



STONEHAGE FLEMING GLOBAL BEST IDEAS EQUITY FUND - VOTING & ENGAGEMENT RECORD 2020

Under the Financial Conduct Authority rules, COBS 2.2B, Stonehage Fleming Investment Management Limited (SFIM) is required to disclose on an annual basis:

1. A description of voting behaviour
2. An explanation of the most significant votes
3. The use of the services of proxy advisors, and
4. A description of how we have cast votes in the general meetings of companies

This disclosure in accordance with the above.

SFIMs Shareholder Engagement Policy can be found here: <https://cdn.io.stonehagefleming.com/craft-cms/legal/Shareholders-Rights-II-SRD-II.pdf>

Investment Manager name	Stonehage Fleming Investment Management Limited
Start of Reporting Period	01-Jan-20
End of Reporting Period	31-Dec-20
Fund Name	Stonehage Fleming Global Best Ideas Fund

FUND/MANDATE INFORMATION

Size of the fund as at the end of the Reporting Period?	\$1,959,228,147.07
What was the number of equity holdings in the fund mandate as at the end of the Reporting period?	29



VOTING POLICIES

<p>Description of our process for deciding how to vote</p>	<p>When deciding how to vote we will consider our voting policy and the companies management’s views, rationales and proposals. We will also consult third party information sources including the services of our proxy advisors, Glass Lewis. We will consider all information in order to draw our own conclusions on each vote and will not default to follow either management or advisor views.</p> <p>We will vote against proposals that compromise our clients’ interests. We may not vote where we are not able to make an informed decision due to poor disclosure, or where we receive an unsatisfactory response from management.</p>
<p>Description of proxy voting services</p>	<p>We use a third party proxy advisory voting services provided by Glass Lewis. Due to the complexity and need for specialist expertise in assessing these specific social and environmental risks, SFEM will, in general, vote in accordance with the recommendation of our third party proxy advisory services company, Glass Lewis.</p> <p>The cost of information for these votes, including the use of proxy advisors, is paid for by SFIM. The cost of executing votes is born by the client as part of their custody fee (the costs vary from client to client and details are available upon request)</p>
<p>How we define “most significant” votes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potential impact on financial outcome. This would include votes which we consider might have a material impact on future company performance, for example approval of a merger. 2. Whether there is the potential for detriment to the interests of our clients. 3. Whether the vote was high-profile or controversial. This could be judged using any or all of the following: level of media interest; level of political or regulatory interest; level of industry debate. 4. Where we have voted against the recommendation of third party proxy voting adviser, Glass Lewis. 5. In the pursuit of governance best practice.
<p>Any conflicts of interest that arose during the reporting period in respect of any votes cast.</p>	<p>None</p>



VOTING STATISTICS FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD

Number of meetings we were eligible to vote at	23
Number of resolutions we were eligible to vote on	347
% of resolutions we voted on for which we were eligible	100%
Of the resolutions on which we voted, the % we voted with management	84%
Of the resolutions on which we voted, % we voted against management	16%
Of the resolutions on which we voted, % we abstained from voting	0%
% of meetings where we voted at least once against management	48%
% of resolutions where we voted against the recommendation of our proxy adviser	2%



MOST SIGNIFICANT VOTES

	VOTE 1	VOTE 3	VOTE 4	VOTE 5	VOTE 6
Company name	Colgate-Palmolive	Estee Lauder	Amazon	Walt Disney	AIA
Date of vote	08/05/2020	10/11/2020	27/05/2020	11/03/2020	29/05/2020
Approximate size of fund's/mandate's holding as at the date of the vote (as % of portfolio)	2%	3.50%	5%	2%	3%
Summary of the resolution	Shareholder proposal for independent Chairperson	Advisory vote to approve executive compensation	Shareholder proposal for independent Chairperson	Advisory vote to approve executive compensation	Approval of new employee share option scheme
How we voted	For	Against	For	Against	For
Communication of intent to the company ahead of the vote	No	No	No	No	No
Rationale for the voting decision	Having an independent Chair of the Board is best practice in terms of corporate governance	Disconnect between pay and performance and guaranteed bonus	Having an independent Chair of the Board is best practice in terms of corporate governance	Disconnect between pay and performance, excessive compensation.	Share options as a standard incentive scheme when not offered at a discount.
Outcome of the vote	Against	For	Against	For	For
Implications of the outcome	Colgate-Palmolive CEO and Chair roles are carried out by the same individual.	Estee Lauder family controls votes. Remuneration policy ratified.	Amazon CEO and Chair roles are carried out by the same individual.	Remuneration policy ratified.	Scheme approved.
On which criteria have we assessed this vote to be "most significant"	5	3	5	3	4



ENGAGEMENT RECORD DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

Number of companies engaged with	27
Number of AGM's voted	25
3rd Parties providing engagement on our behalf	Glass Lewis
Number of AGM's not voted (where eligible)	1 - Nestle
Reasons for not voting:	1. Prohibitive Swiss rules on custody of holding during vote
Number of companies own with no vote entitlement	1 - Alphabet
Number of group investor day's attended	7
Number of individual investor meetings/calls attended	8

Description of proxy voting services	<p>We use a third party proxy advisory voting services provided by Glass Lewis. Whilst SFEM will take guidance from Glass Lewis final voting decisions are determined by the Investment Committee and in accordance with SFEM’s agreed voting procedures and policies.</p> <p>The cost of information for these votes, including the use of proxy advisors, is paid for by SFIM. The cost of executing votes is covered by the fund Custodian fee.</p>
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

