

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

WESTFIELD CAPITAL LARGE CAP GROWTH FUND
(Institutional Class Shares Ticker Symbol: WCLGX)
(Investor Class Shares Ticker Symbol: WCLCX)

WESTFIELD CAPITAL DIVIDEND GROWTH FUND
(Institutional Class Shares Ticker Symbol: WDIVX)
(Investor Class Shares Ticker Symbol: WCDGX)

each, a series of THE ADVISORS' INNER CIRCLE FUND II

March 1, 2017

Investment Adviser:
WESTFIELD CAPITAL MANAGEMENT COMPANY, L.P.

This Statement of Additional Information (“SAI”) is not a prospectus. This SAI is intended to provide additional information regarding the activities and operations of The Advisors’ Inner Circle Fund II (the “Trust”) and the Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund and the Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund (each, a “Fund” and together, the “Funds”). This SAI is incorporated by reference into and should be read in conjunction with the Funds’ prospectuses dated March 1, 2017, as they may be amended from time to time (the “Prospectuses”). Capitalized terms not defined herein are defined in the Prospectuses. The Funds’ financial statements, including the notes thereto and the report of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP thereon, as contained in the 2016 Annual Report to Shareholders, are incorporated by reference into and deemed to be part of this SAI. A copy of the Funds’ 2016 Annual Report to Shareholders must accompany the delivery of this SAI. Shareholders may obtain copies of the Prospectuses or Annual or Semi- Annual Reports free of charge by writing to the Funds at Westfield Funds, P.O. Box 219009, Kansas City, MO 64121-9009 (Express Mail Address: Westfield Funds, c/o DST Systems, Inc., 430 West 7th Street, Kansas City, MO 64105) or by calling the Funds at 1-866-454-0738.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE TRUST	S-1
DESCRIPTION OF PERMITTED INVESTMENTS	S-2
INVESTMENT LIMITATIONS	S-25
THE ADVISER	S-27
PORTFOLIO MANAGERS	S-28
THE ADMINISTRATOR.....	S-30
THE DISTRIBUTOR	S-31
PAYMENTS TO FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES	S-31
THE TRANSFER AGENT	S-32
THE CUSTODIAN.....	S-32
INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM	S-32
LEGAL COUNSEL	S-32
TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS OF THE TRUST	S-32
PURCHASING AND REDEEMING SHARES	S-41
DETERMINATION OF NET ASSET VALUE	S-42
TAXES	S-43
FUND TRANSACTIONS	S-50
PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS	S-52
DESCRIPTION OF SHARES	S-53
SHAREHOLDER LIABILITY	S-53
LIMITATION OF TRUSTEES' LIABILITY	S-54
PROXY VOTING.....	S-54
CODES OF ETHICS	S-54
PRINCIPAL SHAREHOLDERS AND CONTROL PERSONS	S-54
APPENDIX A – DESCRIPTION OF RATINGS.....	A-1
APPENDIX B – PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.....	B-1

March 1, 2017

WCM-SX-001-0700

THE TRUST

General. Each Fund is a separate series of the Trust. The Trust is an open-end investment management company established under Massachusetts law as a Massachusetts voluntary association (commonly known as a business trust) under a Declaration of Trust dated July 24, 1992, as amended and restated February 18, 2004 and August 10, 2004 and amended May 15, 2012 (the “Declaration of Trust”). The Declaration of Trust permits the Trust to offer separate series (“funds”) of shares of beneficial interest (“shares”). The Trust reserves the right to create and issue shares of additional funds. Each fund is a separate mutual fund, and each share of each fund represents an equal proportionate interest in that fund. All consideration received by the Trust for shares of any fund and all assets of such fund belong solely to that fund and would be subject to liabilities related thereto. Each fund of the Trust pays its: (i) operating expenses, including fees of its service providers, expenses of preparing prospectuses, proxy solicitation material and reports to shareholders, costs of custodial services and registering its shares under federal and state securities laws, pricing and insurance expenses, brokerage costs, interest charges, taxes and organization expenses, and (ii) pro rata share of the fund’s other expenses, including audit and legal expenses. Expenses attributable to a specific fund shall be payable solely out of the assets of that fund. Expenses not attributable to a specific fund are allocated across all of the funds on the basis of relative net assets. The other funds of the Trust are described in one or more separate statements of additional information.

History of the Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund. The Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund is the successor to the Westfield Dividend Growth Fund Limited Partnership (the “Predecessor Fund”). The Predecessor Fund was managed by Westfield Capital Management Company, L.P. (“Westfield” or the “Adviser”) using investment objectives, strategies, policies and restrictions that were in all material respects equivalent to those used in managing the Fund. The date of inception of the Predecessor Fund was May 3, 2010. The Predecessor Fund dissolved and reorganized into the Institutional Class Shares of the Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund on July 26, 2013. All of the assets of the Predecessor Fund were transferred to the Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund in connection with the reorganization.

Description of Multiple Classes of Shares. The Trust is authorized to offer shares of the Funds in Institutional Class Shares and Investor Class Shares. The different classes provide for variations in shareholder servicing expenses and in the minimum initial investment requirements. Minimum investment requirements and investor eligibility are described in the Prospectuses. For more information on shareholder servicing expenses, see “Payments to Financial Intermediaries” in the SAI. The Trust reserves the right to create and issue additional classes of shares.

Voting Rights. Each shareholder of record is entitled to one vote for each share held on the record date for the meeting. Each Fund will vote separately on matters relating solely to it. As a Massachusetts voluntary association, the Trust is not required, and does not intend, to hold annual meetings of shareholders. Approval of shareholders will be sought, however, for certain changes in the operation of the Trust and for the election of the Board of Trustees of the Trust (each a “Trustee” and together, the “Board”) under certain circumstances. Under the Declaration of Trust, the Trustees have the power to liquidate the Funds without shareholder approval. While the Trustees have no present intention of exercising this power, they may do so if the Funds fail to reach a viable size within a reasonable amount of time or for such other reasons as may be determined by the Board.

In addition, a Trustee may be removed by the remaining Trustees or by shareholders at a special meeting called upon written request of shareholders owning at least 10% of the outstanding shares of the Trust. In the event that such a meeting is requested, the Trust will provide appropriate assistance and information to the shareholders requesting the meeting.

Any series of the Trust created on or after February 18, 2004 may reorganize or merge with one or more other series of the Trust or of another investment company. Any such reorganization or merger shall be pursuant to the terms and conditions specified in an agreement and plan of reorganization authorized and approved by the Trustees and entered into by the relevant series in connection therewith. In addition, such reorganization or merger may be authorized by vote of a majority of the Trustees then in office and, to the extent permitted by applicable law and the Declaration of Trust, without the approval of shareholders of any series.

DESCRIPTION OF PERMITTED INVESTMENTS

Each Fund's investment objective and principal investment strategies are described in its Prospectus. Each Fund is classified as a "diversified" investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act"). The following information supplements, and should be read in conjunction with, the Prospectuses.

The following are descriptions of permitted investments and investment practices of the Funds and the associated risk factors. Each Fund may invest in any of the following instruments or engage in any of the following investment practices unless such investment or activity is inconsistent with or is not permitted by the Fund's stated investment policies, including those stated below.

Derivatives

Derivatives are financial instruments whose value is based on an underlying asset (such as a stock or a bond), an underlying economic factor (such as interest rates) or a market benchmark. Unless otherwise stated in the Prospectuses, the Funds may use derivatives for a number of purposes including managing risk, gaining exposure to various markets in a cost-efficient manner, reducing transaction costs, remaining fully invested and speculating. The Funds may also invest in derivatives with the goal of protecting themselves from broad fluctuations in market prices, interest rates or foreign currency exchange rates (a practice known as "hedging"). When hedging is successful, a Fund will have offset any depreciation in the value of its portfolio securities by the appreciation in the value of the derivative position. Although techniques other than the sale and purchase of derivatives could be used to control the exposure of the Funds to market fluctuations, the use of derivatives may be a more effective means of hedging this exposure. In the future, to the extent such use is consistent with the Funds' investment objectives and is legally permissible, the Funds may use instruments and techniques that are not presently contemplated, but that may be subsequently developed.

There can be no assurance that a derivative strategy, if employed, will be successful. Because many derivatives have a leverage or borrowing component, adverse changes in the value or level of the underlying asset, reference rate or index can result in a loss substantially greater than the amount invested in the derivative itself. Certain derivatives have the potential for unlimited loss, regardless of the size of the initial investment. Accordingly, certain derivative transactions may be considered to constitute borrowing transactions for purposes of the 1940 Act. Such a derivative transaction will not be considered to constitute the issuance of a "senior security" by a Fund, and therefore such transaction will not be subject to the 300% asset coverage requirement otherwise applicable to borrowings by the Fund, if the Fund covers the transaction or segregates sufficient liquid assets (or such assets are "earmarked" on the Fund's books) in accordance with the requirements and interpretations of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") and its staff. A Fund may enter into agreements with broker-dealers that require the broker-dealers to accept physical settlement for certain types of derivatives instruments. If this occurs, the Fund would treat such derivative instruments as being cash settled for purposes of determining the Fund's coverage requirements.

Pursuant to rules adopted under the Commodity Exchange Act ("CEA") by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC"), a Fund must either operate within certain guidelines and restrictions with respect to the Fund's use of futures, options on such futures, commodity options and certain swaps, or the Adviser will be subject to registration with the CFTC as a "commodity pool operator" ("CPO").

Consistent with the CFTC's regulations, the Trust, on behalf of the Funds, has filed a notice of exclusion from the definition of the term CPO under the CEA pursuant to CFTC Rule 4.5 and, therefore, the Funds are not subject to registration or regulation as CPOs under the CEA. As a result, the Funds will be limited in their ability to use futures, options on such futures, commodity options and certain swaps. Complying with the limitations may restrict the Adviser's ability to implement the Funds' investment strategies and may adversely affect the Funds' performance.

Types of Derivatives:

Futures - A futures contract is an agreement between two parties whereby one party agrees to sell and the other party agrees to buy a specified amount of a financial instrument at an agreed upon price and time. The financial instrument underlying the contract may be a stock, stock index, bond, bond index, interest rate, foreign exchange rate or other similar instrument. Agreeing to buy the underlying financial instrument is called buying a futures contract or taking a long position in the contract. Likewise, agreeing to sell the underlying financial instrument is called selling a futures contract or taking a short position in the contract.

Futures contracts are traded in the United States on commodity exchanges or boards of trade (known as “contract markets”) approved for such trading and regulated by the CFTC. These contract markets standardize the terms, including the maturity date and underlying financial instrument, of all futures contracts.

Unlike other securities, the parties to a futures contract do not have to pay for or deliver the underlying financial instrument until some future date (the delivery date). Contract markets require both the purchaser and seller to deposit “initial margin” with a futures broker, known as a futures commission merchant or custodian bank, when they enter into the contract. Initial margin deposits are typically equal to a percentage of the contract’s value. Initial margin is similar to a performance bond or good faith deposit on a contract and is returned to the depositing party upon termination of the futures contract if all contractual obligations have been satisfied. After they open a futures contract, the parties to the transaction must compare the purchase price of the contract to its daily market value. If the value of the futures contract changes in such a way that a party’s position declines, that party must make additional “variation margin” payments so that the margin payment is adequate. On the other hand, the value of the contract may change in such a way that there is excess margin on deposit, possibly entitling the party that has a gain to receive all or a portion of this amount. This process is known as “marking to the market.” Variation margin does not represent a borrowing or loan by a party but is instead a settlement between the party and the futures broker of the amount one party would owe the other if the futures contract terminated. In computing daily net asset value (“NAV”), each party marks to market its open futures positions.

Although the terms of a futures contract call for the actual delivery of and payment for the underlying security, in many cases the parties may close the contract early by taking an opposite position in an identical contract. If the sale price upon closing out the contract is less than the original purchase price, the party closing out the contract will realize a loss. If the sale price upon closing out the contract is more than the original purchase price, the party closing out the contract will realize a gain. Conversely, if the purchase price upon closing out the contract is more than the original sale price, the party closing out the contract will realize a loss. If the purchase price upon closing out the contract is less than the original sale price, the party closing out the contract will realize a gain.

A Fund may incur commission expenses when it opens or closes a futures position.

Options - An option is a contract between two parties for the purchase and sale of a financial instrument for a specified price (known as the “strike price” or “exercise price”) at any time during the option period. Unlike a futures contract, an option grants a right (not an obligation) to buy or sell a financial instrument. Generally, a seller of an option can grant a buyer two kinds of rights: a “call” (the right to buy the security) or a “put” (the right to sell the security). Options have various types of underlying instruments, including specific securities, indices of securities prices, foreign currencies, interest rates and futures contracts. Options may be traded on an exchange (exchange-traded options) or may be customized agreements between the parties (over-the-counter or “OTC” options). Like futures, a financial intermediary, known as a clearing corporation, financially backs exchange-traded options. However, OTC options have no such intermediary and are subject to the risk that the counterparty will not fulfill its obligations under the contract. The principal factors affecting the market value of an option include supply and demand, interest rates, the current market value of the underlying instrument relative to the exercise price of the option, the volatility of the underlying instrument, and the time remaining until the option expires.

▪ **Purchasing Put and Call Options**

When a Fund purchases a put option, it buys the right to sell the instrument underlying the option at a fixed strike price. In return for this right, the Fund pays the current market price for the option (known as the “option premium”). A Fund may purchase put options to offset or hedge against a decline in the market value of its securities (“protective puts”) or to benefit from a decline in the price of securities that it does not own. A Fund would ordinarily realize a gain if, during the option period, the value of the underlying securities decreased below the exercise price sufficiently to cover the premium and transaction costs. However, if the price of the underlying instrument does not fall enough to offset the cost of purchasing the option, a put buyer would lose the premium and related transaction costs.

Call options are similar to put options, except that a Fund obtains the right to purchase, rather than sell, the underlying instrument at the option’s strike price. A Fund would normally purchase call options in anticipation of an increase in the market value of securities it owns or wants to buy. A Fund would ordinarily realize a gain if, during the option period, the value of the underlying instrument exceeded the exercise price plus the premium paid and related transaction costs. Otherwise, the Fund would realize either no gain or a loss on the purchase of the call option.

The purchaser of an option may terminate its position by:

- Allowing it to expire and losing its entire premium;
- Exercising the option and either selling (in the case of a put option) or buying (in the case of a call option) the underlying instrument at the strike price; or
- Closing it out in the secondary market at its current price.

▪ **Selling (Writing) Put and Call Options**

When a Fund writes a call option it assumes an obligation to sell specified securities to the holder of the option at a fixed strike price if the option is exercised at any time before the expiration date. Similarly, when a Fund writes a put option it assumes an obligation to purchase specified securities from the option holder at a fixed strike price if the option is exercised at any time before the expiration date. The Fund may terminate its position in an exchange-traded put option before exercise by buying an option identical to the one it has written. Similarly, the Fund may cancel an OTC option by entering into an offsetting transaction with the counterparty to the option.

A Fund could try to hedge against an increase in the value of securities it would like to acquire by writing a put option on those securities. If security prices rise, the Fund would expect the put option to expire and the premium it received to offset the increase in the security’s value. If security prices remain the same over time, the Fund would hope to profit by closing out the put option at a lower price. If security prices fall, the Fund may lose an amount of money equal to the difference between the value of the security and the premium it received. Writing covered put options may deprive a Fund of the opportunity to profit from a decrease in the market price of the securities it would like to acquire.

The characteristics of writing call options are similar to those of writing put options, except that call writers expect to profit if prices remain the same or fall. A Fund could try to hedge against a decline in the value of securities it already owns by writing a call option. If the price of that security falls as expected, the Fund would expect the option to expire and the premium it received to offset the decline of the security’s value. However, the Fund must be prepared to deliver the underlying instrument in return for the strike price, which may deprive it of the opportunity to profit from an increase in the market price of the securities it holds.

The Funds are permitted to write only “covered” options. At the time of selling a call option, a Fund may cover the option by owning, among other things:

- The underlying security (or securities convertible into the underlying security without additional consideration), index, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract;

- A call option on the same security or index with the same or lesser exercise price;
- A call option on the same security or index with a greater exercise price, provided that the Fund also segregates cash or liquid securities in an amount equal to the difference between the exercise prices;
- Cash or liquid securities equal to at least the market value of the optioned securities, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract; or
- In the case of an index, the portfolio of securities that corresponds to the index.

At the time of selling a put option, a Fund may cover the option by, among other things:

- Entering into a short position in the underlying security;
- Purchasing a put option on the same security, index, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract with the same or greater exercise price;
- Purchasing a put option on the same security, index, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract with a lesser exercise price and segregating cash or liquid securities in an amount equal to the difference between the exercise prices; or
- Maintaining the entire exercise price in liquid securities.

▪ **Options on Securities Indices**

Options on securities indices are similar to options on securities, except that the exercise of securities index options requires cash settlement payments and does not involve the actual purchase or sale of securities. In addition, securities index options are designed to reflect price fluctuations in a group of securities or segment of the securities market rather than price fluctuations in a single security.

• **Options on Credit Default Swaps**

An option on a credit default swap (“CDS”) gives the holder the right to enter into a CDS at a specified future date and under specified terms in exchange for a purchase price or premium. The writer of the option bears the risk of any unfavorable move in the value of the CDS relative to the market value on the exercise date, while the purchaser may allow the option to expire unexercised.

▪ **Options on Futures**

An option on a futures contract provides the holder with the right to buy a futures contract (in the case of a call option) or sell a futures contract (in the case of a put option) at a fixed time and price. Upon exercise of the option by the holder, the contract market clearing house establishes a corresponding short position for the writer of the option (in the case of a call option) or a corresponding long position (in the case of a put option). If the option is exercised, the parties will be subject to the futures contracts. In addition, the writer of an option on a futures contract is subject to initial and variation margin requirements on the option position. Options on futures contracts are traded on the same contract market as the underlying futures contract.

The buyer or seller of an option on a futures contract may terminate the option early by purchasing or selling an option of the same series (i.e., the same exercise price and expiration date) as the option previously purchased or sold. The difference between the premiums paid and received represents the trader’s profit or loss on the transaction.

A Fund may purchase put and call options on futures contracts instead of selling or buying futures contracts. The Fund may buy a put option on a futures contract for the same reasons it would sell a futures contract. It also may purchase such a put option in

order to hedge a long position in the underlying futures contract. A Fund may buy a call option on a futures contract for the same purpose as the actual purchase of a futures contract, such as in anticipation of favorable market conditions.

A Fund may write a call option on a futures contract to hedge against a decline in the prices of the instrument underlying the futures contracts. If the price of the futures contract at expiration were below the exercise price, the Fund would retain the option premium, which would offset, in part, any decline in the value of its portfolio securities.

The writing of a put option on a futures contract is similar to the purchase of the futures contracts, except that, if the market price declines, a Fund would pay more than the market price for the underlying instrument. The premium received on the sale of the put option, less any transaction costs, would reduce the net cost to the Fund.

▪ **Options on Foreign Currencies**

A put option on a foreign currency gives the purchaser of the option the right to sell a foreign currency at the exercise price until the option expires. A call option on a foreign currency gives the purchaser of the option the right to purchase the currency at the exercise price until the option expires. The Funds may purchase or write put and call options on foreign currencies for the purpose of hedging against changes in future currency exchange rates.

The Funds may use foreign currency options given the same circumstances under which they could use forward foreign currency exchange contracts. For example, a decline in the U.S. dollar value of a foreign currency in which a Fund's securities are denominated would reduce the U.S. dollar value of the securities, even if their value in the foreign currency remained constant. In order to hedge against such a risk, the Fund may purchase a put option on the foreign currency. If the value of the currency then declined, the Fund could sell the currency for a fixed amount in U.S. dollars and thereby offset, at least partially, the negative effect on its securities that otherwise would have resulted. Conversely, if a Fund anticipates a rise in the U.S. dollar value of a currency in which securities to be acquired are denominated, the Fund may purchase call options on the currency in order to offset, at least partially, the effects of negative movements in exchange rates. If currency exchange rates do not move in the direction or to the extent anticipated, the Funds could sustain losses on transactions in foreign currency options.

▪ **Combined Positions**

The Funds may purchase and write options in combination with each other, or in combination with futures or forward contracts or swap agreements, to adjust the risk and return characteristics of the overall position. For example, a Fund could construct a combined position whose risk and return characteristics are similar to selling a futures contract by purchasing a put option and writing a call option on the same underlying instrument. Alternatively, a Fund could write a call option at one strike price and buy a call option at a lower price to reduce the risk of the written call option in the event of a substantial price increase. Because combined options positions involve multiple trades, they result in higher transaction costs and may be more difficult to open and close out.

Forward Foreign Currency Exchange Contracts - A forward foreign currency contract involves an obligation to purchase or sell a specific amount of currency at a future date or date range at a specific price. In the case of a cancelable forward contract, the holder has the unilateral right to cancel the contract at maturity by paying a specified fee. Forward foreign currency exchange contracts differ from foreign currency futures contracts in certain respects. Unlike futures contracts, forward contracts:

- Do not have standard maturity dates or amounts (i.e., the parties to the contract may fix the maturity date and the amount);
- Are typically traded directly between currency traders (usually large commercial banks) and their customers in the inter-bank markets, as opposed to on exchanges regulated by the CFTC (note, however, that under new definitions adopted by the CFTC and SEC, many non-deliverable foreign currency forwards will be considered swaps for certain purposes, including determination of whether such instruments must be traded on exchanges and centrally cleared);
- Do not require an initial margin deposit; and

- May be closed by entering into a closing transaction with the currency trader who is a party to the original forward contract, as opposed to with a commodities exchange.

- **Foreign Currency Hedging Strategies**

A “settlement hedge” or “transaction hedge” is designed to protect a Fund against an adverse change in foreign currency values between the date a security is purchased or sold and the date on which payment is made or received. Entering into a forward contract for the purchase or sale of the amount of foreign currency involved in an underlying security transaction for a fixed amount of U.S. dollars “locks in” the U.S. dollar price of the security. A Fund may also use forward contracts to purchase or sell a foreign currency when it anticipates purchasing or selling securities denominated in foreign currency, even if it has not yet selected the specific investments.

A Fund may use forward contracts to hedge against a decline in the value of existing investments denominated in foreign currency. Such a hedge, sometimes referred to as a “position hedge,” would tend to offset both positive and negative currency fluctuations, but would not offset changes in security values caused by other factors. The Fund could also hedge the position by selling another currency expected to perform similarly to the currency in which the Fund’s investment is denominated. This type of hedge, sometimes referred to as a “proxy hedge,” could offer advantages in terms of cost, yield, or efficiency, but generally would not hedge currency exposure as effectively as a direct hedge into U.S. dollars. Proxy hedges may result in losses if the currency used to hedge does not perform similarly to the currency in which the hedged securities are denominated.

Transaction and position hedging do not eliminate fluctuations in the underlying prices of the securities that a Fund owns or intends to purchase or sell. They simply establish a rate of exchange that one can achieve at some future point in time. Additionally, these techniques tend to minimize the risk of loss due to a decline in the value of the hedged currency and to limit any potential gain that might result from the increase in value of such currency.

A Fund may enter into forward contracts to shift its investment exposure from one currency into another. Such transactions may call for the delivery of one foreign currency in exchange for another foreign currency, including currencies in which its securities are not then denominated. This may include shifting exposure from U.S. dollars to a foreign currency, or from one foreign currency to another foreign currency. This type of strategy, sometimes known as a “cross-hedge,” will tend to reduce or eliminate exposure to the currency that is sold, and increase exposure to the currency that is purchased. Cross-hedges may protect against losses resulting from a decline in the hedged currency but will cause the Fund to assume the risk of fluctuations in the value of the currency it purchases. Cross-hedging transactions also involve the risk of imperfect correlation between changes in the values of the currencies involved.

It is difficult to forecast with precision the market value of portfolio securities at the expiration or maturity of a forward or futures contract. Accordingly, a Fund may have to purchase additional foreign currency on the spot (cash) market if the market value of a security it is hedging is less than the amount of foreign currency it is obligated to deliver. Conversely, the Fund may have to sell on the spot market some of the foreign currency it received upon the sale of a security if the market value of such security exceeds the amount of foreign currency it is obligated to deliver.

Equity-Linked Securities - The Funds may invest in privately issued securities whose investment results are designed to correspond generally to the performance of a specified stock index or “basket” of securities, or sometimes a single stock (referred to as “equity-linked securities”). These securities are used for many of the same purposes as derivative instruments and share many of the same risks. Equity-linked securities may be considered illiquid and thus subject to the Funds’ restrictions on investments in illiquid securities.

Swap Agreements - A swap agreement is a financial instrument that typically involves the exchange of cash flows between two parties on specified dates (settlement dates), where the cash flows are based on agreed-upon prices, rates, indices, etc. The nominal amount on which the cash flows are calculated is called the notional amount. Swap agreements are individually negotiated and structured to include exposure to a variety of different types of investments or market factors, such as interest rates, foreign currency rates, mortgage securities, corporate borrowing rates, security prices or inflation rates.

Swap agreements may increase or decrease the overall volatility of the investments of a Fund and its share price. The performance of swap agreements may be affected by a change in the specific interest rate, currency, or other factors that determine the amounts of payments due to and from the Fund. If a swap agreement calls for payments by the Fund, the Fund must be prepared to make such payments when due. In addition, if the counterparty's creditworthiness declined, the value of a swap agreement would be likely to decline, potentially resulting in losses.

Generally, swap agreements have a fixed maturity date that will be agreed upon by the parties. The agreement can be terminated before the maturity date under certain circumstances, such as default by one of the parties or insolvency, among others, and can be transferred by a party only with the prior written consent of the other party. A Fund may be able to eliminate its exposure under a swap agreement either by assignment or by other disposition, or by entering into an offsetting swap agreement with the same party or a similarly creditworthy party. If the counterparty is unable to meet its obligations under the contract, declares bankruptcy, defaults or becomes insolvent, a Fund may not be able to recover the money it expected to receive under the swap agreement. The Funds will not enter into any swap agreement unless the Adviser believes that the counterparty to the transaction is creditworthy.

A swap agreement can be a form of leverage, which can magnify the Funds' gains or losses. In order to reduce the risk associated with leveraging, the Funds may cover their current obligations under swap agreements according to guidelines established by the SEC. If a Fund enters into a swap agreement on a net basis, it will segregate assets with a daily value at least equal to the excess, if any, of the Fund's accrued obligations under the swap agreement over the accrued amount the Fund is entitled to receive under the agreement. If a Fund enters into a swap agreement on other than a net basis, it will segregate assets with a value equal to the full amount of the Fund's accrued obligations under the swap agreement.

- **Equity Swaps**

In a typical equity swap, one party agrees to pay another party the return on a stock, stock index or basket of stocks in return for a specified interest rate. By entering into an equity index swap, for example, the index receiver can gain exposure to stocks making up the index of securities without actually purchasing those stocks. Equity index swaps involve not only the risk associated with investment in the securities represented in the index, but also the risk that the performance of such securities, including dividends, will not exceed the return on the interest rate that a Fund will be committed to pay.

- **Total Return Swaps**

Total return swaps are contracts in which one party agrees to make payments of the total return from a reference instrument—which may be a single asset, a pool of assets or an index of assets—during a specified period, in return for payments equal to a fixed or floating rate of interest or the total return from another underlying reference instrument. The total return includes appreciation or depreciation on the underlying asset, plus any interest or dividend payments. Payments under the swap are based upon an agreed upon principal amount but, since the principal amount is not exchanged, it represents neither an asset nor a liability to either counterparty, and is referred to as notional. Total return swaps are marked to market daily using different sources, including quotations from counterparties, pricing services, brokers or market makers. The unrealized appreciation or depreciation related to the change in the valuation of the notional amount of the swap is combined with the amount due to a Fund at termination or settlement. The primary risks associated with total return swaps are credit risks (if the counterparty fails to meet its obligations) and market risk (if there is no liquid market for the swap or unfavorable changes occur to the underlying reference instrument).

- **Interest Rate Swaps**

Interest rate swaps are financial instruments that involve the exchange of one type of interest rate for another type of interest rate cash flow on specified dates in the future. Some of the different types of interest rate swaps are “fixed-for-floating rate swaps,” “termed basis swaps” and “index amortizing swaps.” Fixed-for floating rate swaps involve the exchange of fixed interest rate cash flows for floating rate cash flows. Termed basis swaps entail cash flows to both parties based on floating interest rates, where the interest rate indices are different. Index amortizing swaps are typically fixed-for-floating rate swaps where the notional amount changes if certain conditions are met.

As with a traditional investment in a debt security, a Fund could lose money by investing in an interest rate swap if interest rates change adversely. For example, if a Fund enters into a swap where it agrees to exchange a floating rate of interest for a fixed rate of interest, the Fund may have to pay more money than it receives. Similarly, if a Fund enters into a swap where it agrees to exchange a fixed rate of interest for a floating rate of interest, the Fund may receive less money than it has agreed to pay.

- **Currency Swaps**

A currency swap is an agreement between two parties in which one party agrees to make interest rate payments in one currency and the other promises to make interest rate payments in another currency. A Fund may enter into a currency swap when it has one currency and desires a different currency. Typically, the interest rates that determine the currency swap payments are fixed, although occasionally one or both parties may pay a floating rate of interest. Unlike an interest rate swap, however, the principal amounts are exchanged at the beginning of the agreement and returned at the end of the agreement. Changes in foreign exchange rates and changes in interest rates, as described above, may negatively affect currency swaps.

- **Inflation Swaps**

Inflation swaps are fixed-maturity, over-the-counter derivatives where one party pays a fixed rate in exchange for payments tied to an inflation index, such as the Consumer Price Index. The fixed rate, which is set by the parties at the initiation of the swap, is often referred to as the “breakeven inflation” rate and generally represents the current difference between treasury yields and Treasury Inflation Protected Securities yields of similar maturities at the initiation of the swap agreement. Inflation swaps are typically designated as “zero coupon,” where all cash flows are exchanged at maturity. The value of an inflation swap is expected to fluctuate in response to changes in the relationship between nominal interest rates and the rate of inflation. An inflation swap can lose value if the realized rate of inflation over the life of the swap is less than the fixed market implied inflation rate (the breakeven inflation rate) the investor agreed to pay at the initiation of the swap.

- **Credit Default Swaps**

A credit default swap is an agreement between a “buyer” and a “seller” for credit protection. The credit default swap agreement may have as reference obligations one or more securities that are not then held by a Fund. The protection buyer is generally obligated to pay the protection seller an upfront payment and/or a periodic stream of payments over the term of the agreement until a credit event on a reference obligation has occurred. If no default occurs, the seller would keep the stream of payments and would have no payment obligations. If a credit event occurs, the seller generally must pay the buyer the full notional amount (the “par value”) of the swap.

- **Caps, Collars and Floors**

Caps and floors have an effect similar to buying or writing options. In a typical cap or floor agreement, one party agrees to make payments only under specified circumstances, usually in return for payment of a fee by the other party. For example, the buyer of an interest rate cap obtains the right to receive payments to the extent that a specified interest rate exceeds an agreed-upon level. The seller of an interest rate floor is obligated to make payments to the extent that a specified interest rate falls below an agreed-upon level. An interest rate collar combines elements of buying a cap and selling a floor.

Risks of Derivatives:

While transactions in derivatives may reduce certain risks, these transactions themselves entail certain other risks. For example, unanticipated changes in interest rates, securities prices or currency exchange rates may result in a poorer overall performance of the Funds than if they had not entered into any derivatives transactions. Derivatives may magnify the Funds’ gains or losses, causing them to make or lose substantially more than they invested.

When used for hedging purposes, increases in the value of the securities a Fund holds or intends to acquire should offset any losses incurred with a derivative. Purchasing derivatives for purposes other than hedging could expose the Fund to greater risks.

Use of derivatives involves transaction costs, which may be significant, and may also increase the amount of taxable income to shareholders.

Correlation of Prices - The Funds' ability to hedge their securities through derivatives depends on the degree to which price movements in the underlying index or instrument correlate with price movements in the relevant securities. In the case of poor correlation, the price of the securities a Fund is hedging may not move in the same amount, or even in the same direction as the hedging instrument. The Adviser will try to minimize this risk by investing in only those contracts whose behavior it expects to correlate with the behavior of the portfolio securities it is trying to hedge. However, if the Adviser's prediction of interest and currency rates, market value, volatility or other economic factors is incorrect, a Fund may lose money, or may not make as much money as it expected.

Derivative prices can diverge from the prices of their underlying instruments, even if the characteristics of the underlying instruments are very similar to the derivative. Listed below are some of the factors that may cause such a divergence:

- Current and anticipated short-term interest rates, changes in volatility of the underlying instrument, and the time remaining until expiration of the contract;
- A difference between the derivatives and securities markets, including different levels of demand, how the instruments are traded, the imposition of daily price fluctuation limits or discontinued trading of an instrument; and
- Differences between the derivatives, such as different margin requirements, different liquidity of such markets and the participation of speculators in such markets.

Derivatives based upon a narrower index of securities, such as those of a particular industry group, may present greater risk than derivatives based on a broad market index. Since narrower indices are made up of a smaller number of securities, they are more susceptible to rapid and extreme price fluctuations because of changes in the value of those securities.

While currency futures and options values are expected to correlate with exchange rates, they may not reflect other factors that affect the value of the investments of the Funds. A currency hedge, for example, should protect a yen-denominated security from a decline in the yen, but will not protect the Funds against a price decline resulting from deterioration in the issuer's creditworthiness. Because the value of the Funds' foreign-denominated investments changes in response to many factors other than exchange rates, it may not be possible to match the amount of currency options and futures to the value of the Funds' investments precisely over time.

Lack of Liquidity - Before a futures contract or option is exercised or expires, a Fund can terminate it only by entering into a closing purchase or sale transaction. Moreover, a Fund may close out a futures contract only on the exchange the contract was initially traded. Although the Funds intend to purchase options and futures only where there appears to be an active market, there is no guarantee that such a liquid market will exist. If there is no secondary market for the contract, or the market is illiquid, a Fund may not be able to close out its position. In an illiquid market, a Fund may:

- Have to sell securities to meet its daily margin requirements at a time when it is disadvantageous to do so;
- Have to purchase or sell the instrument underlying the contract;
- Not be able to hedge its investments; and/or
- Not be able to realize profits or limit its losses.

Derivatives may become illiquid (i.e., difficult to sell at a desired time and price) under a variety of market conditions. For example:

- An exchange may suspend or limit trading in a particular derivative instrument, an entire category of derivatives or all derivatives, which sometimes occurs because of increased market volatility;

- Unusual or unforeseen circumstances may interrupt normal operations of an exchange;
- The facilities of the exchange may not be adequate to handle current trading volume;
- Equipment failures, government intervention, insolvency of a brokerage firm or clearing house or other occurrences may disrupt normal trading activity; or
- Investors may lose interest in a particular derivative or category of derivatives.

Management Risk - Successful use of derivatives by the Funds is subject to the ability of the Adviser to forecast stock market and interest rate trends. If the Adviser incorrectly predicts stock market and interest rate trends, the Funds may lose money by investing in derivatives. For example, if a Fund were to write a call option based on the Adviser's expectation that the price of the underlying security would fall, but the price were to rise instead, the Fund could be required to sell the security upon exercise at a price below the current market price. Similarly, if a Fund were to write a put option based on the Adviser's expectation that the price of the underlying security would rise, but the price were to fall instead, the Fund could be required to purchase the security upon exercise at a price higher than the current market price.

Pricing Risk - At times, market conditions might make it hard to value some investments. For example, if a Fund has valued its securities too high, shareholders may end up paying too much for Fund shares when they buy into the Fund. If the Fund underestimates its price, shareholders may not receive the full market value for their Fund shares when they sell.

Margin - Because of the low margin deposits required upon the opening of a derivative position, such transactions involve an extremely high degree of leverage. Consequently, a relatively small price movement in a derivative may result in an immediate and substantial loss (as well as gain) to a Fund and it may lose more than it originally invested in the derivative.

If the price of a futures contract changes adversely, a Fund may have to sell securities at a time when it is disadvantageous to do so to meet its minimum daily margin requirement. A Fund may lose its margin deposits if a broker-dealer with whom it has an open futures contract or related option becomes insolvent or declares bankruptcy.

Volatility and Leverage - The Funds' use of derivatives may have a leveraging effect. Leverage generally magnifies the effect of any increase or decrease in value of an underlying asset and results in increased volatility, which means the Funds will have the potential for greater gains, as well as the potential for greater losses, than if the Funds do not use derivative instruments that have a leveraging effect. The prices of derivatives are volatile (i.e., they may change rapidly, substantially and unpredictably) and are influenced by a variety of factors, including:

- Actual and anticipated changes in interest rates;
- Fiscal and monetary policies; and
- National and international political events.

Most exchanges limit the amount by which the price of a derivative can change during a single trading day. Daily trading limits establish the maximum amount that the price of a derivative may vary from the settlement price of that derivative at the end of trading on the previous day. Once the price of a derivative reaches that value, the Funds may not trade that derivative at a price beyond that limit. The daily limit governs only price movements during a given day and does not limit potential gains or losses.

Derivative prices have occasionally moved to the daily limit for several consecutive trading days, preventing prompt liquidation of the derivative.

Government Regulation - The regulation of derivatives markets in the U.S. is a rapidly changing area of law and is subject to modification by government and judicial action. In particular, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, signed into law in 2010, grants significant new authority to the SEC and the CFTC to impose comprehensive regulations on the over-the-counter and cleared derivatives markets. These regulations include, but are not limited to, mandatory clearing of certain derivatives and requirements relating to disclosure, margin and trade reporting. The new law and regulations may

negatively impact the Funds by increasing transaction and/or regulatory compliance costs, limiting the availability of certain derivatives or otherwise adversely affecting the value or performance of the derivatives the Funds trade. In addition, the SEC proposed new derivatives rules in December 2015 that could limit the Funds' use of derivatives, and adversely impact the Funds' ability to achieve their investment objectives. Other potentially adverse regulatory obligations can develop suddenly and without notice.

Equity Securities

Types of Equity Securities:

Common Stocks - Common stocks represent units of ownership in a company. Common stocks usually carry voting rights and earn dividends. Unlike preferred stocks, which are described below, dividends on common stocks are not fixed but are declared at the discretion of the company's board of directors.

Preferred Stocks - Preferred stocks are also units of ownership in a company. Preferred stocks normally have preference over common stock in the payment of dividends and the liquidation of the company. However, in all other respects, preferred stocks are subordinated to the liabilities of the issuer. Unlike common stocks, preferred stocks are generally not entitled to vote on corporate matters. Types of preferred stocks include adjustable-rate preferred stock, fixed dividend preferred stock, perpetual preferred stock, and sinking fund preferred stock. Generally, the market value of preferred stock with a fixed dividend rate and no conversion element varies inversely with interest rates and perceived credit risk.

Convertible Securities - Convertible securities are securities that may be exchanged for, converted into, or exercised to acquire a predetermined number of shares of the issuer's common stock at a Fund's option during a specified time period (such as convertible preferred stocks, convertible debentures and warrants). A convertible security is generally a fixed income security that is senior to common stock in an issuer's capital structure, but is usually subordinated to similar non-convertible securities. In exchange for the conversion feature, many corporations will pay a lower rate of interest on convertible securities than debt securities of the same corporation. In general, the market value of a convertible security is at least the higher of its "investment value" (*i.e.*, its value as a fixed income security) or its "conversion value" (*i.e.*, its value upon conversion into its underlying common stock).

Convertible securities are subject to the same risks as similar securities without the convertible feature. The price of a convertible security is more volatile during times of steady interest rates than other types of debt securities. The price of a convertible security tends to increase as the market value of the underlying stock rises, whereas it tends to decrease as the market value of the underlying common stock declines.

A synthetic convertible security is a combination investment in which a Fund purchases both (i) high-grade cash equivalents or a high grade debt obligation of an issuer or U.S. government securities and (ii) call options or warrants on the common stock of the same or different issuer with some or all of the anticipated interest income from the associated debt obligation that is earned over the holding period of the option or warrant.

While providing a fixed income stream (generally higher in yield than the income derivable from common stock but lower than that afforded by a similar non-convertible security), a convertible security also affords an investor the opportunity, through its conversion feature, to participate in the capital appreciation attendant upon a market price advance in the convertible security's underlying common stock. A synthetic convertible position has similar investment characteristics, but may differ with respect to credit quality, time to maturity, trading characteristics, and other factors. Because the Funds will create synthetic convertible positions only out of high grade fixed income securities, the credit rating associated with the Funds' synthetic convertible investments is generally expected to be higher than that of the average convertible security, many of which are rated below high grade. However, because the options used to create synthetic convertible positions will generally have expirations between one month and three years of the time of purchase, the maturity of these positions will generally be shorter than average for convertible securities. Since the option component of a convertible security or synthetic convertible position is a wasting asset (in the sense of losing "time value" as maturity approaches), a synthetic convertible position may lose such value more rapidly than a convertible security of longer maturity; however, the gain in option value due to appreciation of the underlying stock may

exceed such time value loss, the market price of the option component generally reflects these differences in maturities, and the Adviser takes such differences into account when evaluating such positions. When a synthetic convertible position “matures” because of the expiration of the associated option, a Fund may extend the maturity by investing in a new option with longer maturity on the common stock of the same or different issuer. If the Fund does not so extend the maturity of a position, it may continue to hold the associated fixed income security.

Rights and Warrants - A right is a privilege granted to existing shareholders of a corporation to subscribe to shares of a new issue of common stock before it is issued. Rights normally have a short life of usually two to four weeks, are freely transferable and entitle the holder to buy the new common stock at a lower price than the public offering price. Warrants are securities that are usually issued together with a debt security or preferred stock and that give the holder the right to buy proportionate amounts of common stock at a specified price. Warrants are freely transferable and are traded on major exchanges. Unlike rights, warrants normally have a life that is measured in years and entitles the holder to buy common stock of a company at a price that is usually higher than the market price at the time the warrant is issued. Corporations often issue warrants to make the accompanying debt security more attractive.

An investment in warrants and rights may entail greater risks than certain other types of investments. Generally, rights and warrants do not carry the right to receive dividends or exercise voting rights with respect to the underlying securities, and they do not represent any rights in the assets of the issuer. In addition, their value does not necessarily change with the value of the underlying securities, and they cease to have value if they are not exercised on or before their expiration date. Investing in rights and warrants increases the potential profit or loss to be realized from the investment as compared with investing the same amount in the underlying securities.

Risks of Investing in Equity Securities:

General Risks of Investing in Stocks - While investing in stocks allows investors to participate in the benefits of owning a company, such investors must accept the risks of ownership. Unlike bondholders, who have preference to a company’s earnings and cash flow, preferred stockholders, followed by common stockholders in order of priority, are entitled only to the residual amount after a company meets its other obligations. For this reason, the value of a company’s stock will usually react more strongly to actual or perceived changes in the company’s financial condition or prospects than its debt obligations. Stockholders of a company that fares poorly can lose money.

Stock markets tend to move in cycles with short or extended periods of rising and falling stock prices. The value of a company’s stock may fall because of:

- Factors that directly relate to that company, such as decisions made by its management or lower demand for the company’s products or services;
- Factors affecting an entire industry, such as increases in production costs; and
- Changes in general financial market conditions that are relatively unrelated to the company or its industry, such as changes in interest rates, currency exchange rates or inflation rates.

Because preferred stock is generally junior to debt securities and other obligations of the issuer, deterioration in the credit quality of the issuer will cause greater changes in the value of a preferred stock than in a more senior debt security with similar stated yield characteristics.

Large Capitalization Companies - Large capitalization companies may lag the performance of smaller capitalization companies because large capitalization companies may experience slower rates of growth than smaller capitalization companies and may not respond as quickly to market changes and opportunities.

Initial Public Offerings (“IPOs”) - A Fund may invest a portion of its assets in securities of companies offering shares in IPOs. IPOs may have a magnified performance impact on funds with a small asset base. A Fund may hold IPO shares for a very short period of time, which may increase the turnover of the Fund’s portfolio and may lead to increased expenses for the

Fund, such as commissions and transaction costs. By selling IPO shares, a Fund may realize taxable gains it will subsequently distribute to shareholders. In addition, the market for IPO shares can be speculative and/or inactive for extended periods of time. The limited number of shares available for trading in some IPOs may make it more difficult for a Fund to buy or sell significant amounts of shares without an unfavorable impact on prevailing prices. Holders of IPO shares can be affected by substantial dilution in the value of their shares, by sales of additional shares and by concentration of control in existing management and principal shareholders.

A Fund's investment in IPO shares may include the securities of unseasoned companies (companies with less than three years of continuous operations), which presents risks considerably greater than common stocks of more established companies. These companies may have limited operating histories and their prospects for profitability may be uncertain. These companies may be involved in new and evolving businesses and, compared to their better-established, larger-cap peers, may be more vulnerable to competition and changes in technology, markets and economic conditions. They may be more dependent on key managers and third parties and may have limited product lines.

Master Limited Partnerships (“MLPs”) - MLPs are limited partnerships or limited liability companies, whose partnership units or limited liability interests are listed and traded on a U.S. securities exchange, and are treated as publicly traded partnerships for federal income tax purposes. To qualify to be treated as a partnership for tax purposes, an MLP must receive at least 90% of its income from qualifying sources as set forth in Section 7704(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the “Code”). These qualifying sources include activities such as the exploration, development, mining, production, processing, refining, transportation, storage and marketing of mineral or natural resources. To the extent that an MLP's interests are concentrated in a particular industry or sector, such as the energy sector, the MLP will be negatively impacted by economic events adversely impacting that industry or sector.

MLPs that are formed as limited partnerships generally have two classes of owners, the general partner and limited partners, while MLPs that are formed as limited liability companies generally have two analogous classes of owners, the managing member and the members. For purposes of this section, references to general partners also apply to managing members and references to limited partners also apply to members.

The general partner is typically owned by a major energy company, an investment fund, the direct management of the MLP or is an entity owned by one or more of such parties. The general partner may be structured as a private or publicly traded corporation or other entity. The general partner typically controls the operations and management of the MLP through an equity interest of as much as 2% in the MLP plus, in many cases, ownership of common units and subordinated units. A holder of general partner interests can be liable under certain circumstances for amounts greater than the amount of the holder's investment in the general partner interest. General partner interests are not publicly traded and generally cannot be converted into common units. The general partner interest can be redeemed by the MLP if the MLP unitholders choose to remove the general partner, typically with a supermajority vote by limited partner unitholders.

Limited partners own the remainder of the MLP through ownership of common units and have a limited role in the MLP's operations and management. Common units are listed and traded on U.S. securities exchanges, with their value fluctuating predominantly based on prevailing market conditions and the success of the MLP. Unlike owners of common stock of a corporation, owners of common units have limited voting rights and have no ability annually to elect directors. In the event of liquidation, common units have preference over subordinated units, but not over debt or preferred units, to the remaining assets of the MLP.

MLPs are typically structured such that common units and general partner interests have first priority to receive quarterly cash distributions up to an established minimum amount (“minimum quarterly distributions” or “MQD”). Common and general partner interests also accrue arrearages in distributions to the extent the MQD is not paid. Once common and general partner interests have been paid, subordinated units receive distributions of up to the MQD; however, subordinated units do not accrue arrearages. Distributable cash in excess of the MQD paid to both common and subordinated units is distributed to both common and subordinated units generally on a pro rata basis. The general partner is also eligible to receive incentive distributions if the general partner operates the business in a manner which results in distributions paid per common unit surpassing specified target levels. As the general partner increases cash distributions to the limited partners, the general partner receives an increasingly

higher percentage of the incremental cash distributions. A common arrangement provides that the general partner can reach a tier where it receives 50% of every incremental dollar paid to common and subordinated unit holders. These incentive distributions encourage the general partner to streamline costs, increase capital expenditures and acquire assets in order to increase the partnership's cash flow and raise the quarterly cash distribution in order to reach higher tiers. Such results benefit all security holders of the MLP.

Foreign Securities

The Adviser defines foreign securities as securities issued by companies incorporated outside of the United States that do not maintain a headquarters or primary operation within the United States. Companies incorporated outside of the United States strictly for operational, tax, political, or other benefits, but behave primarily like a U.S. company and are traded on a U.S. exchange, will not be considered a foreign security. Foreign securities include debt and equity securities that are traded in markets outside of the United States. The markets in which foreign securities are located can be developed or emerging. Consistent with its investment strategies, each Fund can invest in foreign securities in a number of ways:

- It can invest directly in foreign securities denominated in a foreign currency;
- It can invest in American Depositary Receipts (“ADRs”), European Depositary Receipts (“EDRs”) and other similar global instruments; and
- It can invest in investment funds.

Types of Foreign Securities:

American Depositary Receipts - ADRs, as well as other “hybrid” forms of ADRs, including EDRs and Global Depositary Receipts (“GDRs”), are certificates evidencing ownership of shares of a foreign issuer. These certificates are issued by depository banks and generally trade on an established market in the United States or elsewhere. A custodian bank or similar financial institution in the issuer's home country holds the underlying shares in trust. The depository bank may not have physical custody of the underlying securities at all times and may charge fees for various services, including forwarding dividends and interest and corporate actions. ADRs are alternatives to directly purchasing the underlying foreign securities in their national markets and currencies. ADRs are subject to many of the risks associated with investing directly in foreign securities. EDRs are similar to ADRs, except that they are typically issued by European banks or trust companies.

ADRs can be sponsored or unsponsored. While these types are similar, there are differences regarding a holder's rights and obligations and the practices of market participants. A depository may establish an unsponsored facility without participation by (or acquiescence of) the underlying issuer; typically, however, the depository requests a letter of non-objection from the underlying issuer prior to establishing the facility. Holders of unsponsored depository receipts generally bear all the costs of the facility. The depository usually charges fees upon the deposit and withdrawal of the underlying securities, the conversion of dividends into U.S. dollars or other currency, the disposition of non-cash distributions, and the performance of other services. Sponsored depository receipt facilities are created in generally the same manner as unsponsored facilities, except that sponsored depository receipts are established jointly by a depository and the underlying issuer through a deposit agreement. The deposit agreement sets out the rights and responsibilities of the underlying issuer, the depository, and the depository receipt holders. With sponsored facilities, the underlying issuer typically bears some of the costs of the depository receipts (such as dividend payment fees of the depository), although most sponsored depository receipts holders may bear costs such as deposit and withdrawal fees. Depositories of most sponsored depository receipts agree to distribute notices of shareholder meetings, voting instructions, and other shareholder communications and information to the depository receipt holders at the underlying issuer's request. The depository of an unsponsored facility frequently is under no obligation to distribute shareholder communications received from the issuer of the deposited security or to pass through, to the holders of the receipts, voting rights with respect to the deposited securities.

Investments in the securities of foreign issuers may subject a Fund to investment risks that differ in some respects from those related to investments in securities of U.S. issuers. Such risks include future adverse political and economic developments, possible imposition of withholding taxes on income, possible seizure, nationalization or expropriation of foreign deposits,

possible establishment of exchange controls or taxation at the source or greater fluctuation in value due to changes in exchange rates. Foreign issuers of securities often engage in business practices different from those of domestic issuers of similar securities, and there may be less information publicly available about foreign issuers. In addition, foreign issuers are, generally speaking, subject to less government supervision and regulation and different accounting treatment than are those in the U.S.

Emerging Markets - An “emerging market” country is generally a country that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) and the International Finance Corporation would consider to be an emerging or developing country. Typically, emerging markets are in countries that are in the process of industrialization, with lower gross national products (“GNPs”) than more developed countries. There are currently over 130 countries that the international financial community generally considers to be emerging or developing countries, approximately 40 of which currently have stock markets.

Investing in emerging markets may magnify the risks of foreign investing. Security prices in emerging markets can be significantly more volatile than those in more developed markets, reflecting the greater uncertainties of investing in less established markets and economies. In particular, countries with emerging markets may:

- Have relatively unstable governments;
- Present greater risks of nationalization of businesses, restrictions on foreign ownership and prohibitions on the repatriation of assets;
- Offer less protection of property rights than more developed countries; and
- Have economies that are based on only a few industries, may be highly vulnerable to changes in local or global trade conditions, and may suffer from extreme and volatile debt burdens or inflation rates.

Local securities markets may trade a small number of securities and may be unable to respond effectively to increases in trading volume, potentially making prompt liquidation of holdings difficult or impossible at times.

Investment Funds - Some emerging countries currently prohibit direct foreign investment in the securities of their companies. Certain emerging countries, however, permit indirect foreign investment in the securities of companies listed and traded on their stock exchanges through investment funds that they have specifically authorized. Investments in these investment funds are subject to the provisions of the 1940 Act. If a Fund invests in such investment funds, shareholders will bear not only their proportionate share of the expenses of the Fund (including operating expenses and the fees of the Adviser), but also will indirectly bear similar expenses of the underlying investment funds. In addition, these investment funds may trade at a premium over their NAV.

Risks of Foreign Securities:

Foreign securities, foreign currencies, and securities issued by U.S. entities with substantial foreign operations may involve significant risks in addition to the risks inherent in U.S. investments.

Political and Economic Factors - Local political, economic, regulatory, or social instability, military action or unrest, or adverse diplomatic developments may affect the value of foreign investments. Listed below are some of the more important political and economic factors that could negatively affect an investment in foreign securities:

- The economies of foreign countries may differ from the economy of the United States in such areas as growth of GNP, rate of inflation, capital reinvestment, resource self-sufficiency, budget deficits and national debt;
- Foreign governments sometimes participate to a significant degree, through ownership interests or regulation, in their respective economies. Actions by these governments could significantly influence the market prices of securities and payment of dividends;

- The economies of many foreign countries are dependent on international trade and their trading partners and they could be severely affected if their trading partners were to enact protective trade barriers and economic conditions;
- The internal policies of a particular foreign country may be less stable than in the United States. Other countries face significant external political risks, such as possible claims of sovereignty by other countries or tense and sometimes hostile border clashes; and
- A foreign government may act adversely to the interests of U.S. investors, including expropriation or nationalization of assets, confiscatory taxation and other restrictions on U.S. investment. A country may restrict or control foreign investments in its securities markets. These restrictions could limit a Fund's ability to invest in a particular country or make it very expensive for the Fund to invest in that country. Some countries require prior governmental approval, may limit the types or amount of securities or companies in which a foreigner can invest, or may restrict the ability of foreign investors to repatriate their investment income and capital gains.

In June 2016, the United Kingdom (the "UK") voted in a referendum to leave the European Union ("EU"). Although the precise timeframe for "Brexit" is uncertain, it is currently expected that the UK will seek to withdraw from the EU by invoking article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty with an anticipated completion date within two years from notifying the European Council of the UK's intention to withdraw. It is unclear how withdrawal negotiations will be conducted and what the potential consequences may be. In addition, it is possible that measures could be taken to revote on the issue of Brexit, or that portions of the UK could seek to separate and remain a part of the EU. As a result of the political divisions within the UK and between the UK and the EU that the referendum vote has highlighted and the uncertain consequences of a Brexit, the UK and European economies and the broader global economy could be significantly impacted, which may result in increased volatility and illiquidity, and potentially lower economic growth on markets in the UK, Europe and globally that could potentially have an adverse effect on the value of the Funds' investments.

Information and Supervision - There is generally less publicly available information about foreign companies than companies based in the United States. For example, there are often no reports and ratings published about foreign companies comparable to the ones written about U.S. companies. Foreign companies are typically not subject to uniform accounting, auditing and financial reporting standards, practices and requirements comparable to those applicable to U.S. companies. The lack of comparable information makes investment decisions concerning foreign companies more difficult and less reliable than those concerning domestic companies.

Stock Exchange and Market Risk - The Adviser anticipates that in most cases an exchange or over-the-counter market located outside of the United States will be the best available market for foreign securities. Foreign stock markets, while growing in volume and sophistication, are generally not as developed as the markets in the United States. Foreign stock markets tend to differ from those in the United States in a number of ways.

Foreign stock markets:

- Are generally more volatile than, and not as developed or efficient as, those in the United States;
- Have substantially less volume;
- Trade securities that tend to be less liquid and experience rapid and erratic price movements;
- Have generally higher commissions and are subject to set minimum rates, as opposed to negotiated rates;
- Employ trading, settlement and custodial practices less developed than those in U.S. markets; and
- May have different settlement practices, which may cause delays and increase the potential for failed settlements.

Foreign markets may offer less protection to shareholders than U.S. markets because:

- Foreign accounting, auditing, and financial reporting requirements may render a foreign corporate balance sheet more difficult to understand and interpret than one subject to U.S. law and standards;

- Adequate public information on foreign issuers may not be available, and it may be difficult to secure dividends and information regarding corporate actions on a timely basis;
- In general, there is less overall governmental supervision and regulation of securities exchanges, brokers, and listed companies than in the United States;
- Over-the-counter markets tend to be less regulated than stock exchange markets and, in certain countries, may be totally unregulated;
- Economic or political concerns may influence regulatory enforcement and may make it difficult for shareholders to enforce their legal rights; and
- Restrictions on transferring securities within the United States or to U.S. persons may make a particular security less liquid than foreign securities of the same class that are not subject to such restrictions.

Foreign Currency Risk - While each Fund denominates its NAV in U.S. dollars, the securities of foreign companies are frequently denominated in foreign currencies. Thus, a change in the value of a foreign currency against the U.S. dollar will result in a corresponding change in value of securities denominated in that currency. Some of the factors that may impair the investments denominated in a foreign currency are:

- It may be expensive to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars and vice versa;
- Complex political and economic factors may significantly affect the values of various currencies, including the U.S. dollar, and their exchange rates;
- Government intervention may increase risks involved in purchasing or selling foreign currency options, forward contracts and futures contracts, since exchange rates may not be free to fluctuate in response to other market forces;
- There may be no systematic reporting of last sale information for foreign currencies or regulatory requirement that quotations available through dealers or other market sources be firm or revised on a timely basis;
- Available quotation information is generally representative of very large round-lot transactions in the inter-bank market and thus may not reflect exchange rates for smaller odd-lot transactions (less than \$1 million) where rates may be less favorable; and
- The inter-bank market in foreign currencies is a global, around-the-clock market. To the extent that a market is closed while the markets for the underlying currencies remain open, certain markets may not always reflect significant price and rate movements.

Taxes - Certain foreign governments levy withholding taxes on dividend and interest income. Although in some countries it is possible for the Funds to recover a portion of these taxes, the portion that cannot be recovered will reduce the income the Funds receive from their investments.

Money Market Securities

Money market securities include short-term U.S. government securities; custodial receipts evidencing separately traded interest and principal components of securities issued by the U.S. Treasury; commercial paper rated in the highest short-term rating category by a nationally recognized statistical ratings organization (“NRSRO”), such as Standard & Poor’s Ratings Service (“S&P”) or Moody’s Investor Service (“Moody’s”), or determined by the Adviser to be of comparable quality at the time of purchase; short-term bank obligations (certificates of deposit, time deposits and bankers’ acceptances) of U.S. commercial banks with assets of at least \$1 billion as of the end of their most recent fiscal year; and repurchase agreements involving such securities. Each of these money market securities are described below. For a description of ratings, see “Appendix A - Description of Ratings” to this SAI.

Fixed Income Securities

Fixed income securities include bonds, notes, debentures and other interest-bearing securities that represent indebtedness. The market value of the fixed income investments in which the Funds invest will change in response to interest rate changes and other factors. During periods of falling interest rates, the values of outstanding fixed income securities generally rise. Conversely, during periods of rising interest rates, the values of such securities generally decline. Moreover, while securities with longer maturities tend to produce higher yields, the prices of longer maturity securities are also subject to greater market fluctuations as a result of changes in interest rates. Changes by recognized agencies in the rating of any fixed income security and in the ability of an issuer to make payments of interest and principal also affect the value of these investments. Changes in the value of these securities will not necessarily affect cash income derived from these securities but will affect a Fund's NAV.

U.S. Government Securities - Each Fund may invest in U.S. government securities. Securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. government or its agencies or instrumentalities include U.S. Treasury securities, which are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Treasury and which differ only in their interest rates, maturities, and times of issuance. U.S. Treasury bills have initial maturities of one-year or less; U.S. Treasury notes have initial maturities of one to ten years; and U.S. Treasury bonds generally have initial maturities of greater than ten years. U.S. Treasury notes and bonds typically pay coupon interest semi-annually and repay the principal at maturity. Certain U.S. government securities are issued or guaranteed by agencies or instrumentalities of the U.S. government including, but not limited to, obligations of U.S. government agencies or instrumentalities such as the Federal National Mortgage Association ("Fannie Mae"), the Government National Mortgage Association ("Ginnie Mae"), the Small Business Administration, the Federal Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Home Loan Banks, Banks for Cooperatives (including the Central Bank for Cooperatives), the Federal Land Banks, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Financing Bank, the Student Loan Marketing Association, the National Credit Union Administration and the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation ("Farmer Mac").

Some obligations issued or guaranteed by U.S. government agencies and instrumentalities, including, for example, Ginnie Mae pass-through certificates, are supported by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Treasury. Other obligations issued by or guaranteed by federal agencies, such as those securities issued by Fannie Mae, are supported by the discretionary authority of the U.S. government to purchase certain obligations of the federal agency. Additionally, some obligations are issued by or guaranteed by federal agencies, such as those of the Federal Home Loan Banks, which are supported by the right of the issuer to borrow from the U.S. Treasury. While the U.S. government provides financial support to such U.S. government-sponsored federal agencies, no assurance can be given that the U.S. government will always do so, since the U.S. government is not so obligated by law. Guarantees of principal by U.S. government agencies or instrumentalities may be a guarantee of payment at the maturity of the obligation so that in the event of a default prior to maturity there might not be a market and thus no means of realizing on the obligation prior to maturity. Guarantees as to the timely payment of principal and interest do not extend to the value or yield of these securities nor to the value of the Funds' shares.

On September 7, 2008, the U.S. Treasury announced a federal takeover of Fannie Mae and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation ("Freddie Mac"), placing the two federal instrumentalities in conservatorship. Under the takeover, the U.S. Treasury agreed to acquire \$1 billion of senior preferred stock of each instrumentality and obtained warrants for the purchase of common stock of each instrumentality (the "Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement" or "Agreement"). Under the Agreement, the U.S. Treasury pledged to provide up to \$200 billion per instrumentality as needed, including the contribution of cash capital to the instrumentalities in the event their liabilities exceed their assets. This was intended to ensure that the instrumentalities maintain a positive net worth and meet their financial obligations, preventing mandatory triggering of receivership. On December 24, 2009, the U.S. Treasury announced that it was amending the Agreement to allow the \$200 billion cap on the U.S. Treasury's funding commitment to increase as necessary to accommodate any cumulative reduction in net worth through the end of 2012. The unlimited support the U.S. Treasury extended to the two companies expired at the beginning of 2013 – Fannie Mae's support is now capped at \$125 billion and Freddie Mac has a limit of \$149 billion.

On August 17, 2012, the U.S. Treasury announced that it was again amending the Agreement to terminate the requirement that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac each pay a 10% annual dividend. Instead, the companies will transfer to the U.S. Treasury on a quarterly basis all profits earned during a quarter that exceed a capital reserve amount of \$3 billion. It is believed that the new amendment puts Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in a better position to service their debt because the companies no longer have to

borrow from the U.S. Treasury to make fixed dividend payments. As part of the new terms, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac also will be required to reduce their investment portfolios at an annual rate of 15% instead of the previous 10%, which puts each of them on track to cut their portfolios to a targeted \$250 billion in 2018.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are the subject of several continuing class action lawsuits and investigations by federal regulators over certain accounting, disclosure or corporate governance matters, which (along with any resulting financial restatements) may adversely affect the guaranteeing entities. Importantly, the future of the entities is in serious question as the U.S. government reportedly is considering multiple options, ranging from nationalization, privatization, consolidation, or abolishment of the entities.

U.S. Treasury Obligations - U.S. Treasury obligations consist of direct obligations of the U.S. Treasury, including Treasury bills, notes and bonds, and separately traded interest and principal component parts of such obligations, including those transferable through the Federal book-entry system known as Separate Trading of Registered Interest and Principal of Securities (“STRIPS”). The STRIPS program lets investors hold and trade the individual interest and principal components of eligible Treasury notes and bonds as separate securities. Under the STRIPS program, the principal and interest components are separately issued by the U.S. Treasury at the request of depository financial institutions, which then trade the component parts separately.

Commercial Paper - Commercial paper is the term used to designate unsecured short-term promissory notes issued by corporations and other entities. Maturities on these issues vary from a few to 270 days.

Obligations of Domestic Banks, Foreign Banks and Foreign Branches of U.S. Banks - The Funds may invest in obligations issued by banks and other savings institutions. Investments in bank obligations include obligations of domestic branches of foreign banks and foreign branches of domestic banks. Such investments in domestic branches of foreign banks and foreign branches of domestic banks may involve risks that are different from investments in securities of domestic branches of U.S. banks. These risks may include future unfavorable political and economic developments, possible withholding taxes on interest income, seizure or nationalization of foreign deposits, currency controls, interest limitations, or other governmental restrictions which might affect the payment of principal or interest on the securities held by a Fund. Additionally, these institutions may be subject to less stringent reserve requirements and to different accounting, auditing, reporting and recordkeeping requirements than those applicable to domestic branches of U.S. banks. Bank obligations include the following:

- **Bankers’ Acceptances** - Bankers’ acceptances are bills of exchange or time drafts drawn on and accepted by a commercial bank. Corporations use bankers’ acceptances to finance the shipment and storage of goods and to furnish dollar exchange. Maturities are generally six months or less.
- **Certificates of Deposit** - Certificates of deposit are interest-bearing instruments with a specific maturity. They are issued by banks and savings and loan institutions in exchange for the deposit of funds and normally can be traded in the secondary market prior to maturity. Certificates of deposit with penalties for early withdrawal will be considered illiquid.
- **Time Deposits** - Time deposits are non-negotiable receipts issued by a bank in exchange for the deposit of funds. Like a certificate of deposit, it earns a specified rate of interest over a definite period of time; however, it cannot be traded in the secondary market. Time deposits with a withdrawal penalty or that mature in more than seven days are considered to be illiquid securities.

Repurchase Agreements

A Fund may enter into repurchase agreements with financial institutions in order to increase its income. A repurchase agreement is an agreement under which a fund acquires a fixed income security (generally a security issued by the U.S. government or an agency thereof, a banker’s acceptance, or a certificate of deposit) from a commercial bank, broker, or dealer, and simultaneously agrees to resell such security to the seller at an agreed upon price and date (normally, the next business day).

Because the security purchased constitutes collateral for the repurchase obligation, a repurchase agreement may be considered a loan that is collateralized by the security purchased. The acquisition of a repurchase agreement may be deemed to be an

acquisition of the underlying securities as long as the obligation of the seller to repurchase the securities is collateralized fully. The Funds follow certain procedures designed to minimize the risks inherent in such agreements. These procedures include effecting repurchase transactions only with creditworthy financial institutions whose condition will be continually monitored by the Adviser. The repurchase agreements entered into by the Funds will provide that the underlying collateral at all times shall have a value at least equal to 102% of the resale price stated in the agreement and consist only of securities permissible under Section 101(47)(A)(i) of the Bankruptcy Code (the Adviser monitors compliance with this requirement). Under all repurchase agreements entered into by the Funds, the custodian or its agent must take possession of the underlying collateral. In the event of a default or bankruptcy by a selling financial institution, the Funds will seek to liquidate such collateral. However, the exercising of a Fund's right to liquidate such collateral could involve certain costs or delays and, to the extent that proceeds from any sale upon a default of the obligation to repurchase were less than the repurchase price, the Fund could suffer a loss. A Fund may enter into "tri-party" repurchase agreements. In "tri-party" repurchase agreements, an unaffiliated third party custodian maintains accounts to hold collateral for the Funds and their counterparties and, therefore, the Funds may be subject to the credit risk of those custodians. It is the current policy of each Fund not to invest in repurchase agreements that do not mature within seven days if any such investment, together with any other illiquid assets held by the Fund, amounts to more than 15% of the Fund's total assets. The investments of the Funds in repurchase agreements, at times, may be substantial when, in the view of the Adviser, liquidity or other considerations so warrant.

Reverse Repurchase Agreements

Reverse repurchase agreements involve sales by a Fund of portfolio assets concurrently with an agreement by the Fund to repurchase the same assets at a later date at a fixed price. Generally, the effect of such a transaction is that a Fund can recover all or most of the cash invested in the portfolio securities involved during the term of the reverse repurchase agreement, while the Fund will be able to keep the interest income associated with those portfolio securities. Such transactions are advantageous only if the interest cost to a Fund of the reverse repurchase transaction is less than the cost of obtaining the cash otherwise. Opportunities to achieve this advantage may not always be available, and the Funds intend to use the reverse repurchase technique only when it will be advantageous to the Funds. Each Fund will establish a segregated account with the Trust's custodian bank in which the Fund will maintain cash or cash equivalents or other portfolio securities equal in value to the Fund's obligations in respect of reverse repurchase agreements. Reverse repurchase agreement are considered to be borrowings under the 1940 Act.

Exchange Traded Funds ("ETFs")

ETFs are investment companies whose shares are bought and sold on a securities exchange. An ETF holds a portfolio of securities designed to track a particular market segment or index. Some examples of ETFs are SPDRs[®], DIAMONDSSM, NASDAQ 100 Index Tracking StockSM ("QQQsSM"), and iShares[®]. A Fund could purchase an ETF to temporarily gain exposure to a portion of the U.S. or foreign market while awaiting an opportunity to purchase securities directly. The risks of owning an ETF generally reflect the risks of owning the securities comprising the index which an index ETF is designed to track or the other holdings of an active or index ETF, although lack of liquidity in an ETF could result in it being more volatile than the tracked index or underlying holdings, and ETFs have management fees that increase their costs versus the costs of owning the underlying holdings directly. See also "Securities of Other Investment Companies" below.

Securities of Other Investment Companies

The Funds may invest in shares of other investment companies, to the extent permitted by applicable law and subject to certain restrictions. These investment companies typically incur fees that are separate from those fees incurred directly by the Funds. A Fund's purchase of such investment company securities results in the layering of expenses, such that shareholders would indirectly bear a proportionate share of the operating expenses of such investment companies, including advisory fees, in addition to paying the Fund's expenses. Unless an exception is available, Section 12(d)(1)(A) of the 1940 Act prohibits a fund from (i) acquiring more than 3% of the voting shares of any one investment company, (ii) investing more than 5% of its total assets in any one investment company, and (iii) investing more than 10% of its total assets in all investment companies combined, including its ETF investments.

For hedging or other purposes, the Funds may invest in investment companies that seek to track the composition and/or performance of specific indexes or portions of specific indexes. Certain of these investment companies, known as ETFs, are traded on a securities exchange. (See “Exchange Traded Funds” above). The market prices of index-based investments will fluctuate in accordance with changes in the underlying portfolio securities of the investment company and also due to supply and demand of the investment company’s shares on the exchange upon which the shares are traded. Index-based investments may not replicate or otherwise match the composition or performance of their specified index due to transaction costs, among other things.

Pursuant to orders issued by the SEC to each of certain iShares, Market Vectors, Vanguard, ProShares, PowerShares, SPDR, Guggenheim (formerly, Claymore), Direxion, WisdomTree, Rydex and First Trust exchange-traded funds (collectively, the “ETFs”) and procedures approved by the Board, the Funds may invest in the ETFs in excess of the 3% limit described above, provided that the Funds otherwise comply with the conditions of the SEC order, as it may be amended, and any other applicable investment limitations. Neither the ETFs nor their investment advisers make any representations regarding the advisability of investing in the ETFs.

Illiquid Securities

Illiquid securities are securities that cannot be sold or disposed of in the ordinary course of business (within seven days) at approximately the prices at which they are valued. Because of their illiquid nature, illiquid securities must be priced at fair value as determined in good faith pursuant to procedures approved by the Board. Despite such good faith efforts to determine fair value prices, the Funds’ illiquid securities are subject to the risk that the security’s fair value price may differ from the actual price which the Funds may ultimately realize upon its sale or disposition. Difficulty in selling illiquid securities may result in a loss or may be costly to the Funds. Under the supervision of the Board, the Adviser determines the liquidity of the Funds’ investments. In determining the liquidity of the Funds’ investments, the Adviser may consider various factors, including: (1) the frequency and volume of trades and quotations; (2) the number of dealers and prospective purchasers in the marketplace; (3) dealer undertakings to make a market; and (4) the nature of the security and the market in which it trades (including any demand, put or tender features, the mechanics and other requirements for transfer, any letters of credit or other credit enhancement features, any ratings, the number of holders, the method of soliciting offers, the time required to dispose of the security, and the ability to assign or offset the rights and obligations of the security). A Fund will not hold more than 15% of its net assets in illiquid securities.

Restricted Securities

Restricted securities are securities that may not be sold freely to the public absent registration under the U.S. Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the “1933 Act”) or an exemption from registration. As consistent with a Fund’s investment objective, the Fund may invest in Section 4(a)(2) commercial paper. Section 4(a)(2) commercial paper is issued in reliance on an exemption from registration under Section 4(a)(2) of the 1933 Act and is generally sold to institutional investors who purchase for investment. Any resale of such commercial paper must be in an exempt transaction, usually to an institutional investor through the issuer or investment dealers who make a market in such commercial paper. The Trust believes that Section 4(a)(2) commercial paper is liquid to the extent it meets the criteria established by the Board. The Trust intends to treat such commercial paper as liquid and not subject to the investment limitations applicable to illiquid securities or restricted securities.

Securities Lending

Each Fund may lend portfolio securities to brokers, dealers and other financial organizations that meet capital and other credit requirements or other criteria established by the Board. These loans, if and when made, may not exceed 33 1/3% of the total asset value of a Fund (including the loan collateral). The Funds will not lend portfolio securities to the Adviser or their affiliates unless permissible under the 1940 Act and the rules and promulgations thereunder. Loans of portfolio securities will be fully collateralized by cash, letters of credit or U.S. government securities, and the collateral will be maintained in an amount equal to at least 100% of the current market value of the loaned securities by marking to market daily. Any gain or loss in the market price of the securities loaned that might occur during the term of the loan would be for the account of a Fund.

The Funds may pay a part of the interest earned from the investment of collateral, or other fee, to an unaffiliated third party for acting as the Funds' securities lending agent, but will bear all of any losses from the investment of collateral.

By lending its securities, a Fund may increase its income by receiving payments from the borrower that reflect the amount of any interest or any dividends payable on the loaned securities as well as by either investing cash collateral received from the borrower in short-term instruments or obtaining a fee from the borrower when U.S. government securities or letters of credit are used as collateral. Each Fund will adhere to the following conditions whenever its portfolio securities are loaned: (i) the Fund must receive at least 100% cash collateral or equivalent securities of the type discussed above from the borrower; (ii) the borrower must increase such collateral whenever the market value of the securities rises above the level of such collateral; (iii) the Fund must be able to terminate the loan on demand; (iv) the Fund must receive reasonable interest on the loan, as well as any dividends, interest or other distributions on the loaned securities and any increase in market value; (v) the Fund may pay only reasonable fees in connection with the loan (which fees may include fees payable to the lending agent, the borrower, the Fund's administrator and the custodian); and (vi) voting rights on the loaned securities may pass to the borrower, provided, however, that if a material event adversely affecting the investment occurs, the Fund must terminate the loan and regain the right to vote the securities. In such instances, the Adviser will vote the securities in accordance with its proxy voting policies and procedures. The Board has adopted procedures reasonably designed to ensure that the foregoing criteria will be met. Loan agreements involve certain risks in the event of default or insolvency of the borrower, including possible delays or restrictions upon a Fund's ability to recover the loaned securities or dispose of the collateral for the loan, which could give rise to loss because of adverse market action, expenses and/or delays in connection with the disposition of the underlying securities.

Short Sales

Description of Short Sales:

Selling a security short is when an investor sells a security it does not own. To sell a security short an investor must borrow the security from someone else to deliver to the buyer. The investor then replaces the security it borrowed by purchasing it at the market price at or before the time of replacement. Until it replaces the security, the investor repays the person that lent it the security for any interest or dividends that may have accrued during the period of the loan.

Investors typically sell securities short to:

- Take advantage of an anticipated decline in prices.
- Protect a profit in a security it already owns.

A Fund can lose money if the price of the security it sold short increases between the date of the short sale and the date on which the Fund replaces the borrowed security. Likewise, a Fund can profit if the price of the security declines between those dates. Because the market price of the security sold short could increase without limit, a Fund could also be subject to a theoretically unlimited loss.

To borrow the security, a Fund may be required to pay a premium, which would increase the cost of the security sold. A Fund will also incur transaction costs in effecting short sales. A Fund's gains and losses will be decreased or increased, as the case may be, by the amount of the premium, dividends, interest, or expenses the Fund may be required to pay in connection with a short sale.

The broker will retain the net proceeds of the short sale, to the extent necessary to meet margin requirements, until the short position is closed out.

Short Sales Against the Box - In addition, the Funds may engage in short sales "against the box." In a short sale against the box, a Fund agrees to sell at a future date a security that it either currently owns or has the right to acquire at no extra cost. A Fund will incur transaction costs to open, maintain and close short sales against the box. For tax purposes, a short sale against the box may be a taxable event to a Fund.

Restrictions on Short Sales:

Each Fund will not short sell a security if:

- After giving effect to such short sale, the total market value of all securities sold short would exceed 25% of the value of the Fund's net assets.
- The market value of the securities of any single issuer that have been sold short by the Fund would exceed two percent (2%) of the value of the Fund's net assets.
- Any security sold short would constitute more than two percent (2%) of any class of the issuer's securities.

Whenever a Fund sells a security short, the Fund segregates an amount of cash or liquid securities equal to the difference between (a) the current market value of the securities sold short and (b) any cash or U.S. government securities the Fund is required to deposit with the broker in connection with the short sale (not including the proceeds from the short sale). The segregated assets are marked to market daily in an attempt to ensure that the amount deposited in the segregated account plus the amount deposited with the broker is at least equal to the current market value of the securities.

When-Issued, Delayed-Delivery and Forward Delivery Transactions - A when-issued security is one whose terms are available and for which a market exists, but which has not been issued. In a forward delivery transaction, a Fund contracts to purchase securities for a fixed price at a future date beyond customary settlement time. "Delayed-delivery" refers to securities transactions on the secondary market where settlement occurs in the future. In each of these transactions, the parties fix the payment obligation and the interest rate that they will receive on the securities at the time the parties enter the commitment; however, they do not pay money or deliver securities until a later date. Typically, no income accrues on securities a Fund has committed to purchase before the securities are delivered, although the Fund may earn income on securities it has in a segregated account to cover its position. The Funds will only enter into these types of transactions with the intention of actually acquiring the securities, but may sell them before the settlement date.

A Fund uses when-issued, delayed-delivery and forward delivery transactions to secure what it considers an advantageous price and yield at the time of purchase. When a Fund engages in when-issued, delayed-delivery or forward delivery transactions, it relies on the other party to consummate the sale. If the other party fails to complete the sale, the Fund may miss the opportunity to obtain the security at a favorable price or yield.

When purchasing a security on a when-issued, delayed-delivery, or forward delivery basis, a Fund assumes the rights and risks of ownership of the security, including the risk of price and yield changes. At the time of settlement, the market value of the security may be more or less than the purchase price. The yield available in the market when the delivery takes place also may be higher than those obtained in the transaction itself. Because a Fund does not pay for the security until the delivery date, these risks are in addition to the risks associated with its other investments.

A Fund will segregate cash or liquid securities equal in value to commitments for the when-issued, delayed delivery or forward delivery transactions. A Fund will segregate additional liquid assets daily so that the value of such assets is equal to the amount of the commitments.

Special Risks of Cyber Attacks

As with any entity that conducts business through electronic means in the modern marketplace, the Funds, and their service providers, may be susceptible to operational and information security risks resulting from cyber attacks. Cyber attacks include, among other behaviors, stealing or corrupting data maintained online or digitally, denial of service attacks on websites, the unauthorized monitoring, release, misuse, loss, destruction or corruption of confidential information, unauthorized access to relevant systems, compromises to networks or devices that the Funds and their service providers use to service the Funds' operations, operational disruption or failures in the physical infrastructure or operating systems that support the Funds and their service providers, or various other forms of cyber security breaches. Cyber attacks affecting the Funds or the Adviser, the Funds' distributor, custodian, or any other of the Funds' intermediaries or service providers may adversely impact the Funds and their shareholders, potentially resulting in, among other things, financial losses or the inability of Fund shareholders to transact

business. For instance, cyber attacks may interfere with the processing of shareholder transactions, impact the Funds' ability to calculate their NAV, cause the release of private shareholder information or confidential business information, impede trading, subject the Funds to regulatory fines or financial losses and/or cause reputational damage. The Funds may also incur additional costs for cyber security risk management purposes designed to mitigate or prevent the risk of cyber attacks. Such costs may be ongoing because threats of cyber attacks are constantly evolving as cyber attackers become more sophisticated and their techniques become more complex. Similar types of cyber security risks are also present for issuers of securities in which the Funds may invest, which could result in material adverse consequences for such issuers and may cause the Funds' investments in such companies to lose value. There can be no assurance that the Funds, the Funds' service providers, or the issuers of the securities in which the Funds invest will not suffer losses relating to cyber attacks or other information security breaches in the future.

INVESTMENT LIMITATIONS

Fundamental Policies

The following investment limitations are fundamental, which means that a Fund cannot change them without approval by the vote of a majority of the outstanding voting securities of the Fund. The phrase "majority of the outstanding shares" means the vote of (i) 67% or more of a Fund's shares present at a meeting, if more than 50% of the outstanding shares of the Fund are present or represented by proxy, or (ii) more than 50% of the Fund's outstanding shares, whichever is less.

Each Fund may not:

1. Purchase securities of an issuer that would cause the Fund to fail to satisfy the diversification requirement for a diversified management company under the 1940 Act, the rules or regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
2. Concentrate investments in a particular industry or group of industries, as concentration is defined under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
3. Borrow money or issue senior securities (as defined under the 1940 Act), except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
4. Make loans, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
5. Purchase or sell commodities or real estate, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
6. Underwrite securities issued by other persons, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.

Non-Fundamental Policies

In addition to the investment objectives of the Funds, the following investment limitations of the Funds are non-fundamental and may be changed by the Board without shareholder approval:

1. Each Fund may not hold illiquid securities in an amount exceeding, in the aggregate, 15% of the Fund's net assets.

2. Each Fund may not make loans if, as a result, more than 33 1/3% of its total assets would be lent to other parties, except that the Fund may: (i) purchase or hold debt instruments in accordance with its investment objective and policies; (ii) enter into repurchase agreements; and (iii) lend its securities.
3. Each Fund may not purchase or sell real estate, physical commodities, or commodities contracts, except that each Fund may purchase: (i) marketable securities issued by companies which own or invest in real estate (including Real Estate Investment Trusts), commodities, or commodities contracts; and (ii) commodities contracts relating to financial instruments, such as financial futures contracts and options on such contracts.
4. The Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund may not change its investment strategy to invest at least 80% of its net assets, plus the amount of any borrowings for investment purposes, in dividend-paying equity securities without 60 days' prior written notice to shareholders.
5. The Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund may not change its investment strategy to invest at least 80% of its net assets, plus the amount of any borrowings for investment purposes, in equity securities of large capitalization companies at the time of purchase without 60 days' prior written notice to shareholders.

Except with respect to Fund policies concerning borrowing, if a percentage restriction is adhered to at the time of an investment, a later increase or decrease in percentage resulting from changes in values or assets will not constitute a violation of such restriction. With respect to the limitation on illiquid securities, in the event that a subsequent change in net assets or other circumstances causes a Fund to exceed its limitation, the Fund will take steps to bring the aggregate amount of illiquid instruments back within the limitation as soon as reasonably practicable. With respect to the limitation on borrowing, in the event that a subsequent change in net assets or other circumstances causes a Fund to exceed its limitation, the Fund will take steps to bring the aggregate amount of borrowing back within the limitation within three days thereafter (not including Sundays and holidays).

The following descriptions of certain provisions of the 1940 Act may assist investors in understanding the above policies and restrictions:

Diversification. Under the 1940 Act, a diversified investment management company, as to 75% of its total assets, may not purchase securities of any issuer (other than securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. government, its agents or instrumentalities or securities of other investment companies) if, as a result, more than 5% of its total assets would be invested in the securities of such issuer, or more than 10% of the issuer's outstanding voting securities would be held by the fund.

Concentration. The SEC staff has defined concentration as investing 25% or more of an investment company's net assets in an industry or group of industries, with certain exceptions.

Borrowing. The 1940 Act presently allows a fund to borrow from any bank in an amount up to 33 1/3% of its total assets (including the amount borrowed) and to borrow for temporary purposes in an amount not exceeding 5% of the value of its total assets.

Senior Securities. Senior securities may include any obligation or instrument issued by a fund evidencing indebtedness. The 1940 Act generally prohibits funds from issuing senior securities, although it does not treat certain transactions as senior securities, such as certain borrowings, short sales, reverse repurchase agreements, firm commitment agreements and standby commitments, with appropriate earmarking or segregation of assets to cover such obligation.

Lending. Under the 1940 Act, a fund may only make loans if expressly permitted by its investment policies.

Underwriting. Under the 1940 Act, underwriting securities involves a fund purchasing securities directly from an issuer for the purpose of selling (distributing) them or participating in any such activity either directly or indirectly. Under the 1940 Act, a diversified fund may not make any commitment as underwriter, if immediately thereafter the amount of its outstanding

underwriting commitments, plus the value of its investments in securities of issuers (other than investment companies) of which it owns more than 10% of the outstanding voting securities, exceeds 25% of the value of its total assets.

Commodities and Real Estate. The 1940 Act does not directly restrict an investment company’s ability to invest in commodities or real estate, but does require that every investment company have a fundamental investment policy governing such investments.

THE ADVISER

General. Established in 1989, Westfield Capital Management Company, L.P. is a 100% employee-owned professional investment management firm registered with the SEC under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended. Westfield is a Delaware limited partnership. Its principal place of business is located at One Financial Center, Boston, Massachusetts 02111. As of December 31, 2016, Westfield had approximately \$11.8 billion in assets under management.

Advisory Agreement with the Trust. The Trust and the Adviser have entered into an investment advisory agreement dated July 13, 2011 (the “Advisory Agreement”). Under the Advisory Agreement, the Adviser serves as the investment adviser and makes investment decisions for the Funds and continuously reviews, supervises and administers the investment program of the Funds, subject to the supervision of, and policies established by, the Trustees.

After the initial two-year term, the continuance of the Advisory Agreement must be specifically approved at least annually: (i) by the vote of the Trustees or by a vote of the majority of the outstanding voting securities of the Funds; and (ii) by the vote of a majority of the Trustees who are not parties to the Advisory Agreement or “interested persons” of any party thereto, cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on such approval. The Advisory Agreement will terminate automatically in the event of its assignment, and is terminable at any time without penalty by the Trustees or, with respect to a Fund, by a majority of the outstanding voting securities of that Fund, or, by the Adviser, on not less than 30 days’ nor more than 60 days’ written notice to the Trust. As used in the Advisory Agreement, the terms “majority of the outstanding voting securities,” “interested persons” and “assignment” have the same meaning as such terms in the 1940 Act.

Advisory Fees Paid to the Adviser. For its services under the Advisory Agreement, the Adviser is entitled to a fee, which is calculated daily and paid monthly, at an annual rate based on the average daily net assets of each Fund as follows:

Fund	Advisory Fee
Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund	0.65% for first \$1 billion 0.60% for next \$1 billion 0.55% above \$2 billion ¹
Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund	0.75%

¹ Prior to March 1, 2015, the management fee for the Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund was 0.65%.

The Adviser has contractually agreed to reduce fees and reimburse expenses in order to keep net operating expenses (excluding shareholder servicing fees, interest, taxes, brokerage commissions, acquired fund fees and expenses, and extraordinary expenses (collectively, “Excluded Expenses”)) from exceeding 0.85% and 0.95% of the average daily net assets of the Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund and the Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund, respectively, until February 28, 2018. In addition, if at any point total annual Fund operating expenses (not including Excluded Expenses) are below a Fund’s expense cap, the Adviser may receive from the Fund the difference between the total annual Fund operating expenses (not including Excluded Expenses) and the expense cap to recover all or a portion of its prior fee reductions or expense reimbursements made during the preceding three-year period during which this Agreement (or any prior agreement) was in place.

For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014, 2015 and 2016, the Funds paid the following in advisory fees:

	Contractual Advisory Fees			Fees Waived by Adviser			Total Fees Paid (after Waivers) to Adviser		
	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016

Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund	\$1,293,404	\$1,325,349	\$1,186,067	\$78,767	\$66,640	\$80,517	\$1,214,637	\$1,258,709	\$1,105,550
Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund	\$591,092	\$746,830	\$713,888	\$120,141	\$89,300	\$92,900	\$470,951	\$657,530	\$620,988

PORTFOLIO MANAGERS

This section includes information about the Funds' portfolio managers, including information about other accounts managed, the dollar range of Fund shares owned and how the portfolio managers are compensated.

Compensation. Investment Committee members receive a base salary commensurate with industry standards. This salary is reviewed annually during the employee's performance assessment. Investment Committee members also receive a performance-based bonus award. This bonus award is determined and paid in December. The amount awarded is based on the employee's individual performance attribution and overall contribution to the investment performance of the Adviser. While the current calendar year is the primary focus, a rolling three year attribution summary is also considered when determining the bonus award. Investment Committee members may also be eligible to receive equity interests in the future profits of the Adviser. Individual awards are typically determined by a member's overall performance within the firm, including but not limited to contribution to company strategy, participation in marketing and client services initiatives, and longevity at the firm. Key members of the Adviser's management team who receive equity interests in the firm enter into agreements restricting post-employment competition and solicitation of clients and employees of Westfield. This compensation is in addition to the base salary and performance-based bonus. Equity interest grants typically vest over five years. Investment Committee members may receive a portion of the performance-based fee earned from a client account that is managed solely by Mr. Muggia. He has full discretion to grant such awards to any member of the Investment Committee.

Fund Shares Owned by the Portfolio Managers. The Funds are required to show the dollar amount range of each portfolio manager's "beneficial ownership" of shares of the Funds as of the end of the most recently completed fiscal year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. "Beneficial ownership" is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "1934 Act").

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares Owned ¹
William A. Muggia	Over \$1,000,000 (Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund)
Ethan J. Meyers, CFA	None
John M. Montgomery	\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund)
Bruce N. Jacobs, CFA	\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund)
Hamlen Thompson	\$50,001 - \$100,000 (Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund) \$50,001 - \$100,000 (Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund)

¹ Valuation date is October 31, 2016.

Other Accounts. In addition to the Funds, the portfolio managers may also be responsible for the day-to-day management of certain other accounts, as indicated by the following table. The information below is provided as of October 31, 2016.

Name	Registered Investment Companies		Other Pooled Investment Vehicles		Other Accounts	
	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in millions)
William A. Muggia	8	\$2,114	10 ¹	\$916 ¹	430 ²	\$8,907 ²
Ethan J. Meyers, CFA	8	\$2,114	4	\$875	371 ³	\$8,521 ³
John M. Montgomery	8	\$2,114	4	\$875	373 ³	\$8,526 ³
Bruce N. Jacobs, CFA	8	\$2,114	4	\$875	384 ³	\$8,525 ³
Hamlen Thompson	8	\$2,114	4	\$875	373 ³	\$8,527 ³

¹ Includes 1 pooled investment vehicle with assets under management of \$19 million that is subject to a performance-based fee.

² Includes 25 other accounts with assets under management of \$1.1 billion that are subject to a performance-based fee.

³ Includes 24 other accounts with assets under management of \$1 billion that are subject to a performance-based fee.

Conflicts of Interests. The simultaneous management of multiple accounts by Westfield’s investment professionals creates a possible conflict of interest as they must allocate their time and investment ideas across multiple accounts. This may result in the Investment Committee or a portfolio manager allocating unequal attention and time to the management of each client account as each has different objectives, benchmarks, investment restrictions and fees. For most client accounts, investment decisions are made at the Investment Committee level. Once an idea has been approved, it is implemented across all eligible and participating accounts within the strategy. Client specific restrictions are monitored by the Compliance team.

Although the Investment Committee collectively acts as portfolio manager on most client accounts, there are some client accounts that are managed by a portfolio manager who also serves as a member of the Investment Committee. This can create a conflict of interest because investment decisions for these individually managed accounts do not require approval by the Investment Committee; thus, there is an opportunity for individually managed client accounts to trade in a security ahead of Investment Committee-managed client accounts. Trade orders for individually managed accounts must be communicated to the Investment Committee. Additionally, the Compliance team performs periodic reviews of such accounts to ensure procedures have been followed.

Westfield has clients with performance-based fee arrangements. A conflict of interest can arise between those portfolios that incorporate a performance fee and those that do not. When the same securities are recommended for both types of accounts, it is Westfield’s policy to allocate investments, on a pro-rata basis, to all participating and eligible accounts, regardless of the account’s fee structure. Westfield’s Operations team performs monthly reviews of each Investment Committee run product’s model portfolio versus each client account. Discrepancies are researched, and exceptions are documented.

In placing each transaction for a client’s account, Westfield seeks best execution of that transaction except in cases where Westfield does not have the authority to select the broker or dealer, as stipulated by the client. Westfield attempts to bundle directed brokerage accounts with non-directed accounts, and then utilizes step-out trades to satisfy the directed arrangements. Clients who do not allow step-out trades will typically go last.

Because of Westfield’s interest in receiving third party research services, there may be an incentive for Westfield to select a broker or dealer based on such interest rather than the clients’ interest in receiving most favorable execution. To mitigate the conflict that Westfield may have an incentive beyond best execution to utilize a particular broker, broker and research votes are conducted and reviewed on a quarterly basis. These votes provide the opportunity to recognize the unique research efforts of a

wide variety of firms, as well as the opportunity to compare aggregate commission dollars with a particular broker to ensure appropriate correlation.

Some Westfield clients have elected to retain certain brokerage firms as consultants or to invest their assets through a broker-sponsored wrap program for which Westfield acts as a manager. Several of these firms are on Westfield’s approved broker list. Since Westfield may gain new clients through such relationships, and will interact closely with such firms to service the client, there may be an incentive for Westfield to select a broker or dealer based on such interest rather than the clients’ interest. To help ensure independence in the brokerage selection process, brokerage selection is handled by Westfield’s traders, while client relationships are managed by Westfield’s Marketing/Client Service team.

Personal accounts may give rise to conflicts of interest. Westfield and its employees will, from time to time, for their own investment accounts, purchase, sell, hold or own securities or other assets which may be recommended for purchase, sale or ownership for one or more clients. Westfield has a Code of Ethics which regulates trading in such accounts; requirements include regular reporting and preclearance of transactions. Compliance reviews personal trading activity regularly.

Westfield serves as manager to the General Partners of private funds, for which Westfield also provides investment advisory services. Westfield and its employees have also invested their own funds in such vehicles and other investment strategies that are advised by the firm. Allowing such investments and having a financial interest in the private funds can create an incentive for the firm to favor these accounts because Westfield’s financial interests are more directly tied to the performance of such accounts. To help ensure all clients are treated equitably and fairly, Westfield allocates investment opportunities on a pro-rata basis. Compliance conducts periodic reviews of client accounts to ensure procedures have been followed.

THE ADMINISTRATOR

General. SEI Investments Global Funds Services (the “Administrator”), a Delaware statutory trust, has its principal business offices at One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456. SEI Investments Management Corporation (“SIMC”), a wholly-owned subsidiary of SEI Investments Company (“SEI Investments”), is the owner of all beneficial interest in the Administrator. SEI Investments and its subsidiaries and affiliates, including the Administrator, are leading providers of fund evaluation services, trust accounting systems, and brokerage and information services to financial institutions, institutional investors, and money managers. The Administrator and its affiliates also serve as administrator or sub-administrator to other mutual funds.

Administration Agreement with the Trust. The Trust and the Administrator have entered into an administration agreement dated January 28, 1993, as amended and restated November 12, 2002 (the “Administration Agreement”). Under the Administration Agreement, the Administrator provides the Trust with administrative services, including regulatory reporting and all necessary office space, equipment, personnel and facilities.

The Administration Agreement provides that the Administrator shall not be liable for any error of judgment or mistake of law or for any loss suffered by the Trust in connection with the matters to which the Administration Agreement relates, except a loss resulting from willful misfeasance, bad faith or gross negligence on the part of the Administrator in the performance of its duties or from reckless disregard by it of its duties and obligations thereunder.

Administration Fees Paid to the Administrator. For its services under the Administration Agreement, the Administrator is paid a fee, which varies based on the average daily net assets of the Funds, subject to certain minimums. For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014, 2015 and 2016, the Funds paid the following amounts for these services:

	Contractual Fees Paid		
	2014	2015	2016
Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund	\$238,785	\$244,682	\$218,967

Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund	\$94,756	\$119,494	\$114,222
--	----------	-----------	-----------

THE DISTRIBUTOR

The Trust and SEI Investments Distribution Co. (the “Distributor”), a wholly-owned subsidiary of SEI Investments and an affiliate of the Administrator, are parties to a distribution agreement dated January 28, 1993, as amended and restated as of November 14, 2005 and as amended August 30, 2010 (the “Distribution Agreement”) whereby the Distributor acts as principal underwriter for the Trust’s shares. The principal business address of the Distributor is One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456.

The continuance of the Distribution Agreement must be specifically approved at least annually (i) by the vote of the Trustees or by a vote of the majority of the outstanding voting securities of the Trust and (ii) by the vote of a majority of the Trustees who are not “interested parties” of the Trust and have no direct or indirect financial interest in the operations of the Distribution Agreement or any related agreement, cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on such approval. The Distribution Agreement will terminate automatically in the event of its assignment, and is terminable at any time without penalty by the Board or by a majority of the outstanding voting securities of the Trust, or by the Distributor, upon not more than 60 days’ written notice to the other party.

PAYMENTS TO FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES

Shareholder Servicing Plan. The Funds have adopted a shareholder servicing plan under which a shareholder servicing fee of up to 0.25% of average daily net assets of Investor Class Shares of the Funds will be paid to financial intermediaries. Under the plan, financial intermediaries may perform, or may compensate other financial intermediaries for performing, certain shareholder and administrative services, including: (i) maintaining shareholder accounts; (ii) arranging for bank wires; (iii) responding to shareholder inquiries relating to the services performed by the financial intermediaries; (iv) responding to inquiries from shareholders concerning their investment in the Funds; (v) assisting shareholders in changing dividend options, account designations and addresses; (vi) providing information periodically to shareholders showing their position in the Funds; (vii) forwarding shareholder communications from the Funds such as proxies, shareholder reports, annual reports, and dividend and capital gain distribution and tax notices to shareholders; (viii) processing purchase, exchange and redemption requests from shareholders and placing orders with the Funds or their service providers; (ix) providing sub-accounting services; (x) processing dividend and capital gain payments from the Funds on behalf of shareholders; (xi) preparing tax reports; and (xii) providing such other similar non-distribution services as the Funds may reasonably request to the extent that the financial intermediary is permitted to do so under applicable laws or regulations.

Payments by the Adviser. The Adviser and/or its affiliates, in their discretion, may make payments from their own resources and not from Fund assets to affiliated or unaffiliated brokers, dealers, banks (including bank trust departments), trust companies, registered investment advisers, financial planners, retirement plan administrators, insurance companies, and any other institution having a service, administration, or any similar arrangement with the Funds, their service providers or their respective affiliates, as incentives to help market and promote the Funds and/or in recognition of their distribution, marketing, administrative services, and/or processing support.

These additional payments may be made to financial intermediaries that sell Fund shares or provide services to the Funds, the Distributor or shareholders of the Funds through the financial intermediary’s retail distribution channel and/or fund supermarkets. Payments may also be made through the financial intermediary’s retirement, qualified tuition, fee-based advisory, wrap fee bank trust, or insurance (e.g., individual or group annuity) programs. These payments may include, but are not limited to, placing the Funds in a financial intermediary’s retail distribution channel or on a preferred or recommended fund list; providing business or shareholder financial planning assistance; educating financial intermediary personnel about the Funds; providing access to sales and management representatives of the financial intermediary; promoting sales of Fund shares; providing marketing and educational support; maintaining share balances and/or for sub-accounting, administrative or

shareholder transaction processing services. A financial intermediary may perform the services itself or may arrange with a third party to perform the services.

The Adviser and/or its affiliates may also make payments from their own resources to financial intermediaries for costs associated with the purchase of products or services used in connection with sales and marketing, participation in and/or presentation at conferences or seminars, sales or training programs, client and investor entertainment and other sponsored events. The costs and expenses associated with these efforts may include travel, lodging, sponsorship at educational seminars and conferences, entertainment and meals to the extent permitted by law.

Revenue sharing payments may be negotiated based on a variety of factors, including the level of sales, the amount of Fund assets attributable to investments in the Funds by financial intermediaries customers, a flat fee or other measures as determined from time to time by the Adviser and/or its affiliates. A significant purpose of these payments is to increase the sales of Fund shares, which in turn may benefit the Adviser through increased fees as Fund assets grow.

Investors should understand that some financial intermediaries may also charge their clients fees in connection with purchases of shares or the provision of shareholder services.

THE TRANSFER AGENT

DST Systems, Inc., 333 W. 11th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64105 (the “Transfer Agent”), serves as the Funds’ transfer agent and dividend disbursing agent under a transfer agency agreement with the Trust.

THE CUSTODIAN

Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., 40 Water Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109-3661 (the “Custodian”), serves as the custodian of the Funds. The Custodian holds cash, securities and other assets of the Funds as required by the 1940 Act.

INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, Two Commerce Square, 2001 Market Street, Suite 1800, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103, serves as independent registered public accounting firm for the Funds. The financial statements and notes thereto incorporated by reference have been audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, as indicated in their report with respect thereto, and are incorporated by reference in reliance on the authority of their report as experts in accounting and auditing.

LEGAL COUNSEL

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, 1701 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2921, serves as legal counsel to the Trust.

TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS OF THE TRUST

Board Responsibilities. The management and affairs of the Trust and its series, including the Funds described in this SAI, are overseen by the Trustees. The Board has approved contracts, as described above, under which certain companies provide essential management services to the Trust.

Like most mutual funds, the day-to-day business of the Trust, including the management of risk, is performed by third party service providers, such as the Adviser, Distributor and Administrator. The Trustees are responsible for overseeing the Trust’s service providers and, thus, have oversight responsibility with respect to risk management performed by those service providers.

Risk management seeks to identify and address risks, i.e., events or circumstances that could have material adverse effects on the business, operations, shareholder services, investment performance or reputation of the funds. The funds and their service providers employ a variety of processes, procedures and controls to identify various possible events or circumstances, to lessen the probability of their occurrence and/or to mitigate the effects of such events or circumstances if they do occur. Each service

provider is responsible for one or more discrete aspects of the Trust's business (e.g., the Adviser is responsible for the day-to-day management of each Fund's portfolio investments) and, consequently, for managing the risks associated with that business. The Board has emphasized to the funds' service providers the importance of maintaining vigorous risk management.

The Trustees' role in risk oversight begins before the inception of a fund, at which time certain of the fund's service providers present the Board with information concerning the investment objective, strategies and risks of the fund as well as proposed investment limitations for the fund. Additionally, the fund's adviser provides the Board with an overview of, among other things, its investment philosophy, brokerage practices and compliance infrastructure. Thereafter, the Board continues its oversight function as various personnel, including the Trust's Chief Compliance Officer, as well as personnel of the adviser and other service providers, such as the fund's independent accountants, make periodic reports to the Audit Committee or to the Board with respect to various aspects of risk management. The Board and the Audit Committee oversee efforts by management and service providers to manage risks to which the funds may be exposed.

The Board is responsible for overseeing the nature, extent and quality of the services provided to the funds by the adviser and receives information about those services at its regular meetings. In addition, on an annual basis, in connection with its consideration of whether to renew the advisory agreement with the adviser, the Board meets with the adviser to review such services. Among other things, the Board regularly considers the adviser's adherence to the funds' investment restrictions and compliance with various fund policies and procedures and with applicable securities regulations. The Board also reviews information about the funds' investments, including, for example, reports on the adviser's use of derivatives in managing the funds, if any, as well as reports on the funds' investments in other investment companies, if any.

The Trust's Chief Compliance Officer reports regularly to the Board to review and discuss compliance issues and fund and adviser risk assessments. At least annually, the Trust's Chief Compliance Officer provides the Board with a report reviewing the adequacy and effectiveness of the Trust's policies and procedures and those of its service providers, including the adviser. The report addresses the operation of the policies and procedures of the Trust and each service provider since the date of the last report; any material changes to the policies and procedures since the date of the last report; any recommendations for material changes to the policies and procedures; and any material compliance matters since the date of the last report.

The Board receives reports from the funds' service providers regarding operational risks and risks related to the valuation and liquidity of portfolio securities. The Trust's Fair Value Pricing Committee makes regular reports to the Board concerning investments for which market quotations are not readily available. Annually, the independent registered public accounting firm reviews with the Audit Committee its audit of the funds' financial statements, focusing on major areas of risk encountered by the funds and noting any significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in the funds' internal controls. Additionally, in connection with its oversight function, the Board oversees fund management's implementation of disclosure controls and procedures, which are designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed by the Trust in its periodic reports with the SEC are recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the required time periods. The Board also oversees the Trust's internal controls over financial reporting, which comprise policies and procedures designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of the Trust's financial reporting and the preparation of the Trust's financial statements.

From their review of these reports and discussions with the adviser, the Chief Compliance Officer, the independent registered public accounting firm and other service providers, the Board and the Audit Committee learn in detail about the material risks of the funds, thereby facilitating a dialogue about how management and service providers identify and mitigate those risks.

The Board recognizes that not all risks that may affect the funds can be identified and/or quantified, that it may not be practical or cost-effective to eliminate or mitigate certain risks, that it may be necessary to bear certain risks (such as investment-related risks) to achieve the funds' goals, and that the processes, procedures and controls employed to address certain risks may be limited in their effectiveness. Moreover, reports received by the Trustees as to risk management matters are typically summaries of the relevant information. Most of the funds' investment management and business affairs are carried out by or through the funds' adviser and other service providers, each of which has an independent interest in risk management but whose policies and the methods by which one or more risk management functions are carried out may differ from the funds' and each other's in the setting of priorities, the resources available or the effectiveness of relevant controls. As a result of the foregoing and other factors, the Board's ability to monitor and manage risk, as a practical matter, is subject to limitations.

Members of the Board. There are eight members of the Board, six of whom are not interested persons of the Trust, as that term is defined in the 1940 Act (“independent Trustees”). Robert Neshier, an interested person of the Trust, serves as Chairman of the Board. George Sullivan, Jr., an independent Trustee, serves as the lead independent Trustee. The Trust has determined its leadership structure is appropriate given the specific characteristics and circumstances of the Trust. The Trust made this determination in consideration of, among other things, the fact that the independent Trustees constitute a super-majority (75%) of the Board, the fact that the chairperson of each Committee of the Board is an independent Trustee, the amount of assets under management in the Trust, and the number of funds (and classes of shares) overseen by the Board. The Board also believes that its leadership structure facilitates the orderly and efficient flow of information to the independent Trustees from fund management.

The Board has two standing committees: the Audit Committee and Governance Committee. The Audit Committee and Governance Committee are chaired by an independent Trustee and composed of all of the independent Trustees. In addition, the Board has a lead independent Trustee.

In his role as lead independent Trustee, Mr. Sullivan, among other things: (i) presides over Board meetings in the absence of the Chairman of the Board; (ii) presides over executive sessions of the independent Trustees; (iii) along with the Chairman of the Board, oversees the development of agendas for Board meetings; (iv) facilitates communication between the independent Trustees and management, and among the independent Trustees; (v) serves as a key point person for dealings between the independent Trustees and management; and (vi) has such other responsibilities as the Board or independent Trustees determine from time to time.

Set forth below are the names, years of birth, position with the Trust and length of time served, and principal occupations and other directorships held during at least the last five years of each of the persons currently serving as a Trustee. There is no stated term of office for the Trustees. Nevertheless, an independent Trustee must retire from the Board as of the end of the calendar year in which such independent Trustee first attains the age of seventy-five years; provided, however, that, an independent Trustee may continue to serve for one or more additional one calendar year terms after attaining the age of seventy-five years (each calendar year a “Waiver Term”) if, and only if, prior to the beginning of such Waiver Term: (1) the Governance Committee (a) meets to review the performance of the independent Trustee; (b) finds that the continued service of such independent Trustee is in the best interests of the Trust; and (c) unanimously approves excepting the independent Trustee from the general retirement policy set out above; and (2) a majority of the Trustees approves excepting the independent Trustee from the general retirement policy set out above. Unless otherwise noted, the business address of each Trustee is SEI Investments Company, One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456.

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust and Length of Time Served	Principal Occupations in the Past 5 Years	Other Directorships Held in the Past 5 Years
<u>Interested Trustees</u>			
Robert Neshier (Born: 1946)	Chairman of the Board of Trustees ¹ (since 1991)	SEI employee 1974 to present; currently performs various services on behalf of SEI Investments for which Mr. Neshier is compensated. Vice Chairman of The Advisors’ Inner Circle Fund III, Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund	Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors’ Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds, The KP Funds, SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. Director of SEI Structured Credit Fund, LP, SEI Global Master Fund plc, SEI Global Assets Fund plc, SEI Global Investments Fund plc, SEI

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust and Length of Time Served	Principal Occupations in the Past 5 Years	Other Directorships Held in the Past 5 Years
		<p>(closed-end investment company) and Gallery Trust. President, Chief Executive Officer and Trustee of SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. President and Director of SEI Structured Credit Fund, LP. President, Chief Executive Officer and Director of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP, 2007 to 2013. President and Director of SEI Opportunity Fund, L.P. to 2010. Vice Chairman of O'Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company) to 2016. President, Chief Executive Officer and Trustee of SEI Liquid Asset Trust to 2016.</p>	<p>Investments—Global Funds Services, Limited, SEI Investments Global, Limited, SEI Investments (Europe) Ltd., SEI Investments—Unit Trust Management (UK) Limited, SEI Multi-Strategy Funds PLC and SEI Global Nominee Ltd.</p> <p>Former Directorships: Director of SEI Opportunity Fund, L.P. to 2010. Director of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP to 2013. Trustee of SEI Liquid Asset Trust to 2016.</p>
<p>William M. Doran (Born: 1940)</p>	<p>Trustee¹ (since 1991)</p>	<p>Self-Employed Consultant since 2003. Partner at Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP (law firm) from 1976 to 2003. Counsel to the Trust, SEI Investments, SIMC, the Administrator and the Distributor. Secretary of SEI Investments since 1978.</p>	<p>Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds, The KP Funds, The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund III, Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company), Gallery Trust, SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. Director of SEI Investments, SEI</p>

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust and Length of Time Served	Principal Occupations in the Past 5 Years	Other Directorships Held in the Past 5 Years
			<p>Investments (Europe), Limited, SEI Investments—Global Funds Services, Limited, SEI Investments Global, Limited, SEI Investments (Asia), Limited, SEI Global Nominee Ltd. and SEI Investments – Unit Trust Management (UK) Limited. Director of the Distributor.</p> <p>Former Directorships: Director of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP to 2013. Trustee of O’Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company) to 2016. Trustee of SEI Liquid Asset Trust to 2016.</p>
<u>Independent Trustees</u>			
John K. Darr (Born: 1944)	Trustee (since 2008)	Retired. Chief Executive Officer, Office of Finance, Federal Home Loan Banks, from 1992 to 2007.	Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors’ Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds and The KP Funds. Director of Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, Meals on Wheels, Lewes/Rehoboth Beach and West Rehoboth Land Trust.
Joseph T. Grause, Jr. (Born: 1952)	Trustee (since 2011)	Self-Employed Consultant since January 2012. Director of Endowments and Foundations, Morningstar Investment Management, Morningstar, Inc., 2010 to 2011. Director of International Consulting and Chief Executive Officer of Morningstar Associates Europe Limited, Morningstar, Inc., 2007 to 2010. Country Manager – Morningstar UK Limited, Morningstar, Inc., 2005 to 2007.	Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors’ Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds and The KP Funds. Director of The Korea Fund, Inc.
Mitchell A. Johnson (Born: 1942)	Trustee (since 2005)	Retired. Private Investor since 1994.	Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors’ Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds, The KP Funds, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust and Length of Time Served	Principal Occupations in the Past 5 Years	Other Directorships Held in the Past 5 Years
			Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. Director of Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation (Farmer Mac) since 1997. Former Directorships: Director of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP to 2013. Trustee of SEI Liquid Asset Trust to 2016.
Betty L. Krikorian (Born: 1943)	Trustee (since 2005)	Vice President, Compliance, AARP Financial Inc., from 2008 to 2010. Self-Employed Legal and Financial Services Consultant since 2003. Counsel (in-house) for State Street Bank from 1995 to 2003.	Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds and The KP Funds.
Bruce Speca (Born: 1956)	Trustee (since 2011)	Global Head of Asset Allocation, Manulife Asset Management (subsidiary of Manulife Financial), 2010 to 2011. Executive Vice President – Investment Management Services, John Hancock Financial Services (subsidiary of Manulife Financial), 2003 to 2010.	Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds and The KP Funds. Director of Stone Harbor Investments Funds, Stone Harbor Emerging Markets Income Funds (closed-end fund) and Stone Harbor Emerging Markets Total Income Fund (closed-end fund).
George J. Sullivan, Jr. (Born: 1942)	Trustee (since 1999) Lead Independent Trustee	Retired since 2012. Self-Employed Consultant, Newfound Consultants Inc., 1997 to 2011.	Current Directorships: Trustee/ Director of State Street Navigator Securities Lending Trust, The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds, The KP Funds, SEI Structured Credit Fund, LP, SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. Member of the independent review committee for SEI's Canadian-registered mutual funds. Former Directorships: Director of SEI Opportunity Fund, L.P. to 2010. Director of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP to 2013. Trustee of SEI Liquid Asset Trust to 2016.

1 Denotes Trustees who may be deemed to be “interested” persons of the Funds as that term is defined in the 1940 Act by virtue of their affiliation with the Distributor and/or its affiliates.

Individual Trustee Qualifications

The Trust has concluded that each of the Trustees should serve on the Board because of their ability to review and understand information about the funds provided to them by management, to identify and request other information they may deem relevant to the performance of their duties, to question management and other service providers regarding material factors bearing on the management and administration of the funds, and to exercise their business judgment in a manner that serves the best interests of the funds' shareholders. The Trust has concluded that each of the Trustees should serve as a Trustee based on their own experience, qualifications, attributes and skills as described below.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Neshor should serve as Trustee because of the experience he has gained in his various roles with SEI Investments Company, which he joined in 1974, his knowledge of and experience in the financial services industry, and the experience he has gained serving as a trustee of the Trust since 1991.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Doran should serve as Trustee because of the experience he gained serving as a Partner in the Investment Management and Securities Industry Practice of a large law firm, his experience in and knowledge of the financial services industry, and the experience he has gained serving as a trustee of the Trust since 1991.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Darr should serve as Trustee because of his background in economics, the business experience he gained in a variety of roles with different financial and banking institutions and as a founder of a money management firm, his knowledge of the financial services industry, and the experience he has gained serving as a trustee of the Trust since 2008.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Grause should serve as Trustee because of the knowledge and experience he gained in a variety of leadership roles with different financial institutions, his knowledge of the mutual fund and investment management industries, and his past experience as an interested trustee and chair of the investment committee for a multi-managed investment company.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Johnson should serve as Trustee because of the experience he gained as a senior vice president, corporate finance, of a Fortune 500 company, his experience in and knowledge of the financial services and banking industries, the experience he gained serving as a director of other mutual funds, and the experience he has gained serving as a trustee of the Trust since 2005.

The Trust has concluded that Ms. Krikorian should serve as Trustee because of the experience she gained serving as a legal and financial services consultant, in-house counsel to a large custodian bank and Vice President of Compliance of an investment adviser, her background in fiduciary and banking law, her experience in and knowledge of the financial services industry, and the experience she has gained serving as a trustee of the Trust since 2005.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Speca should serve as Trustee because of the knowledge and experience he gained serving as president of a mutual fund company and portfolio manager for a \$95 billion complex of asset allocation funds, and his over 25 years of experience working in a management capacity with mutual fund boards.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Sullivan should serve as Trustee because of the experience he gained as a certified public accountant and financial consultant, his experience in and knowledge of public company accounting and auditing and the financial services industry, the experience he gained as an officer of a large financial services firm in its operations department, and his experience from serving as a trustee of the Trust since 1999.

In its periodic assessment of the effectiveness of the Board, the Board considers the complementary individual skills and experience of the individual Trustees primarily in the broader context of the Board's overall composition so that the Board, as a body, possesses the appropriate (and appropriately diverse) skills and experience to oversee the business of the funds.

Board Committees. The Board has established the following standing committees:

- Audit Committee.** The Board has a standing Audit Committee that is composed of each of the independent Trustees. The Audit Committee operates under a written charter approved by the Board. The principal responsibilities of the Audit Committee include: (i) recommending which firm to engage as each fund’s independent registered public accounting firm and whether to terminate this relationship; (ii) reviewing the independent registered public accounting firm’s compensation, the proposed scope and terms of its engagement, and the firm’s independence; (iii) pre-approving audit and non-audit services provided by each fund’s independent registered public accounting firm to the Trust and certain other affiliated entities; (iv) serving as a channel of communication between the independent registered public accounting firm and the Trustees; (v) reviewing the results of each external audit, including any qualifications in the independent registered public accounting firm’s opinion, any related management letter, management’s responses to recommendations made by the independent registered public accounting firm in connection with the audit, reports submitted to the Committee by the internal auditing department of the Administrator that are material to the Trust as a whole, if any, and management’s responses to any such reports; (vi) reviewing each fund’s audited financial statements and considering any significant disputes between the Trust’s management and the independent registered public accounting firm that arose in connection with the preparation of those financial statements; (vii) considering, in consultation with the independent registered public accounting firm and the Trust’s senior internal accounting executive, if any, the independent registered public accounting firms’ reports on the adequacy of the Trust’s internal financial controls; (viii) reviewing, in consultation with each fund’s independent registered public accounting firm, major changes regarding auditing and accounting principles and practices to be followed when preparing each fund’s financial statements; and (ix) other audit related matters. Messrs. Darr, Grause, Johnson, Specca and Sullivan and Ms. Krikorian currently serve as members of the Audit Committee. Mr. Sullivan serves as the Chairman of the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee meets periodically, as necessary, and met four (4) times during the most recently completed fiscal year.
- Governance Committee.** The Board has a standing Governance Committee (formerly the Nominating Committee) that is composed of each of the independent Trustees. The Governance Committee operates under a written charter approved by the Board. The principal responsibilities of the Governance Committee include: (i) considering and reviewing Board governance and compensation issues; (ii) conducting a self-assessment of the Board’s operations; (iii) selecting and nominating all persons to serve as independent Trustees and evaluating the qualifications of “interested” Trustee candidates; and (iv) reviewing shareholder recommendations for nominations to fill vacancies on the Board if such recommendations are submitted in writing and addressed to the Committee at the Trust’s office. Ms. Krikorian and Messrs. Darr, Grause, Johnson, Specca and Sullivan currently serve as members of the Governance Committee. Ms. Krikorian serves as the Chairman of the Governance Committee. The Governance Committee meets periodically, as necessary, and met four (4) times during the most recently completed fiscal year.

Fair Value Pricing Committee. The Board has also established a standing Fair Value Pricing Committee that is composed of various representatives of the Trust’s service providers, as appointed by the Board. The Fair Value Pricing Committee operates under procedures approved by the Board. The principal responsibility of the Fair Value Pricing Committee is to determine the fair value of securities for which current market quotations are not readily available. The Fair Value Pricing Committee’s determinations are reviewed by the Board.

Fund Shares Owned by Board Members. The following table shows the dollar amount range of each Trustee’s “beneficial ownership” of shares of the Funds as of the end of the most recently completed calendar year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. “Beneficial ownership” is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the 1934 Act. The Trustees and officers of the Trust own less than 1% of the outstanding shares of the Trust.

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares (Fund) ¹	Aggregate Dollar Range of Shares (All Funds in the Family of Investment Companies) ¹
Interested Trustees		
Doran	None	None
Nesher	None	None

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares (Fund) ¹	Aggregate Dollar Range of Shares (All Funds in the Family of Investment Companies) ¹
Independent Trustees		
Darr	None	None
Grause	None	None
Johnson	None	None
Krikorian	None	None
Specia	None	None
Sullivan	None	None

¹ Valuation date is December 31, 2016.

Board Compensation. The Trust paid the following fees to the Trustees during the Funds' most recently completed fiscal year.

Name	Aggregate Compensation from the Trust	Pension or Retirement Benefits Accrued as Part of Fund Expenses	Estimated Annual Benefits Upon Retirement	Total Compensation from the Trust and Fund Complex ¹
Interested Trustees				
Doran	\$0	N/A	N/A	\$0 for service on one (1) board
Nesher	\$0	N/A	N/A	\$0 for service on one (1) board
Independent Trustees				
Darr	\$59,835	N/A	N/A	\$59,835 for service on one (1) board
Grause	\$59,835	N/A	N/A	\$59,835 for service on one (1) board
Johnson	\$59,835	N/A	N/A	\$59,835 for service on one (1) board
Krikorian	\$63,261	N/A	N/A	\$63,261 for service on one (1) board
Specia	\$59,835	N/A	N/A	\$59,835 for service on one (1) board
Sullivan	\$67,163	N/A	N/A	\$67,163 for service on one (1) board

¹ All funds in the Fund Complex are series of the Trust.

Trust Officers. Set forth below are the names, years of birth, position with the Trust and length of time served, and the principal occupations for the last five years of each of the persons currently serving as executive officers of the Trust. There is no stated term of office for the officers of the Trust. Unless otherwise noted, the business address of each officer is SEI Investments Company, One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456. The Chief Compliance Officer is the only officer who receives compensation from the Trust for his services.

Certain officers of the Trust also serve as officers of one or more mutual funds for which SEI Investments Company or its affiliates act as investment manager, administrator or distributor.

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust and Length of Time Served	Principal Occupations in Past 5 Years
Michael Beattie (Born: 1965)	President (since 2011)	Director of Client Service, SEI Investments Company, since 2004.
Stephen Connors (Born: 1984)	Treasurer, Controller and Chief Financial Officer (since 2015)	Director, SEI Investments, Fund Accounting since 2014. Audit Manager, Deloitte & Touche LLP, from 2011 to 2014.

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust and Length of Time Served	Principal Occupations in Past 5 Years
Dianne M. Descoteaux (Born: 1977)	Vice President and Secretary (since 2011)	Counsel at SEI Investments since 2010. Associate at Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP from 2006 to 2010.
Russell Emery (Born: 1962)	Chief Compliance Officer (since 2006)	Chief Compliance Officer of SEI Structured Credit Fund, LP since June 2007. Chief Compliance Officer of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP from June 2007 to September 2013. Chief Compliance Officer of The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund, Bishop Street Funds, The KP Funds, The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund III, Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company), Gallery Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. Chief Compliance Officer of SEI Opportunity Fund, L.P. to 2010. Chief Compliance Officer of O'Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company) to 2016. Chief Compliance Officer of SEI Liquid Asset Trust to 2016.
Lisa Whittaker (Born: 1978)	Vice President and Assistant Secretary (since 2013)	Attorney, SEI Investments Company (2012-present). Associate Counsel and Compliance Officer, The Glenmede Trust Company, N.A. (2011-2012). Associate, Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP (2006-2011).
John Y. Kim (Born: 1981)	Vice President and Assistant Secretary (since 2014)	Attorney, SEI Investments Company (2014-present). Associate, Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP (2009-2014).
Bridget E. Sudall (Born: 1980)	Anti-Money Laundering Compliance Officer and Privacy Officer (since 2015)	Senior Associate and AML Officer, Morgan Stanley Alternative Investment Partners from April 2011 to March 2015. Investor Services Team Lead, Morgan Stanley Alternative Investment Partners from 2007 to 2011.

PURCHASING AND REDEEMING SHARES

Purchases and redemptions may be made through the Transfer Agent on any day the New York Stock Exchange (the "NYSE") is open for business. Shares of the Funds are offered and redeemed on a continuous basis. Currently, the Trust is closed for business when the following holidays are observed: New Year's Day, Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Presidents' Day, Good Friday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas.

It is currently the Trust's policy to pay all redemptions in cash. The Trust retains the right, however, to alter this policy to provide for redemptions in whole or in part by a distribution in-kind of securities held by the Funds in lieu of cash. Shareholders may incur brokerage charges on the sale of any such securities so received in payment of redemptions. A shareholder will at all times be entitled to aggregate cash redemptions from all funds of the Trust up to the lesser of \$250,000 or 1% of the Trust's net assets during any 90-day period. The Trust has obtained an exemptive order from the SEC that permits a

Fund to make in-kind redemptions to those shareholders of the Fund that are affiliated with the Trust solely by their ownership of a certain percentage of the Trust's investment portfolios.

The Trust reserves the right to suspend the right of redemption and/or to postpone the date of payment upon redemption during times when the NYSE is closed, other than during customary weekends or holidays, for any period on which trading on the NYSE is restricted (as determined by the SEC by rule or regulation), or during the existence of an emergency (as determined by the SEC by rule or regulation) as a result of which disposal or valuation of the Funds' securities is not reasonably practicable, or for such other periods as the SEC has by order permitted. The Trust also reserves the right to suspend sales of shares of the Funds for any period during which the NYSE, the Adviser, the Administrator, the Transfer Agent and/or the Custodian are not open for business.

DETERMINATION OF NET ASSET VALUE

General Policy. The Funds adhere to Section 2(a)(41), and Rule 2a-4 thereunder, of the 1940 Act with respect to the valuation of portfolio securities. In general, securities for which market quotations are readily available are valued at current market value, and all other securities are valued at fair value in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board. In complying with the 1940 Act, the Trust relies on guidance provided by the SEC and by the SEC staff in various interpretive letters and other guidance.

Equity Securities. Securities listed on a securities exchange, market or automated quotation system for which quotations are readily available (except for securities traded on NASDAQ), including securities traded over the counter, are valued at the last quoted sale price on an exchange or market (foreign or domestic) on which they are traded on the valuation date (or at approximately 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time if such exchange is normally open at that time), or, if there is no such reported sale on the valuation date, at the most recent quoted bid price. For securities traded on NASDAQ, the NASDAQ Official Closing Price will be used. If such prices are not available or determined to not represent the fair value of the security as of the Funds' pricing time, the security will be valued at fair value as determined in good faith using methods approved by the Board.

Money Market Securities and other Debt Securities. If available, money market securities and other debt securities are priced based upon valuations provided by recognized independent, third-party pricing agents. Such values generally reflect the last reported sales price if the security is actively traded. The third-party pricing agents may also value debt securities by employing methodologies that utilize actual market transactions, broker-supplied valuations, or other methodologies designed to identify the market value for such securities. Such methodologies generally consider such factors as security prices, yields, maturities, call features, ratings and developments relating to specific securities in arriving at valuations. Money market securities and other debt securities with remaining maturities of sixty days or less may be valued at their amortized cost, which approximates market value. If such prices are not available or determined to not represent the fair value of the security as of each Fund's pricing time, the security will be valued at fair value as determined in good faith using methods approved by the Board.

Foreign Securities. The prices for foreign securities are reported in local currency and converted to U.S. dollars using currency exchange rates. Exchange rates are provided daily by recognized independent pricing agents.

Derivatives and Other Complex Securities. Exchange traded options on securities and indices purchased by the Funds generally are valued at their last trade price or, if there is no last trade price, the last bid price. Exchange traded options on securities and indices written by the Funds generally are valued at their last trade price or, if there is no last trade price, the last asked price. In the case of options traded in the over-the-counter market, if the OTC option is also an exchange traded option, the Funds will follow the rules regarding the valuation of exchange traded options. If the OTC option is not also an exchange traded option, the Funds will value the option at fair value in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board.

Futures and swaps cleared through a central clearing house ("centrally cleared swaps") are valued at the settlement price established each day by the board of the exchange on which they are traded. The daily settlement prices for financial futures are provided by an independent source. On days when there is excessive volume or market volatility, or the future or centrally cleared swap does not end trading by the time the Funds calculate NAV, the settlement price may not be available at the time at which each Fund calculates its NAV. On such days, the best available price (which is typically the last sales price) may be used

to value a Fund's futures or centrally cleared swaps position.

Foreign currency forward contracts are valued at the current day's interpolated foreign exchange rate, as calculated using the current day's spot rate, and the thirty, sixty, ninety and one-hundred eighty day forward rates provided by an independent source.

If available, non-centrally cleared swaps, collateralized debt obligations, collateralized loan obligations and bank loans are priced based on valuations provided by an independent third party pricing agent. If a price is not available from an independent third party pricing agent, the security will be valued at fair value as determined in good faith using methods approved by the Board.

Use of Third-Party Independent Pricing Agents and Independent Brokers. Pursuant to contracts with the Administrator, prices for most securities held by the Funds are provided daily by third-party independent pricing agents that are approved by the Board. The valuations provided by third-party independent pricing agents are reviewed daily by the Administrator.

If a security price cannot be obtained from an independent, third-party pricing agent, the Administrator shall seek to obtain a bid price from at least one independent broker.

Fair Value Procedures. Securities for which market prices are not "readily available" or which cannot be valued using the methodologies described above are valued in accordance with Fair Value Procedures established by the Board and implemented through the Fair Value Pricing Committee. The members of the Fair Value Pricing Committee report, as necessary, to the Board regarding portfolio valuation determinations. The Board, from time to time, will review these methods of valuation and will recommend changes which may be necessary to assure that the investments of the Funds are valued at fair value.

Some of the more common reasons that may necessitate a security being valued using Fair Value Procedures include: the security's trading has been halted or suspended; the security has been de-listed from a national exchange; the security's primary trading market is temporarily closed at a time when under normal conditions it would be open; the security has not been traded for an extended period of time; the security's primary pricing source is not able or willing to provide a price; trading of the security is subject to local government-imposed restrictions; or a significant event with respect to a security has occurred after the close of the market or exchange on which the security principally trades and before the time the Funds calculate NAV. When a security is valued in accordance with the Fair Value Procedures, the Fair Value Pricing Committee will determine the value after taking into consideration relevant information reasonably available to the Fair Value Pricing Committee.

TAXES

The following is only a summary of certain additional U.S. federal income tax considerations generally affecting the Funds and their shareholders that is intended to supplement the discussion contained in the Prospectuses. No attempt is made to present a detailed explanation of the tax treatment of the Funds or their shareholders, and the discussion here and in the Prospectuses is not intended as a substitute for careful tax planning. Shareholders are urged to consult their tax advisors with specific reference to their own tax situations, including their state, local, and foreign tax liabilities.

The following general discussion of certain federal income tax consequences is based on the Code, and the regulations issued thereunder as in effect on the date of this SAI. New legislation, as well as administrative changes or court decisions, may significantly change the conclusions expressed herein, and may have a retroactive effect with respect to the transactions contemplated herein.

Qualification as a Regulated Investment Company ("RIC"). Each Fund intends to qualify and elect to be treated as a RIC. By following such a policy, each Fund expects to eliminate or reduce to a nominal amount the federal taxes to which it may be subject. A Fund that qualifies as a RIC will generally not be subject to federal income taxes on the net investment income and net realized capital gains that the Fund timely distributes to its shareholders.

The Board reserves the right not to maintain the qualification of a Fund as a RIC if it determines such course of action to be beneficial to shareholders.

In order to qualify as a RIC under the Code, each Fund must distribute annually to its shareholders at least 90% of its net investment income (which, includes dividends, taxable interest, and the excess of net short-term capital gains over net long-term capital losses, less operating expenses) and at least 90% of its net tax exempt interest income, for each tax year, if any (the “Distribution Requirement”) and also must meet certain additional requirements. Among these requirements are the following: (i) at least 90% of each Fund’s gross income each taxable year must be derived from dividends, interest, payments with respect to certain securities loans, and gains from the sale or other disposition of stock, securities, or foreign currencies, or other income (including but not limited to gains from options, futures or forward contracts) derived with respect to its business of investing in such stock, securities, or currencies, and net income derived from an interest in a qualified publicly traded partnership (the “Qualifying Income Test”); and (ii) at the close of each quarter of each Fund’s taxable year: (A) at least 50% of the value of each Fund’s total assets must be represented by cash and cash items, U.S. government securities, securities of other RICs and other securities, with such other securities limited, in respect to any one issuer, to an amount not greater than 5% of the value of each Fund’s total assets and that does not represent more than 10% of the outstanding voting securities of such issuer including the equity securities of a qualified publicly traded partnership, and (B) not more than 25% of the value of each Fund’s total assets is invested in the securities (other than U.S. government securities or the securities of other RICs) of any one issuer or the securities (other than the securities of another RIC) of two or more issuers that a Fund controls and which are engaged in the same or similar trades or businesses or related trades or businesses, or the securities of one or more qualified publicly traded partnerships (the “Asset Test”).

Although the Funds intend to distribute substantially all of their net investment income and may distribute their capital gains for any taxable year, the Funds will be subject to federal income taxation to the extent any such income or gains are not distributed. Each Fund is treated as a separate corporation for federal income tax purposes. A Fund therefore is considered to be a separate entity in determining its treatment under the rules for RICs described herein. Losses in one Fund do not offset gains in another and the requirements (other than certain organizational requirements) for qualifying RIC status are determined at the Fund level rather than at the Trust level.

If a Fund fails to satisfy the Qualifying Income or Asset Tests in any taxable year, such Fund may be eligible for relief provisions if the failures are due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect and if a penalty tax is paid with respect to each failure to satisfy the applicable requirements. Additionally, relief is provided for certain de minimis failures of the diversification requirements where the Fund corrects the failure within a specified period. If a Fund fails to maintain qualification as a RIC for a tax year, and the relief provisions are not available, such Fund will be subject to federal income tax at regular corporate rates without any deduction for distributions to shareholders. In such case, its shareholders would be taxed as if they received ordinary dividends, although corporate shareholders could be eligible for the dividends received deduction (subject to certain limitations) and individuals may be able to benefit from the lower tax rates available to qualified dividend income. In addition, a Fund could be required to recognize unrealized gains, pay substantial taxes and interest, and make substantial distributions before requalifying as a RIC. The Board reserves the right not to maintain the qualification of a Fund as a RIC if it determines such course of action to be beneficial to shareholders.

A Fund may elect to treat part or all of any “qualified late year loss” as if it had been incurred in the succeeding taxable year in determining the Fund’s taxable income, net capital gain, net short-term capital gain, and earnings and profits. The effect of this election is to treat any such “qualified late year loss” as if it had been incurred in the succeeding taxable year in characterizing a Fund’s distributions for any calendar year. A “qualified late year loss” generally includes net capital loss, net long-term capital loss, or net short-term capital loss incurred after October 31 of the current taxable year (commonly referred to as “post-October losses”) and certain other late-year losses.

The treatment of capital loss carryovers for the Funds is similar to the rules that apply to capital loss carryovers of individuals which provide that such losses are carried over indefinitely. If a Fund has a “net capital loss” (that is, capital losses in excess of capital gains) for a taxable year beginning after December 22, 2010 (a “Post-2010 Loss”), the excess of the Fund’s net short-term capital losses over its net long-term capital gains is treated as a short-term capital loss arising on the first day of the Fund’s next taxable year, and the excess (if any) of the Fund’s net long-term capital losses over its net short-term capital gains is treated

as a long-term capital loss arising on the first day of the Fund's next taxable year. A Fund's unused capital loss carryforwards that arose in taxable years that began on or before December 22, 2010 ("Pre-2011 Losses") are available to be applied against future capital gains, if any, realized by a Fund prior to the expiration of those carryforwards, generally eight years after the year in which they arose. A Fund's Post-2010 Losses must be fully utilized before the Fund will be permitted to utilize carryforwards of Pre-2011 Losses. In addition, the carryover of capital losses may be limited under the general loss limitation rules if a Fund experiences an ownership change as defined in the Code.

Federal Excise Tax. Notwithstanding the Distribution Requirement described above, which generally requires a Fund to distribute at least 90% of its annual investment company taxable income and the excess of its exempt interest income (but does not require any minimum distribution of net capital gain), a Fund will be subject to a nondeductible 4% federal excise tax to the extent it fails to distribute by the end of the calendar year at least 98% of its ordinary income and 98.2% of its capital gain net income (the excess of short- and long-term capital gains over short- and long-term capital losses) for the one-year period ending on October 31 of such year (including any retained amount from the prior calendar year on which a Fund paid no federal income tax). The Funds intend to make sufficient distributions to avoid liability for federal excise tax, but can make no assurances that such tax will be completely eliminated. The Funds may in certain circumstances be required to liquidate Fund investments in order to make sufficient distributions to avoid federal excise tax liability at a time when the Adviser might not otherwise have chosen to do so, and liquidation of investments in such circumstances may affect the ability of the Funds to satisfy the requirement for qualification as a RIC.

Distributions to Shareholders. The Funds receive income generally in the form of dividends and interest on investments. This income, plus net short-term capital gains, if any, less expenses incurred in the operation of a Fund, constitutes the Fund's net investment income from which dividends may be paid to you. Any distributions by the Funds from such income will be taxable to you as ordinary income or at the lower capital gains rates that apply to individuals receiving qualified dividend income, whether you take them in cash or in additional shares.

Distributions by the Funds are currently eligible for the reduced maximum tax rate to individuals of 20% (lower rates apply to individuals in lower tax brackets) to the extent that the Funds receive qualified dividend income on the securities they hold and the Funds report the distributions as qualified dividend income. Qualified dividend income is, in general, dividend income from taxable domestic corporations and certain foreign corporations (e.g., foreign corporations incorporated in a possession of the United States or in certain countries with a comprehensive tax treaty with the United States, or the stock of which is readily tradable on an established securities market in the United States). A dividend will not be treated as qualified dividend income to the extent that (i) the shareholder has not held the shares on which the dividend was paid for more than 60 days during the 121-day period that begins on the date that is 60 days before the date on which the shares become "ex-dividend" (which is the day on which declared distributions (dividends or capital gains) are deducted from a Fund's assets before it calculates the NAV) with respect to such dividend, (ii) a Fund has not satisfied similar holding period requirements with respect to the securities it holds that paid the dividends distributed to the shareholder, (iii) the shareholder is under an obligation (whether pursuant to a short sale or otherwise) to make related payments with respect to substantially similar or related property, or (iv) the shareholder elects to treat such dividend as investment income under section 163(d)(4)(B) of the Code. Therefore, if you lend your shares in a Fund, such as pursuant to securities lending arrangement, you may lose the ability to treat dividends (paid while the shares are held by the borrower) as qualified dividend income. Distributions that the Funds receive from an ETF or an underlying fund taxable as a RIC or a real estate investment trust ("REIT") will be treated as qualified dividend income only to the extent so reported by such ETF, underlying fund or REIT. Distributions by each Fund of its net short-term capital gains will be taxable as ordinary income. Capital gain distributions consisting of each Fund's net capital gains will be taxable as long-term capital gains for individuals currently set at a maximum rate of 20% regardless of how long you have held your shares in such Fund.

In the case of corporate shareholders, Fund distributions (other than capital gain distributions) generally qualify for the dividends-received deduction to the extent such distributions are so reported and do not exceed the gross amount of qualifying dividends received by such Fund for the year. Generally, and subject to certain limitations (including certain holding period limitations), a dividend will be treated as a qualifying dividend if it has been received from a domestic corporation. All such qualifying dividends (including the deducted portion) must be included in your alternative minimum taxable income calculation.

To the extent that a Fund makes a distribution of income received by such Fund in lieu of dividends (a "substitute payment")

with respect to securities on loan pursuant to a securities lending transaction, such income will not constitute qualified dividend income to individual shareholders and will not be eligible for the dividends received deduction for corporate shareholders.

If a Fund's distributions exceed its taxable income and capital gains realized during a taxable year, all or a portion of the distributions made in the same taxable year may be recharacterized as a return of capital to the shareholders. A return of capital distribution will generally not be taxable, but will reduce each shareholder's cost basis in such Fund and result in a higher reported capital gain or lower reported capital loss when those shares on which the distribution was received are sold.

A dividend or distribution received shortly after the purchase of shares reduces the NAV of the shares by the amount of the dividend or distribution and, although in effect a return of capital, will be taxable to the shareholder. If the NAV of shares were reduced below the shareholder's cost by dividends or distributions representing gains realized on sales of securities, such dividends or distributions would be a return of investment though taxable to the shareholder in the same manner as other dividends or distributions.

Dividends declared to shareholders of record in October, November or December and actually paid in January of the following year will be treated as having been received by shareholders on December 31 of the calendar year in which declared. Under this rule, therefore, a shareholder may be taxed in one year on dividends or distributions actually received in January of the following year.

The Funds (or their administrative agent) will inform you of the amount of your ordinary income dividends, qualified dividend income and capital gain distributions, if any, at the time they are paid and will advise you of their tax status for federal income tax purposes shortly after the close of each calendar year. If you have not held Fund shares for a full year, the Funds may report and distribute to you, as ordinary income, qualified dividend income or capital gain, a percentage of income that is not equal to the actual amount of such income earned during the period of your investment in the Funds.

Sales, Exchanges or Redemptions. Any gain or loss recognized on a sale, exchange, or redemption of shares of the Funds by a shareholder who is not a dealer in securities will generally, for individual shareholders, be treated as a long-term capital gain or loss if the shares have been held for more than twelve months and otherwise will be treated as a short-term capital gain or loss. However, if shares on which a shareholder has received a net capital gain distribution are subsequently sold, exchanged, or redeemed and such shares have been held for six months or less, any loss recognized will be treated as a long-term capital loss to the extent of the net capital gain distribution. In addition, the loss realized on a sale or other disposition of shares will be disallowed to the extent a shareholder repurchases (or enters into a contract to or option to repurchase) shares within a period of 61 days (beginning 30 days before and ending 30 days after the disposition of the shares). This loss disallowance rule will apply to shares received through the reinvestment of dividends during the 61-day period. For tax purposes, an exchange of your Fund shares for shares of a different fund is the same as a sale.

The Funds (or their administrative agent) must report to the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") and furnish to Fund shareholders cost basis information for Fund shares purchased on or after January 1, 2012, and sold on or after that date. In addition to reporting the gross proceeds from the sale of Fund shares, the Funds are also required to report the cost basis information for such shares and indicate whether these shares had a short-term or long-term holding period. For each sale of Fund shares, the Funds will permit shareholders to elect from among several IRS-accepted cost basis methods, including the average basis method. In the absence of an election, the Funds will use the average basis method as the default cost basis method. The cost basis method elected by the Fund shareholder (or the cost basis method applied by default) for each sale of Fund shares may not be changed after the settlement date of each such sale of Fund shares. Fund shareholders should consult their tax advisors to determine the best IRS-accepted cost basis method for their tax situation and to obtain more information about how cost basis reporting applies to them. The requirement to report only the gross proceeds from the sale of Fund shares continues to apply to all Fund shares acquired through December 31, 2011, and sold on and after that date. Shareholders also should carefully review any cost basis information provided to them and make any additional basis, holding period or other adjustments that are required when reporting these amounts on their federal income tax returns.

U.S. individuals with income exceeding \$200,000 (\$250,000 if married and filing jointly) are subject to a 3.8% Medicare contribution tax on their "net investment income," including interest, dividends, and capital gains (including capital gains

realized on the sale or exchange of shares of a Fund).

Tax Treatment of Complex Securities. The Funds may invest in complex securities. These investments may be subject to numerous special and complex tax rules. These rules could affect a Fund's ability to qualify as a RIC, affect whether gains and losses recognized by the Funds are treated as ordinary income or capital gain, accelerate the recognition of income to the Funds and/or defer the Funds' ability to recognize losses, and, in limited cases, subject the Funds to U.S. federal income tax on income from certain of their foreign securities. In turn, these rules may affect the amount, timing or character of the income distributed to you by the Funds.

Each Fund is required for federal income tax purposes to mark-to-market and recognize as income for each taxable year its net unrealized gains and losses on certain futures contracts as of the end of the year as well as those actually realized during the year. Gain or loss from futures and options contracts on broad-based indexes required to be marked to market will be 60% long-term and 40% short-term capital gain or loss. Application of this rule may alter the timing and character of distributions to shareholders. A Fund may be required to defer the recognition of losses on futures contracts, options contracts and swaps to the extent of any unrecognized gains on offsetting positions held by the Fund. These provisions may also require the Funds to mark-to-market certain types of positions in their portfolios (i.e., treat them as if they were closed out), which may cause a Fund to recognize income without receiving cash with which to make distributions in amounts necessary to satisfy the Distribution Requirement and for avoiding the excise tax discussed above. Accordingly, in order to avoid certain income and excise taxes, a Fund may be required to liquidate its investments at a time when the Adviser might not otherwise have chosen to do so.

In general, for purposes of the Qualifying Income Test described above, income derived from a partnership will be treated as qualifying income only to the extent such income is attributable to items of income of the partnership that would be qualifying income if realized directly by a Fund. However, 100% of the net income derived from an interest in a "qualified publicly traded partnership" (generally, a partnership (i) interests in which are traded on an established securities market or are readily tradable on a secondary market or the substantial equivalent thereof, (ii) that derives at least 90% of its income from the passive income sources specified in Code section 7704(d), and (iii) that derives less than 90% of its income from the same source as described in the Qualifying Income Test) will be treated as qualifying income. In addition, although in general the passive loss rules of the Code do not apply to RICs, such rules do apply to a RIC with respect to items attributable to an interest in a qualified publicly traded partnership.

The Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund may invest in certain MLPs which may be treated as "qualified publicly traded partnerships." Income from qualified publicly traded partnerships is qualifying income for purposes of the Qualifying Income Test, but the Fund's investment in one or more of such "qualified publicly traded partnerships" is limited under the Asset Test to no more than 25% of the value of the Fund's assets. The Fund will monitor its investment in such qualified publicly traded partnerships in order to ensure compliance with the Qualifying Income and Asset Tests. In addition, investments in qualified publicly traded partnerships may require the Fund to accrue and distribute income not yet received. To generate sufficient cash to make the requisite distributions, the Fund may be required to sell securities in its portfolio (including when it is not advantageous to do so) that it otherwise would have continued to hold. The Fund's investments in publicly traded partnerships may at other times result in the Fund's receipt of nontaxable cash distributions from a publicly traded partnership and if the Fund then distributes these nontaxable distributions to Fund shareholders, it could constitute a return of capital to Fund shareholders for federal income tax purposes.

MLPs and other partnerships that the Fund may invest in will deliver Form K-1s to the Fund to report their share of income, gains, losses, deductions and credits of the MLP or other partnership. These Form K-1s may be delayed and may not be received until after the time that the Fund issues its tax reporting statements. As a result, the Fund may at times find it necessary to reclassify the amount and character of its distributions to you after it issues you your tax reporting statement.

Foreign Currency. The Funds' transactions in foreign currencies and forward foreign currency contracts will generally be subject to special provisions of the Code that, among other things, may affect the character of gains and losses realized by the Funds (i.e., may affect whether gains or losses are ordinary or capital), accelerate recognition of income to the Funds and defer losses. These rules could therefore affect the character, amount and timing of distributions to shareholders. These provisions also may require the Funds to mark-to-market certain types of positions in their portfolios (i.e., treat them as if they were closed

out) which may cause the Funds to recognize income without receiving cash with which to make distributions in amounts necessary to satisfy the Distribution Requirements and for avoiding the excise tax described above. The Funds intend to monitor their transactions, intends to make the appropriate tax elections, and intends to make the appropriate entries in their books and records when they acquire any foreign currency or forward foreign currency contract in order to mitigate the effect of these rules so as to prevent disqualification of the Funds as a RIC and minimize the imposition of income and excise taxes.

If the Funds own shares in certain foreign investment entities, referred to as “passive foreign investment companies” or “PFIC,” each Fund will generally be subject to one of the following special tax regimes: (i) the Fund would be liable for U.S. federal income tax, and an additional interest charge, on a portion of any “excess distribution” from such foreign entity or any gain from the disposition of such shares, even if the entire distribution or gain is paid out by the Fund as a dividend to its shareholders; (ii) if the Fund was able and elected to treat a PFIC as a “qualified electing fund” or “QEF,” the Fund would be required each year to include in income, and distribute to shareholders in accordance with the distribution requirements set forth above, the Fund’s pro rata share of the ordinary earnings and net capital gains of the PFIC, whether or not such earnings or gains are distributed to the Fund; or (iii) the Fund may be entitled to mark-to-market annually shares of the PFIC, and in such event would be required to distribute to shareholders any such mark-to-market gains in accordance with the distribution requirements set forth above. Each Fund intends to make the appropriate tax elections, if possible, and take any additional steps that are necessary to mitigate the effect of these rules.

Foreign Taxes. Dividends and interest received by the Funds may be subject to income, withholding or other taxes imposed by foreign countries and U.S. possessions that would reduce the yield on the Funds’ stock or securities. Tax conventions between certain countries and the U.S. may reduce or eliminate these taxes. Foreign countries generally do not impose taxes on capital gains with respect to investments by foreign investors.

If more than 50% of the value of the Funds’ total assets at the close of their taxable year consists of stocks or securities of foreign corporations, the Funds will be eligible to, and intend to file an election with the IRS that may enable shareholders, in effect, to receive either the benefit of a foreign tax credit, or a deduction from such taxes, with respect to any foreign and U.S. possessions income taxes paid by the Funds, subject to certain limitations. Pursuant to the election, the Funds will treat those taxes as dividends paid to their shareholders. Each such shareholder will be required to include a proportionate share of those taxes in gross income as income received from a foreign source and must treat the amount so included as if the shareholder had paid the foreign tax directly. The shareholder may then either deduct the taxes deemed paid by him or her in computing his or her taxable income or, alternatively, use the foregoing information in calculating any foreign tax credit they may be entitled to use against the shareholders’ federal income tax. If the Funds make the election, the Funds (or their administrative agent) will report annually to their shareholders the respective amounts per share of the Funds’ income from sources within, and taxes paid to, foreign countries and U.S. possessions.

Backup Withholding. The Funds will be required in certain cases to withhold at a rate of 28% and remit to the U.S. Treasury the amount withheld on amounts payable to any shareholder who: (i) has provided the Funds either an incorrect tax identification number or no number at all; (ii) is subject to backup withholding by the IRS for failure to properly report payments of interest or dividends; (iii) has failed to certify to the Funds that such shareholder is not subject to backup withholding; or (iv) has failed to certify to the Funds that the shareholder is a U.S. person (including a resident alien).

Tax-Exempt Shareholders. Certain tax-exempt shareholders, including qualified pension plans, individual retirement accounts, salary deferral arrangements, 401(k)s, and other tax-exempt entities, generally are exempt from federal income taxation except with respect to their unrelated business taxable income (“UBTI”). Under current law, the Funds generally serve to block UBTI from being realized by their tax-exempt shareholders. However, notwithstanding the foregoing, the tax-exempt shareholder could realize UBTI by virtue of an investment in the Funds where, for example: (i) the Funds invest in residual interests of Real Estate Mortgage Investment Conduits (“REMICs”); (ii) the Funds invest in a REIT that is a taxable mortgage pool (“TMP”) or that has a subsidiary that is a TMP or that invests in the residual interest of a REMIC, or (iii) shares in the Funds constitute debt-financed property in the hands of the tax-exempt shareholder within the meaning of section 514(b) of the Code. Charitable remainder trusts are subject to special rules and should consult their tax advisor. The IRS has issued guidance with respect to these issues and prospective shareholders, especially charitable remainder trusts, are strongly encouraged to consult their tax advisors regarding these issues.

Non-U.S. Investors. Any non-U.S. investors in the Funds may be subject to U.S. withholding and estate tax and are encouraged to consult their tax advisors prior to investing in the Funds.

Foreign shareholders (i.e., nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations, partnerships, trusts and estates) are generally subject to U.S. withholding tax at the rate of 30% (or a lower tax treaty rate) on distributions derived from taxable ordinary income. A Fund may, under certain circumstances, report all or a portion of a dividend as an “interest-related dividend” or a “short-term capital gain dividend,” which would generally be exempt from this 30% U.S. withholding tax, provided certain other requirements are met. Short-term capital gain dividends received by a nonresident alien individual who is present in the U.S. for a period or periods aggregating 183 days or more during the taxable year are not exempt from this 30% withholding tax. Gains realized by foreign shareholders from the sale or other disposition of shares of a Fund generally are not subject to U.S. taxation, unless the recipient is an individual who is physically present in the U.S. for 183 days or more per year. Foreign shareholders who fail to provide an applicable IRS form may be subject to backup withholding on certain payments from a Fund. Backup withholding will not be applied to payments that are subject to the 30% (or lower applicable treaty rate) withholding tax described in this paragraph. Different tax consequences may result if the foreign shareholder is engaged in a trade or business within the U.S. In addition, the tax consequences to a foreign shareholder entitled to claim the benefits of a tax treaty may be different than those described above.

Under legislation generally known as “FATCA” (the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act), the Funds are required to withhold 30% of certain ordinary dividends they pay, and, after December 31, 2018, 30% of the gross proceeds of share redemptions and certain Capital Gain Dividends they pay, to shareholders that fail to meet prescribed information reporting or certification requirements. In general, no such withholding will be required with respect to a U.S. person or non-U.S. individual that timely provides the certifications required by a Fund or its agent on a valid IRS Form W-9 or applicable IRS Form W-8, respectively. Shareholders potentially subject to withholding include foreign financial institutions (“FFIs”), such as non-U.S. investment funds, and non-financial foreign entities (“NFFEs”). To avoid withholding under FATCA, an FFI generally must enter into an information sharing agreement with the IRS in which it agrees to report certain identifying information (including name, address, and taxpayer identification number) with respect to its U.S. account holders (which, in the case of an entity shareholder, may include its direct and indirect U.S. owners), and an NFFE generally must identify and provide other required information to the Funds or other withholding agent regarding its U.S. owners, if any. Such non-U.S. shareholders also may fall into certain exempt, excepted or deemed compliant categories as established by regulations and other guidance. A non-U.S. shareholder resident or doing business in a country that has entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the U.S. to implement FATCA will be exempt from FATCA withholding provided that the shareholder and the applicable foreign government comply with the terms of the agreement.

A non-U.S. entity that invests in a Fund will need to provide such Fund with documentation properly certifying the entity’s status under FATCA in order to avoid FATCA withholding. Non-U.S. investors in the Funds should consult their tax advisors in this regard.

Tax Shelter Reporting Regulations. Under U.S. Treasury regulations, generally, if a shareholder recognizes a loss of \$2 million or more for an individual shareholder or \$10 million or more for a corporate shareholder, the shareholder must file with the IRS a disclosure statement on Form 8886. Direct shareholders of portfolio securities are in many cases excepted from this reporting requirement, but under current guidance, shareholders of a RIC such as the Funds are not excepted. Future guidance may extend the current exception from this reporting requirement to shareholders of most or all RICs. The fact that a loss is reportable under these regulations does not affect the legal determination of whether the taxpayer’s treatment of the loss is proper. Shareholders should consult their tax advisors to determine the applicability of these regulations in light of their individual circumstances.

State Taxes. Depending upon state and local law, distributions by the Funds to their shareholders and the ownership of such shares may be subject to state and local taxes. Rules of state and local taxation of dividend and capital gains distributions from RICs often differ from rules for federal income taxation described above. It is expected that the Funds will not be liable for any corporate excise, income or franchise tax in Massachusetts if they qualify as a RIC for federal income tax purposes.

Many states grant tax-free status to dividends paid to you from interest earned on direct obligations of the U.S. government, subject in some states to minimum investment requirements that must be met by the Funds. Investment in Ginnie Mae or Fannie Mae securities, banker's acceptances, commercial paper, and repurchase agreements collateralized by U.S. government securities do not generally qualify for such tax-free treatment. The rules on exclusion of this income are different for corporate shareholders. Shareholders are urged to consult their tax advisors regarding state and local taxes applicable to an investment in the Funds.

The Funds' shares held in a tax-qualified retirement account will generally not be subject to federal taxation on income and capital gains distributions from a Fund until a shareholder begins receiving payments from his or her retirement account. Because each shareholder's tax situation is different, shareholders should consult their tax advisor about the tax implications of an investment in the Funds.

FUND TRANSACTIONS

Brokerage Transactions. Generally, equity securities are bought and sold through brokerage transactions for which commissions are payable. Purchases from underwriters will include the underwriting commission or concession, and purchases from dealers serving as market makers will include a dealer's mark-up or reflect a dealer's mark-down. Money market securities and other debt securities are usually bought and sold directly from the issuer or an underwriter or market maker for the securities. Generally, the Funds will not pay brokerage commissions for such purchases. When a debt security is bought from an underwriter, the purchase price will usually include an underwriting commission or concession. The purchase price for securities bought from dealers serving as market makers will similarly include the dealer's mark up or reflect a dealer's mark down. When a Fund executes transactions in the over-the-counter market, it will generally deal with primary market makers unless prices that are more favorable are otherwise obtainable.

In addition, the Adviser may place a combined order for two or more accounts it manages, including the Funds, engaged in the purchase or sale of the same security if, in its judgment, joint execution is in the best interest of each participant and will result in best price and execution. Transactions involving commingled orders are allocated in a manner deemed equitable to each account or fund. Although it is recognized that, in some cases, the joint execution of orders could adversely affect the price or volume of the security that a particular account or the Funds may obtain, it is the opinion of the Adviser that the advantages of combined orders outweigh the possible disadvantages of separate transactions.

For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014, 2015 and 2016, the Funds paid the following aggregate brokerage commissions on portfolio transactions:

Fund	Aggregate Dollar Amount of Brokerage Commissions Paid		
	2014	2015	2016
Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund	\$117,983	\$160,042	\$123,164
Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund	\$128,467	\$145,029	\$132,752

Brokerage Selection. The Trust does not expect to use one particular broker or dealer, and when one or more brokers is believed capable of providing the best combination of price and execution, the Adviser may select a broker based upon brokerage or research services provided to the Adviser. The Adviser may pay a higher commission than otherwise obtainable from other brokers in return for such services only if a good faith determination is made that the commission is reasonable in relation to the services provided.

Section 28(e) of the 1934 Act permits the Adviser, under certain circumstances, to cause the Funds to pay a broker or dealer a commission for effecting a transaction in excess of the amount of commission another broker or dealer would have charged for effecting the transaction in recognition of the value of brokerage and research services provided by the broker or dealer. In addition to agency transactions, the Adviser may receive brokerage and research services in connection with certain riskless principal transactions, in accordance with applicable SEC guidance. Brokerage and research services include: (1) furnishing

advice as to the value of securities, the advisability of investing in, purchasing or selling securities, and the availability of securities or purchasers or sellers of securities; (2) furnishing analyses and reports concerning issuers, industries, securities, economic factors and trends, portfolio strategy, and the performance of accounts; and (3) effecting securities transactions and performing functions incidental thereto (such as clearance, settlement, and custody). In the case of research services, the Adviser believes that access to independent investment research is beneficial to its investment decision-making processes and, therefore, to the Funds.

To the extent that research services may be a factor in selecting brokers, such services may be in written form or through direct contact with individuals and may include information as to particular companies and securities as well as market, economic, or institutional areas and information which assists in the valuation and pricing of investments. Examples of research-oriented services for which the Adviser might utilize Fund commissions include research reports and other information on the economy, industries, sectors, groups of securities, individual companies, statistical information, political developments, technical market action, pricing and appraisal services, credit analysis, risk measurement analysis, performance and other analysis. The Adviser may use research services furnished by brokers in servicing all client accounts and not all services may necessarily be used in connection with the account that paid commissions to the broker providing such services. Information so received by the Adviser will be in addition to and not in lieu of the services required to be performed by the Adviser under the Advisory Agreement. Any advisory or other fees paid to the Adviser are not reduced as a result of the receipt of research services.

In some cases the Adviser may receive a service from a broker that has both a “research” and a “non-research” use. When this occurs, the Adviser makes a good faith allocation, under all the circumstances, between the research and non-research uses of the service. The percentage of the service that is used for research purposes may be paid for with client commissions, while the Adviser will use its own funds to pay for the percentage of the service that is used for non-research purposes. In making this good faith allocation, the Adviser faces a potential conflict of interest, but the Adviser believes that its allocation procedures are reasonably designed to ensure that it appropriately allocates the anticipated use of such services to their research and non-research uses.

From time to time, the Adviser may purchase new issues of securities for clients, including the Funds, in a fixed price offering. In these situations, the seller may be a member of the selling group that will, in addition to selling securities, provide the Adviser with research services. The Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (“FINRA”) has adopted rules expressly permitting these types of arrangements under certain circumstances. Generally, the seller will provide research “credits” in these situations at a rate that is higher than that which is available for typical secondary market transactions. These arrangements may not fall within the safe harbor of Section 28(e).

For the fiscal year ended October 31, 2016, the Funds paid the following commissions on brokerage transactions directed to brokers pursuant to an agreement or understanding whereby the broker provides research or other brokerage services to the Adviser:

Fund	Total Dollar Amount of Brokerage Commissions for Research Services	Total Dollar Amount of Transactions Involving Brokerage Commissions for Research Services
Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund	\$71,648	\$114,493,280
Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund	\$68,571	\$73,255,288

Brokerage with Fund Affiliates. The Funds may execute brokerage or other agency transactions through registered broker-dealer affiliates of either the Funds or the Adviser for a commission in conformity with the 1940 Act and rules promulgated by the SEC. The 1940 Act requires that commissions paid to the affiliate by the Funds for exchange transactions not exceed “usual and customary” brokerage commissions. The rules define “usual and customary” commissions to include amounts which are “reasonable and fair compared to the commission, fee or other remuneration received or to be received by other brokers in connection with comparable transactions involving similar securities being purchased or sold on a securities exchange during a comparable period of time.” The Trustees, including those who are not “interested persons” of the Funds, have adopted

procedures for evaluating the reasonableness of commissions paid to affiliates and review these procedures periodically.

For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014, 2015 and 2016, the Funds did not pay any brokerage commissions on Fund transactions effected by affiliated brokers.

Securities of “Regular Broker-Dealers.” The Funds are required to identify any securities of their “regular brokers and dealers” (as such term is defined in the 1940 Act) that each Fund held during their most recent fiscal year. During the most recent fiscal year, the Funds did not hold any securities of their “regular brokers and dealers.”

Portfolio Turnover Rate. Portfolio turnover rate is defined under SEC rules as the greater of the value of the securities purchased or securities sold, excluding all securities whose maturities at the time of acquisition were one-year or less, divided by the average monthly value of such securities owned during the year. Based on this definition, instruments with remaining maturities of less than one-year are excluded from the calculation of the portfolio turnover rate. The Funds may at times hold investments in short-term instruments, which are excluded for purposes of computing portfolio turnover. For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2015 and 2016, the Funds’ portfolio turnover rates were as follows:

Fund	Portfolio Turnover Rates	
	2015	2016
Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund	82%	63%
Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund	133%	112%

PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS

The Board has approved policies and procedures that govern the timing and circumstances regarding the disclosure of the Funds’ portfolio holdings information to shareholders and third parties. These policies and procedures are designed to ensure that disclosure of information regarding the Funds’ portfolio securities is in the best interests of the Funds’ shareholders, and include procedures to address conflicts between the interests of the Funds’ shareholders, on the one hand, and those of the Adviser, principal underwriter, or any affiliated person of the Funds, the Adviser, or the principal underwriter, on the other. Pursuant to such procedures, the Board has authorized the Adviser’s Chief Compliance Officer to authorize the release of the Funds’ portfolio holdings, as necessary, in conformity with the foregoing principles. The Adviser’s Chief Compliance Officer, either directly or through reports by the Trust’s Chief Compliance Officer, reports quarterly to the Board regarding the operation and administration of such policies and procedures.

Pursuant to applicable law, the Funds are required to disclose their complete portfolio holdings quarterly, within 60 days of the end of each fiscal quarter (currently, each January 31, April 30, July 31, and October 31). Each Fund will disclose a complete or summary schedule of investments (which includes the Fund’s 50 largest holdings in unaffiliated issuers and each investment in unaffiliated issuers that exceeds one percent of the Fund’s NAV (“Summary Schedule”)) in its Semi-Annual and Annual Reports which are distributed to the Fund’s shareholders. Each Fund’s complete schedule of investments following the first and third fiscal quarters will be available in quarterly holdings reports filed with the SEC on Form N-Q, and the Fund’s complete schedule of investments following the second and fourth fiscal quarters will be available in shareholder reports filed with the SEC on Form N-CSR.

Reports filed with the SEC on Form N-Q and Form N-CSR are not distributed to the Funds’ shareholders but are available, free of charge, on the EDGAR database on the SEC’s website at www.sec.gov. Should the Funds include only a Summary Schedule rather than a complete schedule of investments in their Semi-Annual and Annual Reports, their Form N-CSR will be available without charge, upon request, by calling 1-866-454-0738.

The Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund generally publishes a complete list of its portfolio holdings on a monthly basis, ten (10) days after the end of each month. This information can be found on the internet at www.westfieldcapital.com. This information will generally remain available until it is replaced by new portfolio holdings information as described above. The Adviser may exclude any portion of the Fund’s portfolio holdings from publication when deemed to be in the best interest of the

Fund. The Fund may provide ratings and rankings organizations with the same information one day after it is made available on the internet web site.

In addition to information provided to shareholders and the general public, portfolio holdings information may be disclosed as frequently as daily to certain service providers, such as the Custodian, Administrator or Transfer Agent, in connection with their services to the Funds. From time to time rating and ranking organizations, such as S&P, Lipper and Morningstar, Inc., may request non-public portfolio holdings information in connection with rating the Funds. Similarly, institutional investors, financial planners, pension plan sponsors and/or their consultants or other third-parties may request portfolio holdings information in order to assess the risks of a Fund's portfolio along with related performance attribution statistics. The lag time for such disclosures will vary. The Funds believe that these third parties have legitimate objectives in requesting such portfolio holdings information.

The Funds' policies and procedures provide that the Adviser's Chief Compliance Officer may authorize disclosure of non-public portfolio holdings information to such parties at differing times and/or with different lag times. Prior to making any disclosure to a third party, the Adviser's Chief Compliance Officer must determine that such disclosure serves a reasonable business purpose, is in the best interests of the Funds' shareholders and that to the extent conflicts between the interests of the Funds' shareholders and those of the Funds' Adviser, principal underwriter, or any affiliated person of the Funds exist, such conflicts are addressed. Portfolio holdings information may be disclosed no more frequently than monthly to ratings agencies, consultants and other qualified financial professionals or individuals. The disclosures will not be made sooner than three days after the date of the information. The Trust's Chief Compliance Officer will regularly review these arrangements and will make periodic reports to the Board regarding disclosure pursuant to such arrangements.

With the exception of disclosures to rating and ranking organizations as described above, the Funds require any third party receiving non-public holdings information to enter into a confidentiality agreement with the Adviser. The confidentiality agreement provides, among other things, that non-public portfolio holdings information will be kept confidential and that the recipient has a duty not to trade on the non-public information and will use such information solely to analyze and rank the Funds, or to perform due diligence and asset allocation, depending on the recipient of the information.

The Funds' policies and procedures prohibit any compensation or other consideration from being paid to or received by any party in connection with the disclosure of portfolio holdings information, including the Funds, the Adviser and its affiliates or recipients of the Funds' portfolio holdings information.

DESCRIPTION OF SHARES

The Declaration of Trust authorizes the issuance of an unlimited number of funds and shares of each fund, each of which represents an equal proportionate interest in that fund with each other share. Shares are entitled upon liquidation to a pro rata share in the net assets of the fund. Shareholders have no preemptive rights. The Declaration of Trust provides that the Trustees may create additional series or classes of shares. All consideration received by the Trust for shares of any additional funds and all assets in which such consideration is invested would belong to that fund and would be subject to the liabilities related thereto. Share certificates representing shares will not be issued. The Funds' shares, when issued, are fully paid and non-assessable.

SHAREHOLDER LIABILITY

The Trust is an entity of the type commonly known as a "Massachusetts business trust." Under Massachusetts law, shareholders of such a trust could, under certain circumstances, be held personally liable as partners for the obligations of the trust. Even if, however, the Trust were held to be a partnership, the possibility of the shareholders incurring financial loss for that reason appears remote because the Declaration of Trust contains an express disclaimer of shareholder liability for obligations of the Trust and requires that notice of such disclaimer be given in each agreement, obligation or instrument entered into or executed by or on behalf of the Trust or the Trustees, and because the Declaration of Trust provides for indemnification out of the Trust property for any shareholder held personally liable for the obligations of the Trust.

LIMITATION OF TRUSTEES' LIABILITY

The Declaration of Trust provides that a Trustee shall be liable only for his or her own willful defaults and, if reasonable care has been exercised in the selection of officers, agents, employees or investment advisers, shall not be liable for any neglect or wrongdoing of any such person. The Declaration of Trust also provides that the Trust will indemnify its Trustees and officers against liabilities and expenses incurred in connection with actual or threatened litigation in which they may be involved because of their offices with the Trust unless it is determined in the manner provided in the Declaration of Trust that they have not acted in good faith in the reasonable belief that their actions were in the best interests of the Trust. However, nothing in the Declaration of Trust shall protect or indemnify a Trustee against any liability for his or her willful misfeasance, bad faith, gross negligence or reckless disregard of his or her duties. Nothing contained in this section attempts to disclaim a Trustee's individual liability in any manner inconsistent with the federal securities laws.

PROXY VOTING

The Board has delegated responsibility for decisions regarding proxy voting for securities held by the Funds to the Adviser. The Adviser will vote such proxies in accordance with its proxy policies and procedures, which are included in Appendix B to this SAI.

The Trust is required to disclose annually the Funds' complete proxy voting record during the most recent 12-month period ended June 30 on Form N-PX. This voting record is available: (i) without charge, upon request, by calling 1-866-454-0738 and (ii) on the SEC's website at <http://www.sec.gov>.

CODES OF ETHICS

The Board, on behalf of the Trust, has adopted a Code of Ethics pursuant to Rule 17j-1 under the 1940 Act. In addition, the Adviser, the Distributor and the Administrator have adopted Codes of Ethics pursuant to Rule 17j-1. These Codes of Ethics apply to the personal investing activities of trustees, officers and certain employees ("Access Persons"). Rule 17j-1 and the Codes of Ethics are designed to prevent unlawful practices in connection with the purchase or sale of securities by Access Persons. Under each Code of Ethics, Access Persons are permitted to invest in securities, including securities that may be purchased or held by the Funds, but are required to report their personal securities transactions for monitoring purposes. The Codes of Ethics further require certain Access Persons to obtain approval before investing in initial public offerings and limited offerings. Copies of these Codes of Ethics are on file with the SEC, and are available to the public.

PRINCIPAL SHAREHOLDERS AND CONTROL PERSONS

As of February 13, 2017, the following persons were record owners (or to the knowledge of the Trust, beneficial owners) of 5% or more of any class of the shares of the Funds. The Trust believes that most of the shares referred to below were held by the below persons in accounts for their fiduciary, agency or custodial customers. Persons beneficially owning more than 25% of a Fund's outstanding shares may be deemed to "control" the Fund within the meaning of the 1940 Act. Shareholders controlling a Fund may have a significant impact on any shareholder vote of the Fund.

Westfield Capital Large Cap Growth Fund		
Name and Address	Class of Shares	% of Class
National Financial Services LLC for Exclusive Benefit of Our Customers ATTN Mutual Funds Dept 4th Fl 499 Washington Blvd Jersey City, NJ 07310-2010	Investor Class	99.89%
Dengel & Co c/o Fiduciary Trust Co Int'l PO Box 3199 Church Street Station	Institutional Class	16.13%

New York, NY 10008-3199		
Charles Schwab & Co Inc Special Custody A/C FBO Customers ATTN Mutual Funds 101 Montgomery St San Francisco, CA 94104-4151	Institutional Class	13.85%
Northern Trust Co Tr FBO The SI Organization Inc PO Box 92994 Chicago, IL 60607	Institutional Class	8.65%
Eleutherian Mills – Hagley Foundation Inc PO Box 3630 Wilmington, DE 19807-0630	Institutional Class	8.32%
Capinco c/o US Bank NA 1555 N Rivercenter Dr Ste 302 Milwaukee, WI 53212-3958	Institutional Class	6.58%
Key Bank NA Cust FBO Munson Williams Proctor UAD 10-23012 PO Box 94871 Cleveland, OH 44101-4871	Institutional Class	5.71%

Westfield Capital Dividend Growth Fund		
Name and Address	Class of Shares	% of Class
National Financial Services LLC for Exclusive Benefit of Our Customers ATTN Mutual Funds Dept 4th Fl 499 Washington Blvd Jersey City, NJ 07310-2010	Investor Class	91.49%
Indrani Mitra & Indrajit Mitra JTWROS Subject to DST TOD Rules 26 Inches Brook Ln Boxborough, MA 01719-1626	Investor Class	8.51%
W Johnston Associates LLC c/o Kathryn M. Cook 132 Turnpike Rd #100 Southborough, MA 01772-2129	Institutional Class	23.92%
William A. Muggia 15 Longfellow Rd Wellesley Hills, MA 02481-5220	Institutional Class	22.21%
Annette Jane Campbell-White Subject to DST TOD Rules 4100 Redwood Road No. 412 Oakland, CA 94619-2363	Institutional Class	8.64%
National Financial Services LLC for Exclusive Benefit of Our Customers ATTN Mutual Funds Dept 4th Fl 499 Washington Blvd	Institutional Class	7.21%

Jersey City, NJ 07310-2010		
----------------------------	--	--

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF RATINGS

Description of Ratings

The following descriptions of securities ratings have been published by Moody's Investors Services, Inc. ("Moody's"), Standard & Poor's ("S&P"), and Fitch Ratings ("Fitch"), respectively.

DESCRIPTION OF MOODY'S GLOBAL RATINGS

Ratings assigned on Moody's global long-term and short-term rating scales are forward-looking opinions of the relative credit risks of financial obligations issued by non-financial corporates, financial institutions, structured finance vehicles, project finance vehicles, and public sector entities. Long-term ratings are assigned to issuers or obligations with an original maturity of one year or more and reflect both on the likelihood of a default on contractually promised payments and the expected financial loss suffered in the event of default. Short-term ratings are assigned to obligations with an original maturity of thirteen months or less and reflect both on the likelihood of a default on contractually promised payments and the expected financial loss suffered in the event of default.

Description of Moody's Global Long-Term Ratings

Aaa Obligations rated Aaa are judged to be of the highest quality, subject to the lowest level of credit risk.

Aa Obligations rated Aa are judged to be of high quality and are subject to very low credit risk.

A Obligations rated A are judged to be upper-medium grade and are subject to low credit risk.

Baa Obligations rated Baa are judged to be medium-grade and subject to moderate credit risk and as such may possess certain speculative characteristics.

Ba Obligations rated Ba are judged to be speculative and are subject to substantial credit risk.

B Obligations rated B are considered speculative and are subject to high credit risk.

Caa Obligations rated Caa are judged to be speculative of poor standing and are subject to very high credit risk.

Ca Obligations rated Ca are highly speculative and are likely in, or very near, default, with some prospect of recovery of principal and interest.

C Obligations rated C are the lowest rated and are typically in default, with little prospect for recovery of principal or interest.

Note: Moody's appends numerical modifiers 1, 2, and 3 to each generic rating classification from Aa through Caa. The modifier 1 indicates that the obligation ranks in the higher end of its generic rating category; the modifier 2 indicates a mid-range ranking; and the modifier 3 indicates a ranking in the lower end of that generic rating category.

Hybrid Indicator (hyb)

The hybrid indicator (hyb) is appended to all ratings of hybrid securities issued by banks, insurers, finance companies, and securities firms. By their terms, hybrid securities allow for the omission of scheduled dividends, interest, or principal payments, which can potentially result in impairment if such an omission occurs. Hybrid securities may also be subject to contractually allowable write-downs of principal that could result in impairment. Together with the hybrid indicator, the long-term obligation rating assigned to a hybrid security is an expression of the relative credit risk associated with that security.

Description of Moody's Global Short-Term Ratings

P-1 Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Prime-1 have a superior ability to repay short-term debt obligations.

P-2 Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Prime-2 have a strong ability to repay short-term debt obligations.

P-3 Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Prime-3 have an acceptable ability to repay short-term obligations.

NP Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Not Prime do not fall within any of the Prime rating categories.

Description of Moody's U.S. Municipal Short-Term Obligation Ratings

The Municipal Investment Grade (“MIG”) scale is used to rate U.S. municipal bond anticipation notes of up to three years maturity. Municipal notes rated on the MIG scale may be secured by either pledged revenues or proceeds of a take-out financing received prior to note maturity. MIG ratings expire at the maturity of the obligation, and the issuer’s long-term rating is only one consideration in assigning the MIG rating. MIG ratings are divided into three levels—MIG 1 through MIG 3—while speculative grade short-term obligations are designated SG.

Moody’s U.S. municipal short-term obligation ratings are as follows:

MIG 1 This designation denotes superior credit quality. Excellent protection is afforded by established cash flows, highly reliable liquidity support, or demonstrated broad-based access to the market for refinancing.

MIG 2 This designation denotes strong credit quality. Margins of protection are ample, although not as large as in the preceding group.

MIG 3 This designation denotes acceptable credit quality. Liquidity and cash-flow protection may be narrow, and market access for refinancing is likely to be less well-established.

SG This designation denotes speculative-grade credit quality. Debt instruments in this category may lack sufficient margins of protection.

Description of Moody's Demand Obligation Ratings

In the case of variable rate demand obligations (“VRDOs”), a two-component rating is assigned: a long or short-term debt rating and a demand obligation rating. The first element represents Moody’s evaluation of risk associated with scheduled principal and interest payments. The second element represents Moody’s evaluation of risk associated with the ability to receive purchase price upon demand (“demand feature”). The second element uses a rating from a variation of the MIG scale called the Variable Municipal Investment Grade (“VMIG”) scale.

Moody’s demand obligation ratings are as follows:

VMIG 1 This designation denotes superior credit quality. Excellent protection is afforded by the superior short-term credit strength of the liquidity provider and structural and legal protections that ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

VMIG 2 This designation denotes strong credit quality. Good protection is afforded by the strong short-term credit strength of the liquidity provider and structural and legal protections that ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

VMIG 3 This designation denotes acceptable credit quality. Adequate protection is afforded by the satisfactory short-term credit strength of the liquidity provider and structural and legal protections that ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

SG This designation denotes speculative-grade credit quality. Demand features rated in this category may be supported by a liquidity provider that does not have an investment grade short-term rating or may lack the structural and/or legal protections necessary to ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

DESCRIPTION OF S&P'S ISSUE CREDIT RATINGS

An S&P issue credit rating is a forward-looking opinion about the creditworthiness of an obligor with respect to a specific financial obligation, a specific class of financial obligations, or a specific financial program (including ratings on medium-term note programs and commercial paper programs). It takes into consideration the creditworthiness of guarantors, insurers, or other forms of credit enhancement on the obligation and takes into account the currency in which the obligation is denominated. The opinion reflects S&P's view of the obligor's capacity and willingness to meet its financial commitments as they come due, and may assess terms, such as collateral security and subordination, which could affect ultimate payment in the event of default.

Issue credit ratings can be either long-term or short-term. Short-term ratings are generally assigned to those obligations considered short-term in the relevant market. In the U.S., for example, that means obligations with an original maturity of no more than 365 days—including commercial paper. Short-term ratings are also used to indicate the creditworthiness of an obligor with respect to put features on long-term obligations. Medium-term notes are assigned long-term ratings.

Issue credit ratings are based, in varying degrees, on S&P's analysis of the following considerations:

- The likelihood of payment—the capacity and willingness of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on a financial obligation in accordance with the terms of the obligation;
- The nature of and provisions of the financial obligation; and the promise S&P imputes; and
- The protection afforded by, and relative position of, the obligation in the event of bankruptcy, reorganization, or other arrangement under the laws of bankruptcy and other laws affecting creditors' rights.

Issue ratings are an assessment of default risk, but may incorporate an assessment of relative seniority or ultimate recovery in the event of default. Junior obligations are typically rated lower than senior obligations, to reflect the lower priority in bankruptcy. (Such differentiation may apply when an entity has both senior and subordinated obligations, secured and unsecured obligations, or operating company and holding company obligations.)

Description of S&P's Long-Term Issue Credit Ratings*

AAA An obligation rated 'AAA' has the highest rating assigned by S&P. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is extremely strong.

AA An obligation rated 'AA' differs from the highest-rated obligations only to a small degree. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is very strong.

A An obligation rated 'A' is somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligations in higher-rated categories. However, the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is still strong.

BBB An obligation rated 'BBB' exhibits adequate protection parameters. However, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

BB; B; CCC; CC; and C Obligations rated 'BB', 'B', 'CCC', 'CC', and 'C' are regarded as having significant speculative characteristics. 'BB' indicates the least degree of speculation and 'C' the highest. While such obligations will likely have some quality and protective characteristics, these may be outweighed by large uncertainties or major exposures to adverse conditions.

BB An obligation rated 'BB' is less vulnerable to nonpayment than other speculative issues. However, it faces major ongoing uncertainties or exposure to adverse business, financial, or economic conditions which could lead to the obligor's inadequate capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

B An obligation rated 'B' is more vulnerable to nonpayment than obligations rated 'BB', but the obligor currently has the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation. Adverse business, financial, or economic conditions will likely

impair the obligor's capacity or willingness to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

CCC An obligation rated 'CCC' is currently vulnerable to nonpayment, and is dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions for the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation. In the event of adverse business, financial, or economic conditions, the obligor is not likely to have the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

CC An obligation rated 'CC' is currently highly vulnerable to nonpayment. The 'CC' rating is used when a default has not yet occurred, but S&P expects default to be a virtual certainty, regardless of the anticipated time to default.

C An obligation rated 'C' is currently highly vulnerable to nonpayment, and the obligation is expected to have lower relative seniority or lower ultimate recovery compared to obligations that are rated higher.

D An obligation rated 'D' is in default or in breach of an imputed promise. For non-hybrid capital instruments, the 'D' rating category is used when payments on an obligation are not made on the date due, unless S&P believes that such payments will be made within five business days in the absence of a stated grace period or within the earlier of the stated grace period or 30 calendar days. The 'D' rating also will be used upon the filing of a bankruptcy petition or the taking of similar action and where default on an obligation is a virtual certainty, for example due to automatic stay provisions. An obligation's rating is lowered to 'D' if it is subject to a distressed exchange offer.

NR This indicates that no rating has been requested, or that there is insufficient information on which to base a rating, or that S&P does not rate a particular obligation as a matter of policy.

*The ratings from 'AA' to 'CCC' may be modified by the addition of a plus (+) or minus (-) sign to show relative standing within the major rating categories.

Description of S&P's Short-Term Issue Credit Ratings

A-1 A short-term obligation rated 'A-1' is rated in the highest category by S&P. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is strong. Within this category, certain obligations are designated with a plus sign (+). This indicates that the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on these obligations is extremely strong.

A-2 A short-term obligation rated 'A-2' is somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligations in higher rating categories. However, the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is satisfactory.

A-3 A short-term obligation rated 'A-3' exhibits adequate protection parameters. However, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

B A short-term obligation rated 'B' is regarded as vulnerable and has significant speculative characteristics. The obligor currently has the capacity to meet its financial commitments; however, it faces major ongoing uncertainties which could lead to the obligor's inadequate capacity to meet its financial commitments.

C A short-term obligation rated 'C' is currently vulnerable to nonpayment and is dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions for the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

D A short-term obligation rated 'D' is in default or in breach of an imputed promise. For non-hybrid capital instruments, the 'D' rating category is used when payments on an obligation are not made on the date due, unless S&P believes that such payments will be made within any stated grace period. However, any stated grace period longer than five business days will be treated as five business days. The 'D' rating also will be used upon the filing of a bankruptcy petition or the taking of a similar action and where default on an obligation is a virtual certainty, for example due to automatic stay provisions. An obligation's rating is lowered to 'D' if it is subject to a distressed exchange offer.

Description of S&P's Municipal Short-Term Note Ratings

An S&P U.S. municipal note rating reflects S&P’s opinion about the liquidity factors and market access risks unique to the notes. Notes due in three years or less will likely receive a note rating. Notes with an original maturity of more than three years will most likely receive a long-term debt rating. In determining which type of rating, if any, to assign, S&P’s analysis will review the following considerations:

- Amortization schedule—the larger the final maturity relative to other maturities, the more likely it will be treated as a note; and
- Source of payment—the more dependent the issue is on the market for its refinancing, the more likely it will be treated as a note.

S&P’s municipal short-term note ratings are as follows:

SP-1 Strong capacity to pay principal and interest. An issue determined to possess a very strong capacity to pay debt service is given a plus (+) designation.

SP-2 Satisfactory capacity to pay principal and interest, with some vulnerability to adverse financial and economic changes over the term of the notes.

SP-3 Speculative capacity to pay principal and interest.

DESCRIPTION OF FITCH’S CREDIT RATINGS

Fitch’s credit ratings provide an opinion on the relative ability of an entity to meet financial commitments, such as interest, preferred dividends, repayment of principal, insurance claims or counterparty obligations. Credit ratings are used by investors as indications of the likelihood of receiving the money owed to them in accordance with the terms on which they invested.

The terms “investment grade” and “speculative grade” have established themselves over time as shorthand to describe the categories ‘AAA’ to ‘BBB’ (investment grade) and ‘BB’ to ‘D’ (speculative grade). The terms “investment grade” and “speculative grade” are market conventions, and do not imply any recommendation or endorsement of a specific security for investment purposes. “Investment grade” categories indicate relatively low to moderate credit risk, while ratings in the “speculative” categories either signal a higher level of credit risk or that a default has already occurred.

Fitch’s credit ratings do not directly address any risk other than credit risk. In particular, ratings do not deal with the risk of a market value loss on a rated security due to changes in interest rates, liquidity and other market considerations. However, in terms of payment obligation on the rated liability, market risk may be considered to the extent that it influences the *ability* of an issuer to pay upon a commitment. Ratings nonetheless do not reflect market risk to the extent that they influence the size or other conditionality of the *obligation* to pay upon a commitment (for example, in the case of index-linked bonds).

In the default components of ratings assigned to individual obligations or instruments, the agency typically rates to the likelihood of non-payment or default in accordance with the terms of that instrument’s documentation. In limited cases, Fitch may include additional considerations (i.e. rate to a higher or lower standard than that implied in the obligation’s documentation). In such cases, the agency will make clear the assumptions underlying the agency’s opinion in the accompanying rating commentary.

A designation of Not Rated or NR is used to denote securities not rated by Fitch where Fitch has rated some, but not all, securities comprising an issuance capital structure.

Description of Fitch’s Long-Term Corporate Finance Obligations Ratings

AAA Highest credit quality. ‘AAA’ ratings denote the lowest expectation of credit risk. They are assigned only in cases of exceptionally strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is highly unlikely to be adversely affected by foreseeable events.

AA Very high credit quality. ‘AA’ ratings denote expectations of very low credit risk. They indicate very strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable events.

A High credit quality. ‘A’ ratings denote expectations of low credit risk. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is

considered strong. This capacity may, nevertheless, be more vulnerable to adverse business or economic conditions than is the case for higher ratings.

BBB Good credit quality. 'BBB' ratings indicate that expectations of credit risk are currently low. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered adequate but adverse business or economic conditions are more likely to impair this capacity.

BB Speculative. 'BB' ratings indicate an elevated vulnerability to credit risk, particularly in the event of adverse changes in business or economic conditions over time; however, business or financial alternatives may be available to allow financial commitments to be met.

B Highly speculative. 'B' ratings indicate that material credit risk is present.

CCC Substantial credit risk. 'CCC' ratings indicate that substantial credit risk is present.

CC Very high levels of credit risk. 'CC' ratings indicate very high levels of credit risk.

C Exceptionally high levels of credit risk. 'C' ratings indicate exceptionally high levels of credit risk.

Defaulted obligations typically are not assigned 'RD' or 'D' ratings, but are instead rated in the 'B' to 'C' rating categories, depending upon their recovery prospects and other relevant characteristics. This approach better aligns obligations that have comparable overall expected loss but varying vulnerability to default and loss.

Note: The modifiers "+" or "-" may be appended to a rating to denote relative status within major rating categories. Such suffixes are not added to the 'AAA' obligation rating category, or to corporate finance obligation ratings in the categories below 'CCC'.

The subscript 'emr' is appended to a rating to denote embedded market risk which is beyond the scope of the rating. The designation is intended to make clear that the rating solely addresses the counterparty risk of the issuing bank. It is not meant to indicate any limitation in the analysis of the counterparty risk, which in all other respects follows published Fitch criteria for analyzing the issuing financial institution. Fitch does not rate these instruments where the principal is to any degree subject to market risk.

Description of Fitch's Short-Term Ratings

A short-term issuer or obligation rating is based in all cases on the short-term vulnerability to default of the rated entity or security stream and relates to the capacity to meet financial obligations in accordance with the documentation governing the relevant obligation. Short-Term Ratings are assigned to obligations whose initial maturity is viewed as short term based on market convention. Typically, this means up to 13 months for corporate, sovereign, and structured obligations, and up to 36 months for obligations in U.S. public finance markets.

Fitch's short-term ratings are as follows:

F1 Highest short-term credit quality. Indicates the strongest intrinsic capacity for timely payment of financial commitments; may have an added "+" to denote any exceptionally strong credit feature.

F2 Good short-term credit quality. Good intrinsic capacity for timely payment of financial commitments.

F3 Fair short-term credit quality. The intrinsic capacity for timely payment of financial commitments is adequate.

B Speculative short-term credit quality. Minimal capacity for timely payment of financial commitments, plus heightened vulnerability to near term adverse changes in financial and economic conditions.

C High short-term default risk. Default is a real possibility.

RD Restricted default. Indicates an entity that has defaulted on one or more of its financial commitments, although it continues to

meet other financial obligations. Typically applicable to entity ratings only.

D Default. Indicates a broad-based default event for an entity, or the default of a short-term obligation.

Proxy Voting

APPENDIX B

Westfield Capital Management Company, L.P. Proxy Voting Policy

Introduction

Westfield will offer to vote U.S. exchange traded proxies for all client accounts. Westfield believes that the voting of proxies can be an important tool for investors to promote best practices in corporate governance and we seek to vote all proxies in the best interests of our clients as investors. Westfield also recognizes that the voting of proxies with respect to securities held in client accounts is an investment responsibility having economic value.

In accordance with Rule 206(4)-6 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the “Act”), Westfield has adopted and implemented policies and procedures that we believe are reasonably designed to ensure that proxies are voted in the best interest of our clients. Our authority to vote proxies for our clients is established in writing, usually by the investment advisory contract. Clients can change such authority at any time with prior written notice to Westfield. Clients can also contact their Marketing representative or the Compliance Department (wcmcompliance@wcmgmt.com) for a report of how their accounts’ securities were voted.

Oversight of Proxy Voting Function

Westfield has engaged a third party service provider, Institutional Shareholder Services, Inc. (the “vendor”), to assist with proxy voting. Westfield’s Compliance team will:

- oversee the vendor; this includes performing periodic audits of the proxy votes and conducting periodic due diligence;
- ensure required proxy records are retained according to applicable rules and regulations and internal policy;
- prepare and distribute proxy reports for internal and external requests;
- review the proxy policy and voting guidelines at least annually; and
- identify material conflicts of interest that may impair our ability to vote shares in our clients’ best interest.

Proxy Voting Guidelines

Westfield utilizes the vendor’s proxy voting guidelines, which consider market-specific best practices, transparency, and disclosure when addressing shareholder matters. Clients may choose to vote in accordance with the vendor’s U.S. proxy voting guidelines (i.e., Standard Guidelines), Taft-Hartley guidelines which are in full conformity with the AFL-CIO’s proxy voting guidelines, Socially Responsible Investing Guidelines (“SRI”) or Sustainability Guidelines. A copy of ISS’ voting guidelines is located at the end of this policy.

Generally, information on Westfield’s proxy voting decisions or status of votes will not be communicated or distributed to external solicitors. On occasion, Westfield may provide such information to solicitors if we believe a response will benefit our clients or a response is requested from the Westfield security analyst.

Proxy Voting Process

The vendor tracks proxy meetings and reconciles proxy ballots received for each meeting. Westfield will use best efforts in obtaining any missing ballots; however, we vote only those proxy ballots our vendor has received. For any missing ballots, the vendor will contact custodians to locate such missing ballots. Since there can be many factors affecting proxy ballot retrieval, it is possible that Westfield will not receive a ballot in time to place a vote. Clients who participate in securities lending programs should be aware that Westfield will not call back any shares on loan for proxy voting purposes.

Proxy Voting

For each meeting, the vendor reviews the agenda and applies a vote recommendation for each proposal based on the written guidelines assigned to the applicable accounts. Proxies will be voted in accordance with the guidelines, unless the Westfield analyst or portfolio manager believes that following the vendor's guidelines would not be in the clients' best interests. With limited exceptions, an analyst or portfolio manager may request to override the Standard or the Sustainability Guidelines at any time before the votes have been cast. In addition, certain proxy ballots (e.g., contentious proposals) may necessitate further review from the analyst or portfolio manager. Compliance will attempt to identify such ballots and bring them to the analyst's or portfolio manager's attention. If the analyst or portfolio manager chooses to vote against the vendor's stated guidelines in any instance, he/she must make the request in writing and provide rationale for the vote against stated guidelines. No analyst or portfolio manager overrides are permitted in either the Taft-Hartley or SRI Guidelines.

Non-U.S. Proxies

With the exception of ADRs and foreign domiciled securities that trade on U.S. exchanges, Westfield will not vote non-U.S. proxies.

Conflicts of Interest

Compliance is responsible for identifying conflicts of interest that could arise when voting proxy ballots on behalf of our clients. Since our business is solely focused on providing investment advisory services, it is unlikely that a material conflict will arise in connection with proxy voting. Additionally, per Westfield's Code of Ethics and other internal policies, all employees should avoid situations where potential conflicts may exist. Westfield has put in place certain reviews to ensure proxies are voted solely on the investment merits of the proposal. In identifying potential conflicts, Compliance will review many factors, including, but not limited to existing relationships with Westfield or an employee, and the vendor's disclosed conflicts. If an actual conflict of interest is identified, it is reviewed by the Compliance team. If it is determined that the conflict is material in nature, the analyst or portfolio manager may not override the vendor's recommendation.

Proxy Reports

Westfield can provide account specific proxy reports to clients upon request or at scheduled time periods (e.g., quarterly). Client reporting requirements typically are established during the initial account set-up stage, but clients may modify this reporting schedule at any time with prior written notice to Westfield. The reports will contain at least the following information:

- company name
- meeting agenda
- how the account voted on each agenda item
- whether the account vote was in-line or against management recommendation
- rationale for any votes against the established guidelines (rationale is not always provided for votes that are in-line with guidelines since these are set forth in the written guidelines)

Recordkeeping

In accordance with Rule 204-2 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, proxy voting records will be maintained for at least five years. The following records will be retained by either Westfield or the proxy vendor:

- a copy of the Proxy Voting Policies and Guidelines and amendments that were in effect during the required time period;

DB17 89349575.9

Proxy Voting

- electronic or paper copies of each proxy statement received by Westfield or the vendor with respect to securities in client accounts (Westfield may also rely on obtaining copies of proxy statements from the SEC's Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval (EDGAR) system);
- records of each vote cast for each client;
- documents created by Westfield that were material to making a decision on how to vote proxies or memorializes the basis for such decision (basis for decisions voted in line with policy is provided in the written guidelines);
- written reports to clients on proxy voting and all client requests for information and Westfield's response;
- disclosure documentation to clients on how they may obtain information on how we voted their securities



United States

Concise Proxy Voting Guidelines

2017 Benchmark Policy Recommendations

Effective for Meetings on or after February 1, 2017

Published January 17, 2017



The policies contained herein are a sampling of selected key U.S. proxy voting guidelines and are not intended to be exhaustive. A full summary of ISS' [2017 proxy voting guidelines](https://www.issgovernance.com/policy-gateway/2017-policy-information/) can be found at: <https://www.issgovernance.com/policy-gateway/2017-policy-information/>

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

General Recommendation: Generally vote for director nominees, except under the following circumstances:

1. Accountability

Vote against¹ or withhold from the entire board of directors (except new nominees², who should be considered case-by-case) for the following:

Problematic Takeover Defenses

Classified Board Structure:

1.1. The board is classified, and a continuing director responsible for a problematic governance issue at the board/committee level that would warrant a withhold/against vote recommendation is not up for election. All appropriate nominees (except new) may be held accountable.

Director Performance Evaluation:

1.2. The board lacks accountability and oversight, coupled with sustained poor performance relative to peers. Sustained poor performance is measured by one- and three-year total shareholder returns in the bottom half of a company's four-digit GICS industry group (Russell 3000 companies only). Take into consideration the company's five-year total shareholder return and operational metrics. Problematic provisions include but are not limited to:

- > A classified board structure;
- > A supermajority vote requirement;
- > Either a plurality vote standard in uncontested director elections or a majority vote standard with no plurality carve-out for contested elections;
- > The inability of shareholders to call special meetings;
- > The inability of shareholders to act by written consent;
- > A dual-class capital structure; and/or
- > A non-shareholder-approved poison pill.

¹ In general, companies with a plurality vote standard use "Withhold" as the contrary vote option in director elections; companies with a majority vote standard use "Against". However, it will vary by company and the proxy must be checked to determine the valid contrary vote option for the particular company.

² A "new nominee" is any current nominee who has not already been elected by shareholders and who joined the board after the problematic action in question transpired. If ISS cannot determine whether the nominee joined the board before or after the problematic action transpired, the nominee will be considered a "new nominee" if he or she joined the board within the 12 months prior to the upcoming shareholder meeting.

Poison Pills:

- 1.3. The company's poison pill has a "dead-hand" or "modified dead-hand" feature. Vote against or withhold from nominees every year until this feature is removed;
- 1.4. The board adopts a poison pill with a term of more than 12 months ("long-term pill"), or renews any existing pill, including any "short-term pill" (12 months or less), without shareholder approval. A commitment or policy that puts a newly adopted pill to a binding shareholder vote may potentially offset an adverse vote recommendation. Review such companies with classified boards every year, and such companies with annually elected boards at least once every three years, and vote against or withhold votes from all nominees if the company still maintains a non-shareholder-approved poison pill; or
- 1.5. The board makes a material adverse change to an existing poison pill without shareholder approval.

Vote case-by-case on all nominees if:

- 1.6. The board adopts a poison pill with a term of 12 months or less ("short-term pill") without shareholder approval, taking into account the following factors:
- › The date of the pill's adoption relative to the date of the next meeting of shareholders—i.e. whether the company had time to put the pill on the ballot for shareholder ratification given the circumstances;
 - › The issuer's rationale;
 - › The issuer's governance structure and practices; and
 - › The issuer's track record of accountability to shareholders.

Restricting Binding Shareholder Proposals:

Generally vote against or withhold from members of the governance committee if:

- 1.7. The company's charter imposes undue restrictions on shareholders' ability to amend the bylaws. Such restrictions include, but are not limited to: outright prohibition on the submission of binding shareholder proposals, or share ownership requirements or time holding requirements in excess of SEC Rule 14a-8. Vote against on an ongoing basis.

Problematic Audit-Related Practices

Generally vote against or withhold from the members of the Audit Committee if:

- 1.8. The non-audit fees paid to the auditor are excessive (see discussion under "[Auditor Ratification](#)");
- 1.9. The company receives an adverse opinion on the company's financial statements from its auditor; or
- 1.10. There is persuasive evidence that the Audit Committee entered into an inappropriate indemnification agreement with its auditor that limits the ability of the company, or its shareholders, to pursue legitimate legal recourse against the audit firm.

Vote case-by-case on members of the Audit Committee and potentially the full board if:

- 1.11. Poor accounting practices are identified that rise to a level of serious concern, such as: fraud; misapplication of GAAP; and material weaknesses identified in Section 404 disclosures. Examine the severity, breadth, chronological sequence, and duration, as well as the company's efforts at remediation or corrective actions, in determining whether withhold/against votes are warranted.

Problematic Compensation Practices/Pay for Performance Misalignment

In the absence of an Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation ballot item or in egregious situations, vote against or withhold from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- 1.12. There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);
- 1.13. The company maintains significant problematic pay practices;
- 1.14. The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders;
- 1.15. The company fails to submit one-time transfers of stock options to a shareholder vote; or
- 1.16. The company fails to fulfill the terms of a burn-rate commitment made to shareholders.

Vote case-by-case on Compensation Committee members (or, in exceptional cases, the full board) and the Management Say-on-Pay proposal if:

1.17. The company's previous say-on-pay received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast, taking into account:

- > The company's response, including:
- > Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors regarding the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
- > Specific actions taken to address the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
- > Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
- > Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
- > The company's ownership structure; and
- > Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.

Unilateral Bylaw/Charter Amendments and Problematic Capital Structures

1.18. Generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the board amends the company's bylaws or charter without shareholder approval in a manner that materially diminishes shareholders' rights or that could adversely impact shareholders, considering the following factors:

- > The board's rationale for adopting the bylaw/charter amendment without shareholder ratification;
- > Disclosure by the company of any significant engagement with shareholders regarding the amendment;
- > The level of impairment of shareholders' rights caused by the board's unilateral amendment to the bylaws/charter;
- > The board's track record with regard to unilateral board action on bylaw/charter amendments or other entrenchment provisions;
- > The company's ownership structure;
- > The company's existing governance provisions;
- > The timing of the board's amendment to the bylaws/charter in connection with a significant business development; and
- > Other factors, as deemed appropriate, that may be relevant to determine the impact of the amendment on shareholders.

Unless the adverse amendment is reversed or submitted to a binding shareholder vote, in subsequent years vote case-by-case on director nominees. Generally vote against (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the directors:

- > Classified the board;
- > Adopted supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter; or
- > Eliminated shareholders' ability to amend bylaws.

1.19. For newly public companies, generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if, prior to or in connection with the company's public offering, the company or its board adopted bylaw or charter provisions materially adverse to shareholder rights, or implemented a multi-class capital structure in which the classes have unequal voting rights considering the following factors:

- > The level of impairment of shareholders' rights;
- > The disclosed rationale;
- > The ability to change the governance structure (e.g., limitations on shareholders' right to amend the bylaws or charter, or supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter);
- > The ability of shareholders to hold directors accountable through annual director elections, or whether the company has a classified board structure;
- > Any reasonable sunset provision; and
- > Other relevant factors.

Unless the adverse provision and/or problematic capital structure is reversed or removed, vote case-by-case on director nominees in subsequent years.

Governance Failures

Under extraordinary circumstances, vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board, due to:

- 1.20. Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight³, or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
- 1.21. Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
- 1.22. Egregious actions related to a director's service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company.

2. Responsiveness

Vote case-by-case on individual directors, committee members, or the entire board of directors as appropriate if:

2.1. The board failed to act on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the shares cast in the previous year. Factors that will be considered are:

- > Disclosed outreach efforts by the board to shareholders in the wake of the vote;
- > Rationale provided in the proxy statement for the level of implementation;
- > The subject matter of the proposal;
- > The level of support for and opposition to the resolution in past meetings;
- > Actions taken by the board in response to the majority vote and its engagement with shareholders;
- > The continuation of the underlying issue as a voting item on the ballot (as either shareholder or management proposals); and
- > Other factors as appropriate.

2.2. The board failed to act on takeover offers where the majority of shares are tendered;

³ Examples of failure of risk oversight include, but are not limited to: bribery; large or serial fines or sanctions from regulatory bodies; significant adverse legal judgments or settlements; hedging of company stock; or significant pledging of company stock.

- 2.3. At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold/against votes of the shares cast and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the high withhold/against vote;
- 2.4. The board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received the majority of votes cast at the most recent shareholder meeting at which shareholders voted on the say-on-pay frequency; or
- 2.5. The board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received a plurality, but not a majority, of the votes cast at the most recent shareholder meeting at which shareholders voted on the say-on-pay frequency, taking into account:
- > The board's rationale for selecting a frequency that is different from the frequency that received a plurality;
 - > The company's ownership structure and vote results;
 - > ISS' analysis of whether there are compensation concerns or a history of problematic compensation practices; and
 - > The previous year's support level on the company's say-on-pay proposal.

3. Composition

Attendance at Board and Committee Meetings:

- 3.1. Generally vote against or withhold from directors (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case⁴) who attend less than 75 percent of the aggregate of their board and committee meetings for the period for which they served, unless an acceptable reason for absences is disclosed in the proxy or another SEC filing. Acceptable reasons for director absences are generally limited to the following:
- > Medical issues/illness;
 - > Family emergencies; and
 - > Missing only one meeting (when the total of all meetings is three or fewer).

3.2. If the proxy disclosure is unclear and insufficient to determine whether a director attended at least 75 percent of the aggregate of his/her board and committee meetings during his/her period of service, vote against or withhold from the director(s) in question.

Overboarded Directors:

Generally vote against or withhold from individual directors who:

- 3.3. Sit on more than five public company boards; or
- 3.4. Are CEOs of public companies who sit on the boards of more than two public companies besides their own— withhold only at their outside boards⁵.

4. Independence


⁴ For new nominees only, schedule conflicts due to commitments made prior to their appointment to the board are considered if disclosed in the proxy or another SEC filing.

⁵ Although all of a CEO's subsidiary boards will be counted as separate boards, ISS will not recommend a withhold vote for the CEO of a parent company board or any of the controlled (>50 percent ownership) subsidiaries of that parent, but may do so at subsidiaries that are less than 50 percent controlled and boards outside the parent/subsidiary relationships.

Vote against or withhold from Inside Directors and Affiliated Outside Directors (per the [Categorization of Directors](#)) when:

- 4.1. The inside or affiliated outside director serves on any of the three key committees: audit, compensation, or nominating;
- 4.2. The company lacks an audit, compensation, or nominating committee so that the full board functions as that committee;
- 4.3. The company lacks a formal nominating committee, even if the board attests that the independent directors fulfill the functions of such a committee; or
- 4.4. Independent directors make up less than a majority of the directors.

Independent Chair (Separate Chair/CEO)

 **General Recommendation:** Generally vote for shareholder proposals requiring that the chairman's position be filled by an independent director, taking into consideration the following:

- › The scope of the proposal;
- › The company's current board leadership structure;
- › The company's governance structure and practices;
- › Company performance; and
- › Any other relevant factors that may be applicable.

Regarding the scope of the proposal, consider whether the proposal is precatory or binding and whether the proposal is seeking an immediate change in the chairman role or the policy can be implemented at the next CEO transition.


Under the review of the company's board leadership structure, ISS may support the proposal under the following scenarios absent a compelling rationale: the presence of an executive or non-independent chair in addition to the CEO; a recent recombination of the role of CEO and chair; and/or departure from a structure with an independent chair. ISS will also consider any recent transitions in board leadership and the effect such transitions may have on independent board leadership as well as the designation of a lead director role.

When considering the governance structure, ISS will consider the overall independence of the board, the independence of key committees, the establishment of governance guidelines, board tenure and its relationship to CEO tenure, and any other factors that may be relevant. Any concerns about a company's governance structure will weigh in favor of support for the proposal.

The review of the company's governance practices may include, but is not limited to, poor compensation practices, material failures of governance and risk oversight, related-party transactions or other issues putting director independence at risk, corporate or management scandals, and actions by management or the board with potential or realized negative impact on shareholders. Any such practices may suggest a need for more independent oversight at the company thus warranting support of the proposal.

ISS' performance assessment will generally consider one-, three-, and five-year TSR compared to the company's peers and the market as a whole. While poor performance will weigh in favor of the adoption of an independent chair policy, strong performance over the long term will be considered a mitigating factor when determining whether the proposed leadership change warrants support.

Proxy Access


 **General Recommendation:** Generally vote for management and shareholder proposals for proxy access with the following provisions:

- › **Ownership threshold:** maximum requirement not more than three percent (3%) of the voting power;
- › **Ownership duration:** maximum requirement not longer than three (3) years of continuous ownership for each member of the nominating group;
- › **Aggregation:** minimal or no limits on the number of shareholders permitted to form a nominating group;
- › **Cap:** cap on nominees of generally twenty-five percent (25%) of the board.

Review for reasonableness any other restrictions on the right of proxy access.

Generally vote against proposals that are more restrictive than these guidelines.

Proxy Contests/Proxy Access — Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections

 **General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on the election of directors in contested elections, considering the following factors:


- › Long-term financial performance of the company relative to its industry;
- › Management's track record;
- › Background to the contested election;
- › Nominee qualifications and any compensatory arrangements;
- › Strategic plan of dissident slate and quality of the critique against management;
- › Likelihood that the proposed goals and objectives can be achieved (both slates); and
- › Stock ownership positions.

In the case of candidates nominated pursuant to proxy access, vote case-by-case considering any applicable factors listed above or additional factors which may be relevant, including those that are specific to the company, to the nominee(s) and/or to the nature of the election (such as whether or not there are more candidates than board seats).

CAPITAL/RESTRUCTURING

Capital

Common Stock Authorization

 **General Recommendation:** Vote for proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares where the primary purpose of the increase is to issue shares in connection with a transaction on the same ballot that warrants support.

Vote against proposals at companies with more than one class of common stock to increase the number of authorized shares of the class of common stock that has superior voting rights.

Vote against proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares if a vote for a reverse stock split on the same ballot is warranted despite the fact that the authorized shares would not be reduced proportionally.

Vote case-by-case on all other proposals to increase the number of shares of common stock authorized for issuance. Take into account company-specific factors that include, at a minimum, the following:

- › **Past Board Performance:**
 - › The company's use of authorized shares during the last three years;
- › **The Current Request:**

- › Disclosure in the proxy statement of the specific purposes of the proposed increase;
 - › Disclosure in the proxy statement of specific and severe risks to shareholders of not approving the request;
- and
- › The dilutive impact of the request as determined relative to an allowable increase calculated by ISS (typically 100 percent of existing authorized shares) that reflects the company's need for shares and total shareholder returns.

ISS will apply the relevant allowable increase below to requests to increase common stock that are for general corporate purposes (or to the general corporate purposes portion of a request that also includes a specific need):

- A. Most companies: **100 percent** of existing authorized shares.
- B. Companies with less than 50 percent of existing authorized shares either outstanding or reserved for issuance: **50 percent** of existing authorized shares.
- C. Companies with one- and three-year total shareholder returns (TSRs) in the bottom 10 percent of the U.S. market as of the end of the calendar quarter that is closest to their most recent fiscal year end: **50 percent** of existing authorized shares.
- D. Companies at which both conditions (B and C) above are both present: **25 percent** of existing authorized shares.

If there is an acquisition, private placement, or similar transaction on the ballot (not including equity incentive plans) that ISS is recommending FOR, the allowable increase will be the greater of (i) twice the amount needed to support the transactions on the ballot, and (ii) the allowable increase as calculated above.

Mergers and Acquisitions

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on mergers and acquisitions. Review and evaluate the merits and drawbacks of the proposed transaction, balancing various and sometimes countervailing factors including:

- › *Valuation* - Is the value to be received by the target shareholders (or paid by the acquirer) reasonable? While the fairness opinion may provide an initial starting point for assessing valuation reasonableness, emphasis is placed on the offer premium, market reaction, and strategic rationale.
- › *Market reaction* - How has the market responded to the proposed deal? A negative market reaction should cause closer scrutiny of a deal.
- › *Strategic rationale* - Does the deal make sense strategically? From where is the value derived? Cost and revenue synergies should not be overly aggressive or optimistic, but reasonably achievable. Management should also have a favorable track record of successful integration of historical acquisitions.
- › *Negotiations and process* - Were the terms of the transaction negotiated at arm's-length? Was the process fair and equitable? A fair process helps to ensure the best price for shareholders. Significant negotiation "wins" can also signify the deal makers' competency. The comprehensiveness of the sales process (e.g., full auction, partial auction, no auction) can also affect shareholder value.
- › *Conflicts of interest* - Are insiders benefiting from the transaction disproportionately and inappropriately as compared to non-insider shareholders? As the result of potential conflicts, the directors and officers of the company may be more likely to vote to approve a merger than if they did not hold these interests. Consider whether these interests may have influenced these directors and officers to support or recommend the merger. The CIC figure presented in the "ISS Transaction Summary" section of this report is an aggregate figure that can in certain cases be a misleading indicator of the true value transfer from shareholders to insiders. Where such figure appears to be excessive, analyze the underlying assumptions to determine whether a potential conflict exists.
- › *Governance* - Will the combined company have a better or worse governance profile than the current governance profiles of the respective parties to the transaction? If the governance profile is to change for the worse, the burden is on the company to prove that other issues (such as valuation) outweigh any deterioration in governance.


COMPENSATION

Executive Pay Evaluation

Underlying all evaluations are five global principles that most investors expect corporations to adhere to in designing and administering executive and director compensation programs:

1. Maintain appropriate pay-for-performance alignment, with emphasis on long-term shareholder value: This principle encompasses overall executive pay practices, which must be designed to attract, retain, and appropriately motivate the key employees who drive shareholder value creation over the long term. It will take into consideration, among other factors, the link between pay and performance; the mix between fixed and variable pay; performance goals; and equity-based plan costs;
2. Avoid arrangements that risk “pay for failure”: This principle addresses the appropriateness of long or indefinite contracts, excessive severance packages, and guaranteed compensation;
3. Maintain an independent and effective compensation committee: This principle promotes oversight of executive pay programs by directors with appropriate skills, knowledge, experience, and a sound process for compensation decision-making (*e.g.*, including access to independent expertise and advice when needed);
4. Provide shareholders with clear, comprehensive compensation disclosures: This principle underscores the importance of informative and timely disclosures that enable shareholders to evaluate executive pay practices fully and fairly;
5. Avoid inappropriate pay to non-executive directors: This principle recognizes the interests of shareholders in ensuring that compensation to outside directors does not compromise their independence and ability to make appropriate judgments in overseeing managers’ pay and performance. At the market level, it may incorporate a variety of generally accepted best practices.

Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation—Management Proposals (Management Say-on-Pay)

 **General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on ballot items related to executive pay and practices, as well as certain aspects of outside director compensation.

Vote against Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation (Management Say-on-Pay or “MSOP”) if:

- › There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance ([pay for performance](#));
- › The company maintains significant [problematic pay practices](#);
- › The board exhibits a significant level of [poor communication and responsiveness](#) to shareholders.

Vote against or withhold from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- › There is no MSOP on the ballot, and an against vote on an MSOP is warranted due to pay-for-performance misalignment, problematic pay practices, or the lack of adequate responsiveness on compensation issues raised previously, or a combination thereof;
- › The board fails to respond adequately to a previous MSOP proposal that received less than 70 percent support of votes cast;
- › The company has recently practiced or approved problematic pay practices, including option repricing or option backdating; or
- › The situation is egregious.

Primary Evaluation Factors for Executive Pay

Pay-for-Performance Evaluation

ISS annually conducts a pay-for-performance analysis to identify strong or satisfactory alignment between pay and performance over a sustained period. With respect to companies in the Russell 3000 or Russell 3000E Indices⁶, this analysis considers the following:

1. Peer Group⁷ Alignment:
 - › The degree of alignment between the company's annualized TSR rank and the CEO's annualized total pay rank within a peer group, each measured over a three-year period.
 - › The multiple of the CEO's total pay relative to the peer group median.
2. Absolute Alignment⁸ – the absolute alignment between the trend in CEO pay and company TSR over the prior five fiscal years – i.e., the difference between the trend in annual pay changes and the trend in annualized TSR during the period.

If the above analysis demonstrates significant unsatisfactory long-term pay-for-performance alignment or, in the case of companies outside the Russell indices, misaligned pay and performance are otherwise suggested, our analysis may include any of the following qualitative factors, as relevant to evaluating how various pay elements may work to encourage or to undermine long-term value creation and alignment with shareholder interests:

- › The ratio of performance- to time-based equity awards;
- › The overall ratio of performance-based compensation;
- › The completeness of disclosure and rigor of performance goals;
- › The company's peer group benchmarking practices;
- › Actual results of financial/operational metrics, such as growth in revenue, profit, cash flow, etc., both absolute and relative to peers;
- › Special circumstances related to, for example, a new CEO in the prior FY or anomalous equity grant practices (e.g., bi-annual awards);
- › Realizable pay⁹ compared to grant pay; and
- › Any other factors deemed relevant.

Problematic Pay Practices

The focus is on executive compensation practices that contravene the global pay principles, including:

- › Problematic practices related to non-performance-based compensation elements;
- › Incentives that may motivate excessive risk-taking; and
- › Options backdating.

Problematic Pay Practices related to Non-Performance-Based Compensation Elements

⁶ The [Russell 3000E](#) Index includes approximately 4,000 of the largest U.S. equity securities.

⁷ The revised peer group is generally comprised of 14-24 companies that are selected using market cap, revenue (or assets for certain financial firms), GICS industry group, and company's selected peers' GICS industry group, with size constraints, via a process designed to select peers that are comparable to the subject company in terms of revenue/assets and industry, and also within a market-cap bucket that is reflective of the company's. For Oil, Gas & Consumable Fuels companies, market cap is the only size determinant.

⁸ Only Russell 3000 Index companies are subject to the Absolute Alignment analysis.

⁹ ISS research reports include realizable pay for S&P1500 companies.

Pay elements that are not directly based on performance are generally evaluated case-by-case considering the context of a company's overall pay program and demonstrated pay-for-performance philosophy. Please refer to ISS' Compensation FAQ document for detail on specific pay practices that have been identified as potentially problematic and may lead to negative recommendations if they are deemed to be inappropriate or unjustified relative to executive pay best practices. The list below highlights the problematic practices that carry significant weight in this overall consideration and may result in adverse vote recommendations:

- › Repricing or replacing of underwater stock options/SARS without prior shareholder approval (including cash buyouts and voluntary surrender of underwater options);
- › Excessive perquisites or tax gross-ups, including any gross-up related to a secular trust or restricted stock vesting;
- › New or extended agreements that provide for:
 - › CIC payments exceeding 3 times base salary and average/target/most recent bonus;
 - › CIC severance payments without involuntary job loss or substantial diminution of duties ("single" or "modified single" triggers);
 - › CIC payments with excise tax gross-ups (including "modified" gross-ups);
- › Insufficient executive compensation disclosure by externally-managed issuers (EMIs) such that a reasonable assessment of pay programs and practices applicable to the EMI's executives is not possible.

Incentives that may Motivate Excessive Risk-Taking

- › Multi-year guaranteed bonuses;
- › A single or common performance metric used for short- and long-term plans;
- › Lucrative severance packages;
- › High pay opportunities relative to industry peers;
- › Disproportionate supplemental pensions; or
- › Mega annual equity grants that provide unlimited upside with no downside risk.

Factors that potentially mitigate the impact of risky incentives include rigorous claw-back provisions and robust stock ownership/holding guidelines.

Options Backdating

The following factors should be examined case-by-case to allow for distinctions to be made between "sloppy" plan administration versus deliberate action or fraud:

- › Reason and motive for the options backdating issue, such as inadvertent vs. deliberate grant date changes;
- › Duration of options backdating;
- › Size of restatement due to options backdating;
- › Corrective actions taken by the board or compensation committee, such as canceling or re-pricing backdated options, the recouping of option gains on backdated grants; and
- › Adoption of a grant policy that prohibits backdating, and creates a fixed grant schedule or window period for equity grants in the future.

Compensation Committee Communications and Responsiveness

Consider the following factors case-by-case when evaluating ballot items related to executive pay on the board's responsiveness to investor input and engagement on compensation issues:

- › Failure to respond to majority-supported shareholder proposals on executive pay topics; or

- › Failure to adequately respond to the company's previous say-on-pay proposal that received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast, taking into account:
 - › The company's response, including:
 - › Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors regarding the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
 - › Specific actions taken to address the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
 - › Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
 - › Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
 - › The company's ownership structure; and
 - › Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.

Frequency of Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation ("Say When on Pay")

- ▶ **General Recommendation:** Vote for annual advisory votes on compensation, which provide the most consistent and clear communication channel for shareholder concerns about companies' executive pay programs.

Equity-Based and Other Incentive Plans

- ▶ **General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on certain equity-based compensation plans¹⁰ depending on a combination of certain plan features and equity grant practices, where positive factors may counterbalance negative factors, and vice versa, as evaluated using an "equity plan scorecard" (EPSC) approach with three pillars:

- › **Plan Cost:** The total estimated cost of the company's equity plans relative to industry/market cap peers, measured by the company's estimated Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT) in relation to peers and considering both:
 - › SVT based on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants, plus outstanding unvested/unexercised grants; and
 - › SVT based only on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants.
- › **Plan Features:**
 - › Automatic single-triggered award vesting upon a change in control (CIC);
 - › Discretionary vesting authority;
 - › Liberal share recycling on various award types;
 - › Lack of minimum vesting period for grants made under the plan;
 - › Dividends payable prior to award vesting.
- › **Grant Practices:**
 - › The company's three-year burn rate relative to its industry/market cap peers;
 - › Vesting requirements in most recent CEO equity grants (3-year look-back);
 - › The estimated duration of the plan (based on the sum of shares remaining available and the new shares requested, divided by the average annual shares granted in the prior three years);
 - › The proportion of the CEO's most recent equity grants/awards subject to performance conditions;
 - › Whether the company maintains a claw-back policy;
 - › Whether the company has established post-exercise/vesting share-holding requirements.

¹⁰ Proposals evaluated under the EPSC policy generally include those to approve or amend (1) stock option plans for employees and/or employees and directors, (2) restricted stock plans for employees and/or employees and directors, and (3) omnibus stock incentive plans for employees and/or employees and directors; amended plans will be further evaluated case-by-case.

Generally vote against the plan proposal if the combination of above factors indicates that the plan is not, overall, in shareholders' interests, or if any of the following egregious factors apply:

- › Awards may vest in connection with a liberal change-of-control definition;
- › The plan would permit repricing or cash buyout of underwater options without shareholder approval (either by expressly permitting it – for NYSE and Nasdaq listed companies – or by not prohibiting it when the company has a history of repricing – for non-listed companies);
- › The plan is a vehicle for problematic pay practices or a significant pay-for-performance disconnect under certain circumstances; or
- › Any other plan features are determined to have a significant negative impact on shareholder interests.

SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Global Approach

Issues covered under the policy include a wide range of topics, including consumer and product safety, environment and energy, labor standards and human rights, workplace and board diversity, and corporate political issues. While a variety of factors goes into each analysis, the overall principle guiding all vote recommendations focuses on how the proposal may enhance or protect shareholder value in either the short or long term.

General Recommendation: Generally vote case-by-case, taking into consideration whether implementation of the proposal is likely to enhance or protect shareholder value, and in addition the following will also be considered:

- › If the issues presented in the proposal are more appropriately or effectively dealt with through legislation or government regulation;
- › If the company has already responded in an appropriate and sufficient manner to the issue(s) raised in the proposal;
- › Whether the proposal's request is unduly burdensome (scope or timeframe) or overly prescriptive;
- › The company's approach compared with any industry standard practices for addressing the issue(s) raised by the proposal;
- › If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not reasonable and sufficient information is currently available to shareholders from the company or from other publicly available sources; and
- › If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not implementation would reveal proprietary or confidential information that could place the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Pharmaceutical Pricing, Access to Medicines, and Prescription Drug Reimportation

General Recommendation: Generally vote against proposals requesting that companies implement specific price restraints on pharmaceutical products unless the company fails to adhere to legislative guidelines or industry norms in its product pricing practices.

Vote case-by-case on proposals requesting that a company report on its product pricing or access to medicine policies, considering:

- › The potential for reputational, market, and regulatory risk exposure;
- › Existing disclosure of relevant policies;
- › Deviation from established industry norms;
- › Relevant company initiatives to provide research and/or products to disadvantaged consumers;
- › Whether the proposal focuses on specific products or geographic regions;

- › The potential burden and scope of the requested report;
- › Recent significant controversies, litigation, or fines at the company.

Generally vote for proposals requesting that a company report on the financial and legal impact of its prescription drug reimportation policies unless such information is already publicly disclosed.

Generally vote against proposals requesting that companies adopt specific policies to encourage or constrain prescription drug reimportation. Such matters are more appropriately the province of legislative activity and may place the company at a competitive disadvantage relative to its peers.

Climate Change/Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

General Recommendation: Generally vote for resolutions requesting that a company disclose information on the risks related to climate change on its operations and investments, such as financial, physical, or regulatory risks, considering:

- › Whether the company already provides current, publicly-available information on the impact that climate change may have on the company as well as associated company policies and procedures to address related risks and/or opportunities;
- › The company's level of disclosure is at least comparable to that of industry peers; and
- › There are no significant controversies, fines, penalties, or litigation associated with the company's environmental performance.

Generally vote for proposals requesting a report on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from company operations and/or products and operations, unless:

- › The company already discloses current, publicly-available information on the impacts that GHG emissions may have on the company as well as associated company policies and procedures to address related risks and/or opportunities;
- › The company's level of disclosure is comparable to that of industry peers; and
- › There are no significant, controversies, fines, penalties, or litigation associated with the company's GHG emissions.

Vote case-by-case on proposals that call for the adoption of GHG reduction goals from products and operations, taking into account:

- › Whether the company provides disclosure of year-over-year GHG emissions performance data;
- › Whether company disclosure lags behind industry peers;
- › The company's actual GHG emissions performance;
- › The company's current GHG emission policies, oversight mechanisms, and related initiatives; and
- › Whether the company has been the subject of recent, significant violations, fines, litigation, or controversy related to GHG emissions.

Board Diversity

General Recommendation: Generally vote for requests for reports on a company's efforts to diversify the board, unless:

- › The gender and racial minority representation of the company's board is reasonably inclusive in relation to companies of similar size and business; and
- › The board already reports on its nominating procedures and gender and racial minority initiatives on the board and within the company.

Vote case-by-case on proposals asking a company to increase the gender and racial minority representation on its board, taking into account:

- › The degree of existing gender and racial minority diversity on the company's board and among its executive officers;
- › The level of gender and racial minority representation that exists at the company's industry peers;
- › The company's established process for addressing gender and racial minority board representation;
- › Whether the proposal includes an overly prescriptive request to amend nominating committee charter language;
- › The independence of the company's nominating committee;
- › Whether the company uses an outside search firm to identify potential director nominees; and
- › Whether the company has had recent controversies, fines, or litigation regarding equal employment practices.

This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, and charts (collectively, the "Information") is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), its subsidiaries, or, in some cases third party suppliers.

The Information has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), or a promotion or recommendation of, any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy, and ISS does not endorse, approve, or otherwise express any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information.

ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY, AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by law, in no event shall ISS have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits), or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited.

The Global Leader In Corporate Governance

www.issgovernance.com



United States

2017 Taft-Hartley Proxy Voting Guidelines

Executive Summary



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	5
Board Independence.....	5
Board Competence	5
Board Accountability.....	5
Board Responsiveness	9
Proxy Contests/Proxy Access — Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections.....	10
Independent Directors.....	10
Non-independent Chairperson	10
Board Structure.....	11
Board and Committee Size.....	11
Majority Threshold Voting Requirement for Director Elections	12
Cumulative Voting.....	12
Shareholder Access to the Proxy	12
Poison Pills	13
CAPITAL STRUCTURE	14
Increase Authorized Common Stock.....	14
Stock Distributions: Splits and Dividends.....	14
Reverse Stock Splits	14
Dual Class Structures.....	14
Preemptive Rights.....	15
Preferred Stock Authorization	15
AUDITOR RATIFICATION.....	16
Auditor Independence	16
Disclosures Under Section 404 of Sarbanes-Oxley Act	16
MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, AND TRANSACTIONS.....	17
Mergers and Acquisitions	17
Reincorporation	17
EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION	18
Stock Option Plans	18
Problematic Compensation Practices	18
Proposals to Limit Executive and Director Pay.....	18
Golden Parachutes.....	19
Options Backdating	19
Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation – Management Say-on-Pay Proposals.....	19
Frequency of Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation – Management Say on Pay.....	20
SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	21
CERES Principles.....	21
Corporate and Supplier Codes of Conduct.....	21
Political Contributions, Lobbying Reporting & Disclosure	22
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	22

Sustainability Reporting and Planning	22
Hydraulic Fracturing.....	23
Water Use	23
Workplace Safety	23



INTRODUCTION

The proxy voting policy of ISS' Taft-Hartley Advisory Services is based upon the AFL-CIO Proxy Voting Guidelines, which comply with all the fiduciary standards delineated by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Taft-Hartley client accounts are governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA). ERISA sets forth the tenets under which pension fund assets must be managed and invested. Proxy voting rights have been declared by the Department of Labor to be valuable plan assets and therefore must be exercised in accordance with the fiduciary duties of loyalty and prudence. The duty of loyalty requires that the voting fiduciary exercise proxy voting authority solely in the economic interest of participants and plan beneficiaries. The duty of prudence requires that decisions be made based on financial criteria and that a clear process exists for evaluating proxy issues.

The Taft-Hartley Advisory Services voting policy was carefully crafted to meet those requirements by promoting long-term shareholder value, emphasizing the "economic best interests" of plan participants and beneficiaries. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will assess the short-term and long-term impact of a vote and will promote a position that is consistent with the long-term economic best interests of plan members embodied in the principle of a "worker-owner view of value."

The Taft-Hartley Advisory Services guidelines address a broad range of issues, including election of directors, executive compensation, proxy contests, auditor ratification, and tender offer defenses – all significant voting items that affect long-term shareholder value. In addition, these guidelines delve deeper into workplace issues that may have an impact on corporate performance, including:

- Corporate policies that affect job security and wage levels;
- Corporate policies that affect local economic development and stability;
- Corporate responsibility to employees, communities and the environment; and
- Workplace safety and health issues.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services shall analyze each proxy on a case-by-case basis, informed by the guidelines outlined in the following pages. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services does not intend for these guidelines to be exhaustive. It is neither practical nor productive to fashion voting guidelines and policies which attempt to address every eventuality. Rather, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services' guidelines are intended to cover the most significant and frequent proxy issues that arise. Issues not covered by the guidelines shall be voted in the interest of plan participants and beneficiaries of the plan based on a worker-owner view of long-term corporate value. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services shall revise its guidelines as events warrant and will remain in full conformity with the AFL-CIO proxy voting policy.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Electing directors is the single most important stock ownership right that shareholders can exercise. The board of directors is responsible for holding management accountable to performance standards on behalf of the shareholders. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services holds directors to a high standard when voting on their election, qualifications, and compensation.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Votes on individual director nominees are always made on a case-by-case basis. Specific director nominee withhold/against votes can be triggered by one or more of the following factors:

Board Independence

Without independence from management, the board and/or its committees may be unwilling or unable to effectively set company strategy and scrutinize performance or executive compensation.

- › Lack of board and key board committee independence (fully independent audit, compensation, and nominating committees);
- › Lack of a board that is at least two-thirds (67 percent) independent – i.e. where the composition of non-independent board members is in excess of 33 percent of the entire board;
- › Lack of an independent board chair;
- › Lack of independence on key board committees (i.e. audit, compensation, and nominating committees); or
- › Failure to establish any key board committees (i.e. audit, compensation, or nominating).

Board Competence

Companies should seek a diverse board of directors who can add value to the board through specific skills or expertise and who can devote sufficient time and commitment to serve effectively. While directors should not be constrained by arbitrary limits such as age or term limits, directors who are unable to attend board and committee meetings and/or who are overextended (i.e. serving on too many boards) raise concern on the director's ability to effectively serve in shareholders' best interests.

- › Attendance of director nominees at board meetings of less than 75 percent in one year without valid reason or explanation; or
- › Directors serving on an excessive number of other boards which could compromise their primary duties of care and loyalty.

Board Accountability

Practices that promote accountability include; transparency into a company's governance practices, annual board elections, and providing shareholders the ability to remove problematic directors and to vote on takeover defenses or other charter/bylaw amendments. These practices help reduce the opportunity for management entrenchment.

▶ **Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:** Vote against or withhold from the entire board of directors, (except new nominees, who should be considered on a case-by-case basis) if:

Problematic Takeover Defenses

- › The board lacks accountability and oversight due to the presence of problematic governance provisions, coupled with long-term poor corporate performance relative to peers;
- › If the company has a classified board and a continuing director is responsible for a problematic governance issue at the board/committee level that would warrant a withhold/against vote, in addition to potential future withhold/against votes on that director, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services may recommend votes against or withhold votes from any or all of the nominees up for election, with the exception of new nominees;
- › The company's poison pill has a "dead-hand" or "modified dead-hand" feature; or
- › The board adopts a pill or makes a material adverse change to an existing pill without shareholder approval.

Restriction of Binding Shareholder Proposals:

▶ **Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:** Vote against or withhold from members of the governance committee if:

- › The company's charter or articles of incorporation impose undue restrictions on shareholders' ability to amend the bylaws. Such restrictions include, but are not limited to: outright prohibition on the submission of binding shareholder proposals, or share ownership requirements or time holding requirements in excess of SEC Rule 14a-8. Vote against on an ongoing basis.

Problematic Compensation Practices/Pay-for-Performance Misalignment

Performance of compensation committee members and/or the entire board in relation to the approval of egregious or excessive executive compensation (including perquisites and cash or equity awards).

▶ **Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:** Vote against or withhold votes from members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- › There is a misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (see Pay-for-Performance policy);
- › The company maintains problematic pay practices including options backdating, excessive perks and overly generous employment contracts etc.;
- › The company fails to submit one-time transfers of stock options to a shareholder vote;
- › The company fails to fulfill the terms of a burn rate commitment they made to shareholders; or
- › There is evidence that management/board members are using company stock in hedging activities.

Vote case-by-case on Compensation Committee members (or, potentially, the full board) and the Management Say-on-Pay proposal if:

- › The company's previous say-on-pay proposal received low levels of investor support, taking into account:
- › The company's response, including: a) disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors regarding the issues that contributed to the low level of support; b) specific actions taken to address the issues that contributed to the low level of support; c) other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
- › Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
- › The company's ownership structure; and

- › Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.

Problematic Audit-Related Practices

Performance of audit committee members concerning the approval of excessive non-audit fees, material weaknesses, and/or the lack of auditor ratification upon the proxy ballot

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Vote against or withhold votes from the members of the Audit Committee when:

- › Consulting (i.e. non-audit) fees paid to the auditor are excessive;
- › Auditor ratification is not included on the proxy ballot;
- › The company receives an adverse opinion on the company's financial statements from its auditor;
- › There is evidence that the audit committee entered into an inappropriate indemnification agreement with its auditor that limits the ability of the company, or its shareholders, to pursue legitimate legal recourse against the audit firm; or
- › Poor accounting practices such as: fraud; misapplication of GAAP; and material weaknesses identified in Section 404 disclosures, exist. Poor accounting practices may warrant voting against or withholding votes from the full board.

Unilateral Bylaw/ Charter Amendments and Problematic Capital Structures

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the board amends the company's bylaws or charter without shareholder approval in a manner that materially diminishes shareholders' rights or that could adversely impact shareholders, considering the following factors:

- › The board's rationale for adopting the bylaw/charter amendment without shareholder ratification;
- › Disclosure by the company of any significant engagement with shareholders regarding the amendment;
- › The level of impairment of shareholders' rights caused by the board's unilateral amendment to the bylaws/charter;
- › The board's track record with regard to unilateral board action on bylaw/charter amendments or other entrenchment provisions;
- › The company's ownership structure;
- › The company's existing governance provisions;
- › The timing of the board's amendment to the bylaws/charter in connection with a significant business development; and
- › Other factors, as deemed appropriate, that may be relevant to determine the impact of the amendment on shareholders.

Unless the adverse amendment is reversed or submitted to a binding shareholder vote, in subsequent years vote case-by-case on director nominees. Generally vote against (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the directors:

- › Classified the board;
- › Adopted supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter; or
- › Eliminated shareholders' ability to amend bylaws.

For newly public companies, generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if, prior to or in connection with

the company's public offering, the company or its board adopted bylaw or charter provisions materially adverse to shareholder rights, or implemented a multi-class capital structure in which the classes have unequal voting rights considering the following factors:

- › The level of impairment of shareholders' rights;
- › The disclosed rationale;
- › The ability to change the governance structure (e.g., limitations on shareholders' right to amend the bylaws or charter, or supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter);
- › The ability of shareholders to hold directors accountable through annual director elections, or whether the company has a classified board structure;
- › Any reasonable sunset provision; and
- › Other relevant factors.

Unless the adverse provision and/or problematic capital structure is reversed or removed, vote case-by-case on director nominees in subsequent years.

Governance Failures

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Under extraordinary circumstances, vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board, due to:

- › The presence of problematic governance practices including interlocking directorships, multiple related-party transactions, excessive risk-taking, imprudent use of corporate assets, etc.;
- › Inadequate CEO succession planning, including the absence of an emergency and non-emergency/orderly CEO succession plan;
- › Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight¹, or fiduciary responsibilities at the company, failure to replace management as appropriate, flagrant or egregious actions related to the director(s)' service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company;
- › Chapter 7 bankruptcy, Securities & Exchange Commission (SEC) violations or fines, and criminal investigations by the Department of Justice (DOJ), Government Accounting Office (GAO) or any other federal agency.

Director Performance Evaluation

Many institutional investors believe long-term financial performance and the appropriateness of governance practices should be taken into consideration when determining vote recommendations with regard to directors in uncontested elections. When evaluating whether to vote against or withhold votes from director nominees, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will evaluate underperforming companies that exhibit sustained poor performance as measured by total returns to shareholders over a one- and three-year period.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services views deficient oversight mechanisms and the lack of board accountability to shareholders especially in the context of sustained poor performance, as problematic. As part of the framework for assessing director performance, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will also evaluate board accountability and oversight at companies that demonstrate sustained underperformance. A governance structure that discourages director accountability may lead to board and management entrenchment. For example, the existence of several anti-takeover provisions* has the cumulative

¹ Examples of failure of risk oversight include, but are not limited to: bribery; large or serial fines or sanctions from regulatory bodies; significant adverse legal judgments or settlements; hedging of company stock; or significant pledging of company stock.

effect of deterring legitimate tender offers, mergers, and corporate transactions that may have ultimately proved beneficial to shareholders. When a company maintains entrenchment devices, shareholders of poorly performing companies are left with few effective routes to beneficial change.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will assess the company's response to the ongoing performance issues, and consider recent board and management changes, board independence, overall governance practices, and other factors that may have an impact on shareholders. If a company exhibits sustained poor performance coupled with a lack of board accountability and oversight, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services may also consider the company's five-year total shareholder return and five-year operational metrics.

*Problematic provisions include but are not limited to:

- › A classified board structure;
- › A supermajority vote requirement;
- › Either a plurality vote standard in uncontested director elections or a majority vote standard with no plurality carve-out for contested elections;
- › The inability for shareholders to call special meetings;
- › The inability for shareholders to act by written consent;
- › A dual-class structure; and/or
- › A non-shareholder approved poison pill.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Vote against or withhold votes from all director nominees if the board lacks accountability and oversight, coupled with sustained poor performance relative to peers. Sustained poor performance is measured by one- and three-year total shareholder returns in the bottom half of a company's four-digit GICS industry group (Russell 3000 companies only).

Board Responsiveness

Directors should be responsive to shareholders, particularly in regard to shareholder proposals that receive a majority vote and to tender offers where a majority of shares are tendered. Boards should also be sufficiently responsive to high against/withhold votes on directors. Furthermore, shareholders should expect directors to devote sufficient time and resources to oversight of the company. Vote against or withhold votes from individual directors, committee members, or the entire board as appropriate if:

- › At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold/against votes of the shares cast and the company has failed to address the underlying issue(s) that caused the high withhold/against votes;
- › The board failed to act on takeover offers where the majority of the shareholders tendered their shares;
- › The board failed to act on a shareholder proposal that received approval by a majority of the shares cast the previous year; or
- › The board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received the majority of votes cast at the most recent shareholder meeting at which shareholders voted on the say-on-pay frequency.

Proxy Contests/Proxy Access — Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections

Contested elections of directors frequently occur when a board candidate or “dissident slate” seeks election for the purpose of achieving a significant change in corporate policy or control of seats on the board. Competing slates will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis with a number of considerations in mind. These include, but are not limited to, the following: personal qualifications of each candidate; the economic impact of the policies advanced by the dissident slate of nominees; and their expressed and demonstrated commitment to the interests of the shareholders of the company.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Votes in a contested election of directors are evaluated on a case-by-case basis with the following seven factors in consideration:

- › Long-term financial performance of the company relative to its industry;
- › Management’s track record;
- › Background to the contested election;
- › Nominee qualifications and any compensatory arrangements;
- › Strategic plan of dissident slate and quality of critique against management;
- › Likelihood that the proposed goals and objectives can be achieved (both slates);
- › Stock ownership positions.

In the case of candidates nominated pursuant to proxy access, vote case-by-case considering any applicable factors listed above or additional factors which may be relevant, including those that are specific to the company, to the nominee(s) and/or to the nature of the election (such as whether or not there are more candidates than board seats).

Independent Directors

Board independence from management is of vital importance to a company and its shareholders. Accordingly, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services believes votes should be cast in a manner that will encourage the independence of boards. Independence will be evaluated based upon a number of factors, including: employment by the company or an affiliate in an executive capacity; past or current employment by a firm that is one of the company’s paid advisors or consultants; a personal services contract with the company; family relationships of an executive or director of the company; interlocks with other companies on which the company’s chairman or chief executive officer is also a board member; and service with a non-profit organization that receives significant contributions from the company.

Non-independent Chairperson

Two major components at the top of every public company are the running of the board and the executive responsibility for the running of the company’s business. Many institutional investors believe there should be a clear division of responsibilities at the head of the company that will ensure a balance of power and authority, such that no one individual has unfettered powers of decision. When there is no clear division between the executive and board branches of a company, poor executive and/or board actions often go unchecked to the ultimate detriment of shareholders. Since executive compensation is so heavily correlated to the managerial power relationship in the boardroom, the separation of the CEO and chairman positions is a critical step in curtailing excessive pay, which ultimately can become a drain on shareholder value.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:

- › Generally vote against or withhold votes from any non-independent director who serves as board chairman.
- › Generally vote against or withhold votes from a CEO who is also serving in the role of chairman at the same company.
- › Generally support shareholder proposals calling for the separation of the CEO and chairman positions.
- › Generally support shareholder proposals calling for a non-executive director to serve as chairman who is not a former CEO or senior-level executive of the company.

Board Structure

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports the principle that all directors should be accountable to shareholder vote on an annual basis. A classified board is a board divided into separate classes (typically three), with only one class of nominees coming up to vote at the annual meeting each year. As a result, shareholders are only able to vote a single director approximately once every three years. A classified board makes it difficult to change control of the board through a proxy contest because typically only one-third of the seats will be at stake. Classified boards can also reduce director accountability by insulating directors, at least for a certain period of time, from the consequences of their actions. Continuing directors who are responsible for a problematic governance issue at the board/committee level would avoid shareholders' reactions to their actions because they would not be up for election in that year. In these cases, the full board should be responsible for the actions of its directors.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:

- › Vote against management or shareholder proposals seeking to classify the board when the issue comes up for vote.
- › Vote for management or shareholder proposals to repeal a company's classified board structure.
- › If the company has a classified board and a continuing director is responsible for a problematic governance issue at the board/committee level that would warrant a withhold/against vote, in addition to potential future withhold/against votes on that director, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services may vote against or withhold votes from any or all of the nominees up for election, with the exception of new nominees.

Board and Committee Size

While there is no hard and fast rule among institutional investors as to what may be an optimal board size, there is an acceptable range that companies should strive to meet and not exceed. A board that is too large may function inefficiently. Conversely, a board that is too small may allow the CEO to exert disproportionate influence or may stretch the time requirements of individual directors too thin.

Proposals seeking to set board size will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Given that the preponderance of boards in the U.S. range between five and fifteen directors, many institutional investors believe this benchmark is a useful standard for evaluating such proposals.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:

- › Generally vote against any proposal seeking to amend the company's board size to fewer than five seats.
- › Generally vote against any proposal seeking to amend the company's board size to more than fifteen seats;
- › Evaluate board size on a case-by-case basis and consider withhold or against votes or other action at companies that have fewer than five directors and more than 15 directors on their board.

Majority Threshold Voting Requirement for Director Elections

Taft-Hartley fiduciaries believe shareholders should have a greater voice in regard to the election of directors and view majority threshold voting as a viable alternative to the current deficiencies of the plurality system in the U.S. Shareholders have expressed strong support for resolutions on majority threshold voting. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports proposals calling for directors to be elected with an affirmative majority of votes cast and/or the elimination of the plurality standard for electing directors, provided the proposal includes a carve-out for a plurality voting standard in contested director elections.

Cumulative Voting

Under a cumulative voting scheme, shareholders are permitted to have one vote per share for each director to be elected and may apportion these votes among the director candidates in any manner they wish. This voting method allows minority shareholders to influence the outcome of director contests by “cumulating” their votes for one nominee, thereby creating a measure of independence from management control.

With the advent and prevalence of majority voting for director elections, shareholders now have greater flexibility in supporting candidates for a company’s board of directors. Cumulative voting and majority voting can work together operationally, with companies electing to use majority voting for uncontested elections and cumulative voting for contested elections to increase accountability and ensure minority representation on the board. In contested elections, similar to cumulative voting, proxy access allows shareholder access to the ballot without a veto from the nominating committee, but unlike cumulative voting, it also requires majority support to elect such directors.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services recommends votes against proposals to eliminate cumulative voting, and votes for proposals to allow cumulative voting unless: 1) The company has adopted a majority vote standard, with a carve-out for plurality voting in contested board elections, and a director resignation policy to address failed elections; and 2) company has proxy access thereby allowing shareholders to nominate directors to the company’s ballot.

Shareholder Access to the Proxy

Many investors view proxy access as an important shareholder right, one that is complementary to other best-practice corporate governance features. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services is generally supportive of reasonably crafted shareholder proposals advocating for the ability of long-term shareholders to cost-effectively nominate director candidates that represent their interests on management’s proxy card. Shareholder proposals that have the potential to result in abuse of the proxy access right by way of facilitating hostile takeovers will generally not be supported.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on proposals to provide shareholders the ability to nominate director candidates to be included on management’s proxy card, taking into account, among other factors:

- › Company-specific factors including:
 - › Responsiveness to shareholders (e.g. failing to implement majority-supported shareholder proposals);
 - › Board and key committee independence;
 - › Problematic governance and compensation practices; and
 - › Past accounting or financial issues such as restatements.
- › Proposal-specific factors, including:
 - › The ownership thresholds proposed in the resolution (i.e., percentage and duration);
 - › The maximum proportion of directors that shareholders may nominate each year; and
 - › The method of determining which nominations should appear on the ballot if multiple shareholders submit nominations.

Poison Pills

Shareholder rights plans, more commonly known as poison pills, are warrants issued to shareholders allowing them to purchase shares from the company at a price far below market value when a certain ownership threshold has been reached, thereby effectively preventing a takeover. Poison pills can entrench management and give the board veto power over takeover bids, thereby altering the balance of power between shareholders and management. While poison pills are evaluated on a case-by-case basis depending on a company's particular set of circumstances, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services generally recommends votes for proposals to submit a company's poison pill to shareholder vote and/or eliminate or redeem poison pills. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote against or withhold votes from boards where a dead-hand poison pill provision is in place. From a shareholder perspective, there is no justification for a dead-hand provision.

CAPITAL STRUCTURE

Increase Authorized Common Stock

Corporations seek shareholder approval to increase their supply of common stock for a variety of business reasons. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote for proposals to increase authorized common stock when management has provided a specific justification for the increase, evaluating proposals on a case-by-case basis. An increase of up to 50 percent is enough to allow a company to meet its capital needs. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote against proposals to increase an authorization by more than 50 percent unless management provides compelling reasons for the increase.

Stock Distributions: Splits and Dividends

Stock splits/dividends involve the partitioning of the outstanding shares of a corporation into a larger number of shares, while proportionately decreasing the market price of the stock. Stock splits/dividends do not affect the equity of the company. An understanding of forward and reverse stock splits and stock dividends is relevant because proposals to increase authorized common shares may be tied to the implementation of a planned stock distribution.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services' generally recommends support for management proposals to increase the common share authorization for stock split or stock dividend, provided that the increase in authorized shares is reasonable in accordance with Taft-Hartley Advisory Services' Common Stock Authorization policy.

Reverse Stock Splits

Reverse splits exchange multiple shares for a lesser amount to increase share price. Evaluation of management proposals to implement a reverse stock split will take into account whether there is a corresponding proportional decrease in authorized shares. Without a corresponding decrease, a reverse stock split is effectively an increase in authorized shares by way of reducing the number of shares outstanding, while leaving the number of authorized shares to be issued at the pre-split level. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services also considers if the reverse stock split is necessary to maintain listing of a company's stock on the national stock exchanges.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services generally supports a reverse stock split if the number of authorized shares will be reduced proportionately. When there is not a proportionate reduction of authorized shares, Taft-Hartley trustees should oppose such proposals unless a stock exchange has provided notice to the company of a potential delisting.

Dual Class Structures

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services does not support dual share class structures. Incumbent management can use a dual class structure to gain unequal voting rights. A separate class of shares with superior voting rights can allow management to concentrate its power and insulate itself from the majority of its shareholders. An additional drawback is the added cost and complication of maintaining the two class system. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote for a one share, one vote capital structure, and a vote against the creation or continuation of dual class structures.

Preemptive Rights

Preemptive rights permit shareholders to share proportionately in any new issues of stock of the same class. These rights guarantee existing shareholders the first opportunity to purchase shares of new issues of stock in the same class as their own and in the same proportion. The absence of these rights could cause stockholders' interest in a company to be reduced by the sale of additional shares without their knowledge and at prices unfavorable to them. Preemptive rights, however, can make it difficult for corporations to issue large blocks of stock for general corporate purposes. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services reviews proposals to create or abolish preemptive rights on a case-by-case basis.

Preferred Stock Authorization

Preferred stock is an equity security which has certain features similar to debt instruments- such as fixed dividend payments and seniority of claims to common stock - and usually carries little to no voting rights. The terms of blank check preferred stock give the board of directors the power to issue shares of preferred stock at their discretion with voting, conversion, distribution, and other rights to be determined by the board at time of issue. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will generally vote recommend a vote for proposals to authorize preferred stock in cases where the company specifies the voting, dividend, conversion, and other rights of such stock and the terms of the preferred stock appear reasonable. Taft- Hartley Advisory Services will also consider company-specific factors including past board performance, disclosure on specific reasons/rationale for the proposed increase, the dilutive impact of the request, disclosure of specific risks to shareholders of not approving the request, and whether the shares requested are blank check preferred shares that can be used for antitakeover purposes.

AUDITOR RATIFICATION

Auditor Independence

Ratifying auditors is no longer a routine procedure. The wave of accounting scandals at companies in the over the past decade underscore the need to ensure auditor independence in the face of selling consulting services to audit clients. The ratio of non-audit services to total revenues at the large accounting firms grew significantly leading up to the accounting scandals. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services believes the ratio of non-audit fees should make up no more than one-quarter of all fees paid to the auditor so as to properly discourage even the appearance of any undue influence upon an auditor's objectivity

Auditors are the backbone upon which a company's financial health is measured, and auditor independence is essential for rendering objective opinions upon which investors then rely. When an auditor is paid more in consulting fees than for auditing, its relationship with the company is left open to conflicts of interest. Because accounting scandals evaporate shareholder value, any proposal to ratify auditors is examined for potential conflicts of interest, with particular attention to the fees paid to the auditor, as well as whether the ratification of auditors has been put up for shareholder vote. Failure by a company to present its selection of auditors for shareholder ratification should be discouraged as it undermines good governance and disenfranchises shareholders.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services recommends a vote against ratification of a company's auditor if it receives more than one-quarter of its total fees for consulting and a vote against or withhold votes from Audit Committee members when auditor ratification is not included on the proxy ballot and/or when consulting fees exceed audit fees. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports shareholder proposals to ensure auditor independence and effect mandatory auditor ratification.

Disclosures Under Section 404 of Sarbanes-Oxley Act

Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act requires that companies document and assess the effectiveness of their internal financial controls. Companies with significant material weaknesses identified in the Section 404 disclosures potentially have ineffective internal financial reporting controls. This may lead to inaccurate financial statements, which hampers shareholders' ability to make informed investment decisions, and may lead to destruction of public confidence and shareholder value. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote against management proposals to ratify auditors if 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.

MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, AND TRANSACTIONS

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services votes for corporate transactions that take the high road to competitiveness and company growth. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services believes that structuring merging companies to build long-term relationships with a stable and quality work force and preserving good jobs creates long-term company value. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services opposes corporate transactions which indiscriminately layoff workers and shed valuable competitive resources.

Mergers and Acquisitions

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Votes on mergers and acquisitions are considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the following factors:

- › Impact of the merger on shareholder value;
- › Perspective of ownership (target vs. acquirer) in the deal;
- › Form and mix of payment (i.e. stock, cash, debt, etc.);
- › Fundamental value drivers behind the deal;
- › Anticipated financial and operating benefits realizable through combined synergies;
- › Offer price (cost vs. premium);
- › Change-in-control payments to executive officers;
- › Financial viability of the combined companies as a single entity;
- › Was the deal put together in good faith? What kind of auction setting took place? Were negotiations carried out at arm's length? Was any portion of the process tainted by possible conflicts of interest?
- › Fairness opinion (or lack thereof);
- › Changes in corporate governance and their impact on shareholder rights;
- › What are the potential legal or environmental liability risks associated with the target firm?
- › Impact on community stakeholders and employees in both workforces; and
- › How will the merger adversely affect employee benefits like pensions and health care?

Reincorporation

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services reviews proposals to change a company's state of incorporation on a case-by-case basis. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote for proposals to reincorporate in another state when the company has provided satisfactory business reasons and there is no significant reduction in shareholder rights. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote against proposals to reincorporate that reduce shareholder rights. In cases of offshore reincorporations to tax havens, among other factors, the effect upon any and all legal recourse of shareholders in a new jurisdiction, potential harm to company brands and image, and any actual, qualified economic benefit will be evaluated.

While a firm's country of incorporation will remain the primary basis for evaluating companies, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will generally apply U.S. policies to the extent possible with respect to issuers that file DEF 14As, 10-K annual reports, and 10-Q quarterly reports, and are thus considered domestic issuers by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Corporations that have reincorporated outside the U.S. have found themselves subject to a combination of governance regulations and best practice standards that may not be entirely compatible with an evaluation framework based solely on country of incorporation.

EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

Stock Option Plans

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports compensating executives at a reasonable rate and believes that executive compensation should be strongly correlated to sustained performance. Stock options and other forms of equity compensation should be performance-based with an eye toward improving shareholder value. Well-designed stock option plans align the interests of executives and shareholders by providing that executives benefit when stock prices rise as the company—and shareholders—prosper together. Poorly designed equity award programs can encourage excessive risk-taking behavior and incentivize executives to pursue corporate strategies that promote short-term stock price to the ultimate detriment of long-term shareholder value.

Many plans sponsored by management provide goals so easily attained that executives can realize massive rewards even though shareholder value is not necessarily created. Stock options that are awarded selectively and excessively can dilute shareholders' share value and voting power. In general, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports plans that are offered at fair terms to executives who satisfy well-defined performance goals. Option plans are evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration factors including: offer price, dilution to outstanding share value, dilution to share voting power, annual burn rate, executive concentration ratios, pay-for-performance and the presence of any repricing provisions. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports plans that retain tax deductibility through the use of performance goals and oppose plans whose award size exceeds the tax deduction limit.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote for option plans that provide legitimately challenging performance targets that truly motivate executives in the pursuit of excellent performance. Likewise, against votes will be recommended for plans that offer unreasonable benefits to executives that are not available to other employees.

Problematic Compensation Practices

Poor disclosure, the absence or non-transparency of disclosure and poor plan design of compensation payouts lead to excessive executive compensation practices that are detrimental to shareholders. Poorly designed plans or those lacking in transparency can be reflective of a poorly performing compensation committee or board. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will generally recommend votes against management "Say on Pay" (MSOP) proposals and will consider recommending against compensation committee members and/or the CEO on a case-by-case basis if the company has problematic compensation practices. In addition, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services may consider recommending a vote against the entire board if the whole board was involved in and contributed to egregious compensation practices.

Proposals to Limit Executive and Director Pay

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services recommends votes for shareholder proposals that seek additional disclosure of executive and director pay information. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will also recommend a vote for shareholder proposals that seek to eliminate outside directors' retirement benefits. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services reviews on a case-by-case basis all other shareholder proposals that seek to limit executive and director pay. This includes shareholder proposals that seek to link executive compensation to customer, employee, or stakeholder satisfaction.

Golden Parachutes

Golden parachutes are designed to protect the senior level employees of a corporation in the event of a change-in-control. Under most golden parachute agreements, senior level management employees receive a lump sum pay-out triggered by a change-in-control at usually two to three times base salary. These severance agreements can grant extremely generous benefits to well-paid executives and most often offer no value to shareholders. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services recommends votes for shareholder proposals to have all golden parachute agreements submitted for shareholder ratification, and generally opposes proposals to ratify golden parachutes if certain considerations are not met.

Options Backdating

Options backdating has serious implications and has resulted in financial restatements, delisting of companies, and/or the termination of executives or directors. When options backdating has taken place, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services may consider recommending against or withholding votes from the compensation committee, depending on the severity of the practices and the subsequent corrective actions taken by the board. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services adopts a case-by-case approach to the options backdating issue to differentiate companies that had sloppy administration versus those that had committed fraud, as well as those companies that have since taken corrective action. Instances in which companies have committed fraud are more disconcerting, and Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will look to them to adopt formal policies to ensure that such practices will not re-occur in the future.

Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation – Management Say-on-Pay Proposals

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation: Taft-Hartley Advisory Services evaluates executive pay and practices, as well as certain aspects of outside director compensation on a case-by-case basis.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote against management say on pay (MSOP) proposals if there is a misalignment between CEO pay and company performance, the company maintains problematic pay practices, and the board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services will recommend a vote against or withhold votes from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- › There is no MSOP on the ballot, and an against vote on an MSOP is warranted due to pay for performance misalignment, problematic pay practices, or the lack of adequate responsiveness on compensation issues raised previously, or a combination thereof;
- › The board fails to respond adequately to a previous MSOP proposal that received less than 70 percent support of votes cast;
- › The company has recently practiced or approved problematic pay practices, including option repricing or option backdating; or
- › The situation is egregious.

Vote against an equity plan on the ballot if:

- › A pay for performance misalignment exists, and a significant portion of the CEO's misaligned pay is attributed to non-performance-based equity awards, taking into consideration: a) magnitude of pay misalignment; b) contribution of non-performance-based equity grants to overall pay; and c) the proportion of equity awards granted in the last three fiscal years concentrated at the named executive officer (NEO) level.

DB1/ 89349575.9



Frequency of Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation – Management Say on Pay

▶ **Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:** Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports annual advisory votes on compensation, which provide the most consistent and clear communication channel for shareholder concerns about companies' executive pay programs.

SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Increasingly, shareholders are presenting proposals related to company environmental practices, workplace practices, social issues and sustainability goals. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services provides specific narrative explanations for votes on these types of shareholder proposals. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services evaluates shareholder proposals on a case-by-case basis to determine if they are in the best economic interests of the plan participants and beneficiaries. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services' clients select investment strategies and criteria for their portfolios. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services views its responsibility to protect plan beneficiary economic interests through the use of the proxy. To meet this obligation, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services votes consistent with the economic best interests of the participants and beneficiaries to create "high road" shareholder and economic value.

In most cases, Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports proposals that request management to report to shareholders information and practices that would help in evaluating the company's operations and risk exposures. In order to be able to intelligently monitor their investments, shareholders often need information best provided by the company itself. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports proposals that seek management compliance with shareholder interests to ensure that shareholders are fully informed about actions harmful to society with special attention to the company's legal and ethical obligations, impact on company profitability, and the potential negative publicity for disreputable practices.

CERES Principles

The CERES Principles, formulated by the Coalition of Environmentally Responsible Economies, require signing companies to address environmental issues, including protection of the biosphere, sustainable use of natural resources, reduction and disposal of wastes, energy conservation, and employee and community risk reduction. Evidence suggests that environmentally conscious companies may realize long-term savings by implementing programs to pollute less and conserve resources while realizing good public relations and new marketing opportunities. Moreover, the reports that are required of signing companies provide shareholders with more information concerning topics they may deem relevant to their company's financial well-being.

Many companies have voluntarily adopted these principles and proven that environmental sensitivity makes good business sense. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports proposals that improve a company's public image, reduce exposure to liabilities, and establish standards so that environmentally responsible companies and markets are not at a competitive financial disadvantage. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services recommends votes for the adoption of the CERES Principles and for reporting to shareholders on environmental issues.

Corporate and Supplier Codes of Conduct

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services generally supports proposals that call for the adoption and/or enforcement of clear principles or codes of conduct relating to countries in which there are systematic violations of human rights. These conditions include the use of slave, child, or prison labor, undemocratically elected governments, widespread reports by human rights advocates, fervent pro-democracy protests, or economic sanctions and boycotts.

Many proposals refer to the seven core conventions, commonly referred to as the "Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights At Work," ratified by the International Labor Organization (ILO). The seven conventions fall under four broad categories: i) right to organize and bargain collectively; ii) non-discrimination in employment; iii) abolition of forced labor; and iv) end of child labor. Each member nation of the ILO body is bound to respect and promote these rights to the best of their abilities.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:

- › Support the principles and codes of conduct relating to company investment and/or operations in countries with patterns of human rights abuses or pertaining to geographic regions experiencing political turmoil (Northern Ireland, Columbia, Burma, former Soviet Union, and China).
- › Support the implementation and reporting on ILO codes of conduct.
- › Support independent monitoring programs in conjunction with local and respected religious and human rights groups to monitor supplier and licensee compliance with Codes.
- › Support requests that a company conduct an assessment of the human rights risks in its operation or in its supply chain, or report on its human rights risk assessment process.

Political Contributions, Lobbying Reporting & Disclosure

Changes in legislation that govern corporate political giving have, rather than limiting such contributions, increased the complexity of tracking how much money corporations contribute to the political process and where that money ultimately ends up. A company's involvement in the political process could impact shareholder value if such activities are not properly overseen and managed.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services Recommendation:

- › Support reporting of political and political action committee (PAC) contributions.
- › Support establishment of corporate political contributions guidelines and internal reporting provisions or controls.
- › Generally support shareholder proposals requesting companies to review and report on their political lobbying activities including efforts to influence governmental legislation.
- › Vote against shareholder proposals asking to publish in newspapers and public media the company's political contributions as such publications could present significant cost to the company without providing commensurate value to shareholders.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Shareholder proposals asking a company to issue a report to shareholders – at reasonable cost and omitting proprietary information – on greenhouse gas emissions ask that the report include descriptions of efforts within companies to reduce emissions, their financial exposure and potential liability from operations that contribute to global warming, and their direct or indirect efforts to promote the view that global warming is not a threat. Proponents argue that there is scientific proof that the burning of fossil fuels causes global warming, that future legislation may make companies financially liable for their contributions to global warming, and that a report on the company's role in global warming can be assembled at reasonable cost. Taft-Hartley Advisory Services generally supports greater disclosure on climate change-related proposals.

Sustainability Reporting and Planning

The concept of sustainability is commonly understood as meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Indeed, the term sustainability is complex and poses significant challenges for companies on many levels. Many in the investment community have termed this broader responsibility the "triple bottom line," referring to the triad of performance goals related to economic prosperity, social responsibility and environmental quality. In essence, the concept requires companies to balance the needs and interests of their various stakeholders while operating in a manner that sustains business growth for the long-term, supports local communities and protects the environment and natural capital for future generations.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services generally supports shareholder proposals seeking greater disclosure on the company's environmental and social practices, and/or associated risks and liabilities.

Hydraulic Fracturing

Shareholder proponents have elevated concerns on the use of hydraulic fracturing, an increasingly controversial process in which water, sand, and a mix of chemicals is blasted horizontally into tight layers of shale rock to extract natural gas. As this practice has gained more widespread use, environmentalists have raised concerns that the chemicals mixed with sand and water to aid the fracturing process can contaminate ground water supplies. Proponents of resolutions at companies that employ hydraulic fracturing are also concerned that wastewater produced by the process could overload the waste treatment plants to which it is shipped. Shareholders have asked companies that utilize hydraulic fracturing to report on the environmental impact of the practice and to disclose policies aimed at reducing hazards from the process.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services generally supports shareholder requests seeking greater transparency on the practice of hydraulic fracturing and its associated risks.

Water Use

Shareholders may ask for a company to prepare a report evaluating the business risks linked to water use and impacts on the company's supply chain, including subsidiaries and bottling partners. Such proposals also ask companies to disclose current policies and procedures for mitigating the impact of operations on local communities in areas of water scarcity.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services generally supports shareholder proposals seeking the preparation of a report on a company's risks linked to water use.

Workplace Safety

In light of fatal accidents at oil refineries (Tesoro – Anacortes refinery, April 2010; and BP – Texas City refinery, March 2005), the 2010 BP Deepwater Horizon incident in the Gulf of Mexico, and the explosion at Massey Energy's Upper Big Branch mine in 2010, shareholders have sought greater transparency and accountability regarding workplace safety by filing resolutions at a number of corporations.

Taft-Hartley Advisory Services supports shareholder proposals requesting requests for workplace safety reports, including reports on accident risk reduction effort.

This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, and charts (collectively, the "Information") is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), its subsidiaries, or, in some cases third party suppliers.

The Information has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), or a promotion or recommendation of, any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy, and ISS does not endorse, approve, or otherwise express any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information.

ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY, AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by law, in no event shall ISS have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits), or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited.



The Global Leader In Corporate Governance

www.issgovernance.com



United States

2017 SRI Proxy Voting Guidelines

[Executive Summary](#)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS	4
1. Board of Directors.....	4
2. Board Responsiveness	4
3. Auditors	4
4. Takeover Defenses / Shareholder Rights.....	5
5. Miscellaneous Governance Provisions	5
6. Capital Structures.....	5
7. Executive and Director Compensation	5
8. Mergers and Corporate Restructurings	6
9. Mutual Fund Proxies.....	6
SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS	7
10. Shareholder Proposals on Corporate Governance and Executive Compensation.....	7
11. Shareholder Proposals on Social and Environmental Topics.....	7
DISCLOSURE/DISCLAIMER.....	8

INTRODUCTION

ISS' Social Advisory Services division recognizes that socially responsible investors have dual objectives: financial and social. Socially responsible investors invest for economic gain, as do all investors, but they also require that companies in which they invest conduct their business in a socially and environmentally responsible manner.

The dual objectives carry through to the proxy voting activity, after the security selection process is completed. In voting their shares, socially responsible institutional shareholders are concerned not only with economic returns to shareholders and good corporate governance, but also with the ethical behavior of corporations and the social and environmental impact of their actions.

Social Advisory Services has, therefore, developed SRI proxy voting guidelines that are consistent with the dual objectives of socially responsible shareholders. On matters of social and environmental import, the guidelines seek to reflect a broad consensus of the socially responsible investing community. Generally, we take as our frame of reference policies that have been developed by groups such as the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits of the United Methodist Church, Domini Social Investments, and other leading church shareholders and socially responsible mutual funds. Additionally, we incorporate the active ownership and investment philosophies of leading globally recognized initiatives such as the United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI), the United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment (UNPRI), the United Nations Global Compact, and environmental and social European Union Directives.

On matters of corporate governance, executive compensation, and corporate structure, the SRI guidelines are based on a commitment to create and preserve economic value and to advance principles of corporate governance best practice consistent with responsibilities to society as a whole.

The guidelines provide an overview of how Social Advisory Services recommends that its clients vote. We note there may be cases in which the final vote recommendation on a particular company varies from the vote guideline due to the fact that we closely examine the merits of each proposal and consider recent and company-specific information in arriving at our decisions. Where Social Advisory Services acts as a voting agent for clients, it follows each client's voting policy, which may differ in some cases from the policies outlined in this document. Social Advisory Services updates its guidelines on an annual basis to take into account new social and environmental issues and the latest trends and developments in corporate governance.

The guidelines evaluate management and shareholder proposals as follows:

MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS

1. Board of Directors

Social Advisory Services considers director elections to be one of the most important voting decisions that shareholders make. Boards should be composed of a majority of independent directors and key board committees should be composed entirely of independent directors. The independent directors are expected to organize much of the board's work, even if the chief executive officer also serves as chairman of the board. It is expected that boards will engage in critical self-evaluation of themselves and of individual members. Directors are ultimately responsible to the corporation's shareholders. The most direct expression of this responsibility is the requirement that directors be elected to their positions by the shareholders.

Social Advisory Services will generally oppose slates of director nominees that are not composed of a majority of independent directors and will vote against/withhold votes from non-independent directors who sit on key board committees. In addition, Social Advisory Services will generally vote against/withhold votes from directors individually, committee members, or potentially the entire board, for failure to adequately guard against or manage ESG risks, and from members of the nominating committee, with the exception of new nominees, where the board lacks gender or racial diversity. The election of directors who have failed to attend a minimum of 75 percent of board meetings held during the year will be opposed.

Social Advisory Services supports requests asking for the separation of the positions of chairman and CEO and requests to adopt cumulative voting, opposes the creation of classified boards, and reviews proposals to change board size on a case-by-case basis. Social Advisory Services also supports shareholder proposals calling for greater access to the board, affording shareholders the ability to nominate directors to corporate boards. Social Advisory Services may vote against/withhold from directors at companies where problematic pay practices exist, and where boards have not been accountable or responsive to their shareholders.

2. Board Responsiveness

Social Advisory Services will vote case-by-case on individual directors, committee members, or the entire board of directors as appropriate if the board fails to act on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the shares in the previous year. Other factors we take into account when evaluating board responsiveness issues include: the board's failure to act on takeover offers where the majority of shares are tendered; at the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold/against votes of the shares cast and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the high withhold/against vote; or if the board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received the majority or a plurality of votes cast at the most recent shareholder meeting at which shareholders voted on the say-on-pay frequency.

3. Auditors

While it is recognized that the company is in the best position to evaluate the competence of the outside accountants, we believe that outside accountants must ultimately be accountable to shareholders. Given the rash of accounting irregularities that were not detected by audit panels or auditors, shareholder ratification is an essential step in restoring investor confidence. A Blue Ribbon Commission concluded that audit committees must improve their current level of oversight of independent accountants. Social Advisory Services will vote against the ratification of the auditor in cases where non-audit fees represent more than 25 percent of the total fees paid to the auditor in the previous year.

Social Advisory Services supports requests asking for the rotation of the audit firm, if the request includes a timetable of five years or more.

4. Takeover Defenses / Shareholder Rights

Topics evaluated in this category include shareholders' ability to call a special meeting or act by written consent, the adoption or redemption of poison pills, unequal voting rights, fair price provisions, greenmail, supermajority vote requirements, and confidential voting.

Social Advisory Services generally opposes takeover defenses, as they limit shareholder value by eliminating the takeover or control premium for the company. As owners of the company, shareholders should be given the opportunity to decide on the merits of takeover offers. Further, takeover devices can be used to entrench a board that is unresponsive to shareholders on both governance and corporate social responsibility issues.

5. Miscellaneous Governance Provisions

Social Advisory Services evaluates proposals that concern governance issues such as shareholder meeting adjournments, quorum requirements, corporate name changes, and bundled or conditional proposals on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the impact on shareholder rights.

6. Capital Structures

Capital structure related topics include requests for increases in authorized stock, stock splits and reverse stock splits, issuances of blank check preferred stock, debt restructurings, and share repurchase plans.

Social Advisory Services supports a one-share, one-vote policy and opposes mechanisms that skew voting rights. Social Advisory Services supports capital requests that provide companies with adequate financing flexibility while protecting shareholders from excessive dilution of their economic and voting interests. Proposals to increase common stock are evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the company's past use of share authorizations and elements of the current request.

7. Executive and Director Compensation

The global financial crisis has resulted in significant erosion of shareholder value and highlighted the need for greater assurance that executive compensation is principally performance-based, fair, reasonable, and not designed in a manner that would incentivize excessive risk-taking by management. The crisis has raised questions about the role of pay incentives in influencing executive behavior and motivating inappropriate or excessive risk-taking and other unsustainable practices that could threaten a corporation's long-term viability. The safety lapses that led to the disastrous explosions at BP's Deepwater Horizon oil rig and Massey Energy's Upper Big Branch mine, and the resulting unprecedented losses in shareholder value; a) underscore the importance of incorporating meaningful economic incentives around social and environmental considerations in compensation program design, and; b) exemplify the costly liabilities of failing to do so.

Social Advisory Services evaluates executive and director compensation by considering the presence of appropriate pay-for-performance alignment with long-term shareholder value, compensation arrangements that risk "pay for failure," and an assessment of the clarity and comprehensiveness of compensation disclosures. Equity plan proposals are considered on a case-by-case basis using a binomial pricing model that estimates the cost of a company's stock-based incentive programs. Plan features and any recent controversies surrounding a company's pay practices are also

factored into the analysis of compensation proposals. Shareholder proposals calling for additional disclosure on compensation issues or the alignment of executive compensation with social or environmental performance criteria are supported, while shareholder proposals calling for other changes to a company's compensation programs are reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act requires advisory shareholder votes on executive compensation (management "say on pay" or MSOP), an advisory vote on the frequency of say on pay, as well as a shareholder advisory vote on golden parachute compensation. Social Advisory Services will vote AGAINST management say on pay (MSOP) proposals if there is a misalignment between CEO pay and company performance, the company maintains problematic pay practices, and the board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Social Advisory Services will evaluate whether pay quantum is in alignment with company performance, and consideration will also be given to whether the proportion of performance-contingent pay elements is sufficient in light of concerns with a misalignment between executive pay and company performance.

Social Advisory Services will vote case-by-case on certain equity-based compensation plans depending on a combination of certain plan features and equity grant practices, where positive factors may counterbalance negative factors, and vice versa, as evaluated using an "equity plan scorecard" (EPSC) approach.

8. Mergers and Corporate Restructurings

Mergers, acquisitions, spinoffs, reincorporations, and other corporate restructuring plans are evaluated on a case-by-case basis, given the potential for significant impact on shareholder value and on shareholders' economic interests. In addition, these corporate actions can have a significant impact on community stakeholders and the workforce, and may affect the levels of employment, community lending, equal opportunity, and impact on the environment.

9. Mutual Fund Proxies

There are a number of proposals that are specific to mutual fund proxies, including the election of trustees, investment advisory agreements, and distribution agreements. Social Advisory Services evaluates these proposals on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration recent trends and best practices at mutual funds.

SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS

10. Shareholder Proposals on Corporate Governance and Executive Compensation

Shareholder proposals topics include board-related issues, shareholder rights and board accountability issues, as well as compensation matters. Each year, shareholders file numerous proposals that address key issues regarding corporate governance and executive compensation. Social Advisory Services evaluates these proposals from the perspective that good corporate governance practices can have positive implications for a company and its ability to maximize shareholder value. Proposals that seek to improve a board's accountability to its shareholders and other stakeholders are supported. Social Advisory Services supports initiatives that seek to strengthen the link between executive pay and performance, including performance elements related to corporate social responsibility.

11. Shareholder Proposals on Social and Environmental Topics

Shareholder resolutions on social and environmental topics include workplace diversity and safety topics, codes of conduct, labor standards and human rights, the environment and energy, weapons, consumer welfare, and public safety.

Socially responsible shareholder resolutions are receiving a great deal more attention from institutional shareholders today than they have in the past. In addition to the moral and ethical considerations intrinsic to many of these proposals, there is a growing recognition of their potential impact on the economic performance of the company. Among the reasons for this change are:

- › The number and variety of shareholder resolutions on social and environmental issues has increased;
- › Many of the sponsors and supporters of these resolutions are large institutional shareholders with significant holdings, and therefore, greater direct influence on the outcomes;
- › The proposals are more sophisticated – better written, more focused, and more sensitive to the feasibility of implementation; and
- › Investors now understand that a company's response to social and environmental issues can have serious economic consequences for the company and its shareholders.

We will closely evaluate proposals that ask the company to cease certain actions that the proponent believes are harmful to society or some segment of society with special attention to the company's legal and ethical obligations, its ability to remain profitable, and potential negative publicity if the company fails to honor the request. Social Advisory Services supports shareholder proposals that seek to improve a company's public image, or reduce its exposure to liabilities and risks.

DISCLOSURE/DISCLAIMER

This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, and charts (collectively, the "Information") is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), its subsidiaries, or, in some cases third party suppliers.

The Information has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), or a promotion or recommendation of, any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy, and ISS does not endorse, approve, or otherwise express any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information.

ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY, AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by law, in no event shall ISS have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits), or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited.



The Global Leader In Corporate Governance

www.issgovernance.com



United States

2017 Sustainability Proxy Voting Guidelines

Executive Summary



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS	4
1. Board of Directors.....	4
2. Board Responsiveness	4
3. Auditors	4
4. Takeover Defenses / Shareholder Rights.....	5
5. Miscellaneous Governance Provisions	5
6. Capital Structures.....	5
7. Executive and Director Compensation	5
8. Mergers and Corporate Restructurings	5
9. Mutual Fund Proxies.....	6
SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS	7
10. Shareholder Proposals on Corporate Governance and Executive Compensation.....	7
11. Shareholder Proposals on Social and Environmental Topics.....	7
DISCLOSURE/DISCLAIMER.....	8

INTRODUCTION

ISS' Sustainability Advisory Services recognizes the growing view among investment professionals that sustainability or environmental, social, and corporate governance (ESG) factors could present material risks to portfolio investments. Whereas investment managers have traditionally analyzed topics such as board accountability and executive compensation to mitigate risk, greater numbers are incorporating ESG performance into their investment making decisions in order to have a more comprehensive understanding of the overall risk profile of the companies in which they invest to ensure sustainable long-term profitability for their beneficiaries.

Investors concerned with portfolio value preservation and enhancement through the incorporation of sustainability factors can also carry out this active ownership approach through their proxy voting activity. In voting their shares, sustainability-minded investors are concerned not only with economic returns to shareholders and good corporate governance, but also with ensuring corporate activities and practices are aligned with the broader objectives of society. These investors seek standardized reporting on ESG issues, request information regarding an issuer's adoption of, or adherence to, relevant norms, standards, codes of conduct or universally recognized international initiatives including affirmative support for related shareholder resolutions advocating enhanced disclosure and transparency.

Sustainability Advisory Services has, therefore, developed proxy voting guidelines that are consistent with the objectives of sustainability-minded investors and fiduciaries. On matters of ESG import, the Sustainability Policy seeks to promote support for recognized global governing bodies promoting sustainable business practices advocating for stewardship of environment, fair labor practices, non-discrimination, and the protection of human rights. Generally, ISS' Sustainability Policy will take as its frame of reference internationally recognized sustainability-related initiatives such as the United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI), United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment (UNPRI), United Nations Global Compact, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), Carbon Principles, International Labour Organization Conventions (ILO), CERES Principles, Global Sullivan Principles, MacBride Principles, and environmental and social European Union Directives. Each of these efforts promote a fair, unified and productive reporting and compliance environment which advances positive corporate ESG actions that promote practices that present new opportunities or that mitigate related financial and reputational risks.

On matters of corporate governance, executive compensation, and corporate structure, the Sustainability Policy guidelines are based on a commitment to create and preserve economic value and to advance principles of good corporate governance.

These guidelines provide an overview of how ISS approaches proxy voting issues for subscribers of the Sustainability Policy. We note there may be cases in which the final vote recommendation at a particular company varies from the voting guidelines due to the fact that we closely examine the merits of each proposal and consider relevant information and company-specific circumstances in arriving at our decisions. To that end, Sustainability Advisory Services engages with both interested shareholders as well as issuers to gain further insight into contentious issues facing the company. Where Sustainability Advisory Services acts as voting agent for clients, it follows each client's voting policy, which may differ in some cases from the policies outlined in this document. Sustainability Advisory Services updates its guidelines on an annual basis to take into account emerging issues and trends on environmental, social and corporate governance topics, as well as the evolution of market standards, regulatory changes and client feedback.

MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS

1. Board of Directors

ISS' Sustainability Advisory Services considers director elections to be one of the most important voting decisions that shareholders make. Boards should be sufficiently independent from management (and significant shareholders) so as to ensure that they are able and motivated to effectively supervise management's performance for the benefit of all shareholders, including in setting and monitoring the execution of corporate strategy, with appropriate use of shareholder capital, and in setting and monitoring executive compensation programs that support that strategy. The chair of the board should ideally be an independent director, and all boards should have an independent leadership position or a similar role in order to help provide appropriate counterbalance to executive management, as well as having sufficiently independent committees that focus on key governance concerns such as audit, compensation, and nomination of directors.

Sustainability Advisory Services will generally oppose non-independent director nominees if the board is not composed of a majority of independent directors and will vote against/withhold votes from non-independent directors who sit on key board committees. In addition, Sustainability Advisory Services will generally vote against/withhold votes from directors individually, committee members, or potentially the entire board, for failure to adequately guard against or manage ESG risks. The election of directors who have failed to attend a minimum of 75 percent of board meetings held during the year will be opposed.

Sustainability Advisory Services also supports shareholder proposals calling for greater access to the board, affording shareholders the ability to nominate directors to corporate boards. Sustainability Advisory Services may vote against/withhold from directors at companies where problematic pay practices exist, and where boards have not been accountable or responsive to their shareholders.

2. Board Responsiveness

Sustainability Advisory Services will vote case-by-case on individual directors, committee members, or the entire board of directors as appropriate if the board fails to act on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the shares in the previous year. Other factors we take into account when evaluating board responsiveness issues include: the board's failure to act on takeover offers where the majority of shares are tendered; at the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold/against votes of the shares cast and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the high withhold/against vote; or if the board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received the majority or a plurality of votes cast at the most recent shareholder meeting at which shareholders voted on the say-on-pay frequency.

3. Auditors

While it is recognized that the company is in the best position to evaluate the competence of the outside accountants, we believe that outside accountants must ultimately be accountable to shareholders. Given the rash of accounting irregularities that were not detected by audit panels or auditors, shareholder ratification is an essential step in restoring investor confidence. A Blue Ribbon Commission concluded that audit committees must improve their current level of oversight of independent accountants. Sustainability Advisory Services will vote against the ratification of the auditor in cases where fees for non-audit services are excessive.

4. Takeover Defenses / Shareholder Rights

Topics evaluated in this category include shareholders' ability to call a special meeting or act by written consent, the adoption or redemption of poison pills, unequal voting rights, fair price provisions, greenmail, supermajority vote requirements, and confidential voting.

Sustainability Advisory Services generally opposes takeover defenses, as they limit shareholder value by eliminating the takeover or control premium for the company. As owners of the company, shareholders should be given the opportunity to decide on the merits of takeover offers. Further, takeover devices can be used to entrench a board that is unresponsive to shareholders on both governance and corporate social responsibility issues.

5. Miscellaneous Governance Provisions

Sustainability Advisory Services evaluates proposals that concern governance issues such as shareholder meeting adjournments, quorum requirements, corporate name changes, and bundled or conditional proposals on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the impact on shareholder rights.

6. Capital Structures

Capital structure related topics include requests for increases in authorized stock, stock splits and reverse stock splits, issuances of blank check preferred stock, debt restructurings, and share repurchase plans.

Sustainability Advisory Services supports a one-share, one-vote policy and opposes mechanisms that skew voting rights. Sustainability Advisory Services supports capital requests that provide companies with adequate financing flexibility while protecting shareholders from excessive dilution of their economic and voting interests. Proposals to increase common stock are evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the company's past use of share authorizations and elements of the current request.

7. Executive and Director Compensation

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act requires advisory shareholder votes on executive compensation (management "say on pay" or MSOP), an advisory vote on the frequency of say on pay, as well as a shareholder advisory vote on golden parachute compensation. Sustainability Advisory Services will vote AGAINST management say on pay (MSOP) proposals if there is a misalignment between CEO pay and company performance, the company maintains problematic pay practices, and the board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Sustainability Advisory Services Sustainability Advisory Services will vote case-by-case on certain equity-based compensation plans depending on a combination of certain plan features and equity grant practices, where positive factors may counterbalance negative factors, and vice versa, as evaluated using an "equity plan scorecard" (EPSC) approach.

8. Mergers and Corporate Restructurings

Mergers, acquisitions, spinoffs, reincorporations, and other corporate restructuring plans are evaluated on a case-by-case basis, given the potential for significant impact on shareholder value and on shareholders' economic interests. In addition, these corporate actions can have a significant impact on community stakeholders and the workforce, and may affect the levels of employment, community lending, equal opportunity, and impact on the environment.

9. Mutual Fund Proxies

There are a number of proposals that are specific to mutual fund proxies, including the election of trustees, investment advisory agreements, and distribution agreements. Sustainability Advisory Services Sustainability Advisory Services evaluates these proposals on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration recent trends and best practices at mutual funds.

SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS

10. Shareholder Proposals on Corporate Governance and Executive Compensation

Shareholder proposals topics include board-related issues, shareholder rights and board accountability issues, as well as compensation matters. Each year, shareholders file numerous proposals that address key issues regarding corporate governance and executive compensation. Sustainability Advisory Services Sustainability Advisory Services evaluates these proposals from the perspective that good corporate governance practices can have positive implications for a company and its ability to maximize shareholder value. Proposals that seek to improve a board's accountability to its shareholders and other stakeholders are supported.

11. Shareholder Proposals on Social and Environmental Topics

Shareholder resolutions on social and environmental topics include workplace diversity and safety topics, codes of conduct, labor standards and human rights, the environment and energy, weapons, consumer welfare, and public safety.

Socially responsible shareholder resolutions are receiving a great deal more attention from institutional shareholders today than they have in the past. In addition to the moral and ethical considerations intrinsic to many of these proposals, there is a growing recognition of their potential impact on the economic performance of the company. Among the reasons for this change are:

- › The number and variety of shareholder resolutions on social and environmental issues has increased;
- › Many of the sponsors and supporters of these resolutions are large institutional shareholders with significant holdings, and therefore, greater direct influence on the outcomes;
- › The proposals are more sophisticated – better written, more focused, and more sensitive to the feasibility of implementation; and
- › Investors now understand that a company's response to social and environmental issues can have serious economic consequences for the company and its shareholders.

While focusing on value enhancement through risk mitigation and exposure to new sustainability-related opportunities, these resolutions also seek standardized reporting on ESG issues, request information regarding an issuer's adoption of, or adherence to, relevant norms, standards, codes of conduct or universally recognized international initiatives to promote disclosure and transparency. Sustainability Advisory Services Sustainability Advisory Services generally supports standards-based ESG shareholder proposals that enhance long-term shareholder and stakeholder value while aligning the interests of the company with those of society at large. In particular, the policy will focus on resolutions seeking greater transparency and/or adherence to internationally recognized standards and principles.

DISCLOSURE/DISCLAIMER

This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, and charts (collectively, the "Information") is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), its subsidiaries, or, in some cases third party suppliers.

The Information has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), or a promotion or recommendation of, any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy, and ISS does not endorse, approve, or otherwise express any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information.

ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY, AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by law, in no event shall ISS have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits), or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited.



The Global Leader In Corporate Governance

www.issgovernance.com