 6 years.

Except as noted in these Procedures or required by law, Janus does not provide information to anyone on how it voted or intends to vote on a particular matter. The Securities Operations Group may confirm to issuers or their agents whether votes have been cast, but will not disclose the size of the position or how the votes were cast. Members of the Janus investment team have the discretion to indicate to issuers or their agents how they voted or intend to vote in the context of discussions with issuers and their management as part of Janus' ongoing investment analysis process.

**Schedule 1**  
**The “Participating Affiliate Funds”**

---

Fund Name

- Janus Henderson All Asset Fund
- Janus Henderson Asia Equity Fund
- Janus Henderson Dividend & Income Builder Fund
- Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Fund
- Janus Henderson European Focus Fund
- Janus Henderson Global Equity Income Fund
- Janus Henderson Global Real Estate Fund
- Janus Henderson International Long/Short Equity Fund
- Janus Henderson International Opportunities Fund
- Janus Henderson International Small Cap Fund
- Janus Henderson Strategic Income Fund
- Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Equity Fund LLC

**Annex A**  
**Proxy Policies and Procedures**

---

It is the intent of the Participating Affiliates<sup>2</sup>, to vote proxies in the best interests of the firm’s clients, which include those Participating Affiliate Funds listed on Schedule 1. The Participating Affiliates believe that in order to achieve long-term success, companies need not only to conceive and execute appropriate business strategies, but also to maintain high standards of corporate governance and corporate responsibility. We therefore expect companies to operate according to recognised national and international standards in these areas.

This policy sets out the Participating Affiliates’ approach to corporate governance, corporate responsibility and proxy voting.

**1. Responsibilities:** The Corporate Governance Manager at Henderson Global Investors, acting on behalf of the Participating Affiliates, is responsible for the implementation of the Proxy Voting Policies.

**2. Service Providers:** The Participating Affiliates have contracted ISS Europe Ltd. to provide policy development, research, advisory and voting disclosure services.

Proxy voting services are provided by BNP Paribas Securities Services plc, which provides a range of administrative services to Henderson. BNP Paribas Securities Services plc is provided with voting services by ISS.

---

<sup>2</sup> The portfolio managers that provide investment advisory services to each of the Participating Affiliate Funds listed on Schedule 1 act under a participating affiliate arrangement between Janus Capital Management LLC and each of Henderson Global Investors Limited, Henderson Global Investors (Singapore) Ltd., and Henderson Global Investors (Japan) Ltd. (each a “Participating Affiliate” and together, the “Participating Affiliates”). Each Participating Affiliate is party to a Memorandum of Understanding with Janus Capital Management LLC, dated January 1, 2018.

**3. Voting Guidelines:** The Participating Affiliates have adopted the Henderson Global Investors Responsible Investment policy. This policy sets out Henderson’s approach to monitoring and taking action on financial performance, corporate governance and corporate responsibility. The International Corporate Governance Policy is detailed below.

**3.1. International Corporate Governance Policy:** International corporate governance systems vary a great deal according to factors such as the legal system, the extent of shareholder rights and the level of dispersed ownership. In formulating our approach to corporate governance we are conscious that a ‘one size fits all’ policy is not appropriate. We therefore seek to vary our voting and engagement activities according to the market, and pay close attention to local market codes of best practice.

Notwithstanding these differences, we consider that certain core principles of corporate governance apply across all markets, and we seek to apply these in our voting policy. The paragraphs below elaborate on these core principles.<sup>3</sup>

**3.2. Corporate Objective:** The overriding objective of the company should be to optimize over time the returns to its shareholders. Where other considerations affect this objective, they should be clearly stated and disclosed. To achieve this objective, the company should endeavour to ensure the long-term viability of its business, and to manage effectively its relationships with stakeholders.

**3.3. Disclosure and Transparency:** Companies should disclose accurate, adequate and timely information, in particular meeting market guidelines where they exist, so as to allow investors to make informed decisions about the acquisition, ownership obligations and rights, and sale of shares. Clear and comprehensive information on directors, corporate governance arrangements and the company’s management of corporate responsibility issues should be provided.

Shareholders should be given sufficient and timely information about all proposals to allow them to make an informed judgment and exercise their voting rights. Each proposal should be presented separately to shareholders – multiple proposals should not be combined in the same resolution. In the absence of sufficient information provided by a company on a proposed resolution we will vote against.

**3.4. Boards of Directors:** Henderson recognises the plurality of corporate governance models across different markets and does not advocate any one form of board structure. However, for any corporate board there are certain key functions which apply.

- Reviewing and guiding corporate strategy, major plans of action, risk policy, annual budgets and business plans; setting performance objectives; monitoring implementation and corporate performance; and overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures.
- Monitoring the effectiveness of the company's governance practices and making changes as needed.
- Selecting, compensating, monitoring and, where necessary, replacing key executives and overseeing succession planning.

---

<sup>3</sup> These Principles are based on the Organisation for Economic Development (OECD) Corporate Governance Principles and those of the International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN).

- Aligning key executive and board remuneration with the longer term interests of the company and its shareholders.
- Ensuring a formal and transparent board nomination and election process.
- Monitoring and managing potential conflicts of interest of management, board members and shareholders, including misuse of corporate assets and abuse in related party transactions.
- Ensuring the integrity of the corporation's accounting and financial reporting systems, including the independent audit, and that appropriate systems of control are in place, in particular, systems for risk management, financial and operational control, and compliance with the law and relevant standards.
- Overseeing the process of disclosure and communications.

The board of directors, or supervisory board, as an entity, and each of its members, as an individual, is a fiduciary for all shareholders, and should be accountable to the shareholder body as a whole. Each member should stand for election on a regular basis.

Boards should include a sufficient number of independent non-executive members with appropriate skills, experience and knowledge. Responsibilities should include monitoring and contributing effectively to the strategy and performance of management, staffing key committees of the board, and influencing the conduct of the board as a whole.

Audit, remuneration and nomination/succession committees should be established. These should be composed wholly or predominantly of independent non-executives. Companies should disclose the terms of reference of these committees and give an account to shareholders in the annual report of how their responsibilities have been discharged. The chairmen and members of these committees should be appointed by the board as a whole according to a transparent procedure.

When determining how to vote on the election of a non-executive director, we will give close consideration to their independence and to the proportion of independent directors on the Board as a whole.

**3.5. Shareholder rights:** All shareholders should be treated equitably. Companies' ordinary shares should provide one vote for each share, and companies should act to ensure the owners' rights to vote.

Major strategic modifications to the core business(es) of a company should not be made without prior shareholder approval. Equally, major corporate changes which in substance or effect materially dilute the equity or erode the economic interests or share ownership rights of existing shareholders should not be made without prior shareholder approval of the proposed change. Such changes include modifications to articles or bylaws, the implementation of shareholder rights plans or so called "poison pills", and the equity component of compensation schemes.

We will not support proposals that have the potential to reduce shareholder rights such as significant open-ended authorities to issue shares without pre-emption rights or anti-takeover proposals unless companies provide a compelling rationale for why they are in shareholder interests.

**3.6. Audit and internal control:** Company boards should maintain robust structures and processes to ensure sound internal controls and to oversee all aspects of relationships with external auditors. The Audit Committee should ensure that the company gives a balanced and clear presentation of its financial position and prospects, and clearly explains its accounting principles and policies. Audit Committee members should have appropriate



levels of financial expertise, in accordance with prevailing legislation or best practice. The Audit Committee should ensure that the independence of the external auditors is not compromised by conflicts of interest (arising, for example, from the award of non-audit consultancy assignments).

Where we have serious concerns over auditor independence we will vote against the re-election of the auditor.

**3.7. Remuneration:** Remuneration of executive directors and key executives should be aligned with the interests of shareholders. Performance criteria attached to share-based remuneration should be demanding and should not reward performance that is not clearly superior to that of a group of comparable companies that is appropriately selected in sector, geographical and index terms. Requirements on directors and senior executives to acquire and retain shareholdings in the company that are meaningful in the context of their cash remuneration are also appropriate.

The design of senior executives' contracts should not commit companies to 'payment for failure'. Boards should pay attention to minimising this risk when drawing up contracts and to resist pressure to concede excessively generous severance conditions.

Companies should disclose in each annual report or proxy statement the board's policies on remuneration - and, preferably, the remuneration of individual board members and top executives, as well as the composition of that remuneration - so that investors can judge whether corporate pay policies and practices are appropriately designed.

Broad-based employee share ownership plans or other profit-sharing programmes are effective market mechanisms that promote employee participation.

When reviewing whether to support proposed new share schemes we place particular importance on the following factors:

- the overall potential cost of the scheme, including the level of dilution the issue price of share options relative to the market price
- the use of performance conditions aligning the interests of participants with shareholders the holding period ie. the length of time from the award date to the earliest date of exercise the level of disclosure.

**4. Voting Procedures:** The procedure for casting proxy votes is as follows:

- a. Custodians notify ISS of forthcoming company meetings and send proxy materials.
- b. ISS notifies Henderson of meetings via its ProxyExchange website.
- c. ISS provides voting recommendations based on the Participating Affiliates's Proxy Voting Policies.
- d. The Corporate Governance Manager (or his designee) consults with fund managers and analysts as appropriate.
- e. The Corporate Governance Manager (or his designee) decides in conjunction with the relevant fund managers and analysts whether to accept or override the voting recommendations provided by ISS.
- f. Voting instructions are sent to custodians via the ProxyExchange website and executed by the custodians.
- g. If at any time during implementation of the above procedures a conflict of interest is identified the matter will be referred to the Henderson Proxy Committee and the Janus Proxy Voting Committee via the Head of Compliance. In such circumstances the Proxy Committee reviews the issue and directs ISS how to vote the proxies through the ProxyExchange website and voting instructions are executed by the custodians.

**Janus Henderson Investors**

151 Detroit Street, Denver, CO 80206

T (303) 336 4000

[janushenderson.com](http://janushenderson.com)

**5. Shareblocking:** In a number of markets in which the funds invest, shares must be suspended from trading ('blocked') for a specified period before the Annual General Meeting if voting rights are to be exercised. Such restrictions may place constraints on portfolio managers that mean exercising proxy votes is not in clients' interest. In other markets casting proxy votes may involve costs that are disproportionate to any benefit gained. In markets where share blocking applies or additional costs are incurred that outweigh the potential benefits of voting, the Participating Affiliates will vote only in exceptional circumstances.

**6. Conflicts of interest:** For each director, officer and employee of a Participating Affiliate ("Participating Affiliate Person"), the interests of the Participating Affiliate's clients must come first, ahead of the interest of any Participating Affiliate and any person within the Participating Affiliate's organization, which includes the Participating Affiliate's affiliates.

Accordingly, each Participating Affiliate Person must not put "personal benefit", whether tangible or intangible, before the interests of clients of any Participating Affiliate or otherwise take advantage of the relationship to the Participating Affiliate's clients. "Personal benefit" includes any intended benefit for oneself or any other individual, company, group or organization of any kind whatsoever except a benefit for a client of a Participating Affiliate, as appropriate. It is imperative that each of the Participating Affiliates' directors, officers and employees avoid any situation that might compromise, or call into question, the exercise of fully independent judgment in the interests of any Participating Affiliate's clients.

Occasions may arise where a person or organization involved in the proxy voting process may have a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest may exist if a Participating Affiliate has a business relationship with (or is actively soliciting business from) either the company soliciting the proxy or a third party that has a material interest in the outcome of a proxy vote or that is actively lobbying for a particular outcome of a proxy vote. Any individual with knowledge of an actual or potential conflict of interest relating to a particular referral item shall disclose that conflict to the Head of Compliance.

The following are examples of situations where a conflict may exist:

- Business Relationships – where a Participating Affiliate manages money for a company or an employee group, manages pension assets or is actively soliciting any such business, or leases office space from a company;
- Personal Relationships – where a Participating Affiliate Person has a personal relationship with other proponents of proxy proposals, participants in proxy contests, corporate directors, or candidates for directorships;
- Familial Relationships – where a Participating Affiliate Person has a known familial relationship relating to a company (e.g. a spouse or other relative who serves as a director of a public company or is employed by the company); and
- Fund Relationships – the Participating Affiliates may have a conflict because of a relationship to fund shares held in client accounts (e.g., an entity who receives fees from a fund is solicited by the fund to increase those fees).
- Fund of Fund's Relationship – A Participating Affiliate may have a conflict where it manages a fund of funds that invests in other affiliated Henderson funds, and the underlying affiliated fund is soliciting votes for a proxy.

It is the responsibility of each director, officer and employee of the Participating Affiliates to report any real or potential conflict of interest to the Head of Compliance who shall present any such information to the Proxy Committee. However, once a particular conflict has been reported to the Head of Compliance, this requirement shall be deemed satisfied with respect to all individuals with knowledge of such conflict. In addition, all Participating Affiliate Persons shall certify annually as to their compliance with this policy.

**7. Proxy Committee:** The Proxy Committee shall have three members, the Head of Equities, the Corporate Governance Manager and the Head of Compliance (or their respective designees). Proxy Committee meetings may be called by any member of the Proxy Committee and shall be called whenever an actual or potential conflict of interest is identified.

Two members of the Proxy Committee shall constitute a quorum and the Proxy Committee shall act by a majority vote. The Proxy Committee shall keep minutes of its meetings that shall be kept with the other corporate records of the Participating Affiliates.

The Proxy Committee will review each item referred to it to determine if an actual or potential conflict of interest indeed exists. If the Proxy Committee determines that no actual or potential conflict exists, then the proxy will be voted as it otherwise would have been under these procedures. If the Proxy Committee determines that an actual or potential conflict exists, then it will review the issue and instruct ISS to: (1) vote based on ISS' recommendation, (2) vote in the same proportion as the other shareholders, (3) abstain from voting entirely, (4) vote in accordance with the recommendation of the investment professional responsible for the account, or (5) vote in another manner as the Proxy Committee deems fit. With respect to a conflict that arises due to (a) a business transaction involving Henderson Group PLC and the company soliciting the proxy, or (b) a Fund of funds relationship described above only options (1)-(3) above shall be available.

For each matter where the Proxy Committee determines an actual or potential conflict exists, the Proxy Committee will produce a Conflicts Report that (1) describes the conflict of interest; (2) discusses the procedures used to address such conflict of interest; and (3) discloses any contacts from parties outside the Participating Affiliates (other than routine communications from proxy solicitors) with respect to the referral item not otherwise reported in a portfolio manager's recommendation. To the extent the Proxy Committee instructs ISS to vote in accordance with the recommendation of the investment professional responsible for the account, the Conflicts Report will also include written confirmation that any recommendation from an investment professional provided under circumstances where a conflict of interest exists was made solely on the investment merits and without regard to any other consideration.

governance standards and a proxy solicitation process that substantially differs from domestic standards and practices. Janus will generally vote international issuer proxies using the Guidelines unless the application of the Guidelines is inconsistent with corporate governance standards and practices in the foreign market, in which case Janus may refer to the research, analysis and recommendations provided by the Proxy Voting Service.

The Janus funds may participate in a securities lending program under which shares of an issuer may be on loan while that issuer is conducting a proxy solicitation. Generally, if shares of an issuer are on loan during a proxy solicitation, a fund cannot vote the shares. Janus fund managers have discretion to instruct the Proxy Administrator to pull back lent shares before proxy record dates and vote proxies.

In circumstances where the Janus funds held a security as of record date, but Janus sells its holdings prior to the shareholder meeting, Janus may abstain from voting that proxy.

The following guidelines are grouped according to the types of proposals generally presented to shareholders.

### **Board of Directors Issues**

The quality of management is a key consideration in the decision to invest in a company. Because management is in the best possible position to evaluate the qualifications and needs of a particular board, Janus considers the recommendation of management to be an important factor in making these decisions.

1. For domestic market and applicable foreign market issuers, Janus will generally vote in favor of slates of director candidates that have a majority of independent directors (as determined by the Proxy Voting Service) and oppose slates of director candidates that do not have a majority of independent directors.
2. After taking into consideration country-specific practices, Janus will generally vote in favor of uncontested director candidates, unless they:
  - attend less than 75% of the board and committee meetings without a valid excuse; ignore or otherwise fail to support shareholder proposals as determined by the proxy voting service;
  - are not responsive to advisory votes on executive compensation matters (as determined by the proxy voting service);
  - fail to provide appropriate oversight of company's risk management practices (as determined by the proxy voting service);
  - are non-independent directors and sit on the audit, compensation or nominating committees;
  - are non-independent directors and the board does not have an audit, compensation, or nominating committees;
  - are audit committee members and the non-audit fees paid to the auditor are excessive (as determined by the Proxy Voting Service);
  - are audit committee members and poor accounting practices rise to a level of serious concern, or other serious issues surrounding the audit process or arrangement exist (as determined by the Proxy Voting Service);
  - serve as directors on an excessive number of boards ("Overboarded") (as determined by the Proxy Voting Service);

#### **Janus Henderson Investors**

151 Detroit Street, Denver, CO 80206  
T (303) 336 4000

[janushenderson.com](http://janushenderson.com)

- are compensation committee members and the company has poor compensation practices (as determined by Janus), or adopt a long term poison pill without shareholder approval or make material adverse changes to an existing poison pill (as determined by the Proxy Voting Service)
  - amend the company's bylaws or charter without shareholder approval in a manner that materially diminishes shareholders' rights or that could adversely impact shareholders.
3. Janus will evaluate proposals relating to contested director candidates and/or contested slates of directors on case-by-case basis.\*
  4. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals to increase the minimum number of independent directors.
  5. Janus believes that attracting qualified director candidates is important to overall company success and effective corporate governance. As such, Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals regarding director indemnification arrangements.
  6. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals to increase the size of a board of directors so long as the board has a majority of independent directors.
  7. If the purpose of the proposal is to promote anti-takeover measures, Janus will generally vote against proposals relating to decreasing the size of a board of directors.
  8. Janus will generally vote against proposals advocating classified or staggered boards of directors.
  9. Janus will generally vote with management regarding proposals to declassify a board.
  10. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals to separate the role of the Chairman from the role of the CEO.

### **Auditors**

11. Janus will vote in favor of proposals asking for approval of auditors, unless: (1) an auditor has a financial interest in or association with the company, and is therefore not independent; (2) fees for non-audit services are excessive (as determined by the Proxy Voting Service); (3) there is reason to believe that the independent auditor has rendered an opinion, which is neither accurate nor indicative of the company's financial position; or (4) the auditors are being changed without explanation or are not named.
12. Janus will evaluate proposals relating to contested auditors on a case-by-case basis.\*
13. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals to appoint internal statutory auditors.

### **Equity Based Compensation Plans**

14. Equity based compensation plans are important tools in attracting and retaining desirable employees. Janus believes these plans should be carefully applied with the intention of maximizing shareholder value. With this in mind, Janus will evaluate proposals relating to executive and director compensation plans on a case-by-case basis, utilizing the research of the Proxy Voting Service.

The Proxy Voting Service research is designed to estimate the total cost of a proposed plan and identify plan features and grant practices that demonstrate good stewardship of investors' interests regarding executive compensation. The Proxy Voting Service evaluates whether the estimated cost is reasonable by

#### **Janus Henderson Investors**

151 Detroit Street, Denver, CO 80206

T (303) 336 4000

[janushenderson.com](http://janushenderson.com)

comparing the cost to an allowable cap. The allowable cap is industry-specific, market cap-based, and pegged to the average amount paid by companies performing in the top quartile of their peer groups. Janus will generally vote against plans if the estimated cost is above the allowable cap and/or plan features and grant practices are determined to be misaligned with maximizing shareholder value.

Janus will generally oppose plans that:

- provide for re-pricing of underwater options;
- provide for automatic replenishment (“evergreen”) or reload options;
- create an inconsistent relationship between long term share performance and compensation increases; and/or
- are proposed by management and do not demonstrate good stewardship of investors’ interests regarding executive compensation or are a vehicle for poor compensation practices.

### **Other Compensation Related Proposals**

15. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals relating to ESPPs – so long as shares purchased through plans are priced no less than 15% below market value and/or do not contain other features disadvantageous to shareholders (as determined by the Proxy Voting Service).
16. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals requiring the expensing of options.
17. Janus will generally oppose proposals requesting approval to make material amendments to equity based compensation plans without shareholder approval.
18. Janus will generally oppose proposals regarding the re-pricing of underwater options.
19. Janus will generally oppose proposals requesting approval of loans to officers, executives and board members of an issuer.
20. Janus will generally oppose proposals requesting approval of automatic share replenishment (“evergreen”) features of equity based compensation plans.
21. Janus will generally oppose the issuance of reload options (stock option that is automatically granted if an outstanding stock option is exercised during a window period).
22. Janus will generally vote in favor of annual advisory votes on executive compensation (say-on-frequency).
23. Janus will generally vote in favor with regard to advisory votes on executive compensation (say-on-pay), unless Janus determines problematic pay practices are maintained;
24. Janus will vote in favor of proposals to require golden parachutes or executive severance agreements to be submitted for shareholder approval, unless the proposal requires shareholder approval *prior* to entering into employment contracts.
25. Janus will vote on a case-by-case basis on proposals to approve or cancel golden or tin parachutes\*. An acceptable parachute should include the following:
  - The parachute should be less attractive than an ongoing employment opportunity with the firm;
  - The triggering mechanism should be beyond the control of management; and

#### **Janus Henderson Investors**

151 Detroit Street, Denver, CO 80206  
T (303) 336 4000

[janushenderson.com](http://janushenderson.com)

- The amount should not exceed three times base salary plus guaranteed benefits.
26. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals intended to increase long-term stock ownership by executives, officers and directors. These may include:
- requiring executive officers and directors to hold a minimum amount of stock in the company;
  - requiring stock acquired through exercised options to be held for a certain period of time; and
  - using restricted stock grants instead of options.

### **Other Corporate Matters**

27. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals relating to the issuance of dividends.
28. Janus will evaluate proposals relating to stock splits on a case-by-case basis.\*
29. Janus will generally vote against proposals regarding supermajority voting rights (for example to approve acquisitions or mergers).
30. Janus will generally oppose proposals for different classes of stock with different voting rights.
31. Janus will evaluate proposals relating to issuances with and without preemptive rights on a case-by-case basis. For foreign issuer proxies, Janus will solicit research from the Proxy Voting Service.\*
32. Janus will generally vote against proposals seeking to implement measures designed to prevent or obstruct corporate takeovers (includes poison pills), unless such measures are designed primarily as a short-term means to protect a tax benefit, or are structured in such a way that they give shareholders the ultimate decision on any proposal or offer, and are proposed in a transparent and independent fashion.
33. Janus will evaluate proposals seeking to increase the number of shares of common or preferred stock authorized for issue on a case-by-case basis. For domestic issuers, Janus will use quantitative criteria provided by the Proxy Voting Service to measure the reasonableness of the proposed share increase as compared against a measure of industry peers. For foreign issuer proxies, Janus will solicit research from the Proxy Voting Service.\*
34. Janus will evaluate proposals regarding the issuance of debt, including convertible debt, on a case-by-case basis.\*
35. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals regarding the authorization of the issuer's Board of Directors to repurchase shares.
36. Janus will evaluate plans of reorganization on a case-by-case basis.\*
37. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals regarding changes in the state of incorporation of an issuer.
38. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals regarding changes in company name.
39. Janus will evaluate proposals relating to the continuance of a company on a case-by-case basis.\*
40. Janus will evaluate proposals regarding acquisitions, mergers, tender offers or changes in control on a case-by-case basis, including any related advisory votes on golden parachutes.\*

41. Janus will generally oppose proposals to authorize preferred stock whose voting, conversion, dividend and other rights are determined at the discretion of the Board of Directors when the stock is issued (“blank check stock”).
42. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals to lower the barriers to shareholder action (i.e., limited rights to call special meetings, limited rights to act by written consents) and against proposals restricting or prohibiting the ability to act by written consent.
43. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals to adopt cumulative voting unless otherwise recommended by the Proxy Voting Service.
44. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals to require that voting be confidential.
45. Janus will generally oppose proposals requesting authorization of political contributions (mainly foreign), except for proposals designed to insure that the charitable giving does not violate laws on political contributions.
46. Janus will generally vote in favor of proposals relating to the administration of an annual shareholder meeting.
47. Janus will generally vote against proposals to approve “other business” when it appears as a voting item.
48. Janus will evaluate proposals related to proxy access on a case-by-case basis.\*

#### **Shareholder Proposals**

49. Janus is primarily concerned with the economic impact of shareholder proposals on a company’s short and long-term share value. Janus will generally apply the Guidelines to shareholder proposals while weighing the following considerations:
50. Janus’ first priority is to act as a fiduciary in the best financial interests of our clients. Janus recognizes that environmental, social, moral or ethical issues present risks and opportunities that can have an impact on company financial performance. Janus strives to balance these issues in a manner consistent with our fiduciary obligations. Janus will generally vote with management on these matters unless we identify areas of weakness or deficiency relative to peers and/or industry best practices or feel that management has failed to adequately respond to shareholder concerns. In such instances Janus will review these matters on a case-by-case basis, consistent with our fiduciary obligations to clients.
51. For shareholder proposals outside the scope of the Guidelines, Janus will solicit additional research and a recommendation from the Proxy Voting Service. Janus will always reserve the right to over-ride a recommendation provided by the Proxy Voting Service.\*

---

\* All discretionary votes of this nature are cast solely in the interests of shareholders and without regard to any other Janus relationship, business or otherwise.



**Schedule 1**  
**The “Participating Affiliate Funds”**

---

Fund Name

- Janus Henderson All Asset Fund
- Janus Henderson Asia Equity Fund
- Janus Henderson Dividend & Income Builder Fund
- Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Fund
- Janus Henderson European Focus Fund
- Janus Henderson Global Equity Income Fund
- Janus Henderson Global Real Estate Fund
- Janus Henderson International Opportunities Fund
- Janus Henderson International Small Cap Fund
- Janus Henderson Strategic Income Fund
- Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Equity Fund LLC