

CAUSEWAY CAPITAL MANAGEMENT LLC PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Overview

As an investment adviser with fiduciary responsibilities to its clients, Causeway Capital Management LLC (“Causeway”) votes the proxies of companies owned by investment vehicles managed and sponsored by Causeway, and institutional and private clients who have granted Causeway such voting authority. Causeway has adopted these Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures to govern how it performs and documents its fiduciary duty regarding the voting of proxies.

Proxies are voted solely in what Causeway believes is the best interests of the client, a fund’s shareholders or, where employee benefit assets are involved, plan participants and beneficiaries (collectively “clients”). Causeway’s intent is to vote proxies, wherever possible to do so, in a manner consistent with its fiduciary obligations. Practicalities involved in international investing may make it impossible at times, and at other times disadvantageous, to vote proxies in every instance.

The Chief Operating Officer of Causeway supervises the proxy voting process. Proxy voting staff monitor upcoming proxy votes, review proxy research, identify potential conflicts of interest and escalate such issues to the Chief Operating Officer, receive input from portfolio managers, and ultimately submit proxy votes in accordance with these Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures. The Chief Operating Officer has final decision-making authority over case-by-case votes. To assist in fulfilling its responsibility for voting proxies, Causeway currently uses Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (“ISS”) for proxy research, which assists the decision-making process, and for proxy voting services, which include organizing and tracking pending proxies, communicating voting decisions to custodian banks, and maintaining records. Causeway will conduct periodic due diligence on ISS and its capacity and competency to provide proxy research and the proxy voting services provided to Causeway.

Proxy Voting Guidelines

Causeway generally votes on specific matters in accordance with the proxy voting guidelines set forth below. However, Causeway reserves the right to vote proxies on behalf of clients on a case-by-case basis if the facts and circumstances so warrant.

Causeway’s proxy voting guidelines are designed to cast votes consistent with certain basic principles: (i) increasing shareholder value; (ii) maintaining or increasing shareholder influence over the board of directors and management; (iii) establishing and enhancing strong and independent boards of directors; (iv) maintaining or increasing the rights of shareholders; and (v) aligning the interests of management and employees with those of shareholders with a view toward the reasonableness of executive compensation and shareholder dilution. Causeway’s guidelines also recognize that a company’s

management is charged with day-to-day operations and, therefore, Causeway generally votes on routine business matters in favor of management's proposals or positions.

Causeway generally votes *for*:

- distributions of income
- appointment of auditors
- director compensation, unless deemed excessive
- boards of directors – Causeway generally votes for management's slate of director nominees. However, it votes against incumbent nominees with poor attendance records, or who have otherwise acted in a manner Causeway believes is not in the best interests of shareholders.
- financial results/director and auditor reports
- share repurchase plans
- changing corporate names and other similar matters

Causeway generally votes the following matters on a *case-by-case* basis:

- amendments to articles of association or other governing documents
- changes in board or corporate governance structure
- changes in authorized capital including proposals to issue shares
- compensation – Causeway believes that it is important that a company's equity-based compensation plans, including stock option or restricted stock plans, are aligned with the interests of shareholders, including Causeway's clients. Causeway evaluates compensation plans on a case-by-case basis. Causeway generally opposes packages that it believes provide excessive awards or create excessive shareholder dilution. Causeway generally opposes proposals to reprice options because the underlying stock has fallen in value.
- debt issuance requests
- mergers, acquisitions and other corporate reorganizations or restructurings
- changes in state or country of incorporation
- related party transactions

Causeway generally votes *against*:

- anti-takeover mechanisms – Causeway generally opposes anti-takeover mechanisms including poison pills, unequal voting rights plans, staggered boards, provisions requiring supermajority approval of a merger and other matters that are designed to limit the ability of shareholders to approve merger transactions.

Causeway generally votes *with management* regarding:

- social issues – Causeway believes that it is management’s responsibility to handle such issues, and generally votes with management on these types of issues, or abstains. Causeway will oppose social proposals that it believes will be a detriment to the investment performance of a portfolio company.

Conflicts of Interest

Causeway’s interests may, in certain proxy voting situations, be in conflict with the interests of clients. Causeway may have a conflict if a company that is soliciting a proxy is a client of Causeway or is a major business partner or vendor for Causeway. Causeway may also have a conflict if Causeway personnel have significant business or personal relationships with participants in proxy contests, corporate directors or director candidates.

The Chief Operating Officer determines the issuers with which Causeway may have a significant business relationship. For this purpose, a “significant business relationship” is one that: (1) represents 1.5% or more of Causeway’s prior calendar year gross revenues; (2) represents \$2,000,000 or more in payments from a sponsored vehicle during the prior calendar year; or (3) may not directly involve revenue to Causeway or payments from its sponsored vehicles, but is otherwise determined by the Chief Operating Officer to be significant to Causeway or its affiliates or sponsored vehicles, such as a primary service provider of a fund or vehicle managed and sponsored by Causeway, or a significant relationship with the company that might create an incentive for Causeway to vote in favor of management.

The Chief Operating Officer will identify issuers with which Causeway’s employees who are involved in the proxy voting process may have a significant personal or family relationship. For this purpose, a “significant personal or family relationship” is one that would be reasonably likely to influence how Causeway votes proxies.

Proxy voting staff will seek to identify potential conflicts of interest in the first instance and escalate relevant information to the Chief Operating Officer. The Chief Operating Officer will reasonably investigate information relating to conflicts of interest. For purposes of identifying conflicts under this policy, the Chief Operating Officer will rely on publicly available information about Causeway and its affiliates, information about Causeway and its affiliates that is generally known by Causeway’s employees, and other

information actually known by the Chief Operating Officer. Absent actual knowledge, the Chief Operating Officer is not required to investigate possible conflicts involving Causeway where the information is (i) non-public, (ii) subject to information blocking procedures, or (iii) otherwise not readily available to the Chief Operating Officer.

Proxy voting staff will maintain a list of issuers with which there may be a conflict and will monitor for potential conflicts of interest on an ongoing basis.

Proxy proposals that are “routine,” such as uncontested elections of directors or those not subject to a vote withholding campaign, meeting formalities, and approvals of annual reports/financial statements are presumed not to involve material conflicts of interest. For non-routine proposals, the Chief Operating Officer in consultation with Causeway’s General Counsel and Chief Compliance Officer decides if they involve a material conflict of interest.

If a proposal is determined to involve a material conflict of interest, Causeway may, but is not required to, obtain instructions from the client on how to vote the proxy or obtain the client’s consent for Causeway’s vote. If Causeway does not seek the client’s instructions or consent, Causeway will vote as follows:

- If a “for” or “against” or “with management” guideline applies to the proposal, Causeway will vote in accordance with that guideline.
- If a “for” or “against” or “with management” guideline does not apply to the proposal, Causeway will follow the recommendation of an independent third party such as ISS. If Causeway seeks to follow the recommendation of a third party, the Chief Operating Officer will assess the third party’s capacity and competency to analyze the issue, as well as the third party’s ability to identify and address conflicts of interest it may have with respect to the recommendation.

To monitor potential conflicts of interest regarding the research and recommendations of independent third parties, such as ISS, proxy voting staff will review the third party’s disclosures of significant relationships. The Chief Operating Officer will review proxy votes involving issuers where a significant relationship has been identified by the proxy research provider.

Practical Limitations Relating to Proxy Voting

While the proxy voting process is well established in the United States and other developed markets with numerous tools and services available to assist an investment manager, voting proxies of non-US companies located in certain jurisdictions may involve a number of problems that may restrict or prevent Causeway’s ability to vote such proxies. 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) restrictions on the sale of the securities for a period of time prior to the shareholder meeting; and (vi) requirements to provide local agents with powers of attorney (which Causeway will typically rely on clients to maintain) to facilitate Causeway's voting instructions. As a result, Causeway will only use its best efforts to vote clients' non-US proxies and Causeway may decide not to vote a proxy if it determines that it would be impractical or disadvantageous to do so.

In addition, regarding US and non-US companies, Causeway will not vote proxies if it does not receive adequate information from the client's custodian in sufficient time to cast the vote.

For clients with securities lending programs, Causeway may not be able to vote proxies for securities that a client has loaned to a third party. Causeway recognizes that clients manage their own securities lending programs. Causeway may, but is not obligated to, notify a client that Causeway is being prevented from voting a proxy due to the securities being on loan. There can be no assurance that such notice will be received in time for the client, if it so chooses, to recall the security.