## Over-Voting And The Options

## OPTION 1: SECTION G 2(i) OF PROXY PROTOCOL

Prorate the vote on all the proxies received on each item on the securities entitled to be voted.
Example:

| Broker A: <br> Record date position: <br> 20,000 | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | For | Withhold | For | Against |
| January 9 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0 |
| January 10 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 5,000 |
| January 11 | 4,000 | 500 | 4,500 | 0 |
| January 12 | 8,000 | 200 | 8,200 | 0 |
| January 13 | 3,000 | 500 | 500 | 3,000 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ |

Outcome of Using Option 1:
Each vote has been prorated down to the record date position providing a portion of each holder's vote to be accepted.

| Broker A: <br> Record date position: <br> 20,000 | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | For | Withhold | For | Against |
| January 9 | 0 | 901 | 901 | 0 |
| January 10 | 2,703 | 1,802 | 0 | 4,505 |
| January 11 | 3,604 | 450 | 4,054 | 0 |
| January 12 | 7,207 | 180 | 7,387 | 0 |
| January 13 | 2,703 | 450 | 450 | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 3}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 6 , 2 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 7 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 7 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 2 0 8}$ |

## IMPACT:

Although each holder is only recognized for a portion of their position, each holder's vote has been counted. Special appointments will have a position; however the value of their position will be altered.

## Over-Voting And The Options

## OPTION 2: SECTION G 2(ii) OF PROXY PROTOCOL

Tabulate the proxies in order of date of receipt until there are no securities left to be voted and set aside any further proxies.
Example:

| Broker A: <br> Record date position: <br> 20,000 | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | For | Withhold | For | Against |
| January 9 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0 |
| January 10 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 5,000 |
| January 11 | 4,000 | 500 | 4,500 | 0 |
| January 12 | 8,000 | 200 | 8,200 | 0 |
| January 13 | 3,000 | 500 | 500 | 3,000 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ |

## Outcome of Using Option 2:

| Broker A: <br> Record date position: <br> $\mathbf{2 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | For | Withhold | For | Against |
| January 9 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0 |
| January 10 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 5,000 |
| January 11 | 4,000 | 500 | 4,500 | 0 |
| January 12 | 8,000 | 200 | 8,200 | 0 |
| January 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 7 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 , 7 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 0 0 0}$ |

## IMPACT:

The January 13 vote is disregarded completely as the combined vote ("For" + "Withhold") places the position into an overvoted position. Shareholders whose vote came at a later date are disenfranchised; cannot take either the "For" or "Withhold" vote individually as this option does not state how to treat split votes. Therefore all votes that exceed the entitlement are disregarded.

## Over-Voting And The Options

## OPTION 3: SECTION G 2(iii) OF PROXY PROTOCOL

Reject all the proxies.
Example:

| Broker A: <br> Record date position: <br> 20,000 | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | For | Withhold | For | Against |
| January 9 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0 |
| January 10 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 5,000 |
| January 11 | 4,000 | 500 | 4,500 | 0 |
| January 12 | 8,000 | 200 | 8,200 | 0 |
| January 13 | 3,000 | 500 | 500 | 3,000 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ |

## Outcome of Using Option 3:

| Broker A: <br> Record date position: <br> 20,000 | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | For | Withhold | For | Against |
| January 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| January 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| January 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| January 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| January 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

## IMPACT:

The impact is clear; no votes will be tabulated for the broker. This may have large implications on the outcome of a meeting depending on the number of the shares being rejected.

## Over-Voting And The Options: Summary Comparison

## OVER-VOTING AND THE OPTIONS: SUMMARY COMPARISON

The chart below offers a quick comparison of the 3 options for the handling of over-votes:

## Example:

| Broker A: <br> Record date <br> position: 20,000 | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | For | Withold | For | Against |
| Total | 18,000 | 4,200 | 14,200 | $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ |


|  | Option 1 |  |  |  | Option 2 |  |  |  | Option 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  | Resolution 1 |  | Resolution 2 |  |
|  | For | Withhold | For | Against | For | Withhold | For | Against | For | Withhold | For | Against |
| Total | 16,217 | 3,783 | 12,792 | 7,208 | 15,000 | 3,700 | 13,700 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% | 90.1 | 90.1 | 90.1 | 90.1 | 83.3 | 88.1 | 96.5 | 62.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

