



Proxy Voting Report

Period: October 01, 2023 - December 31, 2023

Votes Cast	156	Number of meetings	37
For	130	With management	131
Withhold	0	Against management	24
Abstain	0	N/A	1
Against	25		
Other	1		
Total	156	Total	156

In 28% of meetings we have cast one or more votes against management recommendation.

General Highlights

Unlocking value: Corporate governance in state-owned enterprises

Working to improve corporate governance at state-owned enterprises

Many people think that corporate governance is an abstract concept and that its impact on our everyday lives is difficult to grasp. Think again. Only a few months ago, in March 2023, financial stability was tested by a crisis attributed to a large extent to poor corporate governance at US private sector banks. And the crucial importance of good governance becomes even more apparent when we look at State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs).

SOEs are amongst the largest corporations in many countries and account for a growing share of the corporate landscape. The OECD reports a staggering statistic – the ratio of SOEs in the list of top 500 global companies has tripled over the last two decades. The public sector held almost 11% of the listed companies' global market capitalization at the end of 2022. On top of that, in many countries, SOEs are the sole or main providers of essential services such as water or electricity.

Given their size and positioning in high-impact sectors, SOEs play a significant role in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The consequences of poor corporate governance in SOEs will therefore extend far beyond the boardroom. The figures speak for themselves – the International Monetary Fund highlighted in a 2020 publication that the maximum annual support provided by governments to financial and nonfinancial SOEs reached 18% and 16% of GDP, respectively, with the debt of SOEs exceeding 20% in some countries.

Far from a simple matter

Good governance in SOEs is, however, far from being a simple matter. If an SOE is run well and sufficient checks and balance are in place, state control can provide stability. If not, political involvement may also have downsides. State ownership adds to the known corporate governance challenges faced by listed firms for a number of reasons. For one, as noted by the OECD, "the accountability for an SOE's performance is often dispersed across the public administration and among different state bodies with inherently different policy interests". Secondly, SOEs have the hard task of walking a fine line when balancing different – and sometimes conflicting – objectives.

Listed SOEs have the advantage of being subject to the much stricter requirements applicable to publicly listed firms, as well as monitoring from external investors. However, minority shareholders often have limited rights and therefore little power to hold management to account. Governance challenges are very present – and some argue, even exacerbated – in these firms.

Recent scandals stand testament to this. Telecom giant Telia, which is partly-owned by the Swedish state, agreed to pay nearly USD 1 billion in 2017 to settle allegations that it paid major bribes in Uzbekistan in a case labeled as "one of the largest criminal corporate bribery and corruption resolutions ever" at the time.

Brazilian oil giant Petrobras was embroiled in the major 'lava jato' (car wash) scandal that triggered an SOE reform in the country. While Petrobras rolled out significant corporate governance improvements following the scandal, the company has recently come under intense scrutiny over proposed bylaw changes that are perceived to increase the risk of undue government interference.

OECD guidelines can help

The growing awareness of the importance of SOEs to our economies and the

governance challenges that they face have prompted many countries around the world to roll out reforms. These initiatives point out the fact that there is no one-size-fits-all recipe for reform. Nonetheless, the OECD Guidelines on Corporate Governance of State-Owned Enterprises, which are currently undergoing a review expected to be completed in 2024, are widely regarded as the golden standard for SOE reform.

The guidelines provide a multitude of tailored recommendations for SOEs, from encouraging governments to evaluate and disclose the policy rationale that motivates state ownership, to clearly identifying which part of the public administration is responsible for exercising the state ownership function. That said, the guidelines also say that:

“The state should strive toward full implementation of the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance when it is not the sole owner of SOEs, and of all relevant sections when it is the sole owner of SOEs.”

Concerning shareholder protection this includes:

1. The state and SOEs should ensure that all shareholders are treated equally;
2. SOEs should observe a high degree of transparency, including as a general rule, equal and simultaneous disclosure of information towards all shareholders;
3. SOEs should develop an active policy of communication and consultation with all shareholders;
4. The participation of minority shareholders in shareholder meetings should be facilitated so they can take part in fundamental corporate decisions such as board elections;
5. Transactions between the state and SOEs, and between SOEs themselves, should take place on market-consistent terms.

As an investor, we use our voting rights to push for these companies to adopt good governance and sustainable corporate practices. Our votes are guided by a robust policy which sets out our approach to a wide variety of issues ranging from director elections and remuneration to capital management and shareholder rights.

We expect SOEs to have proper safeguards in place, such as the establishment of committees comprising independent members to oversee conflicts of interest, super-majorities or 'majority of minority' voting provisions, and a transparent process for board nominations. If we see that insufficient safeguards are in place, we will hold companies accountable. For example, we vote against article amendments that would lead to a negative impact on minority shareholder rights or to a deterioration in the process for director nominations. Similarly, we vote against related party transactions that are not subject to an adequate oversight process that ensures minority shareholder rights are protected. Where we conclude that a company has not ensured adequate minority shareholder protections, we will consider escalation via a vote against the most accountable board member or via engagement. Because poor corporate governance does make a difference – even in our day-to-day lives.

Disclaimer

Robeco Institutional Asset Management B.V. ('Robeco') distributes voting reports as a service to its clients and other interested parties. Robeco also uses these reports to demonstrate its compliance with the principles and best practices of the Tabaksblat Code which are relevant to Robeco. Although Robeco compiles these reports with utmost care on the basis of several internal and external sources which are deemed to be reliable, Robeco cannot guarantee the completeness, correctness or timeliness of this information. Nor can Robeco guarantee that the use of this information will lead to the right analyses, results and/or that this information is suitable for specific purposes. Robeco can therefore never be held responsible for issues such as, but not limited to, possible omissions, inaccuracies and/or changes made at a later stage. Without written prior consent from Robeco you are not allowed to use this report for any purpose other than the specific one for which it was compiled by Robeco.