

Patriot Fund

Class	A	shares	TRFAX
Class	C	shares	TRFCX
Class	I	shares	TRFTX

Patriot Balanced Fund

Class	A	shares	ATBAX
Class	C	shares	ATBTX
Class	I	shares	ATBIX

Each Fund is a Series of Northern Lights Fund Trust

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

January 30, 2017

This Statement of Additional Information ("SAI") is not a prospectus and should be read in conjunction with the Prospectus of the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund dated January 30, 2017. You can obtain copies of the Funds' Prospectus, annual or semi-annual report without charge by contacting the Funds' transfer agent, Gemini Fund Services, LLC, at 17605 Wright Street, Suite 2, Omaha, Nebraska 68130 or by calling toll-free 1-855-527-2363. You may also obtain a Prospectus by visiting www.patriotfund.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE FUNDS	1
TYPES OF INVESTMENTS	2
INVESTMENT RESTRICTIONS	35
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DISCLOSURE OF PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS	37
MANAGEMENT	39
CONTROL PERSONS AND PRINCIPAL HOLDERS	46
INVESTMENT ADVISER	48
DISTRIBUTION OF SHARES	51
PORTFOLIO MANAGER	56
ALLOCATION OF PORTFOLIO BROKERAGE	57
PORTFOLIO TURNOVER	59
OTHER SERVICE PROVIDERS	60
DESCRIPTION OF SHARES	63
ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING PROGRAM	63
PURCHASE, REDEMPTION AND PRICING OF SHARES	64
TAX STATUS	68
INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM	75
LEGAL COUNSEL	75
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	75
APPENDIX – ADVISER'S PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	A-1

THE FUNDS

The Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund (each a "Fund" and collectively the "Funds") are each a series of Northern Lights Fund Trust, a Delaware statutory trust organized on January 19, 2005 (the "Trust"). The Trust is registered as an open-end management investment company. The Trust is governed by its Board of Trustees (the "Board" or "Trustees").

The Funds may issue an unlimited number of shares of beneficial interest. All shares of the Funds have equal rights and privileges. Each share of the Funds are entitled to one vote on all matters as to which shares are entitled to vote. In addition, each share of the Funds is entitled to participate equally with other shares on a class-specific basis (i) in dividends and distributions declared by the Funds and (ii) on liquidation, to its proportionate share of the assets remaining after satisfaction of outstanding liabilities. Shares of the Funds are fully paid, non-assessable and fully transferable when issued and have no pre-emptive, conversion or exchange rights. Fractional shares have proportionately the same rights, including voting rights, as are provided for a full share.

The Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund are each a diversified series of the Trust consisting of Class A, C and I shares. Ascendant Advisors, LLC (the "Adviser") is the Funds' investment adviser. The Funds' investment objective, restrictions and policies are more fully described here and in the Prospectus. The Board may start other series and offer shares of a new mutual funds under the Trust at any time.

The Funds offer three classes of shares: Class A, Class C, and Class I shares. Each share class represents an interest in the same assets of the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund, has the same rights and is identical in all material respects except that (i) each class of shares may be subject to different (or no) sales loads, (ii) each class of shares may bear different (or no) distribution fees; (iii) each class of shares may have different shareholder features, such as minimum investment amounts; (iv) certain other class-specific expenses will be borne solely by the class to which such expenses are attributable, including transfer agent fees attributable to a specific class of shares, printing and postage expenses related to preparing and distributing materials to current shareholders of a specific class, registration fees paid by a specific class of shares, the expenses of administrative personnel and services required to support the shareholders of a specific class, litigation or other legal expenses relating to a class of shares, Trustees' fees or expenses paid as a result of issues relating to a specific class of shares and accounting fees and expenses relating to a specific class of shares and (v) each class has exclusive voting rights with respect to matters relating to its own distribution arrangements. The Board of Trustees may classify and reclassify the shares of the Funds into additional classes of shares at a future date.

Under the Trust's Agreement and Declaration of Trust, each Trustee will continue in office until the termination of the Trust or his/her earlier death, incapacity, resignation or removal. Shareholders can remove a Trustee to the extent provided by the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act") and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder. Vacancies may be filled by a majority of the remaining Trustees, except insofar as the 1940 Act may require the election by shareholders. As a result, normally no annual or regular meetings of shareholders will be held unless matters arise requiring a vote of shareholders under the Agreement and Declaration of Trust or the 1940 Act.

TYPES OF INVESTMENTS

The investment objective of the Funds and a description of their principal investment strategies are set forth under "Fund Summary" in the Prospectus. The Funds' investment objectives are not "fundamental" and may be changed without the approval of a majority of its outstanding voting securities; however, shareholders will be given at least 60 days' notice of such a change. To the extent that a type of investment is not discussed in the section of a Fund's prospectus titled "Principal Investment Strategies," such type of investment is not used by the Fund in executing its principal investment strategies.

The following information describes securities in which the Funds may invest and their related risks.

Equity Securities

Equity securities include common stock and securities convertible into common stocks, such as convertible bonds, warrants, rights and options. The value of equity securities varies in response to many factors, including the activities and financial condition of individual companies, the business market in which individual companies compete and general market and economic conditions. Equity securities fluctuate in value, often based on factors unrelated to the value of the issuer of the securities, and such fluctuations can be significant.

Common Stock

Common stock represents an equity (ownership) interest in a company, and usually possesses voting rights and earns dividends. Dividends on common stock are not fixed but are declared at the discretion of the issuer. Common stock generally represents the riskiest investment in a company. In addition, common stock generally has the greatest appreciation and depreciation potential because increases and decreases in earnings are usually reflected in a company's stock price.

The fundamental risk of investing in common stock is the risk that the value of the stock might decrease. Stock values fluctuate in response to the activities of an

individual company or in response to general market and/or economic conditions. Historically, common stocks have provided greater long-term returns and have entailed greater short-term risks than fixed-income securities and money market investments. The market value of all securities, including common stocks, is based upon the market's perception of value and not necessarily the book value of an issuer or other objective measures of a company's worth.

Convertible Securities

The Funds may invest in convertible securities and non-investment grade convertible securities. Convertible securities include fixed income securities that may be exchanged or converted into a predetermined number of shares of the issuer's underlying common stock at the option of the holder during a specified period. Convertible securities may take the form of convertible preferred stock, convertible bonds or debentures, units consisting of "usable" bonds and warrants or a combination of the features of several of these securities. Convertible securities are senior to common stocks in an issuer's capital structure, but are usually subordinated to similar non-convertible securities. 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 nonconvertible security), a convertible security also gives an investor the opportunity, through its conversion feature, to participate in the capital appreciation of the issuing company depending upon a market price advance in the convertible security's underlying common stock.

Income Trusts

The Funds may invest in income trusts which are investment trusts that hold assets that are income producing. The income is passed on to the "unitholders." Each income trust has an operating risk based on its underlying business. The term may also be used to designate a legal entity, capital structure and ownership vehicle for certain assets or businesses. Shares or "trust units" are traded on securities exchanges just like stocks. Income is passed on to the investors, called unitholders, through monthly or quarterly distributions. Historically, distributions have typically been higher than dividends on common stocks. The unitholders are the beneficiaries of a trust, and their units represent their right to participate in the income and capital of the trust. Income trusts generally invest funds in assets that provide a return to the trust and its beneficiaries based on the cash flows of an underlying business. This return is often achieved through the acquisition by the trust of equity and debt instruments, royalty interests or real properties. The trust can receive interest, royalty or lease payments from an operating entity carrying on a business, as well as dividends and a return of capital.

Each income trust has an operating risk based on its underlying business; and, typically, the higher the yield, the higher the risk. They also have additional risk factors, including, but not limited to, poorer access to debt markets. Similar to a dividend paying stock, income trusts do not guarantee minimum distributions or even return of capital. If the business starts to lose money, the trust can reduce or even eliminate distributions;

this is usually accompanied by sharp losses in a unit's market value. Since the yield is one of the main attractions of income trusts, there is the risk that trust units will decline in value if interest rates offering in competing markets, such as in the cash/treasury market, increase. Interest rate risk is also present within the trusts themselves because they hold very long term capital assets (e.g. pipelines, power plants, etc.), and much of the excess distributable income is derived from a maturity (or duration) mismatch between the life of the asset, and the life of the financing associated with it. In an increasing interest rate environment, not only does the attractiveness of trust distributions decrease, but quite possibly, the distributions may themselves decrease, leading to a double whammy of both declining yield and substantial loss of unitholder value. Because most income is passed on to unitholders, rather than reinvested in the business, in some cases, a trust can become a wasting asset unless more equity is issued. Because many income trusts pay out more than their net income, the unitholder equity (capital) may decline over time. To the extent that the value of the trust is driven by the deferral or reduction of tax, any change in government tax regulations to remove the benefit will reduce the value of the trusts. Generally, income trusts also carry the same risks as dividend paying stocks that are traded on stock markets.

Publicly Traded Partnerships

The Funds may invest in publicly traded partnerships ("PTPs"). PTPs are limited partnerships the interests in which (known as "units") are traded on public exchanges, just like corporate stock. PTPs are limited partnerships that provide an investor with a direct interest in a group of assets (generally, oil and gas properties). Publicly traded partnership units typically trade publicly, like stock, and thus may provide the investor more liquidity than ordinary limited partnerships. Publicly traded partnerships are also called master limited partnerships and public limited partnerships. A limited partnership has one or more general partners (they may be individuals, corporations, partnerships or another entity) which manage the partnership, and limited partners, which provide capital to the partnership but have no role in its management. When an investor buys units in a PTP, he or she becomes a limited partner. PTPs are formed in several ways. A non-traded partnership may decide to go public. Several non-traded partnerships may "roll up" into a single PTP. A corporation may spin off a group of assets or part of its business into a PTP of which it is the general partner, either to realize what it believes to be the asset's full value or as an alternative to issuing debt. A corporation may fully convert to a PTP, although since 1986 the tax consequences have made this an unappealing; or, a newly formed company may operate as a PTP from its inception.

There are different types of risks to investing in PTPs including regulatory risks and interest rate risks. Currently most partnerships enjoy pass through taxation of their income to partners, which avoids double taxation of earnings. If the government were to change PTP business tax structure, unitholders would not be able to enjoy the relatively high yields in the sector for long. In addition, PTP's which charge government-regulated fees for transportation of oil and gas products through their pipelines are subject to unfavorable changes in government-approved rates and fees, which would affect a PTPs revenue stream negatively. PTPs also carry some interest rate risks. During increases in interest rates, PTPs may not produce decent returns to shareholders.

Real Estate Investment Trusts

The Funds may invest in securities of real estate investment trusts ("REITs"). REITs are publicly traded corporations or trusts that specialize in acquiring, holding and managing residential, commercial or industrial real estate. A REIT is not taxed at the entity level on income distributed to its shareholders or unitholders if it distributes to shareholders or unitholders at least 95% of its taxable income for each taxable year and complies with regulatory requirements relating to its organization, ownership, assets and income.

REITs generally can be classified as "Equity REITs," "Mortgage REITs" and "Hybrid REITs." An Equity REIT invests the majority of its assets directly in real property and derives its income primarily from rents and from capital gains on real estate appreciation, which are realized through property sales. A Mortgage REIT invests the majority of its assets in real estate mortgage loans and services its income primarily from interest payments. A Hybrid REIT combines the characteristics of an Equity REIT and a Mortgage REIT. Although the Funds can invest in all three kinds of REITs, its emphasis is expected to be on investments in Equity REITs.

Investments in the real estate industry involve particular risks. The real estate industry has been subject to substantial fluctuations and declines on a local, regional and national basis in the past and may continue to be in the future. Real property values and income from real property continue to be in the future. Real property values and income from real property may decline due to general and local economic conditions, overbuilding and increased competition, increases in property taxes and operating expenses, changes in zoning laws, casualty or condemnation losses, regulatory limitations on rents, changes in neighborhoods and in demographics, increases in market interest rates, or other factors. Factors such as these may adversely affect companies that own and operate real estate directly, companies that lend to such companies, and companies that service the real estate industry.

Investments in REITs also involve risks. Equity REITs will be affected by changes in the values of and income from the properties they own, while Mortgage REITs may be affected by the credit quality of the mortgage loans they hold. In addition, REITs are dependent on specialized management skills and on their ability to generate cash flow for operating purposes and to make distributions to shareholders or unitholders. REITs may have limited diversification and are subject to risks associated with obtaining financing for real property, as well as to the risk of self-liquidation. REITs also can be adversely affected by their failure to qualify for tax-free pass-through treatment of their income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or their failure to maintain an exemption from registration under the 1940 Act. By investing in REITs indirectly through the Funds, a shareholder bears not only a proportionate share of the expenses of the Funds, but also may indirectly bear similar expenses of some of the REITs in which it invests.

Warrants

The Funds may invest in warrants. Warrants are options to purchase common stock at a specific price (usually at a premium above the market value of the optioned common stock at issuance) valid for a specific period of time. Warrants may have a life ranging from less than one year to twenty years, or longer. Warrants have expiration dates after which they are worthless. In addition, a warrant is worthless if the market price of the common stock does not exceed the warrant's exercise price during the life of the warrant. Warrants have no voting rights, pay no dividends, and have no rights with respect to the assets of the corporation issuing them. The percentage increase or decrease in the market price of the warrant may tend to be greater than the percentage increase or decrease in the market price of the optioned common stock.

Fixed Income/ Debt/ Bond Securities

Yields on fixed income securities, which the Funds define to include preferred stock, are dependent on a variety of factors, including the general conditions of the money market and other fixed income securities markets, the size of a particular offering, the maturity of the obligation and the rating of the issue. An investment in the Funds will be subjected to risk even if all fixed income securities in the Funds' portfolios are paid in full at maturity. All fixed income securities, including U.S. Government securities, can change in value when there is a change in interest rates or the issuer's actual or perceived creditworthiness or ability to meet its obligations.

There is normally an inverse relationship between the market value of securities sensitive to prevailing interest rates and actual changes in interest rates. In other words, an increase in interest rates produces a decrease in market value. The longer the remaining maturity (and duration) of a security, the greater will be the effect of interest rate changes on the market value of that security. Changes in the ability of an issuer to make payments of interest and principal and in the markets' perception of an issuer's creditworthiness will also affect the market value of the debt securities of that issuer. Obligations of issuers of fixed income securities (including municipal securities) are subject to the provisions of bankruptcy, insolvency, and other laws affecting the rights and remedies of creditors, such as the Federal Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978. In addition, the obligations of municipal issuers may become subject to laws enacted in the future by Congress, state legislatures, or referenda extending the time for payment of principal and/or interest, or imposing other constraints upon enforcement of such obligations or upon the ability of municipalities to levy taxes. Changes in the ability of an issuer to make payments of interest and principal and in the market's perception of an issuer's creditworthiness will also affect the market value of the debt securities of that issuer. The possibility exists, therefore, that the ability of any issuer to pay, when due, the principal of and interest on its debt securities may become impaired.

The corporate debt securities in which the Funds may invest include corporate bonds and notes and short-term investments such as commercial paper and variable

rate demand notes. Commercial paper (short-term promissory notes) is issued by companies to finance their or their affiliate's current obligations and is frequently unsecured. Variable and floating rate demand notes are unsecured obligations typically redeemable upon not more than 30 days' notice. These obligations include master demand notes that permit investment of fluctuating amounts at varying rates of interest pursuant to a direct arrangement with the issuer of the instrument. The issuer of these obligations often has the right, after a given period, to prepay the outstanding principal amount of the obligations upon a specified number of days' notice. These obligations generally are not traded, nor generally is there an established secondary market for these obligations. To the extent a demand note does not have a 7-day or shorter demand feature and there is no readily available market for the obligation, it is treated as an illiquid security.

The Funds may invest in debt securities, including non-investment grade debt securities. The following describes some of the risks associated with fixed income debt securities:

Interest Rate Risk. Debt securities have varying levels of sensitivity to changes in interest rates. In general, the price of a debt security can fall when interest rates rise and can rise when interest rates fall. Securities with longer maturities and mortgage securities can be more sensitive to interest rate changes although they usually offer higher yields to compensate investors for the greater risks. The longer the maturity of the security, the greater the impact a change in interest rates could have on the security's price. In addition, short-term and long-term interest rates do not necessarily move in the same amount or the same direction. Short-term securities tend to react to changes in short-term interest rates and long-term securities tend to react to changes in long-term interest rates.

Credit Risk. Fixed income securities have speculative characteristics and changes in economic conditions or other circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity of those issuers to make principal or interest payments, as compared to issuers of more highly rated securities.

Extension Risk. The Funds are subject to the risk that an issuer will exercise its right to pay principal on an obligation held by the Funds (such as mortgage-backed securities) later than expected. This may happen when there is a rise in interest rates. These events may lengthen the duration (i.e. interest rate sensitivity) and potentially reduce the value of these securities.

Prepayment Risk. Certain types of debt securities, such as mortgage-backed securities, have yield and maturity characteristics corresponding to underlying assets. Unlike traditional debt securities, which may pay a fixed rate of interest until maturity when the entire principal amount comes due, payments on certain mortgage-backed securities may include both interest and a partial payment of principal. Besides the scheduled repayment of principal, payments of principal may result from the voluntary prepayment, refinancing, or foreclosure of the underlying mortgage loans.

Securities subject to prepayment are less effective than other types of securities as a means of "locking in" attractive long-term interest rates. One reason is the need to reinvest prepayments of principal; another is the possibility of significant unscheduled prepayments resulting from declines in interest rates. These prepayments would have to be reinvested at lower rates. As a result, these securities may have less potential for capital appreciation during periods of declining interest rates than other securities of comparable maturities, although they may have a similar risk of decline in market value during periods of rising interest rates. Prepayments may also significantly shorten the effective maturities of these securities, especially during periods of declining interest rates. Conversely, during periods of rising interest rates, a reduction in prepayments may increase the effective maturities of these securities, subjecting them to a greater risk of decline in market value in response to rising interest rates than traditional debt securities, and, therefore, potentially increasing the volatility of the Funds.

At times, some of the mortgage-backed securities in which the Funds may invest will have higher than market interest rates and therefore will be purchased at a premium above their par value. Prepayments may cause losses in securities purchased at a premium, as unscheduled prepayments, which are made at par, will cause the Funds to experience a loss equal to any unamortized premium.

Certificates of Deposit and Bankers' Acceptances

The Funds may invest in certificates of deposit and bankers' acceptances, which are considered to be short-term money market instruments.

Certificates of deposit are receipts issued by a depository institution in exchange for the deposit of funds. The issuer agrees to pay the amount deposited plus interest to the bearer of the receipt on the date specified on the certificate. The certificate usually can be traded in the secondary market prior to maturity. Bankers' acceptances typically arise from short-term credit arrangements designed to enable businesses to obtain funds to finance commercial transactions. Generally, an acceptance is a time draft drawn on a bank by an exporter or an importer to obtain a stated amount of funds to pay for specific merchandise. The draft is then "accepted" by a bank that, in effect, unconditionally guarantees to pay the face value of the instrument on its maturity date. The acceptance may then be held by the accepting bank as an earning asset or it may be sold in the secondary market at the going rate of discount for a specific maturity. Although maturities for acceptances can be as long as 270 days, most acceptances have maturities of six months or less.

Commercial Paper

The Funds may purchase commercial paper. Commercial paper consists of short-term (usually from 1 to 270 days) unsecured promissory notes issued by corporations in order to finance their current operations. It may be secured by letters of credit, a surety bond or other forms of collateral. Commercial paper is usually repaid at

maturity by the issuer from the proceeds of the issuance of new commercial paper. As a result, investment in commercial paper is subject to the risk the issuer cannot issue enough new commercial paper to satisfy its outstanding commercial paper, also known as rollover risk. Commercial paper may become illiquid or may suffer from reduced liquidity in certain circumstances. Like all fixed income securities, commercial paper prices are susceptible to fluctuations in interest rates. If interest rates rise, commercial paper prices will decline. The short-term nature of a commercial paper investment makes it less susceptible to interest rate risk than many other fixed income securities because interest rate risk typically increases as maturity lengths increase. Commercial paper tends to yield smaller returns than longer-term corporate debt because securities with shorter maturities typically have lower effective yields than those with longer maturities. As with all fixed income securities, there is a chance that the issuer will default on its commercial paper obligation.

Time Deposits and Variable Rate Notes

The Funds may invest in fixed time deposits, whether or not subject to withdrawal penalties.

The commercial paper obligations, which the Funds may buy are unsecured and may include variable rate notes. The nature and terms of a variable rate note (i.e., a "Master Note") permit the Funds to invest fluctuating amounts at varying rates of interest pursuant to a direct arrangement between the Funds as lender, and the issuer, as borrower. It permits daily changes in the amounts borrowed. The Funds have the right at any time to increase, up to the full amount stated in the note agreement, or to decrease the amount outstanding under the note. The issuer may prepay at any time and without penalty any part of or the full amount of the note. The note may or may not be backed by one or more bank letters of credit. Because these notes are direct lending arrangements between the Funds and the issuer, it is not generally contemplated that they will be traded; moreover, there is currently no secondary market for them. Except as specifically provided in the Prospectus, there is no limitation on the type of issuer from whom these notes may be purchased; however, in connection with such purchase and on an ongoing basis, the Funds' Adviser will consider the earning power, cash flow and other liquidity ratios of the issuer, and its ability to pay principal and interest on demand, including a situation in which all holders of such notes made demand simultaneously. Variable rate notes are subject to the Funds' investment restriction on illiquid securities unless such notes can be put back to the issuer on demand within seven days.

Insured Bank Obligations

The Funds may invest in insured bank obligations. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") insures the deposits of federally insured banks and savings and loan associations (collectively referred to as "banks") up to \$250,000. The Funds may purchase bank obligations that are fully insured as to principal by the FDIC. Currently, to remain fully insured as to principal, these investments must be limited to

\$250,000 per bank; if the principal amount and accrued interest together exceed \$250,000, the excess principal and accrued interest will not be insured. Insured bank obligations may have limited marketability.

High Yield Securities

The Funds may invest in high yield securities. High yield, high risk bonds are securities that are generally rated below investment grade by the primary rating agencies (BB+ or lower by S&P and Ba1 or lower by Moody's). Other terms used to describe such securities include "lower rated bonds," "non-investment grade bonds," "below investment grade bonds," and "junk bonds." These securities are considered to be high-risk investments. The risks include the following:

Greater Risk of Loss. These securities are regarded as predominately speculative. There is a greater risk that issuers of lower rated securities will default than issuers of higher rated securities. Issuers of lower rated securities generally are less creditworthy and may be highly indebted, financially distressed, or bankrupt. These issuers are more vulnerable to real or perceived economic changes, political changes or adverse industry developments. In addition, high yield securities are frequently subordinated to the prior payment of senior indebtedness. If an issuer fails to pay principal or interest, the Funds would experience a decrease in income and a decline in the market value of its investments.

Sensitivity to Interest Rate and Economic Changes. The income and market value of lower-rated securities may fluctuate more than higher rated securities. Although non-investment grade securities tend to be less sensitive to interest rate changes than investment grade securities, non-investment grade securities are more sensitive to short-term corporate, economic and market developments. During periods of economic uncertainty and change, the market price of the investments in lower-rated securities may be volatile. The default rate for high yield bonds tends to be cyclical, with defaults rising in periods of economic downturn.

Valuation Difficulties. It is often more difficult to value lower rated securities than higher rated securities. If an issuer's financial condition deteriorates, accurate financial and business information may be limited or unavailable. In addition, the lower rated investments may be thinly traded and there may be no established secondary market. Because of the lack of market pricing and current information for investments in lower rated securities, valuation of such investments is much more dependent on judgment than is the case with higher rated securities.

Liquidity. There may be no established secondary or public market for investments in lower rated securities. Such securities are frequently traded in markets that may be relatively less liquid than the market for higher rated securities. In addition, relatively few institutional purchasers may hold a major portion of an issue of lower-rated securities at times. As a result, the Funds may be required to sell investments at substantial losses or retain them indefinitely when an issuer's financial condition is deteriorating.

Credit Quality. Credit quality of non-investment grade securities can change suddenly and unexpectedly, and even recently-issued credit ratings may not fully reflect the actual risks posed by a particular high-yield security.

New Legislation. Future legislation may have a possible negative impact on the market for high yield, high risk bonds. As an example, in the late 1980s, legislation required federally-insured savings and loan associations to divest their investments in high yield, high risk bonds. New legislation, if enacted, could have a material negative effect on the Funds' investments in lower rated securities.

High yield, high risk investments may include the following:

Straight Fixed-income Debt Securities. These include bonds and other debt obligations that bear a fixed or variable rate of interest payable at regular intervals and have a fixed or resettable maturity date. The particular terms of such securities vary and may include features such as call provisions and sinking Funds.

Zero-coupon Debt Securities. These do not pay periodic interest but are issued at a discount from their value at maturity. When held to maturity, their entire return equals the difference between their issue price and their maturity value.

Zero-fixed-coupon Debt Securities. These are zero-coupon debt securities that convert on a specified date to periodic interest-paying debt securities.

Pay-in-kind Bonds. These are bonds which allow the issuer, at its option, to make current interest payments on the bonds either in cash or in additional bonds. These are bonds are typically sold without registration under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended ("Securities Act"), usually to a relatively small number of institutional investors.

Convertible Securities. These are bonds or preferred stock that may be converted to common stock.

Preferred Stock. These are stocks that generally pay a dividend at a specified rate and have preference over common stock in the payment of dividends and in liquidation.

Loan Participations and Assignments. These are participations in, or assignments of all or a portion of loans to corporations or to governments, including governments of less developed countries.

Securities issued in connection with Reorganizations and Corporate Restructurings. In connection with reorganizing or restructuring of an issuer, an issuer may issue common stock or other securities to holders of its debt securities. The Funds may hold such common stock and other securities even if they do not invest in such securities.

Municipal Government Obligations

In general, municipal obligations are debt obligations issued by or on behalf of states, territories and possessions of the United States (including the District of Columbia) and their political subdivisions, agencies and instrumentalities. Municipal obligations generally include debt obligations issued to obtain Funds for various public purposes. Certain types of municipal obligations are issued in whole or in part to obtain funding for privately operated facilities or projects. Municipal obligations include general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, industrial development bonds, notes and municipal lease obligations. Municipal obligations also include additional obligations, the interest on which is exempt from federal income tax, that may become available in the future as long as the Board of the Funds determines that an investment in any such type of obligation is consistent with the Funds' investment objectives. Municipal obligations may be fully or partially backed by local government, the credit of a private issuer, current or anticipated revenues from a specific project or specific assets or domestic or foreign entities providing credit support such as letters of credit, guarantees or insurance.

Bonds and Notes. General obligation bonds are secured by the issuer's pledge of its full faith, credit and taxing power for the payment of interest and principal. Revenue bonds are payable only from the revenues derived from a project or facility or from the proceeds of a specified revenue source. Industrial development bonds are generally revenue bonds secured by payments from and the credit of private users. Municipal notes are issued to meet the short-term funding requirements of state, regional and local governments. Municipal notes include tax anticipation notes, bond anticipation notes, revenue anticipation notes, tax and revenue anticipation notes, construction loan notes, short-term discount notes, tax-exempt commercial paper, demand notes and similar instruments.

Municipal Lease Obligations. Municipal lease obligations may take the form of a lease, an installment purchase or a conditional sales contract. They are issued by state and local governments and authorities to acquire land, equipment and facilities, such as vehicles, telecommunications and computer equipment and other capital assets. The Funds may invest in funds that purchase these lease obligations directly, or it may purchase participation interests in such lease obligations. States have different requirements for issuing municipal debt and issuing municipal leases. Municipal leases are generally subject to greater risks than general obligation or revenue bonds because they usually contain a "non-appropriation" clause, which provides that the issuer is not obligated to make payments on the obligation in future years unless funds have been appropriated for this purpose each year. Such non-appropriation clauses are required to avoid the municipal lease obligations from being treated as debt for state debt restriction purposes. Accordingly, such obligations are subject to "non-appropriation" risk. Municipal leases may be secured by the underlying capital asset and it may be difficult to dispose of any such asset in the event of non-appropriation or other default.

United States Government Obligations

These consist of various types of marketable securities issued by the United States Treasury, i.e., bills, notes and bonds. Such securities are direct obligations of the United States government and differ mainly in the length of their maturity. Treasury bills, the most frequently issued marketable government security, have a maturity of up to one year and are issued on a discount basis. The Funds may also invest in Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities ("TIPS"). TIPS are special types of treasury bonds that were created in order to offer bond investors protection from inflation. The values of the TIPS are automatically adjusted to the inflation rate as measured by the Consumer Price Index ("CPI"). If the CPI goes up by half a percent, the value of the bond (the TIPS) would also go up by half a percent. If the CPI falls, the value of the bond does not fall because the government guarantees that the original investment will stay the same. TIPS decline in value when real interest rates rise. However, in certain interest rate environments, such as when real interest rates are rising faster than nominal interest rates, TIPS may experience greater losses than other fixed income securities with similar duration.

United States Government Agency Obligations

These consist of debt securities issued by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States government, including the various types of instruments currently outstanding or which may be offered in the future. Agencies include, among others, the Federal Housing Administration, Government National Mortgage Association ("Ginnie Mae"), Farmer's Home Administration, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Maritime Administration, and General Services Administration. Instrumentalities include, for example, each of the Federal Home Loan Banks, the National Bank for Cooperatives, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation ("Freddie Mac"), the Farm Credit Banks, the Federal National Mortgage Association ("Fannie Mae"), and the United States Postal Service. These securities are either: (i) backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government (e.g., United States Treasury Bills); (ii) guaranteed by the United States Treasury (e.g., Ginnie Mae mortgage-backed securities); (iii) supported by the issuing agency's or instrumentality's right to borrow from the United States Treasury (e.g., Fannie Mae Discount Notes); or (iv) supported only by the issuing agency's or instrumentality's own credit (e.g., Tennessee Valley Association). On September 7, 2008, the U.S. Treasury Department and the Federal Housing Finance Authority (the "FHFA") announced that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac had been placed into conservatorship, a statutory process designed to stabilize a troubled institution with the objective of returning the entity to normal business operations. The U.S. Treasury Department and the FHFA at the same time established a secured lending facility and a Secured Stock Purchase Agreement with both Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to ensure that each entity had the ability to fulfill its financial obligations. The FHFA announced that it does not anticipate any disruption in pattern of payments or ongoing business operations of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Government-related guarantors (i.e. not backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government) include Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Fannie Mae is a government-sponsored corporation owned by stockholders. It is subject to general regulation by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Fannie Mae purchases conventional (i.e., not insured or guaranteed by any government agency) residential mortgages from a list of approved seller/servicers which include state and federally chartered savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, commercial banks and credit unions and mortgage bankers. Pass-through securities issued by Fannie Mae are guaranteed as to timely payment of principal and interest by Fannie Mae but are not backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

Freddie Mac was created by Congress in 1970 for the purpose of increasing the availability of mortgage credit for residential housing. It is a government-sponsored corporation formerly owned by the twelve Federal Home Loan Banks and now owned by stockholders. Freddie Mac issues Participation Certificates ("PCs"), which represent interests in conventional mortgages from Freddie Mac's national portfolio. Freddie Mac guarantees the timely payment of interest and ultimate collection of principal, but PCs are not backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government. Commercial banks, savings and loan institutions, private mortgage insurance companies, mortgage bankers and other secondary market issuers also create pass-through pools of conventional residential mortgage loans. Such issuers may, in addition, be the originators and/or servicers of the underlying mortgage loans as well as the guarantors of the mortgage-related securities. Pools created by such nongovernmental issuers generally offer a higher rate of interest than government and government-related pools because there are no direct or indirect government or agency guarantees of payments in the former pools. However, timely payment of interest and principal of these pools may be supported by various forms of insurance or guarantees, including individual loan, title, pool and hazard insurance and letters of credit. The insurance and guarantees are issued by governmental entities, private insurers and the mortgage poolers.

Mortgage Pass-Through Securities

Interests in pools of mortgage pass-through securities differ from other forms of debt securities (which normally provide periodic payments of interest in fixed amounts and the payment of principal in a lump sum at maturity or on specified call dates). Instead, mortgage pass-through securities provide monthly payments consisting of both interest and principal payments. In effect, these payments are a "pass-through" of the monthly payments made by the individual borrowers on the underlying residential mortgage loans, net of any fees paid to the issuer or guarantor of such securities. Unscheduled payments of principal may be made if the underlying mortgage loans are repaid or refinanced or the underlying properties are foreclosed, thereby shortening the securities' weighted average life. Some mortgage pass-through securities (such as securities guaranteed by Ginnie Mae) are described as "modified pass-through securities." These securities entitle the holder to receive all interest and principal

payments owed on the mortgage pool, net of certain fees, on the scheduled payment dates regardless of whether the mortgagor actually makes the payment.

The principal governmental guarantor of mortgage pass-through securities is Ginnie Mae. Ginnie Mae is authorized to guarantee, with the full faith and credit of the U.S. Treasury, the timely payment of principal and interest on securities issued by lending institutions approved by Ginnie Mae (such as savings and loan institutions, commercial banks and mortgage bankers) and backed by pools of mortgage loans. These mortgage loans are either insured by the Federal Housing Administration or guaranteed by the Veterans Administration. A "pool" or group of such mortgage loans is assembled and after being approved by Ginnie Mae, is offered to investors through securities dealers.

Government-related guarantors of mortgage pass-through securities (i.e., not backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Treasury) include Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Fannie Mae is subject to general regulation by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Fannie Mae purchases conventional (i.e., not insured or guaranteed by any government agency) residential mortgages from a list of approved sellers/servicers which include state and federally chartered savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, commercial banks and credit unions and mortgage bankers. Mortgage pass-through securities issued by Fannie Mae are guaranteed as to timely payment of principal and interest by Fannie Mae but are not backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Treasury.

Resets. The interest rates paid on the Adjustable Rate Mortgage Securities ("ARMs") in which the Funds may invest generally are readjusted or reset at intervals of one year or less to an increment over some predetermined interest rate index. There are two main categories of indices: those based on U.S. Treasury securities and those derived from a calculated measure, such as a cost of funds index or a moving average of mortgage rates. Commonly utilized indices include the one-year and five-year constant maturity Treasury Note rates, the three-month Treasury Bill rate, the 180-day Treasury Bill rate, rates on longer-term Treasury securities, the National Median Cost of Funds, the one-month or three-month London Interbank Offered Rate ("LIBOR"), the prime rate of a specific bank, or commercial paper rates. Some indices, such as the one-year constant maturity Treasury Note rate, closely mirror changes in market interest rate levels. Others tend to lag changes in market rate levels and tend to be somewhat less volatile.

Caps and Floors. The underlying mortgages which collateralize the ARMs in which the Funds may invest will frequently have caps and floors which limit the maximum amount by which the loan rate to the residential borrower may change up or down: (1) per reset or adjustment interval, and (2) over the life of the loan. Some residential mortgage loans restrict periodic adjustments by limiting changes in the borrower's monthly principal and interest payments rather than limiting interest rate changes. These payment caps may result in negative amortization. The value of mortgage securities in which the Funds may invest may be affected if market interest

rates rise or fall faster and farther than the allowable caps or floors on the underlying residential mortgage loans. Additionally, even though the interest rates on the underlying residential mortgages are adjustable, amortization and prepayments may occur, thereby causing the effective maturities of the mortgage securities in which the Funds may invest to be shorter than the maturities stated in the underlying mortgages.

Preferred Stock

The Funds define preferred stock as form of fixed income security because it has similar features to other forms of fixed income securities. Preferred stocks are securities that have characteristics of both common stocks and corporate bonds. Preferred stocks may receive dividends but payment is not guaranteed as with a bond. These securities may be undervalued because of a lack of analyst coverage resulting in a high dividend yield or yield to maturity. The risks of preferred stocks include a lack of voting rights and the Funds' Adviser may incorrectly analyze the security, resulting in a loss to the Funds. Furthermore, preferred stock dividends are not guaranteed and management can elect to forego the preferred dividend, resulting in a loss to the Funds. Preferred stock may also be convertible in the common stock of the issuer. Convertible securities may be exchanged or converted into a predetermined number of shares of the issuer's underlying common stock at the option of the holder during a specified period. Convertible securities are senior to common stocks in an issuer's capital structure, but are usually subordinated to similar non-convertible securities. A convertible security also gives an investor the opportunity, through its conversion feature, to participate in the capital appreciation of the issuing company depending upon a market price advance in the convertible security's underlying common stock. In general, preferred stocks generally pay a dividend at a specified rate and have preference over common stock in the payment of dividends and in liquidation. The Funds may invest in preferred stock with any or no credit rating. Preferred stock is a class of stock having a preference over common stock as to the payment of dividends and the recovery of investment should a company be liquidated, although preferred stock is usually junior to the debt securities of the issuer. Preferred stock market value may change based on changes in interest rates.

Exchange-Traded Notes and Structured Notes

The Funds may invest in exchange-traded notes ("ETNs"), which are a type of debt security that is typically unsecured and unsubordinated. This type of debt security differs from other types of bonds and notes because ETN returns are based upon the performance of a market index minus applicable fees, and typically, no periodic coupon payments are distributed and no principal protections exists, even at maturity. But as debt securities, ETNs do not own the underlying commodity or other index they are tracking. The purpose of ETNs is to create a type of security that combines both the aspects of bonds and exchange-traded funds ("ETFs"). Similar to ETFs, ETNs are traded on a major exchange, such as the New York Stock Exchange during normal trading hours. However, investors such as the Funds can also hold the debt security until maturity. At that time, the issuer will pay the investor a cash amount that would

be equal to principal amount times the return of a benchmark index, less any fees or other reductions. Because fees reduce the amount of return at maturity or upon redemption, if the value of the underlying decreases or does not increase significantly, the Funds may receive less than the principal amount of investment at maturity or upon redemption.

The Funds may invest in structured notes, which are a type of debt security that is typically unsecured and unsubordinated. These notes are typically issued by banks or brokerage firms, and have interest and/or principal payments which are linked to changes in the price level of certain assets or to the price performance of certain indices. The value of a structured note will be influenced by time to maturity, level of supply and demand for this type of note, interest rate and commodity market volatility, changes in the issuer's credit quality rating, and economic, legal, political, or geographic events that affect the referenced commodity. In addition, there may be a lag between a change in the value of the underlying reference asset and the value of the structured note. The Funds may also be exposed to increased transaction costs when it seeks to sell such notes in the secondary market.

Investment Companies

The Funds may invest in investment companies such as open-end funds (mutual funds), closed-end funds, and exchange-traded funds (also referred to as "Underlying Funds"). The 1940 Act provides that the mutual funds may not: (1) purchase more than 3% of an investment company's outstanding shares, (2) invest more than 5% of its assets in any single such investment company (the "5% Limit"), and (3) invest more than 10% of its assets in investment companies overall (the "10% Limit"), unless: (i) the underlying investment company and/or the Funds have received an order for exemptive relief from such limitations from the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"); and (ii) the underlying investment company and the Funds take appropriate steps to comply with any conditions in such order.

In addition, Section 12(d)(1)(F) of the 1940 Act, as amended, provides that the provisions of paragraph 12(d)(1) shall not apply to securities purchased or otherwise acquired by the Funds if (i) immediately after such purchase or acquisition not more than 3% of the total outstanding stock of such registered investment company is owned by the Funds and all affiliated persons of the Funds; and (ii) the Funds have not, and are not proposing to offer or sell any security issued by it through a principal underwriter or otherwise at a public or offering price which includes a sales load of more than 1 ½% percent. An investment company that issues shares to the Funds pursuant to paragraph 12(d)(1)(F) shall not be required to redeem its shares in an amount exceeding 1% of such investment company's total outstanding shares in any period of less than thirty days. The Funds (or the Adviser acting on behalf of the Funds) must comply with the following voting restrictions: when the Funds exercise voting rights, by proxy or otherwise, with respect to investment companies owned by the Funds, the Funds will either seek instruction from the Funds' shareholders with regard to the voting of all proxies and vote in accordance with such instructions, or vote the shares held by the Funds in the same proportion as the vote of all other holders of such security.

Further, the Funds may rely on Rule 12d1-3, which allows unaffiliated mutual funds to exceed the 5% Limit and the 10% Limit, provided the aggregate sales loads any investor pays (i.e., the combined distribution expenses of both the acquiring funds and the acquired funds) does not exceed the limits on sales loads established by Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. ("FINRA") for funds of funds.

The Funds and any "affiliated persons," as defined by the 1940 Act, may purchase in the aggregate only up to 3% of the total outstanding securities of any Underlying Fund. Accordingly, when affiliated persons hold shares of any of the Underlying Funds, the Funds' ability to invest fully in shares of those funds is restricted, and the Adviser must then, in some instances, select alternative investments that would not have been its first preference. The 1940 Act also provides that an Underlying Fund whose shares are purchased by the Funds will be obligated to redeem shares held by the Funds only in an amount up to 1% of the Underlying Funds' outstanding securities during any period of less than 30 days. Shares held by the Funds in excess of 1% of an Underlying Fund's outstanding securities therefore, will be considered not readily marketable securities, which, together with other such securities, may not exceed 15% of the Funds' total assets.

Under certain circumstances an Underlying Fund may determine to make payment of a redemption by the Funds wholly or partly by a distribution in kind of securities from its portfolio, in lieu of cash, in conformity with the rules of the SEC. In such cases, the Funds may hold securities distributed by an Underlying Fund until the Adviser determines that it is appropriate to dispose of such securities.

Investment decisions by the investment advisors of the Underlying Fund are made independently of the Funds and the Adviser. Therefore, the investment advisor of one Underlying Fund may be purchasing shares of the same issuer whose shares are being sold by the investment advisor of another such fund. The result would be an indirect expense to the Funds without accomplishing any investment purpose. Because other investment companies employ an investment adviser, such investments by the Funds may cause shareholders to bear duplicate fees.

Closed-End Investment Companies. The Funds may invest its assets in "closed-end" investment companies (or "closed-end funds"), subject to the investment restrictions set forth above. Shares of closed-end funds are typically offered to the public in a one-time initial public offering by a group of underwriters who retain a spread or underwriting commission of between 4% or 6% of the initial public offering price. Such securities are then listed for trading on the New York Stock Exchange, the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotation System (commonly known as "NASDAQ") or, in some cases, may be traded in other over-the-counter markets. Because the shares of closed-end funds cannot be redeemed upon demand to the issuer like the shares of an open-end investment company (such as the Funds), investors seek to buy and sell shares of closed-end funds in the secondary market.

The Funds generally will purchase shares of closed-end funds only in the secondary market. The Funds will incur normal brokerage costs on such purchases

similar to the expenses the Funds would incur for the purchase of securities of any other type of issuer in the secondary market. The Funds may, however, also purchase securities of a closed-end funds in an initial public offering when, in the opinion of the Adviser, based on a consideration of the nature of the closed-end funds' proposed investments, the prevailing market conditions and the level of demand for such securities, they represent an attractive opportunity for growth of capital. The initial offering price typically will include a dealer spread, which may be higher than the applicable brokerage cost if the Funds purchased such securities in the secondary market.

The shares of many closed-end funds, after their initial public offering, frequently trade at a price per share that is less than the net asset value per share, the difference representing the "market discount" of such shares. This market discount may be due in part to the investment objective of long-term appreciation, which is sought by many closed-end funds, as well as to the fact that the shares of closed-end funds are not redeemable by the holder upon demand to the issuer at the next determined net asset value but rather are subject to the principles of supply and demand in the secondary market. A relative lack of secondary market purchasers of closed-end funds shares also may contribute to such shares trading at a discount to their net asset value.

The Funds may invest in shares of closed-end funds that are trading at a discount to net asset value or at a premium to net asset value. There can be no assurance that the market discount on shares of any closed-end funds purchased by the Funds will ever decrease. In fact, it is possible that this market discount may increase and the Funds may suffer realized or unrealized capital losses due to further decline in the market price of the securities of such closed-end funds, thereby adversely affecting the net asset value of the Funds' shares. Similarly, there can be no assurance that any shares of a closed-end fund purchased by the Funds at a premium will continue to trade at a premium or that the premium will not decrease subsequent to a purchase of such shares by the Funds.

Closed-end funds may issue senior securities (including preferred stock and debt obligations) for the purpose of leveraging the closed-end funds' common shares in an attempt to enhance the current return to such closed-end funds' common shareholders. The Funds' investment in the common shares of closed-end funds that are financially leveraged may create an opportunity for greater total return on its investment, but at the same time may be expected to exhibit more volatility in market price and net asset value than an investment in shares of investment companies without a leveraged capital structure.

Exchange-Traded Funds. ETFs are typically passive funds that track their related index and have the flexibility of trading like a security. They are managed by professionals and provide the investor with diversification, cost and tax efficiency, liquidity, marginability, are useful for hedging, have the ability to go long and short, and some provide quarterly dividends. Additionally, some ETFs are unit investment trusts (UITs), which are unmanaged portfolios overseen by trustees and some ETFs may be

grantor trusts. An ETF typically holds a portfolio of securities or contracts designed to track a particular market segment or index. Some examples of ETFs are Rydex Shares™, ProShares®, SPDRs®, streetTRACKS, DIAMONDSSM, NASDAQ 100 Index Tracking StockSM ("QQQsSM"), and iShares®. The Funds may use ETFs as part of an overall investment strategy and as part of a hedging strategy. To offset the risk of declining security prices, the Funds may invest in inverse ETFs. Inverse ETFs are funds designed to rise in price when stock prices are falling. Additionally, inverse ETFs may employ leverage which magnifies the changes in the underlying stock index upon which they are based. Inverse ETF index funds seek to provide investment results that will match a certain percentage of the inverse of the performance of a specific benchmark on a daily basis. For example, if an inverse ETF's current benchmark is 200% of the inverse of the Russell 2000 Index and the ETF meets its objective, the value of the ETF will tend to increase on a daily basis when the value of the underlying index decreases (e.g., if the Russell 2000 Index goes down 5% then the inverse ETF's value should go up 10%). ETFs generally have two markets. The primary market is where institutions swap "creation units" in block-multiples of 50,000 shares for in-kind securities and cash in the form of dividends. The secondary market is where individual investors can trade as little as a single share during trading hours on the exchange. This is different from open-ended mutual funds that are traded after hours once the net asset value (NAV) is calculated. ETFs share many similar risks with open-end and closed-end funds.

There is a risk that an ETF in which the Funds invest may terminate due to extraordinary events that may cause any of the service providers to the ETFs, such as the trustee or sponsor, to close or otherwise fail to perform their obligations to the ETF. Also, because the ETFs in which the Funds intend to invest may be granted licenses by agreement to use the indices as a basis for determining their compositions and/or otherwise to use certain trade names, the ETFs may terminate if such license agreements are terminated. In addition, an ETF may terminate if its entire net asset value falls below a certain amount. Although the Funds believe that, in the event of the termination of an underlying ETF, they will be able to invest instead in shares of an alternate ETF tracking the same market index or another market index with the same general market, there is no guarantee that shares of an alternate ETF would be available for investment at that time. To the extent the Funds invest in a sector product, the Funds are subject to the risks associated with that sector.

The Funds could also 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 underlying securities they are designed to track, although lack of liquidity in an ETF could result in it being more volatile than the underlying portfolio of securities and ETFs have management fees that increase their costs versus the costs of owning the underlying securities directly.

ETFs are listed on national stock exchanges and are traded like stocks listed on an exchange. ETF shares may trade at a discount or a premium in market price if there

is a limited market in such shares. Investments in ETFs are subject to brokerage and other trading costs, which could result in greater expenses to the Funds. ETFs also are subject to investment advisory and other expenses, which will be indirectly paid by the Funds. As a result, your cost of investing in the Funds will be higher than the cost of investing directly in ETFs and may be higher than other mutual Funds that invest exclusively in stocks and bonds. You will indirectly bear fees and expenses charged by the ETFs in addition to the Funds' direct fees and expenses. Finally, because the value of ETF shares depends on the demand in the market, the Adviser may not be able to liquidate the Funds' holdings at the most optimal time, adversely affecting the Funds' performance.

ETFs may also include high beta index funds ("HBIFs"), which track an index by investing in leveraged instruments such as equity index swaps, futures contracts and options on securities, futures contracts, and stock indices. HBIFs are more volatile than the benchmark index they track and typically don't invest directly in the securities included in the benchmark, or in the same proportion that those securities are represented in that benchmark. On a day-to-day basis, HBIFs will target a volatility that is a specific percentage of the volatility of the underlying index. HBIFs seek to provide investment results that will match a certain percentage greater than 100% of the performance of a specific benchmark on a daily basis. For example, if a HBIF's current benchmark is 200% of the S&P 500 Index and it meets its objective, the value of the HBIF will tend to increase on a daily basis 200% of any increase in the underlying index (if the S&P 500 Index goes up 5% then the HBIF's value should go up 10%). When the value of the underlying index declines, the value of the HBIF's shares should also decrease on a daily basis by 200% of the value of any decrease in the underlying index (if the S&P 500 Index goes down 5% then the value of the HBIF should go down 10%).

Derivatives

Futures Contracts

A futures contract provides for the future sale by one party and purchase by another party of a specified amount of a specific financial instrument (e.g., units of a stock index) for a specified price, date, time and place designated at the time the contract is made. Brokerage fees are paid when a futures contract is bought or sold and margin deposits must be maintained. Entering into a contract to buy is commonly referred to as buying or purchasing a contract or holding a long position. Entering into a contract to sell is commonly referred to as selling a contract or holding a short position.

Unlike when the Funds purchase or sell a security, no price would be paid or received by the Funds upon the purchase or sale of a futures contract. Upon entering into a futures contract, and to maintain the Funds' open positions in futures contracts, the Funds would be required to deposit with a custodian or futures broker in a segregated account in the name of the futures broker an amount of cash, U.S. government securities, suitable money market instruments, or other liquid securities, known as "initial margin." The margin required for a particular futures contract is set by

the exchange on which the contract is traded, and may be significantly modified from time to time by the exchange during the term of the contract. Futures contracts are customarily purchased and sold on margins that may range upward from less than 5% of the value of the contract being traded.

If the price of an open futures contract changes (by increase in underlying instrument or index in the case of a sale or by decrease in the case of a purchase) so that the loss on the futures contract reaches a point at which the margin on deposit does not satisfy margin requirements, the broker will require an increase in the margin. However, if the value of a position increases because of favorable price changes in the futures contract so that the margin deposit exceeds the required margin, the broker will pay the excess to the Funds.

These subsequent payments, called "variation margin," to and from the futures broker, are made on a daily basis as the price of the underlying assets fluctuate making the long and short positions in the futures contract more or less valuable, a process known as "marking to the market." The Funds expects to earn interest income on margin deposits.

Although certain futures contracts, by their terms, require actual future delivery of and payment for the underlying instruments, in practice most futures contracts are usually closed out before the delivery date. Closing out an open futures contract purchase or sale is effected by entering into an offsetting futures contract sale or purchase, respectively, for the same aggregate amount of the identical underlying instrument or index and the same delivery date. If the offsetting purchase price is less than the original sale price, the Funds realize a gain; if it is more, the Funds realize a loss. Conversely, if the offsetting sale price is more than the original purchase price, the Funds realize a gain; if it is less, the Funds realize a loss. The transaction costs must also be included in these calculations. There can be no assurance, however, that the Funds will be able to enter into an offsetting transaction with respect to a particular futures contract at a particular time. If the Funds are not able to enter into an offsetting transaction, the Funds will continue to be required to maintain the margin deposits on the futures contract.

For example, one contract in the Financial Times Stock Exchange 100 Index future is a contract to buy 25 Pounds Sterling multiplied by the level of the UK Financial Times 100 Share Index on a given future date. Settlement of a stock index futures contract may or may not be in the underlying instrument or index. If not in the underlying instrument or index, then settlement will be made in cash, equivalent over time to the difference between the contract price and the actual price of the underlying asset at the time the stock index futures contract expires.

Options on Futures Contracts

The Funds may purchase and sell options on the same types of futures in which they may invest. Options on futures are similar to options on underlying instruments

except that options on futures give the purchaser the right, in return for the premium paid, to assume a position in a futures contract (a long position if the option is a call and a short position if the option is a put), rather than to purchase or sell the futures contract, at a specified exercise price at any time during the period of the option. Upon exercise of the option, the delivery of the futures position by the writer of the option to the holder of the option will be accompanied by the delivery of the accumulated balance in the writer's futures margin account which represents the amount by which the market price of the futures contract, at exercise, exceeds (in the case of a call) or is less than (in the case of a put) the exercise price of the option on the futures contract. Purchasers of options who fail to exercise their options prior to the exercise date suffer a loss of the premium paid.

Regulation as a Commodity Pool Operator

The Trust, on behalf of the Funds, has filed with the National Futures Association, a notice claiming an exclusion from the definition of the term "commodity pool operator" under the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, and the rules of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission promulgated thereunder, with respect to the Funds' operations. Accordingly, the Funds are not subject to registration or regulation as a commodity pool operator.

Options On Securities

The Funds may purchase and write (*i.e.*, sell) put and call options. Such options may relate to particular securities or stock indices, and may or may not be listed on a domestic or foreign securities exchange and may or may not be issued by the Options Clearing Corporation. Option trading is a highly specialized activity that entails greater than ordinary investment risk. Options may be more volatile than the underlying instruments, and therefore, on a percentage basis, an investment in options may be subject to greater fluctuation than an investment in the underlying instruments themselves.

A call option for a particular security gives the purchaser of the option the right to buy, and the writer (seller) the obligation to sell, the underlying security at the stated exercise price at any time prior to the expiration of the option, regardless of the market price of the security. The premium paid to the writer is in consideration for undertaking the obligation under the option contract. A put option for a particular security gives the purchaser the right to sell the security at the stated exercise price at any time prior to the expiration date of the option, regardless of the market price of the security.

Stock index options are put options and call options on various stock indices. In most respects, they are identical to listed options on common stocks. The primary difference between stock options and index options occurs when index options are exercised. In the case of stock options, the underlying security, common stock, is delivered. However, upon the exercise of an index option, settlement does not occur by delivery of the securities comprising the index. The option holder who exercises the index option receives an amount of cash if the closing level of the stock index upon

which the option is based is greater than, in the case of a call, or less than, in the case of a put, the exercise price of the option. This amount of cash is equal to the difference between the closing price of the stock index and the exercise price of the option expressed in dollars times a specified multiple. A stock index fluctuates with changes in the market value of the stocks included in the index. For example, some stock index options are based on a broad market index, such as the Standard & Poor's 500® Index or the Value Line Composite Index or a narrower market index, such as the Standard & Poor's 100®. Indices may also be based on an industry or market segment, such as the NYSE Arca Oil and Gas Index or the Business Equipment Quota Index. Options on stock indices are currently traded on the Chicago Board Options Exchange, the New York Stock Exchange, and the NASDAQ PHLX.

The Funds' obligation to sell an instrument subject to a call option written by it, or to purchase an instrument subject to a put option written by it, may be terminated prior to the expiration date of the option by the Funds' execution of a closing purchase transaction, which is effected by purchasing on an exchange an option of the same series (*i.e.*, same underlying instrument, exercise price and expiration date) as the option previously written. A closing purchase transaction will ordinarily be effected to realize a profit on an outstanding option, to prevent an underlying instrument from being called, to permit the sale of the underlying instrument or to permit the writing of a new option containing different terms on such underlying instrument. The cost of such a liquidation purchase plus transactions costs may be greater than the premium received upon the original option, in which event the Funds will have incurred a loss in the transaction. There is no assurance that a liquid secondary market will exist for any particular option. An option writer unable to effect a closing purchase transaction will not be able to sell the underlying instrument or liquidate the assets held in a segregated account, as described below, until the option expires or the optioned instrument is delivered upon exercise. In such circumstances, the writer will be subject to the risk of market decline or appreciation in the instrument during such period.

If an option purchased by the Funds expires unexercised, the Funds realize a loss equal to the premium paid. If the Funds enter into a closing sale transaction on an option purchased by it, the Funds will realize a gain if the premium received by the Funds on the closing transaction is more than the premium paid to purchase the option or a loss if it is less. If an option written by the Funds expires on the stipulated expiration date or if the Funds enter into a closing purchase transaction, it will realize a gain (or loss if the cost of a closing purchase transaction exceeds the net premium received when the option is sold). If an option written by the Funds is exercised, the proceeds of the sale will be increased by the net premium originally received and the Funds will realize a gain or loss.

Certain Risks Regarding Options. There are several risks associated with transactions in options. For example, there are significant differences between the securities and options markets that could result in an imperfect correlation between these markets, causing a given transaction not to achieve its objectives. In addition, a liquid secondary market for particular options, whether traded over-the-counter or on an exchange, may be absent for reasons which include the following: there may be

insufficient trading interest in certain options; restrictions may be imposed by an exchange on opening transactions or closing transactions or both; trading halts, suspensions or other restrictions may be imposed with respect to particular classes or series of options or underlying securities or currencies; unusual or unforeseen circumstances may interrupt normal operations on an exchange; the facilities of an exchange or the Options Clearing Corporation may not at all times be adequate to handle current trading value; or one or more exchanges could, for economic or other reasons, decide or be compelled at some future date to discontinue the trading of options (or a particular class or series of options), in which event the secondary market on that exchange (or in that class or series of options) would cease to exist, although outstanding options that had been issued by the Options Clearing Corporation as a result of trades on that exchange would continue to be exercisable in accordance with their terms.

Successful use by the Funds of options on stock indices will be subject to the ability of the Adviser to correctly predict movements in the directions of the stock market. This requires different skills and techniques than predicting changes in the prices of individual securities. In addition, the Funds' ability to effectively hedge all or a portion of the securities in a portfolio, in anticipation of or during a market decline, through transactions in put options on stock indices, depends on the degree to which price movements in the underlying index correlate with the price movements of the securities held by the Funds. Inasmuch as the Funds' securities will not duplicate the components of an index, the correlation will not be perfect. Consequently, the Funds bear the risk that the prices of its securities being hedged will not move in the same amount as the prices of its put options on the stock indices. It is also possible that there may be a negative correlation between the index and the Funds' securities that would result in a loss on both such securities and the options on stock indices acquired by the Funds.

The hours of trading for options may not conform to the hours during which the underlying securities are traded. To the extent that the options markets close before the markets for the underlying securities, significant price and rate movements can take place in the underlying markets that cannot be reflected in the options markets. The purchase of options is a highly specialized activity that involves investment techniques and risks different from those associated with ordinary portfolio securities transactions. The purchase of stock index options involves the risk that the premium and transaction costs paid by the Funds in purchasing an option will be lost as a result of unanticipated movements in prices of the securities comprising the stock index on which the option is based.

There is no assurance that a liquid secondary market on an options exchange will exist for any particular option, or at any particular time, and for some options no secondary market on an exchange or elsewhere may exist. If the Funds are unable to close out a call option on securities that it has written before the option is exercised, the Funds may be required to purchase the optioned securities in order to satisfy its obligation under the option to deliver such securities. If the Funds were unable to effect a closing sale transaction with respect to options on securities purchased, the Funds

would have to exercise the option in order to realize any profit and would incur transaction costs upon the purchase and sale of the underlying securities.

Cover for Options Positions. Transactions using options (other than options that the Funds have purchased) expose the Funds to an obligation to another party. The Funds will not enter into any such transactions unless it owns either (i) an offsetting ("covered") position in securities or other options or (ii) cash or liquid securities with a value sufficient at all times to cover its potential obligations not covered as provided in (i) above. The Funds will comply with SEC guidelines regarding cover for these instruments and, if the guidelines so require, set aside cash or liquid securities in a segregated account with the Custodian in the prescribed amount. Under current SEC guidelines, the Funds will segregate assets to cover transactions in which the Funds write or sell options.

Assets used as cover or held in a segregated account cannot be sold while the position in the corresponding option is open, unless they are replaced with similar assets. As a result, the commitment of a large portion of the Funds' assets to cover or segregated accounts could impede portfolio management or the Funds' ability to meet redemption requests or other current obligations.

Dealer Options. The Funds may engage in transactions involving dealer options as well as exchange-traded options. Certain additional risks are specific to dealer options. While the Funds might look to a clearing corporation to exercise exchange-traded options, if the Funds were to purchase a dealer option it would need to rely on the dealer from which it purchased the option to perform if the option were exercised. Failure by the dealer to do so would result in the loss of the premium paid by the Funds as well as loss of the expected benefit of the transaction.

Exchange-traded options generally have a continuous liquid market while dealer options may not. Consequently, the Funds may generally be able to realize the value of a dealer option it has purchased only by exercising or reselling the option to the dealer who issued it. Similarly, when the Funds writes a dealer option, the Funds may generally be able to close out the option prior to its expiration only by entering into a closing purchase transaction with the dealer to whom the Funds originally wrote the option. While the Funds will seek to enter into dealer options only with dealers who will agree to and which are expected to be capable of entering into closing transactions with the Funds, there can be no assurance that the Funds will at any time be able to liquidate a dealer option at a favorable price at any time prior to expiration. Unless the Funds, as a covered dealer call option writer, is able to effect a closing purchase transaction, it will not be able to liquidate securities (or other assets) used as cover until the option expires or is exercised. In the event of insolvency of the other party, the Funds may be unable to liquidate a dealer option. With respect to options written by the Funds, the inability to enter into a closing transaction may result in material losses to the Funds. For example, because the Funds must maintain a secured position with respect to any call option on a security it writes, the Funds may not sell the assets that it has segregated to secure the position while it is obligated under the option. This

requirement may impair the Funds' ability to sell portfolio securities at a time when such sale might be advantageous.

The Staff of the SEC has taken the position that purchased dealer options are illiquid securities. The Funds may treat the cover used for written dealer options as liquid if the dealer agrees that the Funds may repurchase the dealer option it has written for a maximum price to be calculated by a predetermined formula. In such cases, the dealer option would be considered illiquid only to the extent the maximum purchase price under the formula exceeds the intrinsic value of the option. Accordingly, the Funds will treat dealer options as subject to the Funds' limitation on illiquid securities. If the SEC changes its position on the liquidity of dealer options, the Funds will change treatment of such instruments accordingly.

Spread Transactions. The Funds may purchase covered spread options from securities dealers. These covered spread options are not presently exchange-listed or exchange-traded. The purchase of a spread option gives the Funds the right to put securities that it owns at a fixed dollar spread or fixed yield spread in relationship to another security that the Funds do not own, but which is used as a benchmark. The risk to the Funds, in addition to the risks of dealer options described above, is the cost of the premium paid as well as any transaction costs. The purchase of spread options will be used to protect the Funds against adverse changes in prevailing credit quality spreads, *i.e.*, the yield spread between high quality and lower quality securities. This protection is provided only during the life of the spread options.

Swap Agreements

The Funds may enter into interest rate, index and currency exchange rate swap agreements in an attempt to obtain a particular desired return at a lower cost to the Funds than if they had invested directly in an instrument that yielded that desired return. Swap agreements are two-party contracts entered into primarily by institutional investors for periods ranging from a few weeks to more than one year. In a standard "swap" transaction, two parties agree to exchange the returns (or differentials in rates of returns) earned or realized on particular predetermined investments or instruments. The gross returns to be exchanged or "swapped" between the parties are calculated with respect to a "notional amount," *i.e.*, the return on or increase in value of a particular dollar amount invested at a particular interest rate, in a particular foreign currency, or in a "basket" of securities representing a particular index. The "notional amount" of the swap agreement is only a fictive basis on which to calculate the obligations the parties to a swap agreement have agreed to exchange. The Funds' obligations (or rights) under a swap agreement will generally be equal only to the amount to be paid or received under the agreement based on the relative values of the positions held by each party to the agreement (the "net amount"). The Funds' obligations under a swap agreement will be accrued daily (offset against any amounts owing to the Funds) and any accrued but unpaid net amounts owed to a swap counterparty will be covered by the maintenance of a segregated account consisting of cash, U.S. government securities, or other liquid securities, to avoid leveraging of the Funds' portfolios.

Whether the Funds' use of swap agreements enhance the Funds' total return will depend on the Adviser's ability correctly to predict whether certain types of investments are likely to produce greater returns than other investments. Because they are two-party contracts and may have terms of greater than seven days, swap agreements may be considered to be illiquid. Moreover, the Funds bear the risk of loss of the amount expected to be received under a swap agreement in the event of the default or bankruptcy of a swap agreement counterparty. The Funds' Adviser will cause the Funds to enter into swap agreements only with counterparties that it deem creditworthy. The swap market is a relatively new market and is largely unregulated. It is possible that developments in the swaps market, including potential government regulation, could adversely affect the Funds' ability to terminate existing swap agreements or to realize amounts to be received under such agreements.

Certain swap agreements are exempt from most provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act ("CEA") and, therefore, are not regulated as futures or commodity option transactions under the CEA, pursuant to regulations of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC"). To qualify for this exemption, a swap agreement must be entered into by "eligible participants," which include the following, provided the participants' total assets exceed established levels: a bank or trust company, savings association or credit union, insurance company, investment company subject to regulation under the 1940 Act, commodity pool, corporation, partnership, proprietorship, organization, trust or other entity, employee benefit plan, governmental entity, broker-dealer, futures commission merchant, natural person, or regulated foreign person. To be eligible, natural persons and most other entities must have total assets exceeding \$10 million; commodity pools and employees benefit plans must have assets exceeding \$5 million. In addition, an eligible swap transaction must meet three conditions. First, the swap agreement may not be part of a fungible class of agreements that are standardized as to their material economic terms. Second, the creditworthiness of parties with actual or potential obligations under the swap agreement must be a material consideration in entering into or determining the terms of the swap agreement, including pricing, cost or credit enhancement terms. Third, swap agreements may not be entered into and traded on or through a multilateral transaction execution facility.

Certain Investment Techniques and Derivatives Risks

When the Adviser uses investment techniques such as margin, leverage and short sales, and forms of financial derivatives, such as options and futures, an investment in the Funds may be more volatile than investments in other mutual funds. Although the intention is to use such investment techniques and derivatives to minimize risk to the Funds, as well as for speculative purposes, there is the possibility that improper implementation of such techniques and derivative strategies or unusual market conditions could result in significant losses to the Funds. Derivatives are used to limit risk in the Funds or to enhance investment return and have a return tied to a formula based upon an interest rate, index, price of a security, or other measurement. Derivatives involve special risks, including: (1) the risk that interest rates, securities

prices and currency markets will not move in the direction that a portfolio manager anticipates; (2) imperfect correlation between the price of derivative instruments and movements in the prices of the securities, interest rates or currencies being hedged; (3) the fact that skills needed to use these strategies are different than those needed to select portfolio securities; (4) the possible absence of a liquid secondary market for any particular instrument and possible exchange imposed price fluctuation limits, either of which may make it difficult or impossible to close out a position when desired; (5) the risk that adverse price movements in an instrument can result in a loss substantially greater than the Funds' initial investment in that instrument (in some cases, the potential loss is unlimited); (6) particularly in the case of privately-negotiated instruments, the risk that the counterparty will not perform its obligations, or that penalties could be incurred for positions held less than the required minimum holding period, which could leave the Funds worse off than if it had not entered into the position; and (7) the inability to close out certain hedged positions to avoid adverse tax consequences. In addition, the use of derivatives for non-hedging purposes (that is, to seek to increase total return) is considered a speculative practice and may present an even greater risk of loss than when used for hedging purposes.

Foreign Securities

The Funds may invest in securities of foreign issuers and exchange-traded funds and other investment companies that hold a portfolio of foreign securities. Investing in securities of foreign companies and countries involves certain considerations and risks that are not typically associated with investing in U.S. government securities and securities of domestic companies. There may be less publicly available information about a foreign issuer than a domestic one, and foreign companies are not generally subject to uniform accounting, auditing and financial standards and requirements comparable to those applicable to U.S. companies. There may also be less government supervision and regulation of foreign securities exchanges, brokers and listed companies than exists in the United States. Interest and dividends paid by foreign issuers may be subject to withholding and other foreign taxes, which may decrease the net return on such investments as compared to dividends and interest paid to the Funds by domestic companies or the U.S. government. There may be the possibility of expropriations, seizure or nationalization of foreign deposits, confiscatory taxation, political, economic or social instability or diplomatic developments that could affect assets of the Funds held in foreign countries. Finally, the establishment of exchange controls or other foreign governmental laws or restrictions could adversely affect the payment of obligations.

To the extent the Funds' currency exchange transactions, if any, do not fully protect the Funds against adverse changes in currency exchange rates, decreases in the value of currencies of the foreign countries in which the Funds will invest relative to the U.S. dollar will result in a corresponding decrease in the U.S. dollar value of the Funds' assets denominated in those currencies (and possibly a corresponding increase in the amount of securities required to be liquidated to meet distribution requirements). Conversely, increases in the value of currencies of the foreign countries in which the

Funds invests relative to the U.S. dollar will result in a corresponding increase in the U.S. dollar value of the Funds' assets (and possibly a corresponding decrease in the amount of securities to be liquidated).

Emerging Markets Securities. The Funds may purchase securities of emerging market issuers and ETFs and other closed end funds that invest in emerging market securities. Investing in emerging market securities imposes risks different from, or greater than, risks of investing in foreign developed countries. These risks include: smaller market capitalization of securities markets, which may suffer periods of relative illiquidity; significant price volatility; restrictions on foreign investment; possible repatriation of investment income and capital. In addition, foreign investors may be required to register the proceeds of sales; future economic or political crises could lead to price controls, forced mergers, expropriation or confiscatory taxation, seizure, nationalization, or creation of government monopolies. The currencies of emerging market countries may experience significant declines against the U.S. dollar, and devaluation may occur subsequent to investments in these currencies by the Funds. Inflation and rapid fluctuations in inflation rates have had, and may continue to have, negative effects on the economies and securities markets of certain emerging market countries.

Additional risks of emerging markets securities may include: greater social, economic and political uncertainty and instability; more substantial governmental involvement in the economy; less governmental supervision and regulation; unavailability of currency hedging techniques; companies that are newly organized and small; differences in auditing and financial reporting standards, which may result in unavailability of material information about issuers; and less developed legal systems. In addition, emerging securities markets may have different clearance and settlement procedures, which may be unable to keep pace with the volume of securities transactions or otherwise make it difficult to engage in such transactions. Settlement problems may cause the Funds to miss attractive investment opportunities, hold a portion of its assets in cash pending investment, or be delayed in disposing of a portfolio security. Such a delay could result in possible liability to a purchaser of the security.

Depositary Receipts. The Funds may invest in sponsored and unsponsored American Depositary Receipts ("ADRs"), which are receipts issued by an American bank or trust company evidencing ownership of underlying securities issued by a foreign issuer. ADRs, in registered form, are designed for use in U.S. securities markets. Unsponsored ADRs may be created without the participation of the foreign issuer. Holders of these ADRs generally bear all the costs of the ADR facility, whereas foreign issuers typically bear certain costs in a sponsored ADR. The bank or trust company depositary of an unsponsored ADR may be under no obligation to distribute shareholder communications received from the foreign issuer or to pass through voting rights. Many of the risks described above regarding foreign securities apply to investments in ADRs.

Illiquid and Restricted Securities

Each Fund may invest up to 15% of its net assets in illiquid securities. Illiquid securities include securities subject to contractual or legal restrictions on resale (e.g., because they have not been registered under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the "Securities Act")) and securities that are otherwise not readily marketable (e.g., because trading in the security is suspended or because market makers do not exist or will not entertain bids or offers). Securities that have not been registered under the Securities Act are referred to as private placements or restricted securities and are purchased directly from the issuer or in the secondary market. Foreign securities that are freely tradable in their principal markets are not considered to be illiquid.

Restricted and other illiquid securities may be subject to the potential for delays on resale and uncertainty in valuation. The Funds might be unable to dispose of illiquid securities promptly or at reasonable prices and might thereby experience difficulty in satisfying redemption requests from shareholders. The Funds might have to register restricted securities in order to dispose of them, resulting in additional expense and delay. Adverse market conditions could impede such a public offering of securities.

A large institutional market exists for certain securities that are not registered under the Securities Act, including foreign securities. The fact that there are contractual or legal restrictions on resale to the general public or to certain institutions may not be indicative of the liquidity of such investments. Rule 144A under the Securities Act allows such a broader institutional trading market for securities otherwise subject to restrictions on resale to the general public. Rule 144A establishes a "safe harbor" from the registration requirements of the Securities Act for resale of certain securities to qualified institutional buyers. Rule 144A has produced enhanced liquidity for many restricted securities, and market liquidity for such securities may continue to expand as a result of this regulation and the consequent existence of the PORTAL system, which is an automated system for the trading, clearance and settlement of unregistered securities of domestic and foreign issuers sponsored by NASDAQ.

Under guidelines adopted by the Trust's Board, the Adviser of the Funds may determine that particular Rule 144A securities, and commercial paper issued in reliance on the private placement exemption from registration afforded by Section 4(a)(2) of the Securities Act, are liquid even though they are not registered. A determination of whether such a security is liquid or not is a question of fact. In making this determination, the Adviser will consider, as it deems appropriate under the circumstances and among other factors: (1) the frequency of trades and quotes for the security; (2) the number of dealers willing to purchase or sell the security; (3) the number of other potential purchasers of the security; (4) dealer undertakings to make a market in the security; (5) the nature of the security (e.g., debt or equity, date of maturity, terms of dividend or interest payments, and other material terms) and the nature of the marketplace trades (e.g., the time needed to dispose of the security, the method of soliciting offers, and the mechanics of transfer); and (6) the rating of the security and the financial condition and prospects of the issuer. In the case of

commercial paper, the Adviser will also determine that the paper (1) is not traded flat or in default as to principal and interest, (2) is rated in one of the two highest rating categories by at least two National Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO") or, if only one NRSRO rates the security, by that NRSRO, or, if the security is unrated, the Adviser determines that it is of equivalent quality, and (3) the Adviser's decision takes into account all relevant factors of the trading market for the specific security.

Rule 144A securities and Section 4(a)(2) commercial paper that have been deemed liquid as described above will continue to be monitored by the Funds' Adviser to determine if the security is no longer liquid as the result of changed conditions. Investing in Rule 144A securities or Section 4(a)(2) commercial paper could have the effect of increasing the amount of the Funds' assets invested in illiquid securities if institutional buyers are unwilling to purchase such securities.

Lending Portfolio Securities

For the purpose of achieving income, the Funds may lend its portfolio securities, provided (1) the loan is secured continuously by collateral consisting of U.S. Government securities or cash or cash equivalents (cash, U.S. Government securities, negotiable certificates of deposit, bankers' acceptances or letters of credit) maintained on a daily mark-to-market basis in an amount at least equal to the current market value of the securities loaned, (2) the Funds may at any time call the loan and obtain the return of securities loaned, (3) the Funds will receive any interest or dividends received on the loaned securities, and (4) the aggregate value of the securities loaned will not at any time exceed one-third of the total assets of the Funds.

Repurchase Agreements

The Funds may enter into repurchase agreements. In a repurchase agreement, an investor (such as the Funds) purchases a security (known as the "underlying security") from a securities dealer or bank. Any such dealer or bank must be deemed creditworthy by the Adviser. At that time, the bank or securities dealer agrees to repurchase the underlying security at a mutually agreed upon price on a designated future date. The repurchase price may be higher than the purchase price, the difference being income to the Funds, or the purchase and repurchase prices may be the same, with interest at an agreed upon rate due to the Funds on repurchase. In either case, the income to the Funds generally will be unrelated to the interest rate on the underlying securities. Repurchase agreements must be "fully collateralized," in that the market value of the underlying securities (including accrued interest) must at all times be equal to or greater than the repurchase price. Therefore, a repurchase agreement can be considered a loan collateralized by the underlying securities.

Repurchase agreements are generally for a short period of time, often less than a week, and will generally be used by the Funds to invest excess cash or as part of a temporary defensive strategy. Repurchase agreements that do not provide for payment within seven days will be treated as illiquid securities. In the event of a bankruptcy or

other default by the seller of a repurchase agreement, the Funds could experience both delays in liquidating the underlying security and losses. These losses could result from: (a) possible decline in the value of the underlying security while the Funds is seeking to enforce its rights under the repurchase agreement; (b) possible reduced levels of income or lack of access to income during this period; and (c) expenses of enforcing its rights.

Reverse Repurchase Agreements

In a reverse repurchase agreement, a Fund sells portfolio securities to another party and agrees to repurchase the securities at an agreed-upon price and date. Reverse repurchase agreements involve the risk that the other party will fail to return the securities in a timely manner, or at all, which may result in losses to a Fund. A Fund could lose money if it is unable to recover the securities and the value of the collateral held by the Fund is less than the value of the securities. These events could also trigger adverse tax consequences to the Fund. Reverse repurchase agreements also involve the risk that the market value of the securities sold will decline below the price at which a Fund is obligated to repurchase them. Reverse repurchase agreements may increase fluctuations in a Fund's NAV and may be viewed as a form of borrowing by a Fund.

Borrowing

In the event that the Fund engages in any borrowings and such borrowings exceed the limits of Section 18 of the 1940 Act, the Fund will reduce its borrowings within three days in order to comply with such limits.

When-Issued, Forward Commitments and Delayed Settlements

The Funds may purchase and sell securities on a when-issued, forward commitment or delayed settlement basis. In this event, the Custodian (as defined under the section entitled "Custodian") will segregate liquid assets equal to the amount of the commitment in a separate account. Normally, the Custodian will set aside portfolio securities to satisfy a purchase commitment. In such a case, the Funds may be required subsequently to segregate additional assets in order to assure that the value of the account remains equal to the amount of the Funds' commitment. It may be expected that the Funds' net assets will fluctuate to a greater degree when it sets aside portfolio securities to cover such purchase commitments than when it sets aside cash.

The Funds do not intend to engage in these transactions for speculative purposes but only in furtherance of investment objectives. Because the Funds will segregate liquid assets to satisfy its purchase commitments in the manner described, the Funds' liquidity and the ability of the Adviser to manage them may be affected in the event the Funds' forward commitments, commitments to purchase when-issued securities and delayed settlements ever exceeded 15% of the value of net assets.

The Funds will purchase securities on a when-issued, forward commitment or delayed settlement basis only with the intention of completing the transaction. If deemed advisable as a matter of investment strategy, however, the Funds may dispose of or renegotiate a commitment after it is entered into, and may sell securities committed to purchase before those securities are delivered to the Funds on the settlement date. In these cases, the Funds may realize a taxable capital gain or loss. When the Funds engage in when-issued, forward commitment and delayed settlement transactions, they rely on the other party to consummate the trade. Failure of such party to do so may result in the Funds incurring a loss or missing an opportunity to obtain a price credited to be advantageous.

The market value of the securities underlying a when-issued purchase, forward commitment to purchase, or a delayed settlement and any subsequent fluctuations in market value is taken into account when determining the market value of the Funds starting on the day the Funds agree to purchase the securities. The Funds do not earn interest on the securities committed to purchase.

Short Sales

The Funds may sell securities short. A short sale is a transaction in which the Funds sell a security it does not own or have the right to acquire (or that it owns but does not wish to deliver) in anticipation that the market price of that security will decline.

When the Funds make a short sale, the broker-dealer through which the short sale is made must borrow the security sold short and deliver it to the party purchasing the security. The Funds are required to make a margin deposit in connection with such short sales; the Funds may have to pay a fee to borrow particular securities and will often be obligated to pay over any dividends and accrued interest on borrowed securities.

If the price of the security sold short increases between the time of the short sale and the time the Funds cover a short position, the Funds will incur a loss; conversely, if the price declines, the Funds will realize a capital gain. Any gain will be decreased, and any loss increased, by the transaction costs described above. The successful use of short selling may be adversely affected by imperfect correlation between movements in the price of the security sold short and the securities being hedged.

To the extent the Funds sell securities short, they will provide collateral to the broker-dealer and (except in the case of short sales "against the box") will maintain additional asset coverage in the form of cash, U.S. government securities or other liquid securities with its custodian in a segregated account in an amount at least equal to the difference between the current market value of the securities sold short and any amounts required to be deposited as collateral with the selling broker (not including the proceeds of the short sale). The Funds do not intend to enter into short sales (other than short sales "against the box") if immediately after such sales the aggregate of the value of all collateral plus the amount in such segregated account exceeds 50% of the

value of the Funds' net assets. This percentage may be varied by action of the Board of Trustees. A short sale is "against the box" to the extent the Funds contemporaneously owns, or has the right to obtain at no added cost, securities identical to those sold short.

INVESTMENT RESTRICTIONS

The Funds have adopted the following investment restrictions that may not be changed without approval by a "majority of the outstanding shares" of the Funds which, as used in this SAI, means the vote of the lesser of (a) 67% or more of the shares of the Funds represented at a meeting, if the holders of more than 50% of the outstanding shares of the Funds are present or represented by proxy, or (b) more than 50% of the outstanding shares of the Funds.

1. Borrowing Money. Each Fund will not borrow money, except: (a) from a bank, provided that immediately after such borrowing there is an asset coverage of 300% for all borrowings of the Funds; or (b) from a bank or other persons for temporary purposes only, provided that such temporary borrowings are in an amount not exceeding 5% of the Fund's total assets at the time when the borrowing is made.

2. Senior Securities. The Funds will not issue senior securities. This limitation is not applicable to activities that may be deemed to involve the issuance or sale of a senior security by the Funds, provided that the Funds' engagement in such activities is consistent with or permitted by the 1940 Act, as amended, the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder or interpretations of the SEC or its staff.

3. Underwriting. The Funds will not act as underwriter of securities issued by other persons. This limitation is not applicable to the extent that, in connection with the disposition of portfolio securities (including restricted securities), the Funds may be deemed an underwriter under certain federal securities laws.

4. Real Estate. The Funds will not purchase or sell real estate. This limitation is not applicable to investments in marketable securities that are secured by or represent interests in real estate. This limitation does not preclude the Funds from investing in mortgage-related securities or investing in companies engaged in the real estate business or that have a significant portion of their assets in real estate (including real estate investment trusts).

5. Commodities. The Funds will not purchase or sell commodities unless acquired as a result of ownership of securities or other investments. This limitation does not preclude the Funds from purchasing or selling options or futures contracts, from investing in securities or other instruments backed by commodities or from investing in companies which are engaged in a commodities business or have a significant portion of their assets in commodities.

6. Loans. The Funds will not make loans to other persons, except: (a) by loaning portfolio securities; (b) by engaging in repurchase agreements; or (c) by purchasing nonpublicly offered debt securities. For purposes of this limitation, the term "loans" shall not include the purchase of a portion of an issue of publicly distributed bonds, debentures or other securities.

7. Concentration. Each Fund will not invest 25% or more of its total assets in a particular industry or group of industries. The concentration limitation is not applicable to investments in obligations issued or guaranteed by the U.S. government, its agencies and instrumentalities or repurchase agreements with respect thereto.

THE FOLLOWING ARE ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT LIMITATIONS OF THE FUNDS. THE FOLLOWING RESTRICTIONS ARE DESIGNATED AS NON-FUNDAMENTAL AND MAY BE CHANGED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TRUST WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF SHAREHOLDERS.

1. Pledging. The Funds will not mortgage, pledge, hypothecate or in any manner transfer, as security for indebtedness, any assets of the Funds except as may be necessary in connection with borrowings described in limitation (1) above.

2. Borrowing. The Funds will not purchase any security while borrowings representing more than one third of its total assets are outstanding.

3. Margin Purchases. The Funds will not purchase securities or evidences of interest thereon on "margin." This limitation is not applicable to short-term credit obtained by the Funds for the clearance of purchases and sales or redemption of securities, or to arrangements with respect to transactions involving options, futures contracts, short sales and other permitted investment techniques.

4. Illiquid Investments. Each Fund will not hold more than 15% of its net assets in securities for which there are legal or contractual restrictions on resale and other illiquid securities.

If a restriction on a Fund's investments is adhered to at the time an investment is made, a subsequent change in the percentage of Fund assets invested in certain securities or other instruments, or change in average duration of the Fund's investment portfolio, resulting from changes in the value of the Fund's total assets, will not be considered a violation of the restriction; provided, however, that the asset coverage requirement applicable to borrowings shall be maintained in the manner contemplated by applicable law.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DISCLOSURE OF PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS

The Trust has adopted policies and procedures that govern the disclosure of the Funds' portfolio holdings. These policies and procedures are designed to ensure that such disclosure is in the best interests of Funds shareholders.

It is the Trust's policy to: (1) ensure that any disclosure of portfolio holdings information is in the best interest of Trust shareholders; (2) protect the confidentiality of portfolio holdings information; (3) have procedures in place to guard against personal trading based on the information; and (4) ensure that the disclosure of portfolio holdings information does not create conflicts between the interests of the Trust's shareholders and those of the Trust's affiliates.

The Funds will disclose their portfolio holdings by mailing their annual and semi-annual reports to shareholders approximately two months after the end of the fiscal year and semi-annual period. The Funds may also disclose portfolio holdings by mailing a quarterly report to its shareholders. In addition, the Funds will disclose portfolio holdings reports on Forms N-CSR and Form N-Q two months after the end of each quarter/semi-annual period.

The Funds may, from time to time, make available portfolio holdings information on the website at www.patriotfund.com. If month-end portfolio holdings are posted to the website, they are expected to be approximately 30 days old and remain available until new information for the next month is posted.

The Funds may choose to make available portfolio holdings information to rating agencies such as Lipper, Morningstar or Bloomberg more frequently on a confidential basis.

Under limited circumstances, as described below, the Funds' portfolio holdings may be disclosed to, or known by, certain third parties in advance of their filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission on Form N-CSR or Form N-Q. In each case, a determination has been made that such advance disclosure is supported by a legitimate business purpose and that the recipient is subject to a duty to keep the information confidential.

- **The Adviser.** Personnel of the Adviser, including personnel responsible for managing the Funds' portfolios, may have full daily access to Funds portfolio holdings because that information is necessary in order for the Adviser to provide its management, administrative, and investment services to the Funds. As required for purposes of analyzing the impact of existing and future market changes on the prices, availability, demand and liquidity of such securities, as well as for the assistance of portfolio manager in the trading of

such securities, Adviser personnel may also release and discuss certain portfolio holdings with various broker-dealers and research providers.

- **Gemini Fund Services, LLC** is the transfer agent, fund accountant and administrator for the Funds; therefore, its personnel have full daily access to the Funds' portfolio holdings because that information is necessary in order for them to provide the agreed-upon services for the Trust.
- **MUFG Union Bank, National Association** is the custodian for the Funds; therefore, its personnel have full daily access to the Funds' portfolio holdings because that information is necessary in order for them to provide the agreed-upon services for the Trust.
- **BBD, LLP** is the Funds' independent registered public accounting firm; therefore, its personnel have access to the Funds' portfolio holdings in connection with auditing of the Funds' annual financial statements and providing assistance and consultation in connection with SEC filings.
- **Counsel to the Trust and Counsel to the Independent Trustees.** Counsel to the Trust, Counsel to the Independent Trustees and their respective personnel have access to the Fund's portfolio holdings in connection with the review of the Fund's annual and semi-annual shareholder reports and SEC filings..

Additions to List of Approved Recipients. The Trust's Chief Compliance Officer is the person responsible, and whose prior approval is required, for any disclosure of the Funds' portfolio securities at any time or to any persons other than those described above. In such cases, the recipient must have a legitimate business need for the information and must be subject to a duty to keep the information confidential. There are no ongoing arrangements in place with respect to the disclosure of portfolio holdings. In no event shall the Funds, the Adviser or any other party receive any direct or indirect compensation in connection with the disclosure of information about the Funds' portfolio holdings.

Compliance with Portfolio Holdings Disclosure Procedures. The Trust's Chief Compliance Officer will report periodically to the Board with respect to compliance with the Funds' portfolio holdings disclosure procedures, and from time to time will provide the Board any updates to the portfolio holdings disclosure policies and procedures.

There is no assurance that the Trust's policies on disclosure of portfolio holdings will protect the Funds from the potential misuse of holdings information by individuals or firms in possession of that information.

MANAGEMENT

The business of the Trust is managed under the direction of the Board in accordance with the Agreement and Declaration of Trust and the Trust's By-laws (the "Governing Documents"), which have been filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and are available upon request. The Board consists of seven (7) individuals, six (6) of whom are not "interested persons" (as defined under the 1940 Act) of the Trust and the Adviser ("Independent Trustees"). Pursuant to the Governing Documents of the Trust, the Trustees shall elect officers including a President, a Secretary, a Treasurer, a Principal Executive Officer and a Principal Accounting Officer. The Board retains the power to conduct, operate and carry on the business of the Trust and has the power to incur and pay any expenses, which, in the opinion of the Board, are necessary or incidental to carry out any of the Trust's purposes. The Trustees, officers, employees and agents of the Trust, when acting in such capacities, shall not be subject to any personal liability except for his or her own bad faith, willful misfeasance, gross negligence or reckless disregard of his or her duties. Following is a list of the Trustees and executive officers of the Trust and their principal occupation over the last five years.

Board Leadership Structure

The Trust is led by Anthony Hertl, an Independent Trustee, who has served as the Chairman of the Board since July 2013. The Board of Trustees is comprised of Mr. Hertl, five (5) additional Independent Trustees, and one (1) Interested Trustee. Andrew Rogers, the Interested Trustee, is the Chief Executive Officer of Gemini Fund Services, LLC, and President of the Trust. Additionally, under certain 1940 Act governance guidelines that apply to the Trust, the Independent Trustees will meet in executive session, at least quarterly. Under the Trust's Agreement and Declaration of Trust and By-Laws, the Chairman of the Board is responsible for (a) presiding at board meetings, (b) calling special meetings on an as-needed basis, (c) execution and administration of Trust policies including (i) setting the agendas for board meetings and (ii) providing information to board members in advance of each board meeting and between board meetings. Generally, the Trust believes it best to have a non-executive Chairman of the Board, who together with the President (principal executive officer), are seen by our shareholders, business partners and other stakeholders as providing strong leadership. The Trust believes that its Chairman, the independent chair of the Audit Committee, and, as an entity, the full Board of Trustees, provide effective leadership that is in the best interests of the Trust, its funds and each shareholder.

Board Risk Oversight

The Board of Trustees has a standing independent Audit Committee with a separate chair, Mark H. Taylor. The Board is responsible for overseeing risk management, and the full Board regularly engages in discussions of risk management and receives compliance reports that inform its oversight of risk management from its

Chief Compliance Officer at quarterly meetings and on an ad hoc basis, when and if necessary. The Audit Committee considers financial and reporting risk within its area of responsibilities. Generally, the Board believes that its oversight of material risks is adequately maintained through the compliance-reporting chain where the Chief Compliance Officer is the primary recipient and communicator of such risk-related information.

Trustee Qualifications

Generally, the Trust believes that each Trustee is competent to serve because of their individual overall merits including: (i) experience, (ii) qualifications, (iii) attributes and (iv) skills. Mr. Hertl has over 20 years of business experience in financial services industry and related fields including serving as chair of the finance committee for the Borough of Interlaken, New Jersey and Vice President-Finance and Administration of Marymount College, holds a Certified Public Accountant designation, serves or has served as a member of other mutual fund boards outside of the Fund Complex and possesses a strong understanding of the regulatory framework under which investment companies must operate based on his years of service to this Board and other fund boards. Gary W. Lanzen has over 20 years of business experience in the financial services industry, holds a Master's degree in Education Administration, is a Certified Financial Planner ("CFP"), serves as a member of two other mutual fund boards outside of the Fund Complex and possesses a strong understanding of the regulatory framework under which investment companies must operate based on his years of service to this Board and other mutual fund boards. Mark H. Taylor, has over two decades of academic and professional experience in the accounting and auditing areas, has Doctor of Philosophy, a Master's and Bachelor degrees in Accounting, is a Certified Public Accountant and is Professor of Accountancy at the Weatherhead School of Management at Case Western Reserve University. He serves as a member of two other mutual fund boards outside of the Fund Complex, has served a fellowship in the Office of the Chief Accountant at the headquarters of the United States Securities Exchange Commission, served a three-year term on the AICPA Auditing Standards Board (2008-2011), and like the other Board members, possesses a strong understanding of the regulatory framework under which investment companies must operate based on his years of service to this Board and other mutual fund boards. John V. Palancia has over 30 years of business experience in financial services industry including serving as the Director of Futures Operations for Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. Mr. Palancia holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Economics. He also possesses a strong understanding of risk management, balance sheet analysis and the regulatory framework under which regulated financial entities must operate based on service to Merrill Lynch. Additionally, he is well versed in the regulatory framework under which investment companies must operate and serves as a member of three other fund boards. Andrew Rogers has more than 20 years of experience in the financial services industry and has served as the President of the Trust since 2006. Mr. Rogers is also currently the Chief Executive Officer of Gemini Fund Services, LLC. Prior to joining Gemini Fund Services, LLC, he served in executive roles at J.P. Morgan Chase and Co. and Alliance Capital Management Holdings L.P. as Financial Reporting Manager. Mr. Rogers holds a Bachelor of Science in Accounting. Mark D. Gersten has

more than 30 years of experience in the financial services industry, having served in executive roles at AllianceBernstein LP and holding key industry positions at Prudential-Bache Securities and PriceWaterhouseCoopers. He also serves as a member of two other mutual fund boards outside of the Fund Complex. Mr. Gersten is a certified public accountant and holds an MBA in accounting. Like other trustees, his experience has given him a strong understanding of the regulatory framework under which investment companies operate. Mark S. Garbin has more than 30 years of experience in corporate balance sheet and income statement risk management for large asset managers, serving as Managing Principal of Coherent Capital Management LLC since 2007. Mr. Garbin has extensive derivatives experience and has provided consulting services to alternative asset managers. He is both a Chartered Financial Analyst and Professional Risk Manager charterholder and holds advanced degrees in international business. The Trust does not believe any one factor is determinative in assessing a Trustee's qualifications, but that the collective experience of each Trustee makes them each highly qualified.

The following is a list of the Trustees and executive officers of the Trust and each person's principal occupation over the last five years. Unless otherwise noted, the address of each Trustee and Officer is 17605 Wright Street, Suite 2, Omaha, Nebraska 68130.

Independent Trustees

Name, Address and Year of Birth	Position/Term of Office*	Principal Occupation During the Past Five Years	Number of Portfolios in Fund Complex** Overseen by Trustee	Other Directorships held by Trustee During the Past Five Years
Mark Garbin Born in 1951	Trustee Since 2013	Managing Principal, Coherent Capital Management LLC (since 2007).	4	Northern Lights Fund Trust (for series not affiliated with the Funds since 2013); Two Roads Shared Trust (since 2012); Forethought Variable Insurance Trust (since 2013); Northern Lights Variable Trust (since 2013); OHA Mortgage Strategies Fund (offshore), Ltd. (since 2014); Altegris KKR Commitments Master Fund and Altegris KKR Commitments Fund (since 2014)
Mark D. Gersten Born in 1950	Trustee Since 2013	Independent Consultant (since 2012); Senior Vice President – Global Fund Administration Mutual Funds & Alternative Funds, AllianceBernstein LP (1985 –	4	Northern Lights Fund Trust (for series not affiliated with the Funds since 2013); Schroder Global Series Trust (since 2012); Two Roads Shared Trust (since 2012);

		2011).		Northern Lights Variable Trust (since 2013); Altegris KKR Commitments Master Fund; Altegris KKR Commitments Fund (since 2014) and Ramius Archview Credit and Distressed Fund (since 2015)
Anthony J. Hertl Born in 1950	Trustee Since 2005; Chairman of the Board since 2013	Consultant to small and emerging businesses (since 2000).	4	Northern Lights Fund Trust (for series not affiliated with the Funds since 2005); AdvisorOne Funds (2004-2013); Alternative Strategies Fund (since 2010); Satuit Capital Management Trust (since 2007); Greenwich Advisers Trust (2007- February 2011); Global Real Estate Fund (2008-2011); The World Funds Trust (2010-2013); Northern Lights Variable Trust (since 2006)
Gary W. Lanzen Born in 1954	Trustee Since 2005	Retired since 2012. Formerly, Founder, President, and Chief Investment Officer, Orizon Investment Counsel, Inc. (2000-2012).	4	Northern Lights Fund Trust (for series not affiliated with the Funds since 2005); AdvisorOne Funds (since 2003); Alternative Strategies Fund (since 2010); Northern Lights Variable Trust (since 2006); CLA Strategic Allocation Fund (2014-2015)
John V. Palancia Born in 1954	Trustee Since 2011	Retired (since 2011). Formerly, Director of Futures Operations, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc. (1975-2011).	4	Northern Lights Fund Trust (for series not affiliated with the Funds since 2011); Northern Lights Variable Trust (since 2011); Northern Lights Fund Trust III (since February 2012); Alternative Strategies Fund (since 2012)
Mark H. Taylor Born in 1964	Trustee Since 2007; Chairman of the Audit Committee since 2013	Andrew D. Braden Professor of Accounting and Auditing, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University (since 2009); President, Auditing Section of the American Accounting Association (2012-2015); Former member of the AICPA Auditing Standards Board, AICPA (2008-2011).	4	Northern Lights Fund Trust (for series not affiliated with the Funds since 2007); Alternative Strategies Fund (since 2010); Lifetime Achievement Mutual Fund, Inc. (2007-2012); Northern Lights Fund Trust III (since 2012); Northern Lights Variable Trust (since 2007)

Interested Trustees and Officers

Name, Address and Year of Birth	Position/Term of Office*	Principal Occupation During the Past Five Years	Number of Portfolios in Fund Complex** Overseen by Trustee	Other Directorships held by Trustee During the Past Five Years
Andrew Rogers*** 80 Arkay Drive Hauppauge, NY 11788 Born in 1969	Trustee Since 2013; President Since 2006	Chief Executive Officer, Gemini Alternative Funds, LLC (since 2013); Chief Executive Officer, Gemini Hedge Fund Services, LLC (since 2013); Chief Executive Officer, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (since 2012); President and Manager, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (2006 - 2012); Formerly President and Manager, Blu Giant, LLC (2004 - 2011).	4	Northern Lights Fund Trust (for series not affiliated with the Funds since 2013); Northern Lights Variable Trust (since 2013)
Kevin E. Wolf 80 Arkay Drive Hauppauge, NY 11788 Born in 1969	Treasurer Since 2006	President, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (since 2012); Director of Fund Administration, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (2006 - 2012); and Vice-President, Blu Giant, (2004 - 2013).	N/A	N/A
James P. Ash 80 Arkay Drive Hauppauge, NY 11788 Born in 1976	Secretary Since 2011	Senior Vice President, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (since 2012); Vice President, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (2011 - 2012); Director of Legal Administration, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (2009 - 2011); Assistant Vice President of Legal Administration, Gemini Fund Services, LLC (2008 - 2011).	N/A	N/A
Lynn Bowley 17605 Wright Street Suite 2, Omaha, NE 68130 Born in 1958	Chief Compliance Officer Since 2007	Senior Compliance Officer of Northern Lights Compliance Services, LLC (since 2007).	N/A	N/A

* The term of office for each Trustee and officer listed above will continue indefinitely until the individual resigns or is removed.

** As of December 31, 2016, the Trust was comprised of 87 active portfolios managed by unaffiliated investment advisers. The term "Fund Complex" applies only to the Funds. The Funds do not hold themselves out as related to any other series within the Trust for investment purposes, nor do they share the same investment adviser with any other series.

*** Andrew Rogers is an "Interested Trustee" of the Trust as that term is defined under the 1940 Act, because of his affiliation with Gemini Fund Services, LLC, (the Trust's Administrator, Fund Accountant and Transfer Agent).

Board Committees

Audit Committee

The Board has an Audit Committee that consists of all the Trustees who are not "interested persons" of the Trust within the meaning of the 1940 Act. The Audit Committee's responsibilities include: (i) recommending to the Board the selection, retention or termination of the Trust's independent auditors; (ii) reviewing with the independent auditors the scope, performance and anticipated cost of their audit; (iii) discussing with the independent auditors certain matters relating to the Trust's financial statements, including any adjustment to such financial statements recommended by such independent auditors, or any other results of any audit; (iv) reviewing on a periodic basis a formal written statement from the independent auditors with respect to their independence, discussing with the independent auditors any relationships or services disclosed in the statement that may impact the objectivity and independence of the Trust's independent auditors and recommending that the Board take appropriate action in response thereto to satisfy itself of the auditor's independence; and (v) considering the comments of the independent auditors and management's responses thereto with respect to the quality and adequacy of the Trust's accounting and financial reporting policies and practices and internal controls. The Audit Committee operates pursuant to an Audit Committee Charter. During the past fiscal year, the Audit Committee held twelve meetings.

Compensation

Effective January 1, 2017, each Trustee who is not affiliated with the Trust or an investment adviser to any series of the Trust will receive a quarterly fee of \$35,875, allocated among each of the various portfolios comprising the Trust, for his attendance at the regularly scheduled meetings of the Board of Trustees, to be paid in advance of each calendar quarter, as well as reimbursement for any reasonable expenses incurred. Previously, each Trustee who is not affiliated with the Trust or an investment adviser to any series of the Trust received a quarterly fee of \$32,162.50. In addition to the quarterly fees and reimbursements, the Chairman of the Board receives a quarterly fee of \$8,200 and the Audit Committee Chairman receives a quarterly fee of \$6,150.

Additionally, in the event a meeting of the Board of Trustees other than its regularly scheduled meetings (a "Special Meeting") is required, each Independent Trustee will receive a fee of \$2,500 per Special Meeting, as well as reimbursement for any reasonable expenses incurred, to be paid by the relevant series of the Trust or its investment adviser depending on the circumstances necessitating the Special Meeting.

The table below details the amount of compensation the Trustees received from the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund during the fiscal year ended September

30, 2016. Each Independent Trustee attended all quarterly meetings during the period. The Trust does not have a bonus, profit sharing, pension or retirement plan.

Name and Position	Ascendant Deep Value Convertibles Fund	Ascendant Tactical Yield Fund	Patriot Fund	Patriot Balanced Fund	Pension or Retirement Benefits Accrued as Part of Fund Expenses	Estimated Annual Benefits Upon Retirement	Total Compensation From Fund Complex*** Paid to Trustees
Anthony J. Hertl	\$1,557	\$1,655	\$1,557	\$1,557	None	None	\$4,769
Gary Lanzen	\$1,311	\$1,393	\$1,311	\$1,311	None	None	\$5,326
Mark Taylor	\$1,393	\$1,480	\$1,393	\$1,393	None	None	\$5,659
John V. Palancia	\$1,311	\$1,393	\$1,311	\$1,311	None	None	\$5,326
Andrew Rogers*	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Mark D. Gersten**	\$1,311	\$1,393	\$1,311	\$1,311	None	None	\$5,326
Mark Garbin**	\$1,311	\$1,393	\$1,311	\$1,311	None	None	\$5,326

* This Trustee is deemed to be an "interested person" as defined in the 1940 Act as a result of his affiliation with Gemini Fund Services, LLC (the Trust's Administrator, Transfer Agent and Fund Accountant).

**Elected as a Trustee in September 2013.

*** There are currently numerous series comprising the Trust. The term "Fund Complex" refers only to the Funds, and not to any other series of the Trust. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the aggregate independent Trustees' fees paid by the entire Trust were \$805,800.

Trustee Ownership

The following table indicates the dollar range of equity securities that each Trustee beneficially owned in the Funds as of December 31, 2016.

Name of Trustee	Dollar Range of Equity Securities in the Patriot Fund	Dollar Range of Equity Securities in the Patriot Balanced Fund	Aggregate Dollar Range of Equity Securities in All Registered Investment Companies Overseen by Trustee in Family of Investment Companies
Anthony J. Hertl	None	None	None
Gary Lanzen	None	None	None
John V. Palancia	None	None	None
Andrew Rogers*	None	None	None
Mark Taylor	None	None	None
Mark D. Gersten	None	None	None
Mark Garbin	None	None	None

* This Trustee is deemed to be an 'interested person' as defined in the 1940 Act as a result of his affiliation with Gemini Fund Services, LLC (the Trust's Administrator, Transfer Agent and Fund Accountant), Northern Lights Distributors, LLC (the Fund's Funds' Distributor) and Northern Lights Compliance Services, LLC (the Trust's compliance service provider).

Management Ownership

As of January 3, 2017, the Trustees and officers, as a group, owned less than 1.00% of the Funds' outstanding shares and less than 1.00% of the Fund Complex's outstanding shares.

CONTROL PERSONS AND PRINCIPAL HOLDERS

A principal shareholder is any person who owns of record or beneficially 5% or more of the outstanding shares of a Fund. A control person is one who owns beneficially or through controlled companies more than 25% of the voting securities of a company or acknowledges the existence of control.

As of January 3, 2017, the following shareholders of record owned 5% or more of the outstanding shares of the Funds.

The Patriot Fund

Class A		
Name & Address	Shares	Percentage of Shares
SEI PRIVATE TRUST COMPANY/C/O ID 797 UNION BANK FBO: 6734303590 NLFT ASCEN BAL FUND ATTN: MUTUAL FUND ADMIN 1 FREEDOM VALLEY DRIVE OAKS, PA 19456	297,977	44.09%
Class C		
Name & Address	Shares	Percentage of Shares
STIFEL NICOLAUS & CO INC/A/C 3992-4883 DANIEL F LASSUS R/O IRA STIFEL NICOLAUS CUSTODIAN FOR 501 NORTH BROADWAY ST LOUIS MO 63102	2,369	7.44%
PERSHING LLC P. O. BOX 2052 JERSEY CITY, NJ 07303-9998	2,264	7.11%
STIFEL NICOLAUS & CO INC/A/C 2582-1984 STEPHEN C KUHN AU SR IRA STIFEL NICOLAUS CUSTODIAN FOR 501 NORTH BROADWAY ST LOUIS MO 63102	2,165	6.80%
STIFEL NICOLAUS & CO INC/A/C 8622-1077 CYNTHIA L KUHN AU IRA STIFEL NICOLAUS CUSTODIAN FOR 501 NORTH BROADWAY ST LOUIS MO 63102	2,165	6.80%
STIFEL NICOLAUS & CO INC/A/C 8142-3745	1,767	5.55%

JESSICA H BOELTE 501 NORTH BROADWAY ST LOUIS MO 63102		
PERSHING LLC P. O. BOX 2052 JERSEY CITY, NJ 07303-9998	1,626	5.11%

Patriot Balanced Fund

Class A		
Name & Address	Shares	Percentage of Shares
HILLTOP SECURITIES INC. FBO/ANNE HEATH SCHILLER A/C 799778890 PO BOX 509002 DALLAS TX 75250	26,783	23.95%
HILLTOP SECURITIES INC. FBO/JHL CAPITAL HOLDING LLC ATTN JAMES H LEE PO BOX 509002 DALLAS TX 75250	7,020	6.28%
HILLTOP SECURITIES INC. FBO/CHRISTOPHER J ANDERSEN A/C 122513292 PO BOX 509002 DALLAS TX 75250	6,372	5.70%
Class C		
Name & Address	Shares	Percentage of Shares
PERSHING LLC P. O. BOX 2052 JERSEY CITY, NJ 07303-9998	2,931	11.77%
STIFEL NICOLAUS & CO INC/A/C 2644-9216 NANCY CERIDWYN IRA 501 NORTH BROADWAY ST LOUIS MO 63102	2,043	8.20%
PERSHING LLC P. O. BOX 2052 JERSEY CITY, NJ 07303-9998	1,643	6.60%
PERSHING LLC P. O. BOX 2052 JERSEY CITY, NJ 07303-9998	1,396	5.60%
PERSHING LLC P. O. BOX 2052 JERSEY CITY, NJ 07303-9998	1,370	5.50%
PERSHING LLC P. O. BOX 2052 JERSEY CITY, NJ 07303-9998	1,361	5.47%

Class I		
Name & Address	Shares	Percentage of Shares
CHARLES SCHWAB & CO INC/ATTN MUTUAL FUNDS 211 MAIN STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105	1,097,066	86.88%

INVESTMENT ADVISER

Ascendant Advisors, LLC, located at Four Oaks Place, 1330 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1550, Houston, TX 77056, serves as investment adviser to the Funds. The Adviser was originally formed in 1970 and has operated continuously as a registered investment adviser since its inception. In 2009, the Adviser was acquired by its current management and a group of investors, converted to a limited liability company and renamed Ascendant Advisors, LLC. The Adviser also provides investment advisory services to individuals, corporations and pension plans. The Adviser is wholly owned by Ascendant Advisors Group, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company. The fee paid to the Adviser is governed by an investment advisory agreement ("Advisory Agreement") between the Trust, on behalf of the Funds and the Adviser.

Under the Advisory Agreement, the Adviser, under the supervision of the Board, agrees to invest the assets of the Funds in accordance with applicable law and the investment objective, policies and restrictions set forth in the Funds' current Prospectus and Statement of Additional Information, and subject to such further limitations as the Trust may from time to time impose by written notice to the Adviser. The Adviser shall act as the investment advisor to the Funds and, as such shall (i) obtain and evaluate such information relating to the economy, industries, business, securities markets and securities as it may deem necessary or useful in discharging its responsibilities here under, (ii) formulate a continuing program for the investment of the assets of the Funds in a manner consistent with its investment objective, policies and restrictions, and (iii) determine from time to time securities to be purchased, sold, retained or lent by the Funds, and implement those decisions, including the selection of entities with or through which such purchases, sales or loans are to be effected; provided, that the Adviser will place orders pursuant to its investment determinations either directly with the issuer or with a broker or dealer, and if with a broker or dealer, (a) will attempt to obtain the best price and execution of its orders, and (b) may nevertheless in its discretion purchase and sell portfolio securities from and to brokers who provide the Adviser with research, analysis, advice and similar services and pay such brokers in return a higher commission or spread than may be charged by other brokers. The Adviser also provides the Funds with all necessary office facilities and personnel for servicing the Funds' investments, compensates all officers, Trustees and employees of the Trust who are officers, directors or employees of the Advisor, and all personnel of the Funds or the Adviser performing services relating to research, statistical and investment activities. The Advisory Agreement was approved by the Board of the Trust, including by a

majority of the Independent Trustees, at a meeting held on November 18, 2011 and most recently renewed at a meeting held on December 6-7, 2016.

Pursuant to the Advisory Agreement, the Adviser is entitled to receive, on a monthly basis, an annual advisory fee equal to 1.40% of the Patriot Funds' average daily net assets and 1.10% of the Patriot Balanced Funds' average daily net assets. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014, the Patriot Fund accrued \$166,269 in advisory fees and \$57,261 was waived. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Patriot Fund accrued \$231,429 in advisory fees, of which \$36,974 was waived. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the Patriot Fund accrued \$356,003 in advisory fees and of which \$9,031 was waived. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014, the Patriot Balanced Fund accrued \$255,099 in advisory fees, of which none was waived or reimbursed. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Patriot Balanced Fund accrued \$241,645 in advisory fees, of which none was waived or reimbursed, and recaptured an additional \$30,378 of previously waived fees. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the Patriot Balanced Fund accrued \$203,527 in advisory fees, of which none were waived.

The Adviser has contractually agreed to reduce its fees and/or absorb expenses of the Funds, until at least January 31, 2018 to ensure that Total Annual Fund Operating Expenses After Fee Waiver and/or Reimbursement, excluding any front-end or contingent deferred loads; brokerage fees and commissions, acquired fund fees and expenses, borrowing costs (such as interest and dividend expense on securities sold short), taxes; and extraordinary expenses, such as litigation expenses (which may include indemnification of Fund officers and Trustees, contractual indemnification of Fund service providers (other than the Adviser) will not exceed the following levels of the daily average net assets attributable to each of the Class of shares, respectively, subject to possible recoupment from the Funds in future years on a rolling three-year basis (within the three years after the fees have been waived or reimbursed) if such recoupment can be achieved within the following expense limits:

Funds	Class A	Class C	Class I
The Patriot Fund	2.40%	3.15%	2.15%
The Patriot Balanced Fund	2.35%	3.10%	2.10%

Fee waiver and reimbursement arrangements can decrease the Funds' expenses and boost its performance. This agreement may be terminated only by the Funds' Board of Trustees, on 60 days' written notice to the Adviser. A discussion regarding the basis for the Board of Trustees' approval of the Advisory Agreement is available in the Funds' semi-annual shareholder report dated March 31, 2016.

Expenses not expressly assumed by the Adviser under the Advisory Agreement are paid by the Funds. Under the terms of the Advisory Agreement, the Funds are responsible for the payment of the following expenses among others: (a) the fees payable to the Adviser, (b) the fees and expenses of Trustees who are not affiliated persons of the Adviser (c) the fees and certain expenses of the Custodian and Transfer

and Dividend Disbursing Agent (as defined under the section entitled "Transfer Agent"), including the cost of maintaining certain required records of the Funds and of pricing the Funds' shares, (d) the charges and expenses of legal counsel and independent accountants for the Funds, (e) brokerage commissions and any issue or transfer taxes chargeable to the Funds in connection with its securities transactions, (f) all taxes and corporate fees payable by the Funds to governmental agencies, (g) the fees of any trade association of which the Funds may be a member, (h) the cost of fidelity and liability insurance, (i) the fees and expenses involved in registering and maintaining registration of the Funds and of its shares with the SEC, qualifying its shares under state securities laws, including the preparation and printing of the Funds' registration statement and prospectus for such purposes, (j) all expenses of shareholders and Trustees' meetings (including travel expenses of Trustees and officers of the Funds who are directors, officers or employees of the Adviser) and of preparing, printing and mailing reports, proxy statements and prospectuses to shareholders in the amount necessary for distribution to the shareholders and (k) litigation and indemnification expenses and other extraordinary expenses not incurred in the ordinary course of the Funds' business.

The Advisory Agreement continued in effect for two (2) years initially and thereafter continues from year to year provided such continuance is approved at least annually by (a) a vote of the majority of the Independent Trustees, cast in person at a meeting specifically called for the purpose of voting on such approval and by (b) the majority vote of either all of the Trustees or the vote of a majority of the outstanding shares of the Funds. The Advisory Agreement may be terminated without penalty on 60 days' written notice by a vote of a majority of the Trustees or by the Adviser, or by holders of a majority of that Trust's outstanding shares. The Advisory Agreement shall terminate automatically in the event of its assignment.

Codes of Ethics

The Trust, the Adviser and the Distributor (as defined under the section entitled ("Distribution of Shares")) have each adopted respective codes of ethics under Rule 17j-1 under the 1940 Act that govern the personal securities transactions of their board members, officers and employees who may have access to current trading information of the Trust. Under the Trust's code, the Trustees are permitted to invest in securities that may also be purchased by the Funds.

In addition, the Trust has adopted a separate code of ethics (the "Code") that applies only to the Trust's executive officers to ensure that these officers promote professional conduct in the practice of corporate governance and management. The purpose behind these guidelines is to promote (i) honest and ethical conduct, including the ethical handling of actual or apparent conflicts of interest between personal and professional relationships; (ii) full, fair, accurate, timely, and understandable disclosure in reports and documents that a registrant files with, or submits to, the SEC and in other public communications made by the Funds; (iii) compliance with applicable governmental laws, rule and regulations; (iv) the prompt internal reporting of violations

of this Code to an appropriate person or persons identified in the Code; and (v) accountability for adherence to the Code.

Proxy Voting Policies

The Board has adopted Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures ("Policies") on behalf of the Trust, which delegate the responsibility for voting proxies of securities held by the Funds to the Adviser and responsibility for voting proxies of securities held by the Funds to the Adviser, subject to the Board's continuing oversight. The Policies require that the Adviser vote proxies received in a manner consistent with the best interests of the Funds and its shareholders. The Policies also require the Adviser to present to the Board, at least annually, the Adviser's Proxy Policies and a record of each proxy voted by the Adviser on behalf of the Funds, including a report on the resolution of all proxies identified by the Adviser as involving a conflict of interest. A copy of the Adviser's Proxy Voting Policies is attached hereto as an Appendix.

More information. Information regarding how the Funds voted proxies relating to portfolio securities held by the Funds during the most recent 12-month period ending June 30 will be available (1) without charge, upon request, by calling the Funds at 1-855-527-2363; and (2) on the SEC's website at <http://www.sec.gov>. In addition, a copy of the Funds' proxy voting policies and procedures are also available by calling 1-855-527-2363 and will be sent within three business days of receipt of a request.

DISTRIBUTION OF SHARES

Northern Lights Distributors, LLC, (the "Distributor") located at 17605 Wright Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68130 serves as the principal underwriter and national distributor for the shares of the Funds pursuant to an Underwriting Agreement with the Trust (the "Underwriting Agreement"). The Distributor is registered as a broker-dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and each state's securities laws and is a member of FINRA. The offering of the Funds' shares is continuous. The Underwriting Agreement provides that the Distributor, as agent in connection with the distribution of Funds shares, will use reasonable efforts to facilitate the sale of the Funds' shares.

The Underwriting Agreement provides that, unless sooner terminated, it will continue in effect for two years initially and thereafter shall continue from year to year, subject to annual approval by (a) the Board or a vote of a majority of the outstanding shares, and (b) by a majority of the Trustees who are not interested persons of the Trust or of the Distributor by vote cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on such approval.

The Underwriting Agreement may be terminated by the Funds at any time, without the payment of any penalty, by vote of a majority of the entire Board of the Trust or by vote of a majority of the outstanding shares of the Funds on 60 days written notice to the Distributor, or by the Distributor at any time, without the payment of any penalty,

on 60 days written notice to the Funds. The Underwriting Agreement will automatically terminate in the event of its assignment.

The Distributor may enter into selling agreements with broker-dealers that solicit orders for the sale of shares of the Funds and may allow concessions to dealers that sell shares of the Funds.

The following table sets forth the total compensation received by the Distributor during the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014:

Funds	Net Underwriting Discounts and Commissions	Compensation on Redemptions and Repurchases	Brokerage Commissions	Other Compensation
Patriot Fund	\$4,155	\$0	\$0	*
Patriot Balanced Fund	\$914	\$0	\$0	*

* The Distributor received \$5,069 from the Adviser as compensation for its distribution services to the Funds.

The following table sets forth the total compensation received by the Distributor during the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015:

Funds	Net Underwriting Discounts and Commissions	Compensation on Redemptions and Repurchases	Brokerage Commissions	Other Compensation
Patriot Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	*
Patriot Balanced Fund	\$30	\$0	\$0	*

* The Distributor received \$17,547 from the Adviser as compensation for its distribution services to the Funds.

The following table sets forth the total compensation received by the Distributor during the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016:

Funds	Net Underwriting Discounts and Commissions	Compensation on Redemptions and Repurchases	Brokerage Commissions	Other Compensation
Patriot Fund	\$12,926	\$0	\$0	*
Patriot Balanced Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	*

* The Distributor received \$6,536 from the Adviser as compensation for its distribution services to the Funds.

The Distributor also receives 12b-1 fees from the Funds as described under the following section entitled "Rule 12b-1 Plan".

Rule 12b-1 Plan

The Trust, with respect to the Funds, has adopted the Trust's Master Distribution and Shareholder Servicing Plans pursuant to Rule 12b-1 under the 1940 Act for each of the Funds' Class A and Class C shares (the "Plans") pursuant to which the Funds are authorized to pay the Distributor, as compensation for Distributor's account maintenance services under the respective Plans, a distribution and shareholder servicing fee at the rate of up to 0.25% for Class A shares and up to 1.00% for Class C

shares of the Funds' average daily net assets attributable to the relevant class. Such fees are to be paid by the Funds monthly, or at such other intervals as the Board shall determine. There is no Plan for Class I shares. Such fees shall be based upon the Funds' average daily net assets during the preceding month, and shall be calculated and accrued daily. The Funds may pay fees to the Distributor at a lesser rate, as agreed upon by the Board of Trustees of the Trust and the Distributor. The Plans authorize payments to the Distributor as compensation for providing account maintenance services to Class A and Class C Funds shareholders, respectively, including arranging for certain securities dealers or brokers, administrators and others ("Recipients") to provide these services and paying compensation for these services. The Funds will bear its own costs of distribution with respect to its shares. The Funds may make other payments, such as contingent deferred sales charges imposed on certain redemptions of shares, which are separate and apart from payments made pursuant to the Plan.

The services to be provided under the Plans by Recipients may include, but are not limited to, the following: assistance in the offering and sale of Class A and Class C shares and in other aspects of the marketing of the shares to clients or prospective clients of the respective recipients; answering routine inquiries concerning the Funds; assisting in the establishment and maintenance of accounts or sub-accounts in the Funds and in processing purchase and redemption transactions; making the Funds' investment plan and shareholder services available; and providing such other information and services to investors in shares of the Funds as the Distributor or the Trust, on behalf of the Funds, may reasonably request. The distribution services shall also include any advertising and marketing services provided by or arranged by the Distributor with respect to the Funds.

The Distributor is required to provide a written report, at least quarterly to the Board of Trustees of the Trust, specifying in reasonable detail the amounts expended pursuant to each of the Plans and the purposes for which such expenditures were made. Further, the Distributor will inform the Board of any Rule 12b-1 fees to be paid by the Distributor to Recipients.

During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014 the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$6,855 and \$9,891, respectively, in distribution related fees pursuant to the Plans. These fees were allocated as follows:

Actual 12b-1 Expenditures Paid by the Patriot Fund's Shares During the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2014	
	Total Dollars Allocated
Advertising/Marketing	None
Printing/Postage	None
Payment to distributor	None
Payment to dealers	\$6,855
Compensation to sales personnel	None
Other	\$0
Total	\$6,855

Actual 12b-1 Expenditures Paid by the Patriot Balanced Fund's Shares During the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2014	
	Total Dollars Allocated
Advertising/Marketing	None
Printing/Postage	None
Payment to distributor	\$41
Payment to dealers	\$9,850
Compensation to sales personnel	None
Other	\$0
Total	\$9,891

During the fiscal Year ended September 30, 2015 the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$11,720 and \$12,198, respectively, in distribution related fees pursuant to the Plan. These fees were allocated as follows:

Actual 12b-1 Expenditures Paid by the Patriot Fund's Shares During the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015	
	Total Dollars Allocated
Advertising/Marketing	None
Printing/Postage	None
Payment to distributor	None
Payment to dealers	\$11,720
Compensation to sales personnel	None
Other	\$0
Total	\$11,720

Actual 12b-1 Expenditures Paid by the Patriot Balanced Fund's Shares During the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015	
	Total Dollars Allocated
Advertising/Marketing	None
Printing/Postage	None
Payment to distributor	\$8
Payment to dealers	\$12,190
Compensation to sales personnel	None
Other	\$0
Total	\$12,198

During the fiscal Year ended September 30, 2016 the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$22,446 and \$8,846, respectively, in distribution related fees pursuant to the Plan. For the fiscal Year indicated below, the distribution fees were allocated as follows:

**Actual 12b-1 Expenditures Paid by the Patriot Fund's
Shares During the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2016**

	Total Dollars Allocated
Advertising/Marketing	None
Printing/Postage	None
Payment to distributor	None
Payment to dealers	\$22,446
Compensation to sales personnel	None
Other	\$0
Total	\$22,446

**Actual 12b-1 Expenditures Paid by the Patriot Balanced
Fund's Shares During the Fiscal Year Ended
September 30, 2016**

	Total Dollars Allocated
Advertising/Marketing	None
Printing/Postage	None
Payment to distributor	\$1
Payment to dealers	\$8,845
Compensation to sales personnel	None
Other	\$0
Total	\$8,846

The initial term of the each Plan is one year and will continue in effect from year to year thereafter, provided such continuance is specifically approved at least annually by a majority of the Board of Trustees of the Trust and a majority of the Trustees who are not “interested persons” of the Trust and do not have a direct or indirect financial interest in the Plan (“Rule 12b-1 Trustees”) by votes cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on the Plan. Each Plan may be terminated at any time by the Trust or the Funds by vote of a majority of the Rule 12b-1 Trustees or by vote of a majority of the outstanding voting shares of the applicable class of the Funds.

Each of the Plans may not be amended to increase materially the amount of the Distributor's compensation to be paid by the Funds, unless such amendment is approved by the vote of a majority of the outstanding voting securities of the affected class of the Funds (as defined in the 1940 Act). All material amendments must be approved by a majority of the Board of Trustees of the Trust and a majority of the Rule 12b-1 Trustees by votes cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on a Plan. During the term of the Plans, the selection and nomination of non-interested Trustees of the Trust will be committed to the discretion of current non-interested

Trustees. The Distributor will preserve copies of the Plans, any related agreements, and all reports, for a period of not less than six years from the date of such document and for at least the first two years in an easily accessible place.

Any agreement related to the Plans will be in writing and provide that: (a) it may be terminated by the Trust or the Funds at any time upon sixty days written notice, without the payment of any penalty, by vote of a majority of the respective Rule 12b-1 Trustees, or by vote of a majority of the outstanding voting securities of the Trust or the Funds; (b) it will automatically terminate in the event of its assignment (as defined in the 1940 Act); and (c) it will continue in effect for a period of more than one year from the date of its execution or adoption only so long as such continuance is specifically approved at least annually by a majority of the Board and a majority of the Rule 12b-1 Trustees by votes cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on such agreement.

PORTFOLIO MANAGER

The following table lists the number and types of accounts managed by the Portfolio Manager, in addition to those of the Funds and assets under management in those accounts as of September 30, 2016:

Total Other Accounts Managed

Portfolio Manager	Registered Investment Company Accounts	Assets Managed (\$ millions)	Pooled Investment Vehicle Accounts	Assets Managed	Other Accounts	Assets Managed
James H. Lee	2	\$37 million	0	0	76	\$62.2 million

Other Accounts Managed Subject to Performance-Based Fees

Portfolio Manager	Registered Investment Company Accounts	Assets Managed (\$ millions)	Pooled Investment Vehicle Accounts	Assets Managed	Other Accounts	Assets Managed
James H. Lee	0	0	0	0	0	0

Conflicts of Interest

As indicated in the table above, portfolio manager at the Adviser may manage numerous accounts for multiple clients. These accounts may include registered investment companies, other types of pooled accounts (e.g., collective investment funds), and separate accounts (i.e., accounts managed on behalf of individuals or public or private institutions). The portfolio manager makes investment decisions for each account based on the investment objectives and policies and other relevant investment considerations applicable to that portfolio.

When a portfolio manager has responsibility for managing more than one account, potential conflicts of interest may arise. Those conflicts could include preferential treatment of one account over others in terms of allocation of resources or of investment opportunities. For instance, the Adviser may receive fees from certain accounts that are higher than the fee it receives from the Funds, or it may receive a performance-based fee on certain accounts. In those instances, the portfolio manager may have an incentive to favor the higher and/or performance-based fee accounts over the Funds. The Adviser has adopted policies and procedures designed to address these potential material conflicts. For instance, portfolio managers within the Adviser are normally responsible for all accounts within a certain investment discipline, and do not, absent special circumstances, differentiate among the various accounts when allocating resources. Additionally, the Adviser utilizes a system for allocating investment opportunities among portfolios that is designed to provide a fair and equitable allocation.

The portfolio manager receives a salary and may be eligible for a bonus based on the performance of the Adviser. Mr. Lee is also an equity owner of the Adviser, and therefore may share in the Adviser's profits.

Ownership

The following table shows the dollar range of equity securities beneficially owned by the portfolio manager in the Funds as of September 30, 2016.

James H. Lee:

Name of Fund	Dollar Range of Equity Securities in the Fund
Patriot Fund	\$100,001-\$500,000
Patriot Balanced Fund	Over \$1,000,000

ALLOCATION OF PORTFOLIO BROKERAGE

Specific decisions to purchase or sell securities for the Funds is made by the Funds' portfolio manager, who is an employee of the Adviser. The Adviser is authorized by the Trustees to allocate the orders placed on behalf of the Funds to brokers or dealers who may, but need not, provide research or statistical material or other services to the Funds or the Adviser for the Funds' use. Such allocation is to be in such amounts and proportions as the Adviser may determine.

In selecting a broker or dealer to execute each particular transaction, the Adviser will take the following into consideration:

- the best net price available;
- the reliability, integrity and financial condition of the broker or dealer;

- the size of and difficulty in executing the order; and
- the value of the expected contribution of the broker or dealer to the investment performance of the Funds on a continuing basis.

Brokers or dealers executing a portfolio transaction on behalf of the Funds may receive a commission in excess of the amount of commission another broker or dealer would have charged for executing the transaction if the Adviser determines in good faith that such commission is reasonable in relation to the value of brokerage, research and other services provided to the Funds. In allocating portfolio brokerage, the Adviser may select brokers or dealers who also provide brokerage, research and other services to other accounts over which the Adviser exercises investment discretion. Some of the services received as the result of Funds transactions may primarily benefit accounts other than the Funds, while services received as the result of portfolio transactions effected on behalf of those other accounts may primarily benefit the Funds. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$3,755 and \$46,341, in brokerage commissions, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$22,971 and \$42,774 in brokerage commissions, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$28,064 and \$32,947 in brokerage commissions, respectively.

The Funds have no obligation to deal with any broker or dealer in the execution of its transactions. However, it is contemplated that AWM Services, LLC ("AWM") located at 1330 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 1550, Houston, TX 77056, in its capacity as a registered broker-dealer, will effect substantially all securities transactions that are executed on a national securities exchange and over-the-counter transactions conducted on an agency basis. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid AWM brokerage commissions of \$3,755 (100%) and \$212,899 (100%) of the Funds' total brokerage commissions, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Patriot Fund and Patriot Balanced Fund paid AWM brokerage commissions of \$22,971 (100%) and \$141,872 (100%) of the Funds' total brokerage commissions, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$28,064 (100%) and \$32,885 (100%) in brokerage commissions, respectively.

Under 1940 Act, as amended, persons affiliated with an affiliate of the Adviser (such as AWM) may be prohibited from dealing with the Funds as a principal in the purchase and sale of securities. Therefore, AWM will not serve as the Funds' dealer in connection with over-the-counter transactions. However, AWM may serve as the Funds' broker in over-the-counter transactions conducted on an agency basis and will receive brokerage commissions in connection with such transactions.

The Adviser may select AWM to execute portfolio transactions. In executing transactions through its affiliated broker/dealer, the Adviser will at all times comply with SEC Rule 17e-1 under the 1940 Act. The Funds will not affect any brokerage transactions in its portfolio securities with AWM or any affiliate if such transactions

would be unfair or unreasonable to Funds shareholders, and the commissions will be paid solely for the execution of trades and not for any other services. The brokerage agreement with AWM provides that affiliates of affiliates of the Adviser may receive brokerage commissions in connection with effecting such transactions for the Funds. In determining the commissions to be paid to AWM, it is the policy of the Funds that such commissions will, in the judgment of the Trust's Board of Trustees, be (i) at least as favorable to the Funds as those which would be charged by other qualified brokers having comparable execution capability and (ii) at least as favorable to the Funds as commissions contemporaneously charged by AWM on comparable transactions for its most favored unaffiliated customers, except for customers of AWM considered by a majority of the Trust's disinterested Trustees not to be comparable to the Funds. The Advisory Agreement does not provide for a reduction of the Adviser's fee by the amount of any profits earned by an affiliate from brokerage commissions generated from portfolio transactions of the Funds. An affiliated broker-dealer will not receive reciprocal brokerage business as a result of the brokerage business placed by the Funds with others. The brokerage commissions paid to AWM create a conflict of interest because the Adviser may be influenced by such commission payments to select the affiliated broker over another broker. To insure the commissions charged are fair, and any conflict of interest mitigated, the disinterested Trustees from time to time review, among other things, information relating to the commissions charged by AWM to the Funds and its other customers, and rates and other information concerning the commissions charged by other qualified brokers on a quarterly basis.

The Advisory Agreement does not provide for a reduction of the Adviser's fee by the amount of any profits earned by AWM from brokerage commissions generated from portfolio transactions of the Funds.

While the Funds contemplate no ongoing arrangements with any other brokerage firms, brokerage business may be given from time to time to other firms. AWM will not receive reciprocal brokerage business as a result of the brokerage business placed by the Funds with others.

PORTFOLIO TURNOVER

The Funds' portfolio turnover rate is calculated by dividing the lesser of purchases or sales of portfolio securities for the fiscal year by the monthly average of the value of the portfolio securities owned by the Funds during the fiscal year. The calculation excludes from both the numerator and the denominator securities with maturities at the time of acquisition of one year or less. High portfolio turnover involves correspondingly greater brokerage commissions and other transaction costs, which will be borne directly by the Funds. A 100% turnover rate would occur if all of the Funds' portfolio securities were replaced once within a one-year period. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Patriot Fund's and Patriot Balanced Fund's portfolio turnover rates were 22% and 49%, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September

30, 2016, the Patriot Fund's and Patriot Balanced Fund's portfolio turnover rates were 49% and 71%, respectively.

OTHER SERVICE PROVIDERS

Funds Administration, Funds Accounting and Transfer Agent Services

Gemini Fund Services, LLC ("GFS"), which has its principal office at 80 Arkay Drive, Suite 110, Hauppauge, New York 11788, serves as administrator, fund accountant and transfer agent for the Funds pursuant to a Fund Services Agreement (the "Agreement") with the Funds and subject to the supervision of the Board. GFS is primarily in the business of providing administrative, fund accounting and transfer agent services to retail and institutional mutual funds. GFS is an affiliate of the Distributor. GFS may also provide persons to serve as officers of the Funds. Such officers may be directors, officers or employees of GFS or its affiliates.

The Agreement became effective on June 22, 2011 and will remain in effect for two years from the applicable effective date for the Funds, and will continue in effect for successive twelve-month periods provided that such continuance is specifically approved at least annually by a majority of the Board. The Agreement is terminable by the Board or GFS on 90 days' written notice and may be assigned by either party, provided the Trust may not assign this agreement without prior written consent of GFS. This Agreement provides that GFS shall be without liability for any action reasonably taken or omitted to the Agreement.

Under the Agreement, GFS performs administrative services, including: (1) monitoring the performance of administrative and professional services rendered to the Trust by others service providers; (2) monitoring Funds holdings and operations for post-trade compliance with the Funds' registration statement and applicable laws and rules; (3) preparing and coordinating the printing of semi-annual and annual financial statements; (4) preparing selected management reports for performance and compliance analyses; (5) preparing and disseminating materials for and attending and participating in meetings of the Board; (6) determining income and capital gains available for distribution and calculating distributions required to meet regulatory, income, and excise tax requirements; (7) reviewing the Trust's federal, state, and local tax returns as prepared and signed by the Trust's independent public accountants; (8) preparing and maintaining the Trust's operating expense budget to determine proper expense accruals to be charged to each Fund to calculate its daily net asset value; (9) assisting in and monitoring the preparation, filing, printing and where applicable, dissemination to shareholders of amendments to the Trust's Registration Statement on Form N-1A, periodic reports to the Trustees, shareholders and the SEC, notices pursuant to Rule 24f-2, proxy materials and reports to the SEC on Forms N-SAR, N-CSR, N-Q and N-PX; (10) coordinating the Trust's audits and examinations by assisting each Fund's independent public accountants; (11) determining, in consultation with others, the jurisdictions in which shares of the Trust shall be registered or qualified for

sale and facilitating such registration or qualification; (12) monitoring sales of shares and ensure that the shares are properly and duly registered with the SEC; (13) monitoring the calculation of performance data for the Funds; (14) preparing, or cause to be prepared, expense and financial reports; (15) preparing authorizations for the payment of Trust expenses and pay, from Trust assets, all bills of the Trust; (16) providing information typically supplied in the investment company industry to companies that track or report price, performance or other information with respect to investment companies; (17) upon request, assisting each Fund in the evaluation and selection of other service providers, such as independent public accountants, printers, EDGAR providers and proxy solicitors (such parties may be affiliates of GFS); and (18) performing other services, recordkeeping and assistance relating to the affairs of the Trust as the Trust may, from time to time, reasonably request.

For the administrative services rendered to the Funds by GFS, the Funds pay GFS a fund administration fee equal to the greater of \$55,000 minimum base annual fee or an asset based fee, which scales downward upon net assets. The Funds also pay GFS for any out-of-pocket expenses.

GFS also provides the Funds with accounting services, including: (i) daily computation of net asset value; (ii) maintenance of security ledgers and books and records as required by the 1940 Act; (iii) production of the Funds' listing of portfolio securities and general ledger reports; (iv) reconciliation of accounting records; (v) calculation of yield and total return for the Funds; (vi) maintaining certain books and records described in Rule 31a-1 under the 1940 Act, and reconciling account information and balances among the Funds' custodian and Adviser; and (vii) monitoring and evaluating daily income and expense accruals, and sales and redemptions of shares of the Funds.

The fund accounting fees for the Funds are combined with the fund administration fees under this Agreement. Therefore, there is no separate base annual fee per Fund or share class. The Funds also pays GFS for any out-of-pocket expenses. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$57,416 and \$66,939 in combined administrative fees and accounting fees, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$57,329 and \$67,017 in combined administrative fees and accounting fees, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$59,382 and \$66,354 in combined administrative fees and accounting fees, respectively.

GFS also acts as transfer, dividend disbursing, and shareholder servicing agent for the Funds pursuant to the Agreement. Under the Agreement, GFS is responsible for administering and performing transfer agent functions, dividend distribution, shareholder administration, and maintaining necessary records in accordance with applicable rules and regulations.

For these services rendered to the Funds under the Agreement, the Funds pay GFS an annual fee equal to the greater of \$15,000 per share class or an asset based fee, which scales downward upon net assets. The Funds also pay GFS for any out-of-pocket expenses. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$18,154 and \$19,404 in transfer agency fees, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$17,561 and \$19,387 in transfer agency fees, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$19,675 and \$18,409 in transfer agency fees, respectively.

Custodian

MUFG Union Bank, National Association, (the "Custodian") 400 California Street, San Francisco, California 94104, serves as the custodian of the Funds' assets pursuant to a Custody Agreement by and between the Custodian and the Trust on behalf of the Funds. The Custodian's responsibilities include safeguarding and controlling the Funds' cash and securities, handling the receipt and delivery of securities, and collecting interest and dividends on the Funds' investments. Pursuant to the Custody Agreement, the Custodian also maintains original entry documents and books of record and general ledgers; posts cash receipts and disbursements; and records purchases and sales based upon communications from the Adviser. The Funds may employ foreign sub-custodians that are approved by the Board to hold foreign assets.

Compliance Services

Northern Lights Compliance Services, LLC ("NLCS"), 17605 Wright Street, Suite 2, Omaha, NE 68130, an affiliate of GFS and the Distributor, provides a Chief Compliance Officer to the Trust as well as related compliance services pursuant to a consulting agreement between NLCS and the Trust. NLCS's compliance services consist primarily of reviewing and assessing the policies and procedures of the Trust and its service providers pertaining to compliance with applicable federal securities laws, including Rule 38a-1 under the 1940 Act. For the compliance services rendered to the Funds, the Funds pays NLCS a one-time fee of \$2,500, plus an annual fee, based on Fund assets, ranging from \$13,500 (net assets of \$50 million or less) to \$31,500 (net assets over \$1 billion). The Funds also pay NLCS for any out-of-pocket expenses. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2014, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$5,317 and \$10,833 in compliance service fees, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, the Funds paid \$5,832 and \$9,710 in compliance service fees, respectively. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2016, the Patriot Fund and the Patriot Balanced Fund paid \$14,652 and \$7,174 in compliance service fees, respectively.

DESCRIPTION OF SHARES

Each share of beneficial interest of the Trust has one vote in the election of Trustees. Cumulative voting is not authorized for the Trust. This means that the holders of more than 50% of the shares voting for the election of Trustees can elect 100% of the Trustees if they choose to do so, and, in that event, the holders of the remaining shares will be unable to elect any Trustees.

Shareholders of the Trust and any other future series of the Trust will vote in the aggregate and not by series except as otherwise required by law or when the Board determines that the matter to be voted upon affects only the interest of the shareholders of a particular series. Matters such as ratification of the independent public accountants and election of Trustees are not subject to separate voting requirements and may be acted upon by shareholders of the Trust voting without regard to series.

The Trust is authorized to issue an unlimited number of shares of beneficial interest. Each share has equal dividend, distribution and liquidation rights. There are no conversion or preemptive rights applicable to any shares of the Funds. All shares issued are fully paid and non-assessable.

ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING PROGRAM

The Trust has established an Anti-Money Laundering Compliance Program (the "Program") as required by the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001 ("USA PATRIOT Act"). To ensure compliance with this law, the Trust's Program provides for the development of internal practices, procedures and controls, designation of anti-money laundering compliance officers, an ongoing training program and an independent audit function to determine the effectiveness of the Program.

Procedures to implement the Program include, but are not limited to, determining that the Funds' Distributor and Transfer Agent have established proper anti-money laundering procedures, reported suspicious and/or fraudulent activity and a complete and thorough review of all new opening account applications. The Trust will not transact business with any person or entity whose identity cannot be adequately verified under the provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act.

As a result of the Program, the Trust may be required to "freeze" the account of a shareholder if the shareholder appears to be involved in suspicious activity or if certain account information matches information on government lists of known terrorists or other suspicious persons, or the Trust may be required to transfer the account or proceeds of the account to a governmental agency.

PURCHASE, REDEMPTION AND PRICING OF SHARES

Calculation of Share Price

As indicated in the Prospectus under the heading "Net Asset Value," the net asset value ("NAV") of the Funds' shares, by class, is determined by dividing the total value of the Funds' portfolio investments and other assets, less any liabilities, by the total number of shares outstanding of the Funds, by class.

For purposes of calculating the NAV, portfolio securities and other assets for which market quotes are available are stated at market value. Market value is generally determined on the basis of last reported sales prices, or if no sales are reported, based on quotes obtained from a quotation reporting system, established market makers, or pricing services. Securities primarily traded in the NASDAQ National Market System for which market quotations are readily available shall be valued using the NASDAQ Official Closing Price ("NOCP"). If the NOCP is not available, such securities shall be valued at the last sale price on the day of valuation on the primary exchange, or if there has been no sale on such day, at mean between the current bid and ask prices on such exchange. Certain securities or investments for which daily market quotes are not readily available may be valued, pursuant to guidelines established by the Board, with reference to other securities or indices. Short-term investments having a maturity of 60 days or less are generally valued at amortized cost. Exchange traded options; futures and options on futures are valued at the settlement price determined by the exchange. Other securities for which market quotes are not readily available are valued at fair value as determined in good faith by the Board or persons acting at their direction.

Investments initially valued in currencies other than the U.S. dollar are converted to U.S. dollars using exchange rates obtained from pricing services. As a result, the NAV of the Funds' shares may be affected by changes in the value of currencies in relation to the U.S. dollar. The value of securities traded in markets outside the United States or denominated in currencies other than the U.S. dollar may be affected significantly on a day that the New York Stock Exchange is closed and an investor is not able to purchase, redeem or exchange shares.

Fund shares are valued at the close of regular trading on the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") (normally 4:00 p.m., Eastern Time) (the "NYSE Close") on each day that the New York Stock Exchange is open. For purposes of calculating the NAV, the Funds normally use pricing data for domestic equity securities received shortly after the NYSE Close and does not normally take into account trading, clearances or settlements that take place after the NYSE Close. Domestic fixed income and foreign securities are normally priced using data reflecting the earlier closing of the principal markets for those securities. Information that becomes known to the Funds or their agents after the NAV has been calculated on a particular day will not generally be used to retroactively adjust the price of the security or the NAV determined earlier that day.

When market quotations are insufficient or not readily available, the Funds may value securities at fair value or estimate their value as determined in good faith by the Board or its designees, pursuant to procedures approved by the Board. Fair valuation may also be used by the Board if extraordinary events occur after the close of the relevant market but prior to the NYSE Close.

The Funds may hold securities, such as private placements, interests in commodity pools, other non-traded securities or temporarily illiquid securities, for which market quotations are not readily available or are determined to be unreliable. These securities will be valued at their fair market value as determined using the “fair value” procedures approved by the Board. The Board has delegated execution of these procedures to a fair value team composed of one or more representatives from each of the (i) Trust, (ii) administrator, and (iii) Adviser. The team may also enlist third party consultants such as an audit firm or financial officer of a security issuer on an as-needed basis to assist in determining a security-specific fair value. The Board reviews and ratifies the execution of this process and the resultant fair value prices at least quarterly to assure the process produces reliable results.

Fair Value Team and Valuation Process. This team is composed of one or more representatives from each of the (i) Trust, (ii) administrator, and (iii) Adviser. The applicable investments are valued collectively via inputs from each of these groups. For example, fair value determinations are required for the following securities: (i) securities for which market quotations are insufficient or not readily available on a particular business day (including securities for which there is a short and temporary lapse in the provision of a price by the regular pricing source), (ii) securities for which, in the judgment of the adviser, the prices or values available do not represent the fair value of the instrument. Factors which may cause the adviser to make such a judgment include, but are not limited to, the following: only a bid price or an asked price is available; the spread between bid and asked prices is substantial; the frequency of sales; the thinness of the market; the size of reported trades; and actions of the securities markets, such as the suspension or limitation of trading; (iii) securities determined to be illiquid; (iv) securities with respect to which an event that will affect the value thereof has occurred (a “significant event”) since the closing prices were established on the principal exchange on which they are traded, but prior to a Fund’s calculation of its net asset value. Specifically, interests in commodity pools or managed futures pools are valued on a daily basis by reference to the closing market prices of each futures contract or other asset held by a pool, as adjusted for pool expenses. Restricted or illiquid securities, such as private placements or non-traded securities are valued via inputs from the adviser valuation based upon the current bid for the security from two or more independent dealers or other parties reasonably familiar with the facts and circumstances of the security (who should take into consideration all relevant factors as may be appropriate under the circumstances). If the adviser is unable to obtain a current bid from such independent dealers or other independent parties, the fair value team shall determine the fair value of such security using the following factors: (i) the type of security; (ii) the cost at date of purchase; (iii) the size and nature of the Fund’s holdings; (iv) the discount from market value of unrestricted securities of the same class

at the time of purchase and subsequent thereto; (v) information as to any transactions or offers with respect to the security; (vi) the nature and duration of restrictions on disposition of the security and the existence of any registration rights; (vii) how the yield of the security compares to similar securities of companies of similar or equal creditworthiness; (viii) the level of recent trades of similar or comparable securities; (ix) the liquidity characteristics of the security; (x) current market conditions; and (xi) the market value of any securities into which the security is convertible or exchangeable.

Standards For Fair Value Determinations. As a general principle, the fair value of a security is the amount that a Fund might reasonably expect to realize upon its current sale. The Trust has adopted Financial Accounting Standards Board Statement of Financial Accounting Standards Codification Topic 820, Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures ("ASC 820"). In accordance with ASC 820, fair value is defined as the price that the Funds would receive upon selling an investment in a timely transaction to an independent buyer in the principal or most advantageous market of the investment. ASC 820 establishes a three-tier hierarchy to maximize the use of observable market data and minimize the use of unobservable inputs and to establish classification of fair value measurements for disclosure purposes. Inputs refer broadly to the assumptions that market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability, including assumptions about risk, for example, the risk inherent in a particular valuation technique used to measure fair value including such a pricing model and/or the risk inherent in the inputs to the valuation technique. Inputs may be observable or unobservable. Observable inputs are inputs that reflect the assumptions market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability developed based on market data obtained from sources independent of the reporting entity. Unobservable inputs are inputs that reflect the reporting entity's own assumptions about the assumptions market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability, developed based on the best information available under the circumstances.

Various inputs are used in determining the value of each Funds' investments relating to ASC 820. These inputs are summarized in the three broad levels listed below.

Level 1 – quoted prices in active markets for identical securities.

Level 2 – other significant observable inputs. (including quoted prices for similar securities, interest rates, prepayment speeds, credit risk, etc.)

Level 3 – significant unobservable inputs (including a Funds' own assumptions in determining the fair value of investments).

The fair value team takes into account the relevant factors and surrounding circumstances, which may include: (i) the nature and pricing history (if any) of the security; (ii) whether any dealer quotations for the security are available; (iii) possible valuation methodologies that could be used to determine the fair value of the security; (iv) the recommendation of a portfolio manager of the Funds with respect to the

valuation of the security; (v) whether the same or similar securities are held by other funds managed by the Adviser or other funds and the method used to price the security in those funds; (vi) the extent to which the fair value to be determined for the security will result from the use of data or formulae produced by independent third parties; and (vii) the liquidity or illiquidity of the market for the security.

Board of Trustees Determination. The Board of Trustees meets at least quarterly to consider the valuations provided by fair value team and to ratify valuations for the applicable securities. The Board of Trustees considers the reports provided by the fair value team, including follow up studies of subsequent market-provided prices when available, in reviewing and determining in good faith the fair value of the applicable portfolio securities.

The Trust expects that the New York Stock Exchange will be closed on the following holidays: New Year's Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, Presidents' Day, Good Friday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day.

Purchase of Shares

Orders for shares received by the Funds in good order prior to the close of business on the NYSE on each day during such periods that the NYSE is open for trading are priced at NAV per share computed as of the close of the regular session of trading on the NYSE. Orders received in good order after the close of the NYSE, or on a day it is not open for trading, are priced at the close of such NYSE on the next day on which it is open for trading at the next determined NAV or offering price per share.

Redemption of Shares

The Funds will redeem all or any portion of a shareholder's shares in the Funds when requested in accordance with the procedures set forth in the "Redemptions" section of the Prospectus. Under the 1940 Act, a shareholder's right to redeem shares and to receive payment therefore may be suspended at times:

- (a) when the NYSE is closed, other than customary weekend and holiday closings;
- (b) when trading on that exchange is restricted for any reason;
- (c) when an emergency exists as a result of which disposal by the Funds of securities owned by it is not reasonably practicable or it is not reasonably practicable for the Funds to fairly determine the value of its net assets, provided that applicable rules and regulations of the SEC (or any succeeding governmental authority) will govern as to whether the conditions prescribed in (b) or (c) exist; or

(d) when the SEC by order permits a suspension of the right to redemption or a postponement of the date of payment on redemption.

In case of suspension of the right of redemption, payment of a redemption request will be made based on the NAV next determined after the termination of the suspension.

The Funds may purchase shares of Underlying Funds which charge a redemption fee to shareholders (such as the Funds) that redeem shares of the Underlying Fund within a certain period of time (such as one year). The fee is payable to the Underlying Fund. Accordingly, if the Funds were to invest in an Underlying Fund and incur a redemption fee as a result of redeeming shares in such Underlying Fund, the Funds would bear such redemption fee.

Supporting documents in addition to those listed under "Redemptions" in the Prospectus will be required from executors, administrators, Trustees, or if redemption is requested by someone other than the shareholder of record. Such documents include, but are not restricted to, stock powers, Trust instruments, certificates of death, appointments as executor, certificates of corporate authority and waiver of tax required in some states when settling estates.

TAX STATUS

The following discussion is general in nature and should not be regarded as an exhaustive presentation of all possible tax ramifications. All shareholders should consult a qualified tax advisor regarding their investment in the Funds.

The Funds intend to qualify and have elected to be treated as a regulated investment company under Subchapter M of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), which requires compliance with certain requirements concerning the sources of its income, diversification of its assets, and the amount and timing of its distributions to shareholders. Such qualification does not involve supervision of management or investment practices or policies by any government agency or bureau. By so qualifying, the Funds should not be subject to federal income or excise tax on its net investment income or net capital gain, which are distributed to shareholders in accordance with the applicable timing requirements. Net investment income and net capital gain of the Funds will be computed in accordance with Section 852 of the Code.

Net investment income is made up of dividends and interest less expenses. Net capital gain for a fiscal year is computed by taking into account any capital loss carryforward of the Funds. Capital losses incurred in tax years beginning after December 22, 2010 may now be carried forward indefinitely and retain the character of the original loss. Under previously enacted laws, capital losses could be carried forward to offset any capital gains for only eight years, and carried forward as short-term capital losses, irrespective of the character of the original loss. Capital loss carryforwards are

available to offset future realized capital gains. To the extent that these carryforwards are used to offset future capital gains it is probable that the amount offset will not be distributed to shareholders.

The Funds intend to distribute all of their net investment income, any excess of net short-term capital gains over net long-term capital losses, and any excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses in accordance with the timing requirements imposed by the Code and therefore should not be required to pay any federal income or excise taxes. Distributions of net investment income and net capital gain will be made after the end of each fiscal year, and no later than December 31 of each year. Both types of distributions will be in shares of the Funds unless a shareholder elects to receive cash.

To be treated as a regulated investment company under Subchapter M of the Code, each Fund must also (a) derive at least 90% of gross income from dividends, interest, payments with respect to securities loans, net income from certain publicly traded partnerships and gains from the sale or other disposition of securities or foreign currencies, or other income (including, but not limited to, gains from options, futures or forward contracts) derived with respect to the business of investing in such securities or currencies, and (b) diversify its holding so that, at the end of each fiscal quarter, (i) at least 50% of the market value of the Fund's assets is represented by cash, U.S. government securities and securities of other regulated investment companies, and other securities (for purposes of this calculation, generally limited in respect of any one issuer, to an amount not greater than 5% of the market value of the Fund's assets and 10% of the outstanding voting securities of such issuer) and (ii) not more than 25% of the value of its assets is invested in the securities of (other than U.S. government securities or the securities of other regulated investment companies) any one issuer, two or more issuers which the Fund control and which are determined to be engaged in the same or similar trades or businesses, or the securities of certain publicly traded partnerships.

If the Funds fail to qualify as a regulated investment company under Subchapter M in any fiscal year, they will be treated as a corporation for federal income tax purposes. As such the Funds would be required to pay income taxes on its net investment income and net realized capital gains, if any, at the rates generally applicable to corporations. Shareholders of the Funds generally would not be liable for income tax on the Funds' net investment income or net realized capital gains in their individual capacities. Distributions to shareholders, whether from the Funds' net investment income or net realized capital gains, would be treated as taxable dividends to the extent of current or accumulated earnings and profits of the Funds.

The Funds are subject to a 4% nondeductible excise tax on certain undistributed amounts of ordinary income and capital gain under a prescribed formula contained in Section 4982 of the Code. The formula requires payment to shareholders during a calendar year of distributions representing at least 98% of the Funds' ordinary income for the calendar year and at least 98.2% of its capital gain net income (i.e., the excess

of its capital gains over capital losses) realized during the one-year period ending October 31 during such year plus 100% of any income that was neither distributed nor taxed to the Funds during the preceding calendar year. Under ordinary circumstances, the Funds expect to time their distributions so as to avoid liability for this tax.

The following discussion of tax consequences is for the general information of shareholders that are subject to tax. Shareholders that are IRAs or other qualified retirement plans are exempt from income taxation under the Code.

Distributions of taxable net investment income and the excess of net short-term capital gain over net long-term capital loss are taxable to shareholders as ordinary income. In most cases the Funds will hold shares in Underlying Funds for less than 12 months, such that its sales of such shares from time to time will not qualify as long-term capital gains for those investors who hold shares of the Funds in taxable accounts.

Distributions of net capital gain ("capital gain dividends") generally are taxable to shareholders as short-term capital gain; regardless of the length of time the shares of the Trust have been held by such shareholders.

For taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012, certain U.S. shareholders, including individuals and estates and trusts, will be subject to an additional 3.8% Medicare tax on all or a portion of their "net investment income," which should include dividends from the Funds and net gains from the disposition of shares of the Funds. U.S. Shareholders are urged to consult their own tax advisers regarding the implications of the additional Medicare tax resulting from an investment in the Funds.

Redemption of Fund shares by a shareholder will result in the recognition of taxable gain or loss in an amount equal to the difference between the amount realized and the shareholder's tax basis in his or her Fund shares. Such gain or loss is treated as a capital gain or loss if the shares are held as capital assets. However, any loss realized upon the redemption of shares within six months from the date of their purchase will be treated as a long-term capital loss to the extent of any amounts treated as capital gain dividends during such six-month period. All or a portion of any loss realized upon the redemption of shares may be disallowed to the extent shares are purchased (including shares acquired by means of reinvested dividends) within 30 days before or after such redemption.

Distributions of taxable net investment income and net capital gain will be taxable as described above, whether received in additional cash or shares. Shareholders electing to reinvest distributions in the form of additional shares will have a cost basis for federal income tax purposes in each share so received equal to the net asset value of a share on the reinvestment date.

All distributions of taxable net investment income and net capital gain, whether received in shares or in cash, must be reported by each taxable shareholder on his or her federal income tax return. Dividends or distributions declared in October, November

or December as of a record date in such a month, if any, will be deemed to have been received by shareholders on December 31, if paid during January of the following year. Redemptions of shares may result in tax consequences (gain or loss) to the shareholder and are also subject to these reporting requirements.

Under the Code, the Funds will be required to report to the Internal Revenue Service all distributions of taxable income and capital gains as well as gross proceeds from the redemption or exchange of Fund shares, except in the case of certain exempt shareholders. Under the backup withholding provisions of Section 3406 of the Code, distributions of taxable net investment income and net capital gain and proceeds from the redemption or exchange of the shares of a regulated investment company may be subject to withholding of federal income tax in the case of non-exempt shareholders who fail to furnish the investment company with their taxpayer identification numbers and with required certifications regarding their status under the federal income tax law, or if the Funds are notified by the IRS or a broker that withholding is required due to an incorrect TIN or a previous failure to report taxable interest or dividends. If the withholding provisions are applicable, any such distributions and proceeds, whether taken in cash or reinvested in additional shares, will be reduced by the amounts required to be withheld.

Other Reporting and Withholding Requirements

Payments to a shareholder that is either a foreign financial institution (“FFI”) or a non-financial foreign entity (“NFFE”) within the meaning of the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (“FATCA”) may be subject to a generally nonrefundable 30% withholding tax on: (a) income dividends paid by the Funds after June 30, 2014 and (b) certain capital gain distributions and the proceeds arising from the sale of Funds shares paid by the Funds after December 31, 2016. FATCA withholding tax generally can be avoided: (a) by an FFI, subject to any applicable intergovernmental agreement or other exemption, if it enters into a valid agreement with the IRS to, among other requirements, report required information about certain direct and indirect ownership of foreign financial accounts held by U.S. persons with the FFI and (b) by an NFFE, if it: (i) certifies that it has no substantial U.S. persons as owners or (ii) if it does have such owners, reports information relating to them. The Funds may disclose the information that is received from its shareholders to the IRS, non-U.S. taxing authorities or other parties as necessary to comply with FATCA. Withholding also may be required if a foreign entity that is a shareholder of one of the Funds fails to provide the Fund with appropriate certifications or other documentation concerning its status under FATCA.

Options, Futures, Forward Contracts and Swap Agreements

To the extent such investments are permissible for the Funds, the Funds’ transactions in options, futures contracts, hedging transactions, forward contracts, straddles and foreign currencies will be subject to special tax rules (including mark-to-market, constructive sale, straddle, wash sale and short sale rules), the effect of which may be to accelerate income to the Funds, defer losses to the Funds, cause

adjustments in the holding periods of the Funds' securities, convert long-term capital gains into short-term capital gains and convert short-term capital losses into long-term capital losses. These rules could therefore affect the amount, timing and character of distributions to shareholders.

To the extent such investments are permissible, certain of the Funds' hedging activities (including its transactions, if any, in foreign currencies or foreign currency-denominated instruments) are likely to produce a difference between its book income and its taxable income. If the Funds' book income exceeds its taxable income, the distribution (if any) of such excess book income will be treated as (i) a dividend to the extent of the Funds' remaining earnings and profits (including earnings and profits arising from tax-exempt income), (ii) thereafter, as a return of capital to the extent of the recipient's basis in the shares, and (iii) thereafter, as gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset. If the Funds' book income is less than taxable income, the Funds could be required to make distributions exceeding book income to qualify as a regulated investment company that is accorded special tax treatment.

Passive Foreign Investment Companies

Investment by the Funds in certain "passive foreign investment companies" ("PFICs") could subject the Funds to a U.S. federal income tax (including interest charges) on distributions received from the company or on proceeds received from the disposition of shares in the company, which tax cannot be eliminated by making distributions to Funds shareholders. However, the Funds may elect to treat a PFIC as a "qualified electing fund" ("QEF"), in which case the Funds will be required to include their share of the company's income and net capital gains annually, regardless of whether it receives any distribution from the company.

The Funds also may make an election to mark the gains (and to a limited extent losses) in such holdings "to the market" as though they had sold and repurchased holdings in those PFICs on the last day of the Funds' taxable year. Such gains and losses are treated as ordinary income and loss. The QEF and mark-to-market elections may accelerate the recognition of income (without the receipt of cash) and increase the amount required to be distributed for the Funds to avoid taxation. Making either of these elections therefore may require the Funds to liquidate other investments (including when it is not advantageous to do so) to meet their distribution requirement, which also may accelerate the recognition of gain and affect the Funds' total return.

Foreign Currency Transactions

The Funds' transactions in foreign currencies, foreign currency-denominated debt securities and certain foreign currency options, futures contracts and forward contracts (and similar instruments) may give rise to ordinary income or loss to the extent such income or loss results from fluctuations in the value of the foreign currency concerned.

Foreign Taxation

Income received by the Funds from sources within foreign countries may be subject to withholding and other taxes imposed by such countries. Tax treaties and conventions between certain countries and the U.S. may reduce or eliminate such taxes. If more than 50% of the value of the Funds' total assets at the close of its taxable year consists of securities of foreign corporations, the Funds may be able to elect to "pass through" to its shareholders the amount of eligible foreign income and similar taxes paid by the Funds. If this election is made, a shareholder generally subject to tax will be required to include in gross income (in addition to taxable dividends actually received) his or her pro rata share of the foreign taxes paid by the Funds, and may be entitled either to deduct (as an itemized deduction) his or her pro rata share of foreign taxes in computing his or her taxable income or to use it as a foreign tax credit against his or her U.S. federal income tax liability, subject to certain limitations. In particular, a shareholder must hold his or her shares (without protection from risk of loss) on the ex-dividend date and for at least 15 more days during the 30-day period surrounding the ex-dividend date to be eligible to claim a foreign tax credit with respect to a gain dividend. No deduction for foreign taxes may be claimed by a shareholder who does not itemize deductions. Each shareholder will be notified within 60 days after the close of the Funds' taxable year whether the foreign taxes paid by the Funds will "pass through" for that year.

Generally, a credit for foreign taxes is subject to the limitation that it may not exceed the shareholder's U.S. tax attributable to his or her total foreign source taxable income. For this purpose, if the pass-through election is made, the source of the Funds' income will flow through to shareholders of the Funds. With respect to the Funds, gains from the sale of securities will be treated as derived from U.S. sources and certain currency fluctuation gains, including fluctuation gains from foreign currency-denominated debt securities, receivables and payables will be treated as ordinary income derived from U.S. sources. The limitation on the foreign tax credit is applied separately to foreign source passive income, and to certain other types of income. A shareholder may be unable to claim a credit for the full amount of his or her proportionate share of the foreign taxes paid by the Funds. The foreign tax credit can be used to offset only 90% of the revised alternative minimum tax imposed on corporations and individuals and foreign taxes generally are not deductible in computing alternative minimum taxable income.

Original Issue Discount and Pay-In-Kind Securities

Current federal tax law requires the holder of a U.S. Treasury or other fixed income zero coupon security to accrue as income each year a portion of the discount at which the security was purchased, even though the holder receives no interest payment in cash on the security during the year. In addition, pay-in-kind securities will give rise to income, which is required to be distributed and is taxable even though the Funds holding the security receives no interest payment in cash on the security during the year.

Some of the debt securities (with a fixed maturity date of more than one year from the date of issuance) that may be acquired by the Funds may be treated as debt securities that are issued originally at a discount. Generally, the amount of the original issue discount ("OID") is treated as interest income and is included in income over the term of the debt security, even though payment of that amount is not received until a later time, usually when the debt security matures. A portion of the OID includable in income with respect to certain high-yield corporate debt securities (including certain pay-in-kind securities) may be treated as a dividend for U.S. federal income tax purposes.

Some of the debt securities (with a fixed maturity date of more than one year from the date of issuance) that may be acquired by the Funds in the secondary market may be treated as having market discount. Generally, any gain recognized on the disposition of, and any partial payment of principal on, a debt security having market discount is treated as ordinary income to the extent the gain, or principal payment, does not exceed the "accrued market discount" on such debt security. Market discount generally accrues in equal daily installments. The Funds may make one or more of the elections applicable to debt securities having market discount, which could affect the character and timing of recognition of income.

Some debt securities (with a fixed maturity date of one year or less from the date of issuance) that may be acquired by the Funds may be treated as having acquisition discount, or OID in the case of certain types of debt securities. Generally, the Funds will be required to include the acquisition discount, or OID, in income over the term of the debt security, even though payment of that amount is not received until a later time, usually when the debt security matures. The Funds may make one or more of the elections applicable to debt securities having acquisition discount, or OID, which could affect the character and timing of recognition of income.

If the Funds hold the foregoing kinds of securities, it may be required to pay out as an income distribution each year an amount that is greater than the total amount of cash interest the Funds actually received. Such distributions may be made from the cash assets of the Funds or by liquidation of portfolio securities, if necessary (including when it is not advantageous to do so). The Funds may realize gains or losses from such liquidations. In the event the Funds realizes net capital gains from such transactions, its shareholders may receive a larger capital gain distribution, if any, than they would in the absence of such transactions.

Shareholders of the Funds may be subject to state and local taxes on distributions received from the Funds and on redemptions of the Funds' shares. A brief explanation of the form and character of the distribution accompany each distribution. In January of each year the Funds issues to each shareholder a statement of the federal income tax status of all distributions. Shareholders should consult their tax advisors about the application of federal, state and local and foreign tax law in light of their particular situation.

INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

The Funds have selected BBD, LLP, located at 1835 Market Street, 26th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19103, as its independent registered public accounting firm for the current fiscal year. The firm provides services including (1) audit of annual financial statements, and (2) assistance and consultation in connection with SEC filings.

LEGAL COUNSEL

Thompson Hine LLP, 41 South High Street, Suite 1700, Columbus, Ohio 43215 serves as the Trust's legal counsel.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The financial statements and report of the independent registered public accounting firm required to be included in this SAI are hereby incorporated by reference to the Annual Report for the Funds for the fiscal period ended September 30, 2016. You can obtain a copy of the Annual Report without charge by calling the Funds at 1-855-527-2363.

Ascendant Advisors, LLC Proxy Voting Policy

AA, as a matter of policy and as a fiduciary, has responsibility for voting proxies for portfolio securities consistent with the best economic interests of the Funds, Portfolios and clients. Our firm maintains written policies and procedures as to the handling, research, voting and reporting of proxy voting and makes appropriate disclosures about our firm's proxy policies and practices. Our policy and practice includes the responsibility to monitor corporate actions, receive and vote client proxies and disclose any potential conflicts of interest as well as making information available to clients about the voting of proxies for their portfolio securities and maintaining relevant and required records.

AA has retained a third party research provider, Glass Lewis, to provide recommendations regarding proxy voting. AA has also retained a third-party proxy administration service, ProxyEdge, to collect the Glass Lewis research and to then vote all proxies held by clients. The CCO will conduct quarterly tests to insure all proxies have been voted appropriately. A record of all voting activity is retained on the ProxyEdge system and is available for client review if requested.

AA serves as investment adviser to certain investment companies under the Northern Lights Fund Trust. These Funds invest in other investment companies that are not affiliated ("Underlying Funds") and are required by the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act") Act to handle proxies received from Underlying Funds in a certain manner. Notwithstanding the guidelines provided in these procedures, it is the policy of AA to vote all proxies received from the Underlying Funds in the same proportion that all shares of the Underlying Funds are voted, or in accordance with instructions received from Funds shareholders, pursuant to Section 12(d)(1)(F) of the 1940 Act. After properly voted, the proxy materials are placed in a file maintained by the CCO for future reference.

+++++

PROXY VOTING GUIDELINES FOR GLASS LEWIS' & CO

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

The purpose of Glass Lewis' proxy research and advice is to facilitate shareholder voting in favor of governance structures that will drive performance, create shareholder value and maintain a proper tone at the top. Glass Lewis looks for talented boards with a record of protecting shareholders and delivering value over the medium- and long-term. We believe that boards working to protect and enhance the best interests of shareholders are independent, have directors with diverse backgrounds, have a record of positive performance, and have members with a breadth and depth of relevant experience.

Independence

The independence of directors, or lack thereof, is ultimately demonstrated through the decisions they make. In assessing the independence of directors, we will take into consideration, when appropriate, whether a director has a track record indicative of making objective decisions. Likewise, when assessing the independence of directors we will also examine when a director's service track record on multiple boards indicates a lack of objective decision-making. Ultimately, we believe the determination of whether a director is independent or not must take into consideration both compliance with the applicable independence listing requirements as well as judgments made by the director.

We look at each director nominee to examine the director's relationships with the company, the company's executives, and other directors. We do this to evaluate whether personal, familial, or financial relationships (not including director compensation) may impact the director's decisions. We believe that such relationships make it difficult for a director to put shareholders' interests above the director's or the related party's interests. We also believe that a director who owns more than 20% of a company can exert disproportionate influence on the board and, in particular, the audit committee.

Thus, we put directors into three categories based on an examination of the type of relationship they have with the company:

Independent Director – An independent director has no material financial, familial or other current relationships with the company, its executives, or other board members, except for board service and standard fees paid for that service. Relationships that existed within three to five years¹ before the inquiry are usually considered "current" for purposes of this test.

In our view, a director who is currently serving in an interim management position should be considered an insider, while a director who previously served in an interim management position for less than one year and is no longer serving in such capacity is considered independent. Moreover, a director who previously served in an interim management position for over one year and is no longer serving in such capacity is considered an affiliate for five years following the date of his/her resignation or departure from the interim management position. Glass Lewis applies a three-year look-back period to all directors who have an

affiliation with the company other than former, for which we apply a five-year look-back.

Affiliated Director – An affiliated director has a material financial, familial or other relationship with the company or its executives, but is not an employee of the company.² This includes directors whose employers have a material financial relationship with the company.³ In addition, we view a director who owns or controls 20% or more of the company’s voting stock as an affiliate.

We view 20% shareholders as affiliates because they typically have access to and involvement with the management of a company that is fundamentally different from that of ordinary shareholders. More importantly, 20% holders may have interests that diverge from those of ordinary holders, for reasons such as the liquidity (or lack thereof) of their holdings, personal tax issues, etc.

Definition of **“Material”**: A material relationship is one in which the dollar value exceeds:

- \$50,000 (or where no amount is disclosed) for directors who are paid for a service they have agreed to perform for the company, outside of their service as a director, including professional or other services; or

- \$120,000 (or where no amount is disclosed) for those directors employed by a professional services firm such as a law firm, investment bank, or consulting firm where the company pays the firm, not the individual, for services. This dollar limit would also apply to charitable contributions to schools where a board member is a professor; or charities where a director serves on the board or is an executive;⁴ and any aircraft and real estate dealings between the company and the director’s firm; or

- 1% of either company’s consolidated gross revenue for other business relationships (e.g., where the director is an executive officer of a company that provides services or products to or receives services or products from the company).

Definition of **“Familial”**: Familial relationships include a person’s spouse, parents, children, siblings, grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, nieces, nephews, in-laws, and anyone (other than domestic employees) who shares such person’s home. A director is an affiliate if the director has a family member who is employed by the company and who receives compensation of \$120,000 or more per year or the compensation is not disclosed.

Definition of **“Company”**: A company includes any parent or subsidiary in a group with the company or any entity that merged with, was acquired by, or acquired the company.

Inside Director – An inside director simultaneously serves as a director and as an employee of the company. This category may include a chairman of the board who acts as an employee of the company or is paid as an employee of the company. In our view, an inside director who derives a greater amount of income as a result of affiliated transactions with the company rather than

¹ NASDAQ originally proposed a five-year look-back prior to finalizing their rules. A five-year standard is more appropriate, in our view, because we **believe** that the unwinding of conflicting relationships between former management and board members is more likely to be completed and final after five years. However, Glass Lewis does not apply the five-year look-back period to directors who have previously served as executives of the company on an interim basis for less than one year.

² If a company classifies one of its non-employee directors as non-independent; Glass Lewis will classify that director as an affiliate.

³ We allow a five-year grace period for former executives of the company or merged companies who have consulting agreements with the surviving company. (We do not automatically recommend voting against directors in such cases for the first five years.) If the consulting agreement persists after this five-year grace period, we apply the materiality thresholds outlined in the definition of “material.”

⁴ We will generally take into consideration the size and nature of such charitable entities in relation to the company’s size and industry along with any other relevant factors such as the director’s role at the charity. However, unlike for other types of related party transactions, Glass Lewis generally does not apply a look-back period to affiliated relationships involving charitable contributions; if the relationship ceases, we will consider the director to be independent.

through compensation paid by the company (i.e., salary, bonus, etc. as a company employee) faces a conflict between making decisions that are in the best interests of the company versus those in the director's own best interests. Therefore, we will recommend voting against such a director.

Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Board Independence

Glass Lewis believes a board will be most effective in protecting shareholders' interests if it is at least two-thirds independent. We note that each of the Business Roundtable, the Conference Board, and the Council of Institutional Investors advocates that two-thirds of the board be independent. Where more than one-third of the members are affiliated or inside directors, we typically⁵ recommend voting against some of the inside and/or affiliated directors in order to satisfy the two-thirds threshold.

However, where a director serves on a board as a representative (as part of his or her basic responsibilities) of an investment firm with greater than 20% ownership, we will generally consider him/her to be affiliated but will not recommend voting against unless (i) the investment firm has disproportionate board representation or (ii) the director serves on the audit committee.

In the case of a less than two-thirds independent board, Glass Lewis strongly supports the existence of a presiding or lead director with authority to set the meeting agendas and to lead sessions outside the insider chairman's presence.

In addition, we scrutinize avowedly "independent" chairmen and lead directors. We believe that they should be unquestionably independent or the company should not tout them as such.

Committee Independence

We believe that *only* independent directors should serve on a company's audit, compensation, nominating, and governance committees.⁶ We typically recommend that shareholders vote against any affiliated or inside director seeking appointment to an audit, compensation, nominating, or governance committee, or who has served in that capacity in the past year.

Independent Chairman

Glass Lewis believes that separating the roles of CEO (or, more rarely, another executive position) and chairman creates a better governance structure than a combined CEO/chairman position. An executive manages the business according to a course the board charts. Executives should report to the board regarding their performance in achieving goals the board set. This is needlessly complicated when a CEO chairs the board, since a CEO/chairman presumably will have a significant influence over the board.

It can become difficult for a board to fulfill its role of overseer and policy setter when a CEO/chairman controls the agenda and the boardroom discussion. Such control can allow a CEO to have an entrenched position, leading to longer-than-optimal terms, fewer checks on management,

⁵With a staggered board, if the affiliates or insiders that we believe should not be on the board are not up for election, we will express our concern regarding those directors, but we will not recommend voting against the other affiliates or insiders who are up for election just to achieve two-thirds independence. However, we will consider recommending voting against the directors subject to our concern at their next election if the concerning issue is not resolved.

⁶We will recommend voting against an audit committee member who owns 20% or more of the company's stock, and we believe that there should be a maximum of one director (or no directors if the committee is comprised of less than three directors) who owns 20% or more of the company's stock on the compensation, nominating, and governance committees.

less scrutiny of the business operation, and limitations on independent, shareholder-focused goal-setting by the board.

A CEO should set the strategic course for the company, with the board's approval, and the board should enable the CEO to carry out the CEO's vision for accomplishing the board's objectives. Failure to achieve the board's objectives should lead the board to replace that CEO with someone in whom the board has confidence.

Likewise, an independent chairman can better oversee executives and set a pro-shareholder agenda without the management conflicts that a CEO and other executive insiders often face. Such oversight and concern for shareholders allows for a more proactive and effective board of directors that is better able to look out for the interests of shareholders.

Further, it is the board's responsibility to select a chief executive who can best serve a company and its shareholders and to replace this person when his or her duties have not been appropriately fulfilled. Such a replacement becomes more difficult and happens less frequently when the chief executive is also in the position of overseeing the board.

We recognize that empirical evidence regarding the separation of these two roles remains inconclusive. However, Glass Lewis believes that the installation of an independent chairman is almost always a positive step from a corporate governance perspective and promotes the best interests of shareholders. Further, the presence of an independent chairman fosters the creation of a thoughtful and dynamic board, not dominated by the views of senior management. Encouragingly, many companies appear to be moving in this direction—one study even indicates that less than 12 percent of incoming CEOs in 2009 were awarded the chairman title, versus 48 percent as recently as 2002.⁷ Another study finds that 40 percent of S&P 500 boards now separate the CEO and chairman roles, up from 23 percent in 2000, although the same study found that only 19 percent of S&P 500 chairs are independent, versus 9 percent in 2005.⁸

We do not recommend that shareholders vote against CEOs who chair the board. However, we typically encourage our clients to support separating the roles of chairman and CEO whenever that question is posed in a proxy (typically in the form of a shareholder proposal), as we believe that it is in the long-term best interests of the company and its shareholders.

Performance

The most crucial test of a board's commitment to the company and its shareholders lies in the actions of the board and its members. We look at the performance of these individuals as directors and executives of the company and of other companies where they have served.

Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Performance

We disfavor directors who have a record of not fulfilling their responsibilities to shareholders at any company where they have held a board or executive position. We typically recommend voting against:

⁷ Ken Favaro, Per-Ola Karlsson and Gary Neilson. "CEO Succession 2000-2009: A Decade of Convergence and Compression." Booz & Company (from Strategy+Business, Issue 59, Summer 2010). **A-5**

⁸Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2010, p. 4.

1. A director who fails to attend a minimum of 75% of board and applicable committee meetings, calculated in the aggregate.⁹
2. A director who belatedly filed a significant form(s) 4 or 5, or who has a pattern of late filings if the late filing was the director's fault (we look at these late filing situations on a case-by-case basis).
3. A director who is also the CEO of a company where a serious and material restatement has occurred after the CEO had previously certified the pre-restatement financial statements.
4. A director who has received two against recommendations from Glass Lewis for identical reasons within the prior year at different companies (the same situation must also apply at the company being analyzed).
5. All directors who served on the board if, for the last three years, the company's performance has been in the bottom quartile of the sector and the directors have not taken reasonable steps to address the poor performance.

Audit Committees and Performance

Audit committees play an integral role in overseeing the financial reporting process because “[v]ibrant and stable capital markets depend on, among other things, reliable, transparent, and objective financial information to support an efficient and effective capital market process. The vital oversight role audit committees play in the process of producing financial information has never been more important.”¹⁰

When assessing an audit committee's performance, we are aware that an audit committee does not prepare financial statements, is not responsible for making the key judgments and assumptions that affect the financial statements, and does not audit the numbers or the disclosures provided to investors. Rather, an audit committee member monitors and oversees the process and procedures that management and auditors perform. The 1999 Report and Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Improving the Effectiveness of Corporate Audit Committees stated it best:

A proper and well-functioning system exists, therefore, when the three main groups responsible for financial reporting – the full board including the audit committee, financial management including the internal auditors, and the outside auditors – form a ‘three legged stool’ that supports responsible financial disclosure and active participatory oversight. However, in the view of the Committee, the audit committee must be ‘first among equals’ in this process, since the audit committee is an extension of the full board and hence the ultimate monitor of the process.

Standards for Assessing the Audit Committee

For an audit committee to function effectively on investors' behalf, it must include members with sufficient knowledge to diligently carry out their responsibilities. In its audit and accounting

⁹However, where a director has served for less than one full year, we will typically not recommend voting against for failure to attend 75% of meetings. Rather, we will note the poor attendance with a recommendation to track this issue going forward. We will also refrain from recommending to vote against directors when the proxy discloses that the director missed the meetings due to serious illness or other extenuating circumstances.

¹⁰Audit Committee Effectiveness – What Works Best.” PricewaterhouseCoopers. The Institute of Internal Auditors Research Foundation. 2005.

recommendations, the Conference Board Commission on Public Trust and Private Enterprise said “members of the audit committee must be independent and have both knowledge and experience in auditing financial matters.”

1

1

We are skeptical of audit committees where there are members that lack expertise as a Certified Public Accountant (CPA), Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or corporate controller or similar experience. While we will not necessarily vote against members of an audit committee when such expertise is lacking, we are more likely to vote against committee members when a problem such as a restatement occurs and such expertise is lacking.

Glass Lewis generally assesses audit committees against the decisions they make with respect to their oversight and monitoring role. The quality and integrity of the financial statements and earnings reports, the completeness of disclosures necessary for investors to make informed decisions, and the effectiveness of the internal controls should provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements are materially free from errors. The independence of the external auditors and the results of their work all provide useful information by which to assess the audit committee.

When assessing the decisions and actions of the audit committee, we typically defer to its judgment and would vote in favor of its members, but we would recommend voting against the following members under the following circumstances:¹²

1. All members of the audit committee when options were backdated, there is a lack of adequate controls in place, there was a resulting restatement, and disclosures indicate there was a lack of documentation with respect to the option grants.
2. The audit committee chair, if the audit committee does not have a financial expert or the committee’s financial expert does not have a demonstrable financial background sufficient to understand the financial issues unique to public companies.
3. The audit committee chair, if the audit committee did not meet at least 4 times during the year.
4. The audit committee chair, if the committee has less than three members.
5. Any audit committee member who sits on more than three public company audit committees, unless the audit committee member is a retired CPA, CFO, controller or has similar experience, in which case the limit shall be four committees, taking time and availability into consideration including a review of the audit committee member’s attendance at all board and committee meetings.¹³
6. All members of an audit committee who are up for election and who served on the committee at the time of the audit, if audit and audit-related fees total one-third or less of the total fees billed by the auditor.

¹¹Commission on Public Trust and Private Enterprise. The Conference Board. 2003.

¹²Where the recommendation is to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against the members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern with regard to the committee chair.

¹³Glass Lewis may exempt certain audit committee members from the above threshold if, upon further analysis of relevant factors such as the director’s experience, the size, industry-mix and location of the companies involved and the director’s attendance at all the companies, we can reasonably determine that the audit committee member is likely not hindered by multiple audit committee commitments.

7. The audit committee chair when tax and/or other fees are greater than audit and audit-related fees paid to the auditor for more than one year in a row (in which case we also recommend against ratification of the auditor).
8. All members of an audit committee where non-audit fees include fees for tax services (including, but not limited to, such things as tax avoidance or shelter schemes) for senior executives of the company. Such services are now prohibited by the PCAOB.
9. All members of an audit committee that reappointed an auditor that we no longer consider to be independent for reasons unrelated to fee proportions.
10. All members of an audit committee when audit fees are excessively low, especially when compared with other companies in the same industry.
11. The audit committee chair¹⁴ if the committee failed to put auditor ratification on the ballot for shareholder approval. However, if the non-audit fees or tax fees exceed audit plus audit-related fees in either the current or the prior year, then Glass Lewis will recommend voting against the entire audit committee.
12. All members of an audit committee where the auditor has resigned and reported that a section 10A¹⁵ letter has been issued.
13. All members of an audit committee at a time when material accounting fraud occurred at the company.¹⁶
14. All members of an audit committee at a time when annual and/or multiple quarterly financial statements had to be restated, and any of the following factors apply:
 - The restatement involves fraud or manipulation by insiders;
 - The restatement is accompanied by an SEC inquiry or investigation;
 - The restatement involves revenue recognition;
 - The restatement results in a greater than 5% adjustment to costs of goods sold, operating expense, or operating cash flows; or
 - The restatement results in a greater than 5% adjustment to net income, 10% adjustment to assets or shareholders equity, or cash flows from financing or investing activities.
15. All members of an audit committee if the company repeatedly fails to file its financial reports in a timely fashion. For example, the company has filed two or more quarterly or annual financial statements late within the last 5 quarters.
16. All members of an audit committee when it has been disclosed that a law enforcement agency has charged the company and/or its employees with a violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA).

¹⁴In all cases, if the chair of the committee is not specified, we recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest.

¹⁵Auditors are required to report all potential illegal acts to management and the audit committee unless they are clearly inconsequential in nature. If the audit committee or the board fails to take appropriate action on an act that has been determined to be a violation of the law, the independent auditor is required to send a section 10A letter to the SEC. Such letters are rare and therefore we believe should be taken seriously.

¹⁶Recent research indicates that revenue fraud now accounts for over 60% of SEC fraud cases, and that companies that engage in fraud experience significant negative abnormal stock price declines—facing bankruptcy, delisting, and material asset sales at much higher rates than do non-fraud firms (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. “Fraudulent Financial Reporting: 1998-2007.” May 2010).

17. All members of an audit committee when the company has aggressive accounting policies and/or poor disclosure or lack of sufficient transparency in its financial statements.

18. All members of the audit committee when there is a disagreement with the auditor and the auditor resigns or is dismissed.

19. All members of the audit committee if the contract with the auditor specifically limits the auditor's liability to the company for damages.¹⁷

20. All members of the audit committee who served since the date of the company's last annual meeting, and when, since the last annual meeting, the company has reported a material weakness that has not yet been corrected, or, when the company has an ongoing material weakness from a prior year that has not yet been corrected.

We also take a dim view of audit committee reports that are boilerplate, and which provide little or no information or transparency to investors. When a problem such as a material weakness, restatement or late filings occurs, we take into consideration, in forming our judgment with respect to the audit committee, the transparency of the audit committee report.

Compensation Committee Performance

Compensation committees have the final say in determining the compensation of executives. This includes deciding the basis on which compensation is determined, as well as the amounts and types of compensation to be paid. This process begins with the hiring and initial establishment of employment agreements, including the terms for such items as pay, pensions and severance arrangements. It is important in establishing compensation arrangements that compensation be consistent with, and based on the long-term economic performance of, the business's long-term shareholders returns.

Compensation committees are also responsible for the oversight of the transparency of compensation. This oversight includes disclosure of compensation arrangements, the matrix used in assessing pay for performance, and the use of compensation consultants. In order to ensure the independence of the compensation consultant, we believe the compensation committee should only engage a compensation consultant that is not also providing any services to the company or management apart from their contract with the compensation committee. It is important to investors that they have clear and complete disclosure of all the significant terms of compensation arrangements in order to make informed decisions with respect to the oversight and decisions of the compensation committee.

Finally, compensation committees are responsible for oversight of internal controls over the executive compensation process. This includes controls over gathering information used to determine compensation, establishment of equity award plans, and granting of equity awards. Lax controls can and have contributed to conflicting information being obtained, for example through the use of nonobjective consultants. Lax controls can also contribute to improper awards of compensation such as through granting of backdated or spring-loaded options, or granting of bonuses when triggers for bonus payments have not been met.

Central to understanding the actions of a compensation committee is a careful review of the Compensation Discussion and Analysis (CD&A) report included in each company's proxy. We review the CD&A in our evaluation of the overall compensation practices of a company,

¹⁷ The Council of Institutional Investors. "Corporate Governance Policies," p. 4, April 5, 2006; and "Letter from Council of Institutional Investors to the AICPA," November 8, 2006.

as overseen by the compensation committee. The CD&A is also integral to the evaluation of compensation proposals at companies, such as advisory votes on executive compensation, which allow shareholders to vote on the compensation paid to a company's top executives.

In our evaluation of the CD&A, we examine, among other factors, the following:

1. The extent to which the company uses appropriate performance goals and metrics in determining overall compensation as an indication that pay is tied to performance.
2. How clearly the company discloses performance metrics and goals so that shareholders may make an independent determination that goals were met.
3. The extent to which the performance metrics, targets and goals are implemented to enhance company performance and encourage prudent risk-taking.
4. The selected peer group(s) so that shareholders can make a comparison of pay and performance across the appropriate peer group.
5. The extent to which the company benchmarks compensation levels at a specific percentile of its peer group along with the rationale for selecting such a benchmark.
6. The amount of discretion granted management or the compensation committee to deviate from defined performance metrics and goals in making awards, as well as the appropriateness of the use of such discretion.

We provide an overall evaluation of the quality and content of a company's executive compensation policies and procedures as disclosed in a CD&A as either good, fair or poor.

We evaluate compensation committee members on the basis of their performance while serving on the compensation committee in question, not for actions taken solely by prior committee members who are not currently serving on the committee. At companies that provide shareholders with non-binding advisory votes on executive compensation ("Say-on-Pay"), we will use the Say-on-Pay proposal as the initial, primary means to express dissatisfaction with the company's compensation policies and practices rather than recommending voting against members of the compensation committee (except in the most egregious cases).

When assessing the performance of compensation committees, we will recommend voting against for the following:¹⁸

1. All members of the compensation committee who are up for election and served at the time of poor pay-for-performance (e.g., a company receives an F grade in our pay-for-performance analysis) when shareholders are not provided with an advisory vote on executive compensation at the annual meeting.¹⁹

¹⁸Where the recommendation is to vote against the committee chair and the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern with regard to the committee chair.

¹⁹Where there are multiple CEOs in one year, we will consider not recommending against the compensation committee but will defer judgment on compensation policies and practices until the next year or a full year after arrival of the new CEO. In addition, if a company provides shareholders with a Say-on-Pay proposal and receives an F grade in our pay-for-performance model, we will recommend that shareholders only vote against the Say-on-Pay proposal rather than the members of the compensation committee, unless the company exhibits egregious practices. However, if the company receives successive F grades, we will then recommend against the members of the compensation committee in addition to recommending voting against the Say-on-Pay proposal.

2. Any member of the compensation committee who has served on the compensation committee of at least two other public companies that received F grades in our pay-for-performance model and who is also suspect at the company in question.
3. The compensation committee chair if the company received two D grades in consecutive years in our pay-for-performance analysis, and if during the past year the Company performed the same as or worse than its peers.²⁰
4. All members of the compensation committee (during the relevant time period) if the company entered into excessive employment agreements and/or severance agreements.
5. All members of the compensation committee when performance goals were changed (i.e., lowered) when employees failed or were unlikely to meet original goals, or performance-based compensation was paid despite goals not being attained.
6. All members of the compensation committee if excessive employee perquisites and benefits were allowed.
7. The compensation committee chair if the compensation committee did not meet during the year, but should have (e.g., because executive compensation was restructured
8. All members of the compensation committee when the company repriced options or a new executive was hired, completed a “self tender offer” without shareholder approval within the past two years.
9. All members of the compensation committee when vesting of in-the-money options is accelerated or when fully vested options are granted.
10. All members of the compensation committee when option exercise prices were backdated. Glass Lewis will recommend voting against an executive director who played a role in and participated in option backdating.
11. All members of the compensation committee when option exercise prices were spring-loaded or otherwise timed around the release of material information.
12. All members of the compensation committee when a new employment contract is given to an executive that does not include a clawback provision and the company had a material restatement, especially if the restatement was due to fraud.
13. The chair of the compensation committee where the CD&A provides insufficient or unclear information about performance metrics and goals, where the CD&A indicates that pay is not tied to performance, or where the compensation committee or management has excessive discretion to alter performance terms or increase amounts of awards in contravention of previously defined targets.
14. All members of the compensation committee during whose tenure the committee failed to implement a shareholder proposal regarding a compensation-related issue, where the proposal received the affirmative vote of a majority of the voting shares at a shareholder

²⁰In cases where the company received two D grades in consecutive years, but during the past year the company performed better than its peers or improved from an F to a D grade year over year, we refrain from recommending to vote against the compensation chair. In addition, if a company provides shareholders with a Say-on-Pay proposal in this instance, we will consider voting against the advisory vote rather than the compensation committee chair unless the company exhibits unquestionably egregious practices.

meeting, and when a reasonable analysis suggests that the compensation committee (rather than the governance committee) should have taken steps to implement the request.

2
1

Nominating and Governance Committee Performance

The nominating and governance committee, as an agency for the shareholders, is responsible for the governance by the board of the company and its executives. In performing this role, the board is responsible and accountable for selection of objective and competent board members. It is also responsible for providing leadership on governance policies adopted by the company, such as decisions to implement shareholder proposals that have received a majority vote.

Consistent with Glass Lewis' philosophy that boards should have diverse backgrounds and members with a breadth and depth of relevant experience, we believe that nominating and governance committees should consider diversity when making director nominations within the context of each specific company and its industry. In our view, shareholders are best served when boards make an effort to ensure a constituency that is not only reasonably diverse on the basis of age, race, gender and ethnicity, but also on the basis of geographic knowledge, industry experience and culture.

Regarding the nominating and or governance committee, we will recommend voting against the following:²²

1. All members of the governance committee²³ during whose tenure the board failed to implement a shareholder proposal with a direct and substantial impact on shareholders and their rights - i.e., where the proposal received enough shareholder votes (at least a majority) to allow the board to implement or begin to implement that proposal.²⁴ Examples of these types of shareholder proposals are majority vote to elect directors and to declassify the board.
2. The governance committee chair,²⁵ when the chairman is not independent and an independent lead or presiding director has not been appointed.²⁶ We note that each of the Business Roundtable, The Conference Board, and the Council of Institutional Investors advocates that two-thirds of the board be independent.

²¹In all other instances (i.e. a non-compensation-related shareholder proposal should have been implemented) we recommend that shareholders vote against the members of the governance committee.

²²Where we would recommend to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern regarding the committee chair.

²³If the board does not have a governance committee (or a committee that serves such a purpose), we recommend voting against the entire board on this basis.

²⁴Where a compensation-related shareholder proposal should have been implemented, and when a reasonable analysis suggests that the members of the compensation committee (rather than the governance committee) bear the responsibility for failing to implement the request, we recommend that shareholders only vote against members of the compensation committee.

²⁵If the committee chair is not specified, we recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest. If the longest-serving committee member cannot be determined, we will recommend voting against the longest-serving board member serving on the committee.

²⁶We believe that one independent individual should be appointed to serve as the lead or presiding director. When such a position is rotated among directors from meeting to meeting, we will recommend voting against as if there were no lead or presiding director.

3. In the absence of a nominating committee, the governance committee chair when there are less than five or the whole nominating committee when there are more than 20 members on the board.
4. The governance committee chair, when the committee fails to meet at all during the year.
5. The governance committee chair, when for two consecutive years the company provides what we consider to be “inadequate” related party transaction disclosure (i.e. the nature of such transactions and/or the monetary amounts involved are unclear or excessively vague, thereby preventing an average shareholder from being able to reasonably interpret the independence status of multiple directors above and beyond what the company maintains is compliant with SEC or applicable stock-exchange listing requirements).

Regarding the nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the following:²⁷

1. All members of the nominating committee, when the committee nominated or renominated an individual who had a significant conflict of interest or whose past actions demonstrated a lack of integrity or inability to represent shareholder interests.
2. The nominating committee chair, if the nominating committee did not meet during the year, but should have (i.e., because new directors were nominated or appointed since the time of the last annual meeting).
3. In the absence of a governance committee, the nominating committee chair²⁸ when the chairman is not independent, and an independent lead or presiding director has not been appointed.²⁹
4. The nominating committee chair, when there are less than five or the whole nominating committee when there are more than 20 members on the board.³⁰
5. The nominating committee chair, when a director received a greater than 50% against vote the prior year and not only was the director not removed, but the issues that raised shareholder concern were not corrected.³¹

Board-level Risk Management Oversight

Glass Lewis evaluates the risk management function of a public company board on a strictly case-by-case basis. Sound risk management, while necessary at all companies, is particularly important at financial firms which inherently maintain significant exposure to financial risk. We

²⁷Where we would recommend to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern regarding the committee chair.

²⁸If the committee chair is not specified, we will recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest. If the longest-serving committee member cannot be determined, we will recommend voting against the longest-serving board member on the committee.

²⁹In the absence of both a governance and a nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the chairman of the board on this basis.

³⁰In the absence of both a governance and a nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the chairman of the board on this basis.

³¹Considering that shareholder discontent clearly relates to the director who received a greater than 50% against vote rather than the nominating chair, we review the validity of the issue(s) that initially raised shareholder concern, follow-up on such matters, and only recommend voting against the nominating chair if a reasonable analysis suggests that it would be most appropriate. In rare cases, we will consider recommending against the nominating chair when a director receives a substantial (i.e., 25% or more) vote against based on the same analysis.

believe such financial firms should have a chief risk officer reporting directly to the board and a dedicated risk committee or a committee of the board charged with risk oversight. Moreover, many non-financial firms maintain strategies which involve a high level of exposure to financial risk. Similarly, since many non-financial firms have significant hedging or trading strategies, including financial and non-financial derivatives, those firms should also have a chief risk officer and a risk committee.

Our views on risk oversight are consistent with those expressed by various regulatory bodies. In its December 2009 Final Rule release on Proxy Disclosure Enhancements, the SEC noted that risk oversight is a key competence of the board and that additional disclosures would improve investor and shareholder understanding of the role of the board in the organization's risk management practices. The final rules, which became effective on February 28, 2010, now explicitly require companies and mutual funds to describe (while allowing for some degree of flexibility) the board's role in the oversight of risk.

When analyzing the risk management practices of public companies, we take note of any significant losses or writedowns on financial assets and/or structured transactions. In cases where a company has disclosed a sizable loss or writedown, and where we find that the company's board-level risk committee contributed to the loss through poor oversight, we would recommend that shareholders vote against such committee members on that basis. In addition, in cases where a company maintains a significant level of financial risk exposure but fails to disclose any explicit form of board-level risk oversight (committee or otherwise)³², we will consider recommending to vote against the chairman of the board on that basis. However, we generally would not recommend voting against a combined chairman/CEO except in egregious cases.

Experience

We find that a director's past conduct is often indicative of future conduct and performance. We often find directors with a history of overpaying executives or of serving on boards where avoidable disasters have occurred appearing at companies that follow these same patterns. Glass Lewis has a proprietary database of every officer and director serving at 8,000 of the most widely held U.S. companies. We use this database to track the performance of directors across companies.

Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Director Experience

We typically recommend that shareholders vote against directors who have served on boards or as executives of companies with records of poor performance, inadequate risk oversight, overcompensation, audit- or accounting-related issues, and/or other indicators of mismanagement or actions against the interests of shareholders.³³

Likewise, we examine the backgrounds of those who serve on key board committees to ensure that they have the required skills and diverse backgrounds to make informed judgments about the subject matter for which the committee is responsible.

³²A committee responsible for risk management could be a dedicated risk committee, or another board committee, usually the audit committee but occasionally the finance committee, depending on a given company's board structure and method of disclosure. At some companies, the entire board is charged with risk management.

³³We typically apply a three-year look-back to such issues and also research to see whether the responsible directors have been up for election since the time of the failure, and if so, we take into account the percentage of support they received from shareholders.

Other Considerations

In addition to the three key characteristics – independence, performance, experience – that we use to evaluate board members, we consider conflict-of-interest issues in making voting recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest

We believe board members should be wholly free of identifiable and substantial conflicts of interest, regardless of the overall level of independent directors on the board. Accordingly, we recommend that shareholders vote against the following types of affiliated or inside directors:

1. A CFO who is on the board: In our view, the CFO holds a unique position relative to financial reporting and disclosure to shareholders. Because of the critical importance of financial disclosure and reporting, we believe the CFO should report to the board and not be a member of it.

2. A director who is on an excessive number of boards: We will typically recommend voting against a director who serves as an executive officer of any public company while serving on more than two other public company boards and any other director who serves on more than six public company boards typically receives an against recommendation from Glass Lewis. Academic literature suggests that one board takes up approximately 200 hours per year of each member's time. We believe this limits the number of boards on which directors can effectively serve, especially executives at other companies.³⁴ Further, we note a recent study has shown that the average number of outside board seats held by CEOs of S&P 500 companies is 0.6, down from 0.9 in 2005 and 1.4 in 2000.³⁵

3. A director, or a director who has an immediate family member, providing consulting or other material professional services to the company: These services may include legal, consulting, or financial services. We question the need for the company to have consulting relationships with its directors. We view such relationships as creating conflicts for directors, since they may be forced to weigh their own interests against shareholder interests when making board decisions. In addition, a company's decisions regarding where to turn for the best professional services may be compromised when doing business with the professional services firm of one of the company's directors.

4. A director, or a director who has an immediate family member, engaging in airplane, real estate, or similar deals, including perquisite-type grants from the company, amounting to more than \$50,000: Directors who receive these sorts of payments from the company will have to make unnecessarily complicated decisions that may pit their interests against shareholder interests.

³⁴Our guidelines are similar to the standards set forth by the NACD in its "Report of the NACD Blue Ribbon Commission on Director Professionalism," 2001 Edition, pp. 14-15 (also cited approvingly by the Conference Board in its "Corporate Governance Best Practices: A Blueprint for the Post-Enron Era," 2002, p. 17), which suggested that CEOs should not serve on more than 2 additional boards, persons with full-time work should not serve on more than 4 additional boards, and others should not serve on more than six boards.

³⁵Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2010, p. 8.

5. Interlocking directorships: CEOs or other top executives who serve on each other's boards create an interlock that poses conflicts that should be avoided to ensure the promotion of shareholder interests above all else.³⁶

6. All board members who served at a time when a poison pill was adopted without shareholder approval within the prior twelve months.

Size of the Board of Directors

While we do not believe there is a universally applicable optimum board size, we do believe boards should have at least five directors to ensure sufficient diversity in decision-making and to enable the formation of key board committees with independent directors. Conversely, we believe that boards with more than 20 members will typically suffer under the weight of "too many cooks in the kitchen" and have difficulty reaching consensus and making timely decisions. Sometimes the presence of too many voices can make it difficult to draw on the wisdom and experience in the room by virtue of the need to limit the discussion so that each voice may be heard.

To that end, we typically recommend voting against the chairman of the nominating committee at a board with fewer than five directors. With boards consisting of more than 20 directors, we typically recommend voting against all members of the nominating committee (or the governance committee, in the absence of a nominating committee).³⁷

Controlled Companies

Controlled companies present an exception to our independence recommendations. The board's function is to protect shareholder interests; however, when an individual or entity owns more than 50% of the voting shares, the interests of the majority of shareholders *are* the interests of that entity or individual. Consequently, Glass Lewis does not apply our usual two-thirds independence rule and therefore we will not recommend voting against boards whose composition reflects the makeup of the shareholder population.

Independence Exceptions

The independence exceptions that we make for controlled companies are as follows:

1. We do not require that controlled companies have boards that are at least two-thirds independent. So long as the insiders and/or affiliates are connected with the controlling entity, we accept the presence of non-independent board members.
2. The compensation committee and nominating and governance committees do not need to consist solely of independent directors.
 - a. We believe that standing nominating and corporate governance committees at controlled companies are unnecessary. Although having a committee charged with the duties of searching for, selecting, and nominating independent directors can be

³⁶We do not apply a look-back period for this situation. The interlock policy applies to both public and private companies. We will also evaluate multiple board interlocks among non-insiders (i.e. multiple directors serving on the same boards at other companies), for evidence of a pattern of poor oversight.

³⁷The Conference Board, at p. 23 in its report "Corporate Governance Best Practices, Id.," quotes one of its roundtable participants as stating, "[w]hen you've got a 20 or 30 person corporate board, it's one way of assuring that nothing is ever going to happen that the CEO doesn't want to happen."

beneficial, the unique composition of a controlled company's shareholder base makes such committees weak and irrelevant.

b. Likewise, we believe that independent compensation committees at controlled companies are unnecessary. Although independent directors are the best choice for approving and monitoring senior executives' pay, controlled companies serve a unique shareholder population whose voting power ensures the protection of its interests. As such, we believe that having affiliated directors on a controlled company's compensation committee is acceptable. However, given that a controlled company has certain obligations to minority shareholders we feel that an insider should not serve on the compensation committee. Therefore, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against any insider (the CEO or otherwise) serving on the compensation committee.

3. Controlled companies do not need an independent chairman or an independent lead or presiding director. Although an independent director in a position of authority on the board – such as chairman or presiding director – can best carry out the board's duties, controlled companies serve a unique shareholder population whose voting power ensures the protection of its interests.

4. Where an individual or entity owns more than 50% of a company's voting power but the company is not a "controlled" company as defined by relevant listing standards, we apply a lower independence requirement of a majority of the board but keep all other standards in place. Similarly, where an individual or entity holds between 20-50% of a company's voting power, but the company is *not* "controlled" and there is not a "majority" owner, we will allow for proportional representation on the board and committees (excluding the audit committee) based on the individual or entity's percentage of ownership.

Size of the Board of Directors

We have no board size requirements for controlled companies.

Audit Committee Independence

We believe that audit committees should consist solely of independent directors. Regardless of a company's controlled status, the interests of all shareholders must be protected by ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the company's financial statements. Allowing affiliated directors to oversee the preparation of financial reports could create an insurmountable conflict of interest.

Exceptions for Recent IPOs

We believe companies that have recently completed an initial public offering ("IPO") should be allowed adequate time to fully comply with marketplace listing requirements as well as to meet basic corporate governance standards. We believe a one-year grace period immediately following the date of a company's IPO is sufficient time for most companies to comply with all relevant regulatory requirements and to meet such corporate governance standards. Except in egregious cases, Glass Lewis refrains from issuing voting recommendations on the basis of corporate governance best practices (eg. board independence, committee membership and structure, meeting attendance, etc.) during the one-year period following an IPO.

However, in cases where a board implements a poison pill preceding an IPO, we will consider voting against the members of the board who served during the period of the poison pill's adoption if the board (i) did not also commit to submit the poison pill to a shareholder vote within 12 months of the IPO

or (ii) did not provide a sound rationale for adopting the pill and the pill does not expire in three years or less. In our view, adopting such an anti-takeover device unfairly penalizes future shareholders who (except for electing to buy or sell the stock) are unable to weigh in on a matter that could potentially negatively impact their ownership interest. This notion is strengthened when a board adopts a poison pill with a 5-10 year life immediately prior to having a public shareholder base so as to insulate management for a substantial amount of time while postponing and/or avoiding allowing public shareholders the ability to vote on the pill's adoption. Such instances are indicative of boards that may subvert shareholders' best interests following their IPO.

Mutual Fund Boards

Mutual funds, or investment companies, are structured differently from regular public companies (i.e., operating companies). Typically, members of a Funds' adviser are on the board and management takes on a different role from that of regular public companies. Thus, we focus on a short list of requirements, although many of our guidelines remain the same.

The following mutual fund policies are similar to the policies for regular public companies:

1. **Size of the board of directors:** The board should be made up of between five and twenty directors.
2. **The CFO on the board:** Neither the CFO of the Funds nor the CFO of the Funds' registered investment adviser should serve on the board.
3. **Independence of the audit committee:** The audit committee should consist solely of independent directors.
4. **Audit committee financial expert:** At least one member of the audit committee should be designated as the audit committee financial expert.

The following differences from regular public companies apply at mutual funds:

1. **Independence of the board:** We believe that three-fourths of an investment company's board should be made up of independent directors. This is consistent with a proposed SEC rule on investment company boards. The Investment Company Act requires 40% of the board to be independent, but in 2001, the SEC amended the Exemptive Rules to require that a majority of a mutual fund Funds board be independent. In 2005, the SEC proposed increasing the independence threshold to 75%. In 2006, a federal appeals court ordered that this rule amendment be put back out for public comment, putting it back into "proposed rule" status. Since mutual fund boards play a vital role in overseeing the relationship between the fund and its investment manager, there is greater need for independent oversight than there is for an operating company board.
2. **When the auditor is not up for ratification:** We do not recommend voting against the audit committee if the auditor is not up for ratification because, due to the different legal structure of an investment company compared to an operating company, the auditor for the investment company (i.e., mutual fund Funds) does not conduct the same level of financial review for each investment company as for an operating company.

chairman would be better able to create conditions favoring the long-term interests of Funds shareholders than would a chairman who is an executive of the adviser.” (See the comment letter sent to the SEC in support of the proposed rule at <http://sec.gov/rules/proposed/s70304/s70304-179.pdf>)

Although we believe this would be best at all companies, we recommend voting against the chairman of an investment company’s nominating committee as well as the chairman of the board if the chairman and CEO of a mutual funds are the same person and the fund does not have an independent lead or presiding director. Seven former SEC commissioners support the

DECLASSIFIED BOARDS

Glass Lewis favors the repeal of staggered boards and the annual election of directors. We believe staggered boards are less accountable to shareholders than boards that are elected annually. Furthermore, we feel the annual election of directors encourages board members to focus on shareholder interests.

Empirical studies have shown: (i) companies with staggered boards reduce a firm’s value; and (ii) in the context of hostile takeovers, staggered boards operate as a takeover defense, which entrenches management, discourages potential acquirers, and delivers a lower return to target shareholders.

In our view, there is no evidence to demonstrate that staggered boards improve shareholder returns in a takeover context. Research shows that shareholders are worse off when a staggered board blocks a transaction. A study by a group of Harvard Law professors concluded that companies whose staggered boards prevented a takeover “reduced shareholder returns for targets ... on the order of eight to ten percent in the nine months after a hostile bid was announced.”³⁸ When a staggered board negotiates a friendly transaction, no statistically significant difference in premiums occurs.³⁹ Further, one of those same professors found that charter-based staggered boards “reduce the market value of a firm by 4% to 6% of its market capitalization” and that “staggered boards bring about and not merely reflect this reduction in market value.”⁴⁰ A subsequent study reaffirmed that classified boards reduce shareholder value, finding “that the ongoing process of dismantling staggered boards, encouraged by institutional investors, could well contribute to increasing shareholder wealth.”⁴¹

Shareholders have increasingly come to agree with this view. In 2010 approximately 72% of S&P 500 companies had declassified boards, up from approximately 51% in 2005.⁴² Clearly, more shareholders have supported the repeal of classified boards. Resolutions relating to the repeal of staggered boards garnered on average over 70% support among shareholders in 2008, whereas in 1987, only 16.4% of votes cast favored board declassification.⁴³

Given the empirical evidence suggesting staggered boards reduce a company’s value and the increasing shareholder opposition to such a structure, Glass Lewis supports the declassification of boards and the annual election of directors.

³⁸Lucian Bebchuk, John Coates IV, Guhan Subramanian, “The Powerful Antitakeover Force of Staggered Boards: Further Findings and a Reply to Symposium Participants,” 55 *Stanford Law Review* 885-917 (2002), page 1.

³⁹Id. at 2 (“Examining a sample of seventy-three negotiated transactions from 2000 to 2002, we find no systematic benefits in terms of higher premia to boards that have [staggered structures].”).

⁴⁰Lucian Bebchuk, Alma Cohen, “The Costs of Entrenched Boards” (2004).

⁴¹Lucian Bebchuk, Alma Cohen and Charles C.Y. Wang, “Staggered Boards and the Wealth of Shareholders: Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1706806> (2010), p. 26.

⁴²Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2010, p. 14

⁴³Lucian Bebchuk, John Coates IV and Guhan Subramanian, “The Powerful Antitakeover Force of Staggered Boards: Theory, Evidence, and Policy,” 54 *Stanford Law Review* 887-951 (2002).

MANDATORY DIRECTOR RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

Director Term and Age Limits

Glass Lewis believes that director age and term limits typically are not in shareholders' best interests. Too often age and term limits are used by boards as a crutch to remove board members who have served for an extended period of time. When used in that fashion, they are indicative of a board that has a difficult time making "tough decisions."

Academic literature suggests that there is no evidence of a correlation between either length of tenure or age and director performance. On occasion, term limits can be used as a means to remove a director for boards that are unwilling to police their membership and to enforce turnover. Some shareholders support term limits as a way to force change when boards are unwilling to do so.

While we understand that age limits can be a way to force change where boards are unwilling to make changes on their own, the long-term impact of age limits restricts experienced and potentially valuable board members from service through an arbitrary means. Further, age limits unfairly imply that older (or, in rare cases, younger) directors cannot contribute to company oversight.

In our view, a director's experience can be a valuable asset to shareholders because of the complex, critical issues that boards face. However, we support periodic director rotation to ensure a fresh perspective in the boardroom and the generation of new ideas and business strategies. We believe the board should implement such rotation instead of relying on arbitrary limits. When necessary, shareholders can address the issue of director rotation through director elections.

We believe that shareholders are better off monitoring the board's approach to corporate governance and the board's stewardship of company performance rather than imposing inflexible rules that don't necessarily correlate with returns or benefits for shareholders.

However, if a board adopts term/age limits, it should follow through and not waive such limits. If the board waives its term/age limits, Glass Lewis will consider recommending shareholders vote against the nominating and/or governance committees, unless the rule was waived with sufficient explanation, such as consummation of a corporate transaction like a merger.

REQUIRING TWO OR MORE NOMINEES PER BOARD SEAT

In an attempt to address lack of access to the ballot, shareholders sometimes propose that the board give shareholders a choice of directors for each open board seat in every election. However, we feel that policies requiring a selection of multiple nominees for each board seat would discourage prospective directors from accepting nominations. A prospective director could not be confident either that he or she is the board's clear choice or that he or she would be elected. Therefore, Glass Lewis generally will vote against such proposals.

SHAREHOLDER ACCESS

Shareholders have continuously sought a way to have a significant voice in director elections in recent years. While most of these efforts have centered on regulatory change at the SEC, Congress and the Obama Administration have successfully placed "Proxy Access" in the spotlight of the U.S. Government's most recent corporate-governance-related financial reforms.

In July 2010, President Obama signed into law the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act"). The Dodd-Frank Act provides the SEC with the authority to

The SEC received over 500 comments regarding its proposed proxy access rule, some of which questioned

the agency's authority to adopt such a rule. Nonetheless, in August 2010 the SEC adopted final Rule 14a-11, which under certain circumstances, gives shareholders (and shareholder groups) who have

collectively held at least 3% of the voting power of a company's securities continuously for at least three years, the right to nominate up to 25% of a Board's directors and have such nominees included on the company's ballot and described (in up to 500 words per nominee) in its proxy statement.

While final Rule 14a-11 was originally scheduled to take effect on November 15, 2010, on October 4, 2010, the SEC announced that it would delay the rule's implementation following the filing of a lawsuit by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable on September 29, 2010. As a result, it is unlikely shareholders will have the opportunity to vote on access proposals during the 2011 proxy season.

MAJORITY VOTE FOR THE ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

In stark contrast to the failure of shareholder access to gain acceptance, majority voting for the election of directors is fast becoming the *de facto* standard in corporate board elections. In our view, the majority voting proposals are an effort to make the case for shareholder impact on director elections on a company-specific basis.

While this proposal would not give shareholders the opportunity to nominate directors or lead to elections where shareholders have a choice among director candidates, if implemented, the proposal would allow shareholders to have a voice in determining whether the nominees proposed by the board should actually serve as the overseer-representatives of shareholders in the boardroom. We believe this would be a favorable outcome for shareholders.

During 2010, Glass Lewis tracked just under 35 proposals to require a majority vote to elect directors at annual meetings in the U.S., a slight decline from 46 proposals in 2009, but a sharp contrast to the 147 proposals tracked during 2006. The general decline in the number of proposals being submitted was a result of many companies adopting some form of majority voting, including approximately 71% of companies in the S&P 500 index, up from 56% in 2008.⁴⁴ During 2009 these proposals received on average 59% shareholder support (based on for and against votes), up from 54% in 2008.

The plurality vote standard

Today, most US companies still elect directors by a plurality vote standard. Under that standard, if one shareholder holding only one share votes in favor of a nominee (including himself, if the director is a shareholder), that nominee "wins" the election and assumes a seat on the board. The common concern among companies with a plurality voting standard was the possibility that one or more directors would not receive a majority of votes, resulting in "failed elections." This was of particular concern during the 1980s, an era of frequent takeovers and contests for control of companies.

Advantages of a majority vote standard

If a majority vote standard were implemented, a nominee would have to receive the support of a majority of the shares voted in order to be elected. Thus, shareholders could collectively vote to reject a director they believe will not pursue their best interests. We think that this minimal amount of protection for shareholders is reasonable and will not upset the corporate structure nor reduce the willingness of qualified shareholder-focused directors to serve in the future.

We believe that a majority vote standard will likely lead to more attentive directors. Occasional use of this power will likely prevent the election of directors with a record of ignoring shareholder interests in favor of other interests that conflict with those of investors. Glass Lewis will generally support proposals calling for the election of directors by a majority vote except for use in contested director elections.

In response to the high level of support majority voting has garnered, many companies have voluntarily taken steps to implement majority voting or modified approaches to majority voting. These steps range from a modified approach requiring directors that receive a majority of withheld votes to resign (e.g., Ashland Inc.) to actually requiring a majority vote of outstanding shares to elect directors (e.g., Intel).

We feel that the modified approach does not go far enough because requiring a director to resign is not the same as requiring a majority vote to elect a director and does not allow shareholders a definitive voice in the election process. Further, under the modified approach, the corporate governance committee could reject a resignation and, even if it accepts the resignation, the corporate governance committee decides on the director's replacement. And since the modified approach is usually adopted as a policy by the board or a board committee, it could be altered by the same board or committee at any time.

AUDITOR RATIFICATION

The auditor's role as gatekeeper is crucial in ensuring the integrity and transparency of the financial information necessary for protecting shareholder value. Shareholders rely on the auditor to ask tough questions and to do a thorough analysis of a company's books to ensure that the information provided to shareholders is complete, accurate, fair, and that it is a reasonable representation of a company's financial position. The only way shareholders can make rational investment decisions is if the market is equipped with accurate information about a company's fiscal health. As stated in the October 6, 2008 Final Report of the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession to the U.S. Department of the Treasury:

"The auditor is expected to offer critical and objective judgment on the financial matters under consideration, and actual and perceived absence of conflicts is critical to that expectation. The Committee believes that auditors, investors, public companies, and other market participants must understand the independence requirements and their objectives, and that auditors must adopt a mindset of skepticism when facing situations that may compromise their independence."

As such, shareholders should demand an objective, competent and diligent auditor who performs at or above professional standards at every company in which the investors hold an interest. Like directors, auditors should be free from conflicts of interest and should avoid situations requiring a choice between the auditor's interests and the public's interests. Almost without exception, shareholders should be able to annually review an auditor's performance and to annually ratify a board's auditor selection. Moreover, in October 2008, the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession went even further, and recommended that "to further enhance audit committee oversight and auditor accountability ... disclosure in the company proxy statement regarding shareholder ratification [should] include the name(s) of the senior auditing partner(s) staffed on the engagement."⁴⁵

Voting Recommendations on Auditor Ratification

We generally support management's choice of auditor except when we believe the auditor's independence or audit integrity has been compromised. Where a board has not allowed shareholders to review and ratify an auditor, we typically recommend voting against the audit committee chairman. When there have been material restatements of annual financial statements or material weakness in internal controls, we usually recommend voting against the entire audit committee.

Reasons why we may not recommend ratification of an auditor include:

1. When audit fees plus audit-related fees total less than the tax fees and/or other non-audit fees.

⁴⁵Final Report of the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession to the U.S. Department of the Treasury." p. VIII:20, October 6, 2008.

2. Recent material restatements of annual financial statements, including those resulting in the reporting of material weaknesses in internal controls and including late filings by the company where the auditor bears some responsibility for the restatement or late filing.⁴⁶
3. When the auditor performs prohibited services such as tax-shelter work, tax services for the CEO or CFO, or contingent-fee work, such as a fee based on a percentage of economic benefit to the company.
4. When audit fees are excessively low, especially when compared with other companies in the same industry.
5. When the company has aggressive accounting policies.
6. When the company has poor disclosure or lack of transparency in its financial statements.
7. Where the auditor limited its liability through its contract with the company or the audit contract requires the corporation to use alternative dispute resolution procedures.
8. We also look for other relationships or concerns with the auditor that might suggest a conflict between the auditor's interests and shareholder interests.

We typically support audit-related proposals regarding mandatory auditor rotation when the proposal uses a reasonable period of time (usually not less than 5-7 years).

PENSION ACCOUNTING ISSUES

A pension accounting question often raised in proxy proposals is what effect, if any, projected returns on employee pension assets should have on a company's net income. This issue often arises in the executive-compensation context in a discussion of the extent to which pension accounting should be reflected in business performance for purposes of calculating payments to executives.

Glass Lewis believes that pension credits should not be included in measuring income that is used to award performance-based compensation. Because many of the assumptions used in accounting for retirement plans are subject to the company's discretion, management would have an obvious conflict of interest if pay were tied to pension income. In our view, projected income from pensions does not truly reflect a company's performance.

⁴⁶An auditor does not audit interim financial statements. Thus, we generally do not believe that an auditor should be opposed due to a restatement of interim financial statements unless the nature of the misstatement is clear from a reading of the incorrect financial statements.

III. The Link Between Compensation and Performance

Glass Lewis carefully reviews the compensation awarded to senior executives, as we believe that this is an important area in which the board's priorities are revealed. Glass Lewis strongly believes executive compensation should be linked directly with the performance of the business the executive is charged with managing. We believe the most effective compensation arrangements provide for an appropriate mix of performance-based short- and long-term incentives in addition to base salary.

Glass Lewis believes that comprehensive, timely and transparent disclosure of executive pay is critical to allowing shareholders to evaluate the extent to which the pay is keeping pace with company performance. When reviewing proxy materials, Glass Lewis examines whether the company discloses the performance metrics used to determine executive compensation. We recognize performance metrics must necessarily vary depending on the company and industry, among other factors, and may include items such as total shareholder return, earning per share growth, return on equity, return on assets and revenue growth. However, we believe companies should disclose why the specific performance metrics were selected and how the actions they are designed to incentivize will lead to better corporate performance.

Moreover, it is rarely in shareholders' interests to disclose competitive data about individual salaries below the senior executive level. Such disclosure could create internal personnel discord that would be counterproductive for the company and its shareholders. While we favor full disclosure for senior executives and we view pay disclosure at the aggregate level (e.g., the number of employees being paid over a certain amount or in certain categories) as potentially useful, we do not believe shareholders need or will benefit from detailed reports about individual management employees other than the most senior executives.

ADVISORY VOTE ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ("SAY-ON-PAY")

On July 21, 2010, President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act"), providing for sweeping financial and governance reforms. One of the most important reforms is found in Section 951(a) of the Dodd-Frank Act, which requires companies to hold an advisory vote on executive compensation at the first shareholder meeting that occurs six months after enactment (January 21, 2011). Further, since section 957 of the Dodd-Frank Act prohibits broker discretionary voting in connection with shareholder votes with respect to executive compensation, beginning in 2011 a majority vote in support of advisory votes on executive compensation may become more difficult for companies to obtain.

This practice of allowing shareholders a non-binding vote on a company's compensation report is standard practice in many non-US countries, and has been a requirement for most companies in the United Kingdom since 2003 and in Australia since 2005. Although Say-on-Pay proposals are non-binding, a high level of "against" or "abstain" votes indicate substantial shareholder concern about a company's compensation policies and procedures.

Given the complexity of most companies' compensation programs, Glass Lewis applies a highly nuanced approach when analyzing advisory votes on executive compensation. We review each company's compensation on a case-by-case basis, recognizing that each company must be examined in the context of industry, size, maturity, performance, financial condition, its historic pay for performance practices, and any other relevant internal or external factors.

We believe that each company should design and apply specific compensation policies and practices that are appropriate to the circumstances of the company and, in particular, will attract and retain competent executives and other staff, while motivating them to grow the company's long-term shareholder value.

Where we find those specific policies and practices serve to reasonably align compensation with performance, and such practices are adequately disclosed, Glass Lewis will recommend supporting the company's approach. If, however, those specific policies and practices fail to demonstrably link compensation with performance, Glass Lewis will generally recommend voting against the say-on-pay proposal.

Glass Lewis focuses on four main areas when reviewing Say-on-Pay proposals:

- The overall design and structure of the Company's executive compensation program including performance metrics;
- The quality and content of the Company's disclosure;
- The quantum paid to executives; and
- The link between compensation and performance as indicated by the Company's current and past pay-for-performance grades

We also review any significant changes or modifications, and rationale for such changes, made to the Company's compensation structure or award amounts, including base salaries.

Say-on-Pay Voting Recommendations

In cases where we find deficiencies in a company's compensation program's design, implementation or management, we will recommend that shareholders vote against the Say-on-Pay proposal. Generally such instances include evidence of a pattern of poor pay-for-performance practices (i.e., deficient or failing pay for performance grades), unclear or questionable disclosure regarding the overall compensation structure (e.g., limited information regarding benchmarking processes, limited rationale for bonus performance metrics and targets, etc.), questionable adjustments to certain aspects of the overall compensation structure (e.g., limited rationale for significant changes to performance targets or metrics, the payout of guaranteed bonuses or sizable retention grants, etc.), and/or other egregious compensation practices.

Although not an exhaustive list, the following issues when weighed together may cause Glass Lewis to recommend voting against a say-on-pay vote:

- Inappropriate peer group and/or benchmarking issues
- Inadequate or no rationale for changes to peer groups
- Egregious or excessive bonuses, equity awards or severance payments, including golden handshakes and golden parachutes
- Guaranteed bonuses
- Targeting overall levels of compensation at higher than median without adequate justification
- Bonus or long-term plan targets set at less than mean or negative performance levels
- Performance targets not sufficiently challenging, and/or providing for high potential payouts
- Performance targets lowered, without justification
- Discretionary bonuses paid when short- or long-term incentive plan targets were not met

- Executive pay high relative to peers not justified by outstanding company performance
- The terms of the long-term incentive plans are inappropriate (please see “Long-Term Incentives” below)

In the instance that a company has simply failed to provide sufficient disclosure of its policies, we may recommend shareholders vote against this proposal solely on this basis, regardless of the appropriateness of compensation levels.

In the case of companies that maintain poor compensation policies year after year without any showing they took steps to address the issues, we may also recommend that shareholders vote against the chairman and/or additional members of the compensation committee. We may also recommend voting against the compensation committee based on the practices or actions of its members, such as approving large one-off payments, the inappropriate use of discretion, or sustained poor pay for performance practices.

Short-Term Incentives

A short-term bonus or incentive (“STI”) should be demonstrably tied to performance. Whenever possible, we believe a mix of corporate and individual performance measures is appropriate. We would normally expect performance measures for STIs to be based on internal financial measures such as net profit after tax, EPS growth and divisional profitability as well as non-financial factors such as those related to safety, environmental issues, and customer satisfaction. However, we accept variations from these metrics if they are tied to the Company’s business drivers.

Further, the target and potential maximum awards that can be achieved under STI awards should be disclosed. Shareholders should expect stretching performance targets for the maximum award to be achieved. Any increase in the potential maximum award should be clearly justified to shareholders.

Glass Lewis recognizes that disclosure of some measures may include commercially confidential information. Therefore, we believe it may be reasonable to exclude such information in some cases as long as the company provides sufficient justification for non-disclosure. However, where a short-term bonus has been paid, companies should disclose the extent to which performance has been achieved against relevant targets, including disclosure of the actual target achieved.

Where management has received significant STIs but short-term performance as measured by such indicators as increase in profit and/or EPS growth over the previous year *prima facie* appears to be poor or negative, we believe the company should provide a clear explanation why these significant short-term payments were made.

Long-Term Incentives

Glass Lewis recognizes the value of equity-based incentive programs. When used appropriately, they can provide a vehicle for linking an executive’s pay to company performance, thereby aligning their interests with those of shareholders. In addition, equity-based compensation can be an effective way to attract, retain and motivate key employees.

There are certain elements that Glass Lewis believes are common to most well-structured long-term incentive (“LTI”) plans. These include:

- No re-testing or lowering of performance conditions
- Performance metrics that cannot be easily manipulated by management
- Two or more performance metrics

- At least one relative performance metric that compares the company's performance to a relevant peer group or index
- Performance periods of at least three years
- Stretching metrics that incentivize executives to strive for outstanding performance
- Individual limits expressed as a percentage of base salary

Performance measures should be carefully selected and should relate to the specific business/industry in which the company operates and, especially, the key value drivers of the company's business.

Glass Lewis believes that measuring a company's performance with multiple metrics serves to provide a more complete picture of the company's performance than a single metric, which may focus too much management attention on a single target and is therefore more susceptible to manipulation. External benchmarks should be disclosed and transparent, such as total shareholder return ("TSR") against a well-selected sector index, peer group or other performance hurdle. The rationale behind the selection of a specific index or peer group should be disclosed. Internal benchmarks (e.g. earnings per share growth) should also be disclosed and transparent, unless a cogent case for confidentiality is made and fully explained.

We also believe shareholders should evaluate the relative success of a company's compensation programs, particularly existing equity-based incentive plans, in linking pay and performance in evaluating new LTI plans to determine the impact of additional stock awards. We will therefore review the company's pay-for-performance grade, see below for more information, and specifically the proportion of total compensation that is stock-based.

Pay for Performance

Glass Lewis believes an integral part of a well-structured compensation package is a successful link between pay and performance. Therefore, Glass Lewis developed a proprietary pay-for-performance model to evaluate the link between pay and performance of the top five executives at US companies. Our model benchmarks these executives' pay and company performance against four peer groups and across seven performance metrics. Using a forced curve and a school letter-grade system, we grade companies from A-F according to their pay-for-performance linkage. The grades guide our evaluation of compensation committee effectiveness and we generally recommend voting against compensation committee of companies with a pattern of failing our pay-for-performance analysis.

We also use this analysis to inform our voting decisions on say-on-pay proposals. As such, if a company receives a failing grade from our proprietary model, we are likely to recommend shareholders to vote against the say-on-pay proposal. However, there may be exceptions to this rule such as when a company makes significant enhancements to its compensation programs.

Recoupment ("Clawback") Provisions

Section 954 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the SEC to create a rule requiring listed companies to adopt policies for recouping certain compensation during a three-year look-back period. The rule applies to incentive-based compensation paid to current or former executives if the company is required to prepare an accounting restatement due to erroneous data resulting from material non-compliance with any financial reporting requirements under the securities laws.

These recoupment provisions are more stringent than under Section 304 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in three respects: (i) the provisions extend to current or former executive officers rather than only to the

CEO and CFO; (ii) it has a three-year look-back period (rather than a twelve-month look-back period); and (iii) it allows for recovery of compensation based upon a financial restatement due to erroneous data, and therefore does not require misconduct on the part of the executive or other employees.

Frequency of Say-on-Pay

The Dodd-Frank Act also requires companies to allow shareholders a non-binding vote on the frequency of say-on-pay votes, i.e. every one, two or three years. Additionally, Dodd-Frank requires companies to hold such votes on the frequency of say-on-pay votes at least once every six years.

We believe companies should submit say-on-pay votes to shareholders every year. We believe that the time and financial burdens to a company with regard to an annual vote are relatively small and incremental and are outweighed by the benefits to shareholders through more frequent accountability. Implementing biannual or triennial votes on executive compensation limits shareholders' ability to hold the board accountable for its compensation practices through means other than voting against the compensation committee. Unless a company provides a compelling rationale or unique circumstances for say-on-pay votes less frequent than annually, we will generally recommend that shareholders support annual votes on compensation.

Vote on Golden Parachute Arrangements

The Dodd-Frank Act also requires companies to provide shareholders with a separate non-binding vote on approval of golden parachute compensation arrangements in connection with certain change-in-control transactions. However, if the golden parachute arrangements have previously been subject to a say-on-pay vote which shareholders approved, then this required vote is waived.

Glass Lewis believes the narrative and tabular disclosure of golden parachute arrangements will benefit all shareholders. Glass Lewis will analyze each golden parachute arrangement on a case-by-case basis, taking into account, among other items: the ultimate value of the payments, the tenure and position of the executives in question, and the type of triggers involved (single vs double).

EQUITY-BASED COMPENSATION PLAN PROPOSALS

We believe that equity compensation awards are useful, when not abused, for retaining employees and providing an incentive for them to act in a way that will improve company performance. Glass Lewis evaluates option- and other equity-based compensation plans using a detailed model and analytical review.

Equity-based compensation programs have important differences from cash compensation plans and bonus programs. Accordingly, our model and analysis takes into account factors such as plan administration, the method and terms of exercise, repricing history, express or implied rights to reprice, and the presence of evergreen provisions.

Our analysis is quantitative and focused on the plan's cost as compared with the business's operating metrics. We run twenty different analyses, comparing the program with absolute limits we believe are key to equity value creation and with a carefully chosen peer group. In general, our model seeks to determine whether the proposed plan is either absolutely excessive or is more than one standard deviation away from the average plan for the peer group on a range of criteria, including dilution to shareholders and the projected annual cost relative to the company's financial performance. Each of the twenty analyses (and their constituent parts) is weighted and the plan is scored in accordance with that weight.

In our analysis, we compare the program's expected annual expense with the business's operating metrics to help determine whether the plan is excessive in light of company performance. We also compare the option plan's expected annual cost to the enterprise value of the firm rather than to market capitalization because the employees, managers and directors of the firm contribute to the creation of enterprise value but not necessarily market capitalization (the biggest difference is seen where cash represents the vast majority of market capitalization). Finally, we do not rely exclusively on relative comparisons with averages because, in addition to creeping averages serving to inflate compensation, we believe that academic literature proves that some absolute limits are warranted.

We evaluate equity plans based on certain overarching principles:

1. Companies should seek more shares only when needed.
2. Requested share amounts should be small enough that companies seek shareholder approval every three to four years (or more frequently).
3. If a plan is relatively expensive, it should not grant options solely to senior executives and board members.
4. Annual net share count and voting power dilution should be limited.
5. Annual cost of the plan (especially if not shown on the income statement) should be reasonable as a percentage of financial results and should be in line with the peer group.
6. The expected annual cost of the plan should be proportional to the business's value.
7. The intrinsic value that option grantees received in the past should be reasonable compared with the business's financial results.
8. Plans should deliver value on a per-employee basis when compared with programs at peer companies.
9. Plans should not permit re-pricing of stock options.
10. Plans should not contain excessively liberal administrative or payment terms.
11. Selected performance metrics should be challenging and appropriate, and should be subject to relative performance measurements.
12. Stock grants should be subject to minimum vesting and/or holding periods sufficient to ensure sustainable performance and promote retention.

Option Exchanges

Glass Lewis views option repricing plans and option exchange programs with great skepticism. Shareholders have substantial risk in owning stock and we believe that the employees, officers, and directors who receive stock options should be similarly situated to align their interests with shareholder interests.

We are concerned that option grantees who believe they will be "rescued" from underwater options will be more inclined to take unjustifiable risks. Moreover, a predictable pattern of repricing or exchanges substantially alters a stock option's value because options that will practically never expire deeply out of the money are worth far more than options that carry a risk of expiration.

In short, repricings and option exchange programs change the bargain between shareholders and employees after the bargain has been struck. Re-pricing is tantamount to re-trading.

There is one circumstance in which a repricing or option exchange program is acceptable: if macroeconomic or industry trends, rather than specific company issues, cause a stock's value to decline dramatically and the repricing is necessary to motivate and retain employees. In this circumstance, we think it fair to conclude that option grantees may be suffering from a risk that was not foreseeable when the original "bargain" was struck. In such a circumstance, we will recommend supporting a repricing only if the following conditions are true:

- (i) officers and board members cannot not participate in the program;
- (ii) the stock decline mirrors the market or industry price decline in terms of timing and approximates the decline in magnitude;
- (iii) the exchange is value-neutral or value-creative to shareholders using very conservative assumptions and with a recognition of the adverse selection problems inherent in voluntary programs; and
- (iv) management and the board make a cogent case for needing to motivate and retain existing employees, such as being in a competitive employment market.

Option Backdating, Spring-Loading, and Bullet-Dodging

Glass Lewis views option backdating, and the related practices of spring-loading and bullet-dodging, as egregious actions that warrant holding the appropriate management and board members responsible. These practices are similar to re-pricing options and eliminate much of the downside risk inherent in an option grant that is designed to induce recipients to maximize shareholder return.

Backdating an option is the act of changing an option's grant date from the actual grant date to an earlier date when the market price of the underlying stock was lower, resulting in a lower exercise price for the option. Glass Lewis has identified over 270 companies that have disclosed internal or government investigations into their past stock-option grants.

Spring-loading is granting stock options while in possession of material, positive information that has not been disclosed publicly. Bullet-dodging is delaying the grants of stock options until after the release of material, negative information. This can allow option grants to be made at a lower price either before the release of positive news or following the release of negative news, assuming the stock's price will move up or down in response to the information. This raises a concern similar to that of insider trading, or the trading on material non-public information.

The exercise price for an option is determined on the day of grant, providing the recipient with the same market risk as an investor who bought shares on that date. However, where options were backdated, the executive or the board (or the compensation committee) changed the grant date retroactively. The new date may be at or near the lowest price for the year or period. This would be like allowing an investor to look back and select the lowest price of the year at which to buy shares.

A 2006 study of option grants made between 1996 and 2005 at 8,000 companies found that option backdating can be an indication of poor internal controls. The study found that option backdating was more likely to occur at companies without a majority independent board and with a long-serving CEO; both factors, the study concluded, were associated with greater CEO influence on the company's compensation and governance practices.⁴⁷

Where a company granted backdated options to an executive who is also a director, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against that executive/director, regardless of who decided to make the award. In

addition, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against those directors who either approved or allowed the backdating. Glass Lewis feels that executives and directors who either benefited from backdated options or authorized the practice have breached their fiduciary responsibility to shareholders.

Given the severe tax and legal liabilities to the company from backdating, Glass Lewis will consider recommending voting against members of the audit committee who served when options were backdated, a restatement occurs, material weaknesses in internal controls exist and disclosures indicate there was a lack of documentation. These committee members failed in their responsibility to ensure the integrity of the company's financial reports.

When a company has engaged in spring-loading or bullet-dodging, Glass Lewis will consider recommending voting against the compensation committee members where there has been a pattern of granting options at or near historic lows. Glass Lewis will also recommend voting against executives serving on the board who benefited from the spring-loading or bullet-dodging.

162(m) Plans

Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code allows companies to deduct compensation in excess of \$1 million for the CEO and the next three most highly compensated executive officers, excluding the CFO, upon shareholder approval of the excess compensation. Glass Lewis recognizes the value of executive incentive programs and the tax benefit of shareholder-approved incentive plans.

We believe the best practice for companies is to provide robust disclosure to shareholders so that they can make fully-informed judgments about the reasonableness of the proposed compensation plan. To allow for meaningful shareholder review, we prefer that disclosure should include specific performance metrics, a maximum award pool, and a maximum award amount per employee. We also believe it is important to analyze the estimated grants to see if they are reasonable and in line with the company's peers.

We typically recommend voting against a 162(m) plan where: a company fails to provide at least a list of performance targets; a company fails to provide one of either a total pool or an individual maximum; or the proposed plan is excessive when compared with the plans of the company's peers.

The company's record of aligning pay with performance (as evaluated using our proprietary pay-for-performance model) also plays a role in our recommendation. Where a company has a record of setting reasonable pay relative to business performance, we generally recommend voting in favor of a plan even if the plan caps seem large relative to peers because we recognize the value in special pay arrangements for continued exceptional performance.

As with all other issues we review, our goal is to provide consistent but contextual advice given the specifics of the company and ongoing performance. Overall, we recognize that it is generally not in shareholders' best interests to vote against such a plan and forgo the potential tax benefit since shareholder rejection of such plans will not curtail the awards; it will only prevent the tax deduction associated with them.

Glass Lewis uses a proprietary model and analyst review to evaluate the costs of equity plans compared to the plans of peer companies with similar market capitalizations. We use the results of this model to guide our voting recommendations on stock-based director compensation plans.

ANTI-TAKEOVER MEASURES

Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans)

Glass Lewis believes that poison pill plans are not generally in shareholders' best interests. They can reduce management accountability by substantially limiting opportunities for corporate takeovers. Rights plans can thus prevent shareholders from receiving a buy-out premium for their stock. Typically we recommend that shareholders vote against these plans to protect their financial interests and ensure that they have an opportunity to consider any offer for their shares, especially those at a premium.

We believe boards should be given wide latitude in directing company activities and in charting the company's course. However, on an issue such as this, where the link between the shareholders' financial interests and their right to consider and accept buyout offers is substantial, we believe that shareholders should be allowed to vote on whether they support such a plan's implementation. This issue is different from other matters that are typically left to board discretion. Its potential impact on and relation to shareholders is direct and substantial. It is also an issue in which management interests may be different from those of shareholders; thus, ensuring that shareholders have a voice is the only way to safeguard their interests.

In certain circumstances, we will support a poison pill that is limited in scope to accomplish a particular objective, such as the closing of an important merger, or a pill that contains what we believe to be a reasonable qualifying offer clause. We will consider supporting a poison pill plan if the qualifying offer clause includes the following attributes: (i) The form of offer is not required to be an all-cash transaction; (ii) the offer is not required to remain open for more than 90 business days; (iii) the offeror is permitted to amend the offer, reduce the offer, or otherwise change the terms; (iv) there is no fairness opinion requirement; and (v) there is a low to no premium requirement. Where these requirements are met, we typically feel comfortable that shareholders will have the opportunity to voice their opinion on any legitimate offer.

NOL Poison Pills

Similarly, Glass Lewis may consider supporting a limited poison pill in the unique event that a company seeks shareholder approval of a rights plan for the express purpose of preserving Net Operating Losses (NOLs). While companies with NOLs can generally carry these losses forward to offset future taxable income, Section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code limits companies' ability to use NOLs in the event of a "change of ownership."⁴⁸ In this case, a company may adopt or amend a poison pill ("NOL pill") in order to prevent an inadvertent change of ownership by multiple investors purchasing small chunks of stock at the same time, and thereby preserve the ability to carry the NOLs forward. Often such NOL pills have trigger thresholds much lower than the common 15% or 20% thresholds, with some NOL pill triggers as low as 5%.

Glass Lewis evaluates NOL pills on a strictly case-by-case basis taking into consideration, among other factors, the value of the NOLs to the company, the likelihood of a change of ownership based on the size

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

The purpose of Glass Lewis' proxy research and advice is to facilitate shareholder voting in favor of governance structures that will drive performance, create shareholder value and maintain a proper tone at the top. Glass Lewis looks for talented boards with a record of protecting shareholders and delivering value over the medium- and long-term. We believe that boards working to protect and enhance the best interests of shareholders are independent, have directors with diverse backgrounds, have a record of positive performance, and have members with a breadth and depth of relevant experience.

Independence

The independence of directors, or lack thereof, is ultimately demonstrated through the decisions they make. In assessing the independence of directors, we will take into consideration, when appropriate, whether a director has a track record indicative of making objective decisions. Likewise, when assessing the independence of directors we will also examine when a director's service track record on multiple boards indicates a lack of objective decision-making. Ultimately, we believe the determination of whether a director is independent or not must take into consideration both compliance with the applicable independence listing requirements as well as judgments made by the director.

We look at each director nominee to examine the director's relationships with the company, the company's executives, and other directors. We do this to evaluate whether personal, familial, or financial relationships (not including director compensation) may impact the director's decisions. We believe that such relationships make it difficult for a director to put shareholders' interests above the director's or the related party's interests. We also believe that a director who owns more than 20% of a company can exert disproportionate influence on the board and, in particular, the audit committee.

Thus, we put directors into three categories based on an examination of the type of relationship they have with the company:

Independent Director – An independent director has no material financial, familial or other current relationships with the company, its executives, or other board members, except for board service and standard fees paid for that service. Relationships that existed within three to five years¹ before the inquiry are usually considered "current" for purposes of this test.

In our view, a director who is currently serving in an interim management position should be considered an insider, while a director who previously served in an interim management position for less than one year and is no longer serving in such capacity is considered independent. Moreover, a director who previously served in an interim management position for over one year and is no longer serving in such capacity is considered an affiliate for five years following the date of his/her resignation or departure from the interim management position. Glass Lewis applies a three-year look-back period to all directors who have an affiliation with the company other than former, for which we apply a five-year look-back.

Affiliated Director – An affiliated director has a material financial, familial or other relationship with the company or its executives, but is not an employee of the company.² This includes directors whose employers have a material financial relationship with the company.³ In addition, we view a director who owns or controls 20% or more of the company’s voting stock as an affiliate.

We view 20% shareholders as affiliates because they typically have access to and involvement with the management of a company that is fundamentally different from that of ordinary shareholders. More importantly, 20% holders may have interests that diverge from those of ordinary holders, for reasons such as the liquidity (or lack thereof) of their holdings, personal tax issues, etc.

Definition of **“Material”**: A material relationship is one in which the dollar value exceeds:

- \$50,000 (or where no amount is disclosed) for directors who are paid for a service they have agreed to perform for the company, outside of their service as a director, including professional or other services; or
- \$120,000 (or where no amount is disclosed) for those directors employed by a professional services firm such as a law firm, investment bank, or consulting firm where the company pays the firm, not the individual, for services. This dollar limit would also apply to charitable contributions to schools where a board member is a professor; or charities where a director serves on the board or is an executive;⁴ and any aircraft and real estate dealings between the company and the director’s firm; or
- 1% of either company’s consolidated gross revenue for other business relationships (e.g., where the director is an executive officer of a company that provides services or products to or receives services or products from the company).

Definition of **“Familial”**: Familial relationships include a person’s spouse, parents, children, siblings, grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, nieces, nephews, in-laws, and anyone (other than domestic employees) who shares such person’s home. A director is an affiliate if the director has a family member who is employed by the company and who receives compensation of \$120,000 or more per year or the compensation is not disclosed.

Definition of **“Company”**: A company includes any parent or subsidiary in a group with the company or any entity that merged with, was acquired by, or acquired the company.

Inside Director – An inside director simultaneously serves as a director and as an employee of the company. This category may include a chairman of the board who acts as an employee of the company or is paid as an employee of the company. In our view, an inside director who derives a greater amount of income as a result of affiliated transactions with the company rather than

¹ NASDAQ originally proposed a five-year look-back prior to finalizing their rules. A five-year standard is more appropriate, in our view, because we **believe** that the unwinding of conflicting relationships between former management and board members is more likely to be completed and final after five years. However, Glass Lewis does not apply the five-year look-back period to directors who have previously served as executives of the company on an interim basis for less than one year.

² If a company classifies one of its non-employee directors as non-independent; Glass Lewis will classify that director as an affiliate.

³ We allow a five-year grace period for former executives of the company or merged companies who have consulting agreements with the surviving company. (We do not automatically recommend voting against directors in such cases for the first five years.) If the consulting agreement persists after this five-year grace period, we apply the materiality thresholds outlined in the definition of “material.”

⁴ We will generally take into consideration the size and nature of such charitable entities in relation to the company’s size and industry along with any other relevant factors such as the director’s role at the charity. However, unlike for other types of related party transactions, Glass Lewis generally does not apply a look-back period to affiliated relationships involving charitable contributions; if the relationship ceases, we will consider the director to be independent.

through compensation paid by the company (i.e., salary, bonus, etc. as a company employee) faces a conflict between making decisions that are in the best interests of the company versus those in the director's own best interests. Therefore, we will recommend voting against such a director.

Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Board Independence

Glass Lewis believes a board will be most effective in protecting shareholders' interests if it is at least two-thirds independent. We note that each of the Business Roundtable, the Conference Board, and the Council of Institutional Investors advocates that two-thirds of the board be independent. Where more than one-third of the members are affiliated or inside directors, we typically⁵ recommend voting against some of the inside and/or affiliated directors in order to satisfy the two-thirds threshold.

However, where a director serves on a board as a representative (as part of his or her basic responsibilities) of an investment firm with greater than 20% ownership, we will generally consider him/her to be affiliated but will not recommend voting against unless (i) the investment firm has disproportionate board representation or (ii) the director serves on the audit committee.

In the case of a less than two-thirds independent board, Glass Lewis strongly supports the existence of a presiding or lead director with authority to set the meeting agendas and to lead sessions outside the insider chairman's presence.

In addition, we scrutinize avowedly "independent" chairmen and lead directors. We believe that they should be unquestionably independent or the company should not tout them as such.

Committee Independence

We believe that *only* independent directors should serve on a company's audit, compensation, nominating, and governance committees.⁶ We typically recommend that shareholders vote against any affiliated or inside director seeking appointment to an audit, compensation, nominating, or governance committee, or who has served in that capacity in the past year.

Independent Chairman

Glass Lewis believes that separating the roles of CEO (or, more rarely, another executive position) and chairman creates a better governance structure than a combined CEO/chairman position. An executive manages the business according to a course the board charts. Executives should report to the board regarding their performance in achieving goals the board set. This is needlessly complicated when a CEO chairs the board, since a CEO/chairman presumably will have a significant influence over the board.

It can become difficult for a board to fulfill its role of overseer and policy setter when a CEO/chairman controls the agenda and the boardroom discussion. Such control can allow a CEO to have an entrenched position, leading to longer-than-optimal terms, fewer checks on management,

⁵With a staggered board, if the affiliates or insiders that we believe should not be on the board are not up for election, we will express our concern regarding those directors, but we will not recommend voting against the other affiliates or insiders who are up for election just to achieve two-thirds independence. However, we will consider recommending voting against the directors subject to our concern at their next election if the concerning issue is not resolved.

⁶We will recommend voting against an audit committee member who owns 20% or more of the company's stock, and we believe that there should be a maximum of one director (or no directors if the committee is comprised of less than three directors) who owns 20% or more of the company's stock on the compensation, nominating, and governance committees.

less scrutiny of the business operation, and limitations on independent, shareholder-focused goal-setting by the board.

A CEO should set the strategic course for the company, with the board's approval, and the board should enable the CEO to carry out the CEO's vision for accomplishing the board's objectives. Failure to achieve the board's objectives should lead the board to replace that CEO with someone in whom the board has confidence.

Likewise, an independent chairman can better oversee executives and set a pro-shareholder agenda without the management conflicts that a CEO and other executive insiders often face. Such oversight and concern for shareholders allows for a more proactive and effective board of directors that is better able to look out for the interests of shareholders.

Further, it is the board's responsibility to select a chief executive who can best serve a company and its shareholders and to replace this person when his or her duties have not been appropriately fulfilled. Such a replacement becomes more difficult and happens less frequently when the chief executive is also in the position of overseeing the board.

We recognize that empirical evidence regarding the separation of these two roles remains inconclusive. However, Glass Lewis believes that the installation of an independent chairman is almost always a positive step from a corporate governance perspective and promotes the best interests of shareholders. Further, the presence of an independent chairman fosters the creation of a thoughtful and dynamic board, not dominated by the views of senior management. Encouragingly, many companies appear to be moving in this direction—one study even indicates that less than 12 percent of incoming CEOs in 2009 were awarded the chairman title, versus 48 percent as recently as 2002.⁷ Another study finds that 40 percent of S&P 500 boards now separate the CEO and chairman roles, up from 23 percent in 2000, although the same study found that only 19 percent of S&P 500 chairs are independent, versus 9 percent in 2005.⁸

We do not recommend that shareholders vote against CEOs who chair the board. However, we typically encourage our clients to support separating the roles of chairman and CEO whenever that question is posed in a proxy (typically in the form of a shareholder proposal), as we believe that it is in the long-term best interests of the company and its shareholders.

Performance

The most crucial test of a board's commitment to the company and its shareholders lies in the actions of the board and its members. We look at the performance of these individuals as directors and executives of the company and of other companies where they have served.

Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Performance

We disfavor directors who have a record of not fulfilling their responsibilities to shareholders at any company where they have held a board or executive position. We typically recommend voting against:

⁷ Ken Favaro, Per-Ola Karlsson and Gary Neilson. "CEO Succession 2000-2009: A Decade of Convergence and Compression." Booz & Company (from Strategy+Business, Issue 59, Summer 2010). **A-37**

⁸Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2010, p. 4.

1. A director who fails to attend a minimum of 75% of board and applicable committee meetings, calculated in the aggregate.⁹
2. A director who belatedly filed a significant form(s) 4 or 5, or who has a pattern of late filings if the late filing was the director's fault (we look at these late filing situations on a case-by-case basis).
3. A director who is also the CEO of a company where a serious and material restatement has occurred after the CEO had previously certified the pre-restatement financial statements.
4. A director who has received two against recommendations from Glass Lewis for identical reasons within the prior year at different companies (the same situation must also apply at the company being analyzed).
5. All directors who served on the board if, for the last three years, the company's performance has been in the bottom quartile of the sector and the directors have not taken reasonable steps to address the poor performance.

Audit Committees and Performance

Audit committees play an integral role in overseeing the financial reporting process because “[v]ibrant and stable capital markets depend on, among other things, reliable, transparent, and objective financial information to support an efficient and effective capital market process. The vital oversight role audit committees play in the process of producing financial information has never been more important.”¹⁰

When assessing an audit committee's performance, we are aware that an audit committee does not prepare financial statements, is not responsible for making the key judgments and assumptions that affect the financial statements, and does not audit the numbers or the disclosures provided to investors. Rather, an audit committee member monitors and oversees the process and procedures that management and auditors perform. The 1999 Report and Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Improving the Effectiveness of Corporate Audit Committees stated it best:

A proper and well-functioning system exists, therefore, when the three main groups responsible for financial reporting – the full board including the audit committee, financial management including the internal auditors, and the outside auditors – form a ‘three legged stool’ that supports responsible financial disclosure and active participatory oversight. However, in the view of the Committee, the audit committee must be ‘first among equals’ in this process, since the audit committee is an extension of the full board and hence the ultimate monitor of the process.

Standards for Assessing the Audit Committee

For an audit committee to function effectively on investors' behalf, it must include members with sufficient knowledge to diligently carry out their responsibilities. In its audit and accounting

⁹However, where a director has served for less than one full year, we will typically not recommend voting against for failure to attend 75% of meetings. Rather, we will note the poor attendance with a recommendation to track this issue going forward. We will also refrain from recommending to vote against directors when the proxy discloses that the director missed the meetings due to serious illness or other extenuating circumstances.

¹⁰Audit Committee Effectiveness – What Works Best.” PricewaterhouseCoopers. The Institute of Internal Auditors Research Foundation. 2005.

recommendations, the Conference Board Commission on Public Trust and Private Enterprise said “members of the audit committee must be independent and have both knowledge and experience in auditing financial matters.”

1

We are skeptical of audit committees where there are ¹ members that lack expertise as a Certified Public Accountant (CPA), Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or corporate controller or similar experience. While we will not necessarily vote against members of an audit committee when such expertise is lacking, we are more likely to vote against committee members when a problem such as a restatement occurs and such expertise is lacking.

Glass Lewis generally assesses audit committees against the decisions they make with respect to their oversight and monitoring role. The quality and integrity of the financial statements and earnings reports, the completeness of disclosures necessary for investors to make informed decisions, and the effectiveness of the internal controls should provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements are materially free from errors. The independence of the external auditors and the results of their work all provide useful information by which to assess the audit committee.

When assessing the decisions and actions of the audit committee, we typically defer to its judgment and would vote in favor of its members, but we would recommend voting against the following members under the following circumstances:¹²

1. All members of the audit committee when options were backdated, there is a lack of adequate controls in place, there was a resulting restatement, and disclosures indicate there was a lack of documentation with respect to the option grants.
2. The audit committee chair, if the audit committee does not have a financial expert or the committee’s financial expert does not have a demonstrable financial background sufficient to understand the financial issues unique to public companies.
3. The audit committee chair, if the audit committee did not meet at least 4 times during the year.
4. The audit committee chair, if the committee has less than three members.
5. Any audit committee member who sits on more than three public company audit committees, unless the audit committee member is a retired CPA, CFO, controller or has similar experience, in which case the limit shall be four committees, taking time and availability into consideration including a review of the audit committee member’s attendance at all board and committee meetings.¹³
6. All members of an audit committee who are up for election and who served on the committee at the time of the audit, if audit and audit-related fees total one-third or less of the total fees billed by the auditor.

¹¹Commission on Public Trust and Private Enterprise. The Conference Board. 2003.

¹²Where the recommendation is to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against the members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern with regard to the committee chair.

¹³Glass Lewis may exempt certain audit committee members from the above threshold if, upon further analysis of relevant factors such as the director’s experience, the size, industry-mix and location of the companies involved and the director’s attendance at all the companies, we can reasonably determine that the audit committee member is likely not hindered by multiple audit committee commitments.

7. The audit committee chair when tax and/or other fees are greater than audit and audit-related fees paid to the auditor for more than one year in a row (in which case we also recommend against ratification of the auditor).
8. All members of an audit committee where non-audit fees include fees for tax services (including, but not limited to, such things as tax avoidance or shelter schemes) for senior executives of the company. Such services are now prohibited by the PCAOB.
9. All members of an audit committee that reappointed an auditor that we no longer consider to be independent for reasons unrelated to fee proportions.
10. All members of an audit committee when audit fees are excessively low, especially when compared with other companies in the same industry.
11. The audit committee chair¹⁴ if the committee failed to put auditor ratification on the ballot for shareholder approval. However, if the non-audit fees or tax fees exceed audit plus audit-related fees in either the current or the prior year, then Glass Lewis will recommend voting against the entire audit committee.
12. All members of an audit committee where the auditor has resigned and reported that a section 10A¹⁵ letter has been issued.
13. All members of an audit committee at a time when material accounting fraud occurred at the company.¹⁶
14. All members of an audit committee at a time when annual and/or multiple quarterly financial statements had to be restated, and any of the following factors apply:
 - The restatement involves fraud or manipulation by insiders;
 - The restatement is accompanied by an SEC inquiry or investigation;
 - The restatement involves revenue recognition;
 - The restatement results in a greater than 5% adjustment to costs of goods sold, operating expense, or operating cash flows; or
 - The restatement results in a greater than 5% adjustment to net income, 10% adjustment to assets or shareholders equity, or cash flows from financing or investing activities.
15. All members of an audit committee if the company repeatedly fails to file its financial reports in a timely fashion. For example, the company has filed two or more quarterly or annual financial statements late within the last 5 quarters.
16. All members of an audit committee when it has been disclosed that a law enforcement agency has charged the company and/or its employees with a violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA).

¹⁴In all cases, if the chair of the committee is not specified, we recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest.

¹⁵Auditors are required to report all potential illegal acts to management and the audit committee unless they are clearly inconsequential in nature. If the audit committee or the board fails to take appropriate action on an act that has been determined to be a violation of the law, the independent auditor is required to send a section 10A letter to the SEC. Such letters are rare and therefore we believe should be taken seriously.

¹⁶Recent research indicates that revenue fraud now accounts for over 60% of SEC fraud cases, and that companies that engage in fraud experience significant negative abnormal stock price declines—facing bankruptcy, delisting, and material asset sales at much higher rates than do non-fraud firms (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. “Fraudulent Financial Reporting: 1998-2007.” May 2010).

17. All members of an audit committee when the company has aggressive accounting policies and/or poor disclosure or lack of sufficient transparency in its financial statements.

18. All members of the audit committee when there is a disagreement with the auditor and the auditor resigns or is dismissed.

19. All members of the audit committee if the contract with the auditor specifically limits the auditor's liability to the company for damages.¹⁷

20. All members of the audit committee who served since the date of the company's last annual meeting, and when, since the last annual meeting, the company has reported a material weakness that has not yet been corrected, or, when the company has an ongoing material weakness from a prior year that has not yet been corrected.

We also take a dim view of audit committee reports that are boilerplate, and which provide little or no information or transparency to investors. When a problem such as a material weakness, restatement or late filings occurs, we take into consideration, in forming our judgment with respect to the audit committee, the transparency of the audit committee report.

Compensation Committee Performance

Compensation committees have the final say in determining the compensation of executives. This includes deciding the basis on which compensation is determined, as well as the amounts and types of compensation to be paid. This process begins with the hiring and initial establishment of employment agreements, including the terms for such items as pay, pensions and severance arrangements. It is important in establishing compensation arrangements that compensation be consistent with, and based on the long-term economic performance of, the business's long-term shareholders returns.

Compensation committees are also responsible for the oversight of the transparency of compensation. This oversight includes disclosure of compensation arrangements, the matrix used in assessing pay for performance, and the use of compensation consultants. In order to ensure the independence of the compensation consultant, we believe the compensation committee should only engage a compensation consultant that is not also providing any services to the company or management apart from their contract with the compensation committee. It is important to investors that they have clear and complete disclosure of all the significant terms of compensation arrangements in order to make informed decisions with respect to the oversight and decisions of the compensation committee.

Finally, compensation committees are responsible for oversight of internal controls over the executive compensation process. This includes controls over gathering information used to determine compensation, establishment of equity award plans, and granting of equity awards. Lax controls can and have contributed to conflicting information being obtained, for example through the use of nonobjective consultants. Lax controls can also contribute to improper awards of compensation such as through granting of backdated or spring-loaded options, or granting of bonuses when triggers for bonus payments have not been met.

Central to understanding the actions of a compensation committee is a careful review of the Compensation Discussion and Analysis (CD&A) report included in each company's proxy. We review the CD&A in our evaluation of the overall compensation practices of a company,

¹⁷ The Council of Institutional Investors. "Corporate Governance Policies," p. 4, April 5, 2006; and "Letter from Council of Institutional Investors to the AICPA," November 8, 2006.

as overseen by the compensation committee. The CD&A is also integral to the evaluation of compensation proposals at companies, such as advisory votes on executive compensation, which allow shareholders to vote on the compensation paid to a company's top executives.

In our evaluation of the CD&A, we examine, among other factors, the following:

1. The extent to which the company uses appropriate performance goals and metrics in determining overall compensation as an indication that pay is tied to performance.
2. How clearly the company discloses performance metrics and goals so that shareholders may make an independent determination that goals were met.
3. The extent to which the performance metrics, targets and goals are implemented to enhance company performance and encourage prudent risk-taking.
4. The selected peer group(s) so that shareholders can make a comparison of pay and performance across the appropriate peer group.
5. The extent to which the company benchmarks compensation levels at a specific percentile of its peer group along with the rationale for selecting such a benchmark.
6. The amount of discretion granted management or the compensation committee to deviate from defined performance metrics and goals in making awards, as well as the appropriateness of the use of such discretion.

We provide an overall evaluation of the quality and content of a company's executive compensation policies and procedures as disclosed in a CD&A as either good, fair or poor.

We evaluate compensation committee members on the basis of their performance while serving on the compensation committee in question, not for actions taken solely by prior committee members who are not currently serving on the committee. At companies that provide shareholders with non-binding advisory votes on executive compensation ("Say-on-Pay"), we will use the Say-on-Pay proposal as the initial, primary means to express dissatisfaction with the company's compensation policies and practices rather than recommending voting against members of the compensation committee (except in the most egregious cases).

When assessing the performance of compensation committees, we will recommend voting against for the following:¹⁸

1. All members of the compensation committee who are up for election and served at the time of poor pay-for-performance (e.g., a company receives an F grade in our pay-for-performance analysis) when shareholders are not provided with an advisory vote on executive compensation at the annual meeting.¹⁹

¹⁸Where the recommendation is to vote against the committee chair and the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern with regard to the committee chair.

¹⁹Where there are multiple CEOs in one year, we will consider not recommending against the compensation committee but will defer judgment on compensation policies and practices until the next year or a full year after arrival of the new CEO. In addition, if a company provides shareholders with a Say-on-Pay proposal and receives an F grade in our pay-for-performance model, we will recommend that shareholders only vote against the Say-on-Pay proposal rather than the members of the compensation committee, unless the company exhibits egregious practices. However, if the company receives successive F grades, we will then recommend against the members of the compensation committee in addition to recommending voting against the Say-on-Pay proposal.

2. Any member of the compensation committee who has served on the compensation committee of at least two other public companies that received F grades in our pay-for-performance model and who is also suspect at the company in question.
3. The compensation committee chair if the company received two D grades in consecutive years in our pay-for-performance analysis, and if during the past year the Company performed the same as or worse than its peers.²⁰
4. All members of the compensation committee (during the relevant time period) if the company entered into excessive employment agreements and/or severance agreements.
5. All members of the compensation committee when performance goals were changed (i.e., lowered) when employees failed or were unlikely to meet original goals, or performance-based compensation was paid despite goals not being attained.
6. All members of the compensation committee if excessive employee perquisites and benefits were allowed.
7. The compensation committee chair if the compensation committee did not meet during the year, but should have (e.g., because executive compensation was restructured or a new executive was hired).
8. All members of the compensation committee when the company repriced options or completed a “self tender offer” without shareholder approval within the past two years.
9. All members of the compensation committee when vesting of in-the-money options is accelerated or when fully vested options are granted.
10. All members of the compensation committee when option exercise prices were backdated. Glass Lewis will recommend voting against an executive director who played a role in and participated in option backdating.
11. All members of the compensation committee when option exercise prices were spring-loaded or otherwise timed around the release of material information.
12. All members of the compensation committee when a new employment contract is given to an executive that does not include a clawback provision and the company had a material restatement, especially if the restatement was due to fraud.
13. The chair of the compensation committee where the CD&A provides insufficient or unclear information about performance metrics and goals, where the CD&A indicates that pay is not tied to performance, or where the compensation committee or management has excessive discretion to alter performance terms or increase amounts of awards in contravention of previously defined targets.
- 14. All members of the compensation committee during whose tenure the committee failed to implement a shareholder proposal regarding a compensation-related issue, where the proposal received the affirmative vote of a majority of the voting shares at a shareholder meeting, and when a reasonable analysis suggests that the compensation committee (rather than the governance committee) should have taken steps to implement the request.**

²⁰In cases where the company received two D grades in consecutive years, but during the past year the company performed better than its peers or improved from an F to a D grade year over year, we refrain from recommending to vote against the compensation chair. In addition, if a company provides shareholders with a Say-on-Pay proposal in this instance, we will consider voting against the advisory vote rather than the compensation committee chair unless the company exhibits unquestionably egregious practices.

Nominating and Governance Committee Performance

The nominating and governance committee, as an agency for the shareholders, is responsible for the governance by the board of the company and its executives. In performing this role, the board is responsible and accountable for selection of objective and competent board members. It is also responsible for providing leadership on governance policies adopted by the company, such as decisions to implement shareholder proposals that have received a majority vote.

Consistent with Glass Lewis' philosophy that boards should have diverse backgrounds and members with a breadth and depth of relevant experience, we believe that nominating and governance committees should consider diversity when making director nominations within the context of each specific company and its industry. In our view, shareholders are best served when boards make an effort to ensure a constituency that is not only reasonably diverse on the basis of age, race, gender and ethnicity, but also on the basis of geographic knowledge, industry experience and culture.

Regarding the nominating and or governance committee, we will recommend voting against the following:²²

1. All members of the governance committee²³ during whose tenure the board failed to implement a shareholder proposal with a direct and substantial impact on shareholders and their rights - i.e., where the proposal received enough shareholder votes (at least a majority) to allow the board to implement or begin to implement that proposal.²⁴ Examples of these types of shareholder proposals are majority vote to elect directors and to declassify the board.
2. The governance committee chair,²⁵ when the chairman is not independent and an independent lead or presiding director has not been appointed.²⁶ We note that each of the Business Roundtable, The Conference Board, and the Council of Institutional Investors advocates that two-thirds of the board be independent.

²¹In all other instances (i.e. a non-compensation-related shareholder proposal should have been implemented) we recommend that shareholders vote against the members of the governance committee.

²²Where we would recommend to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern regarding the committee chair.

²³If the board does not have a governance committee (or a committee that serves such a purpose), we recommend voting against the entire board on this basis.

²⁴Where a compensation-related shareholder proposal should have been implemented, and when a reasonable analysis suggests that the members of the compensation committee (rather than the governance committee) bear the responsibility for failing to implement the request, we recommend that shareholders only vote against members of the compensation committee.

²⁵If the committee chair is not specified, we recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest. If the longest-serving committee member cannot be determined, we will recommend voting against the longest-serving board member serving on the committee.

²⁶We believe that one independent individual should be appointed to serve as the lead or presiding director. When such a position is rotated among directors from meeting to meeting, we will recommend voting against as if there were no lead or presiding director.

3. In the absence of a nominating committee, the governance committee chair when there are less than five or the whole nominating committee when there are more than 20 members on the board.
4. The governance committee chair, when the committee fails to meet at all during the year.
5. The governance committee chair, when for two consecutive years the company provides what we consider to be “inadequate” related party transaction disclosure (i.e. the nature of such transactions and/or the monetary amounts involved are unclear or excessively vague, thereby preventing an average shareholder from being able to reasonably interpret the independence status of multiple directors above and beyond what the company maintains is compliant with SEC or applicable stock-exchange listing requirements).

Regarding the nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the following:²⁷

1. All members of the nominating committee, when the committee nominated or renominated an individual who had a significant conflict of interest or whose past actions demonstrated a lack of integrity or inability to represent shareholder interests.
2. The nominating committee chair, if the nominating committee did not meet during the year, but should have (i.e., because new directors were nominated or appointed since the time of the last annual meeting).
3. In the absence of a governance committee, the nominating committee chair²⁸ when the chairman is not independent, and an independent lead or presiding director has not been appointed.²⁹
4. The nominating committee chair, when there are less than five or the whole nominating committee when there are more than 20 members on the board.³⁰
5. The nominating committee chair, when a director received a greater than 50% against vote the prior year and not only was the director not removed, but the issues that raised shareholder concern were not corrected.³¹

Board-level Risk Management Oversight

Glass Lewis evaluates the risk management function of a public company board on a strictly case-by-case basis. Sound risk management, while necessary at all companies, is particularly important at financial firms which inherently maintain significant exposure to financial risk. We

²⁷Where we would recommend to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will simply express our concern regarding the committee chair.

²⁸If the committee chair is not specified, we will recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest. If the longest-serving committee member cannot be determined, we will recommend voting against the longest-serving board member on the committee.

²⁹In the absence of both a governance and a nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the chairman of the board on this basis.

³⁰In the absence of both a governance and a nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the chairman of the board on this basis.

³¹Considering that shareholder discontent clearly relates to the director who received a greater than 50% against vote rather than the nominating chair, we review the validity of the issue(s) that initially raised shareholder concern, follow-up on such matters, and only recommend voting against the nominating chair if a reasonable analysis suggests that it would be most appropriate. In rare cases, we will consider recommending against the nominating chair when a director receives a substantial (i.e., 25% or more) vote against based on the same analysis.

believe such financial firms should have a chief risk officer reporting directly to the board and a dedicated risk committee or a committee of the board charged with risk oversight. Moreover, many non-financial firms maintain strategies which involve a high level of exposure to financial risk. Similarly, since many non-financial firms have significant hedging or trading strategies, including financial and non-financial derivatives, those firms should also have a chief risk officer and a risk committee.

Our views on risk oversight are consistent with those expressed by various regulatory bodies. In its December 2009 Final Rule release on Proxy Disclosure Enhancements, the SEC noted that risk oversight is a key competence of the board and that additional disclosures would improve investor and shareholder understanding of the role of the board in the organization's risk management practices. The final rules, which became effective on February 28, 2010, now explicitly require companies and mutual funds to describe (while allowing for some degree of flexibility) the board's role in the oversight of risk.

When analyzing the risk management practices of public companies, we take note of any significant losses or writedowns on financial assets and/or structured transactions. In cases where a company has disclosed a sizable loss or writedown, and where we find that the company's board-level risk committee contributed to the loss through poor oversight, we would recommend that shareholders vote against such committee members on that basis. In addition, in cases where a company maintains a significant level of financial risk exposure but fails to disclose any explicit form of board-level risk oversight (committee or otherwise)³², we will consider recommending to vote against the chairman of the board on that basis. However, we generally would not recommend voting against a combined chairman/CEO except in egregious cases.

Experience

We find that a director's past conduct is often indicative of future conduct and performance. We often find directors with a history of overpaying executives or of serving on boards where avoidable disasters have occurred appearing at companies that follow these same patterns. Glass Lewis has a proprietary database of every officer and director serving at 8,000 of the most widely held U.S. companies. We use this database to track the performance of directors across companies.

Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Director Experience

We typically recommend that shareholders vote against directors who have served on boards or as executives of companies with records of poor performance, inadequate risk oversight, overcompensation, audit- or accounting-related issues, and/or other indicators of mismanagement or actions against the interests of shareholders.³³

Likewise, we examine the backgrounds of those who serve on key board committees to ensure that they have the required skills and diverse backgrounds to make informed judgments about the subject matter for which the committee is responsible.

³²A committee responsible for risk management could be a dedicated risk committee, or another board committee, usually the audit committee but occasionally the finance committee, depending on a given company's board structure and method of disclosure. At some companies, the entire board is charged with risk management.

³³We typically apply a three-year look-back to such issues and also research to see whether the responsible directors have been up for election since the time of the failure, and if so, we take into account the percentage of support they received from shareholders.

Other Considerations

In addition to the three key characteristics – independence, performance, experience – that we use to evaluate board members, we consider conflict-of-interest issues in making voting recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest

We believe board members should be wholly free of identifiable and substantial conflicts of interest, regardless of the overall level of independent directors on the board. Accordingly, we recommend that shareholders vote against the following types of affiliated or inside directors:

1. A CFO who is on the board: In our view, the CFO holds a unique position relative to financial reporting and disclosure to shareholders. Because of the critical importance of financial disclosure and reporting, we believe the CFO should report to the board and not be a member of it.

2. A director who is on an excessive number of boards: We will typically recommend voting against a director who serves as an executive officer of any public company while serving on more than two other public company boards and any other director who serves on more than six public company boards typically receives an against recommendation from Glass Lewis. Academic literature suggests that one board takes up approximately 200 hours per year of each member's time. We believe this limits the number of boards on which directors can effectively serve, especially executives at other companies.³⁴ Further, we note a recent study has shown that the average number of outside board seats held by CEOs of S&P 500 companies is 0.6, down from 0.9 in 2005 and 1.4 in 2000.³⁵

3. A director, or a director who has an immediate family member, providing consulting or other material professional services to the company: These services may include legal, consulting, or financial services. We question the need for the company to have consulting relationships with its directors. We view such relationships as creating conflicts for directors, since they may be forced to weigh their own interests against shareholder interests when making board decisions. In addition, a company's decisions regarding where to turn for the best professional services may be compromised when doing business with the professional services firm of one of the company's directors.

4. A director, or a director who has an immediate family member, engaging in airplane, real estate, or similar deals, including perquisite-type grants from the company, amounting to more than \$50,000: Directors who receive these sorts of payments from the company will have to make unnecessarily complicated decisions that may pit their interests against shareholder interests.

³⁴Our guidelines are similar to the standards set forth by the NACD in its "Report of the NACD Blue Ribbon Commission on Director Professionalism," 2001 Edition, pp. 14-15 (also cited approvingly by the Conference Board in its "Corporate Governance Best Practices: A Blueprint for the Post-Enron Era," 2002, p. 17), which suggested that CEOs should not serve on more than 2 additional boards, persons with full-time work should not serve on more than 4 additional boards, and others should not serve on more than six boards.

³⁵Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2010, p. 8.

5. Interlocking directorships: CEOs or other top executives who serve on each other's boards create an interlock that poses conflicts that should be avoided to ensure the promotion of shareholder interests above all else.³⁶

6. All board members who served at a time when a poison pill was adopted without shareholder approval within the prior twelve months.

Size of the Board of Directors

While we do not believe there is a universally applicable optimum board size, we do believe boards should have at least five directors to ensure sufficient diversity in decision-making and to enable the formation of key board committees with independent directors. Conversely, we believe that boards with more than 20 members will typically suffer under the weight of "too many cooks in the kitchen" and have difficulty reaching consensus and making timely decisions. Sometimes the presence of too many voices can make it difficult to draw on the wisdom and experience in the room by virtue of the need to limit the discussion so that each voice may be heard.

To that end, we typically recommend voting against the chairman of the nominating committee at a board with fewer than five directors. With boards consisting of more than 20 directors, we typically recommend voting against all members of the nominating committee (or the governance committee, in the absence of a nominating committee).³⁷

Controlled Companies

Controlled companies present an exception to our independence recommendations. The board's function is to protect shareholder interests; however, when an individual or entity owns more than 50% of the voting shares, the interests of the majority of shareholders *are* the interests of that entity or individual. Consequently, Glass Lewis does not apply our usual two-thirds independence rule and therefore we will not recommend voting against boards whose composition reflects the makeup of the shareholder population.

Independence Exceptions

The independence exceptions that we make for controlled companies are as follows:

1. We do not require that controlled companies have boards that are at least two-thirds independent. So long as the insiders and/or affiliates are connected with the controlling entity, we accept the presence of non-independent board members.
2. The compensation committee and nominating and governance committees do not need to consist solely of independent directors.
 - a. We believe that standing nominating and corporate governance committees at controlled companies are unnecessary. Although having a committee charged with the duties of searching for, selecting, and nominating independent directors can be

³⁶We do not apply a look-back period for this situation. The interlock policy applies to both public and private companies. We will also evaluate multiple board interlocks among non-insiders (i.e. multiple directors serving on the same boards at other companies), for evidence of a pattern of poor oversight.

³⁷The Conference Board, at p. 23 in its report "Corporate Governance Best Practices, Id.," quotes one of its roundtable participants as stating, "[w]hen you've got a 20 or 30 person corporate board, it's one way of assuring that nothing is ever going to happen that the CEO doesn't want to happen."
A-48

beneficial, the unique composition of a controlled company's shareholder base makes such committees weak and irrelevant.

b. Likewise, we believe that independent compensation committees at controlled companies are unnecessary. Although independent directors are the best choice for approving and monitoring senior executives' pay, controlled companies serve a unique shareholder population whose voting power ensures the protection of its interests. As such, we believe that having affiliated directors on a controlled company's compensation committee is acceptable. However, given that a controlled company has certain obligations to minority shareholders we feel that an insider should not serve on the compensation committee. Therefore, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against any insider (the CEO or otherwise) serving on the compensation committee.

3. Controlled companies do not need an independent chairman or an independent lead or presiding director. Although an independent director in a position of authority on the board – such as chairman or presiding director – can best carry out the board's duties, controlled companies serve a unique shareholder population whose voting power ensures the protection of its interests.

4. Where an individual or entity owns more than 50% of a company's voting power but the company is not a "controlled" company as defined by relevant listing standards, we apply a lower independence requirement of a majority of the board but keep all other standards in place. Similarly, where an individual or entity holds between 20-50% of a company's voting power, but the company is *not* "controlled" and there is not a "majority" owner, we will allow for proportional representation on the board and committees (excluding the audit committee) based on the individual or entity's percentage of ownership.

Size of the Board of Directors

We have no board size requirements for controlled companies.

Audit Committee Independence

We believe that audit committees should consist solely of independent directors. Regardless of a company's controlled status, the interests of all shareholders must be protected by ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the company's financial statements. Allowing affiliated directors to oversee the preparation of financial reports could create an insurmountable conflict of interest.

Exceptions for Recent IPOs

We believe companies that have recently completed an initial public offering ("IPO") should be allowed adequate time to fully comply with marketplace listing requirements as well as to meet basic corporate governance standards. We believe a one-year grace period immediately following the date of a company's IPO is sufficient time for most companies to comply with all relevant regulatory requirements and to meet such corporate governance standards. Except in egregious cases, Glass Lewis refrains from issuing voting recommendations on the basis of corporate governance best practices (eg. board independence, committee membership and structure, meeting attendance, etc.) during the one-year period following an IPO.

However, in cases where a board implements a poison pill preceding an IPO, we will consider voting against the members of the board who served during the period of the poison pill's adoption if the board (i) did not also commit to submit the poison pill to a shareholder vote within 12 months of the IPO

or (ii) did not provide a sound rationale for adopting the pill and the pill does not expire in three years or less. In our view, adopting such an anti-takeover device unfairly penalizes future shareholders who (except for electing to buy or sell the stock) are unable to weigh in on a matter that could potentially negatively impact their ownership interest. This notion is strengthened when a board adopts a poison pill with a 5-10 year life immediately prior to having a public shareholder base so as to insulate for a substantial amount of time while postponing and/or avoiding allowing public shareholders the ability to vote on the pill's adoption. Such instances are indicative of boards that may subvert shareholders' best interests following their IPO.

Mutual Fund Boards

Mutual fund, or investment companies, are structured differently from regular public companies (i.e., operating companies). Typically, members of a fund's adviser are on the board and management takes on a different role from that of regular public companies. Thus, we focus on a short list of requirements, although many of our guidelines remain the same.

The following mutual fund policies are similar to the policies for regular public companies:

1. **Size of the board of directors:** The board should be made up of between five and twenty directors.
2. **The CFO on the board:** Neither the CFO of the fund nor the CFO of the fund's registered investment adviser should serve on the board.
3. **Independence of the audit committee:** The audit committee should consist solely of independent directors.
4. **Audit committee financial expert:** At least one member of the audit committee should be designated as the audit committee financial expert.

The following differences from regular public companies apply at mutual funds:

1. **Independence of the board:** We believe that three-fourths of an investment company's board should be made up of independent directors. This is consistent with a proposed SEC rule on investment company boards. The Investment Company Act requires 40% of the board to be independent, but in 2001, the SEC amended the Exemptive Rules to require that a majority of a mutual funds board be independent. In 2005, the SEC proposed increasing the independence threshold to 75%. In 2006, a federal appeals court ordered that this rule amendment be put back out for public comment, putting it back into "proposed rule" status. Since mutual funds boards play a vital role in overseeing the relationship between the funds and its investment manager, there is greater need for independent oversight than there is for an operating company board.
2. **When the auditor is not up for ratification:** We do not recommend voting against the audit committee if the auditor is not up for ratification because, due to the different legal structure of an investment company compared to an operating company, the auditor for the investment company (i.e., mutual funds) does not conduct the same level of financial review for each investment company as for an operating company.

3. **Non-independent chairman:** The SEC has proposed that the chairman of the funds board be

Although we believe this would be best at all companies, we recommend voting against the independent. We agree that the roles of a mutual funds' chairman and CEO should be separate.

board if the chairman and CEO of a mutual Funds are the same person and the funds does not have an independent lead or presiding director. Seven former SEC commissioners support the chairman of an investment company's nominating committee as well as the chairman of the

appointment of an independent chairman and we agree with them that “an independent board chairman would be better able to create conditions favoring the long-term interests of funds shareholders than would a chairman who is an executive of the adviser.” (See the comment letter sent to the SEC in support of the proposed rule at <http://sec.gov/rules/proposed/s70304/s70304-179.pdf>)

DECLASSIFIED BOARDS

Glass Lewis favors the repeal of staggered boards and the annual election of directors. We believe staggered boards are less accountable to shareholders than boards that are elected annually. Furthermore, we feel the annual election of directors encourages board members to focus on shareholder interests.

Empirical studies have shown: (i) companies with staggered boards reduce a firm’s value; and (ii) in the context of hostile takeovers, staggered boards operate as a takeover defense, which entrenches management, discourages potential acquirers, and delivers a lower return to target shareholders.

In our view, there is no evidence to demonstrate that staggered boards improve shareholder returns in a takeover context. Research shows that shareholders are worse off when a staggered board blocks a transaction. A study by a group of Harvard Law professors concluded that companies whose staggered boards prevented a takeover “reduced shareholder returns for targets ... on the order of eight to ten percent in the nine months after a hostile bid was announced.”³⁸ When a staggered board negotiates a friendly transaction, no statistically significant difference in premiums occurs.³⁹ Further, one of those same professors found that charter-based staggered boards “reduce the market value of a firm by 4% to 6% of its market capitalization” and that “staggered boards bring about and not merely reflect this reduction in market value.”⁴⁰ A subsequent study reaffirmed that classified boards reduce shareholder value, finding “that the ongoing process of dismantling staggered boards, encouraged by institutional investors, could well contribute to increasing shareholder wealth.”⁴¹

Shareholders have increasingly come to agree with this view. In 2010 approximately 72% of S&P 500 companies had declassified boards, up from approximately 51% in 2005.⁴² Clearly, more shareholders have supported the repeal of classified boards. Resolutions relating to the repeal of staggered boards garnered on average over 70% support among shareholders in 2008, whereas in 1987, only 16.4% of votes cast favored board declassification.⁴³

Given the empirical evidence suggesting staggered boards reduce a company’s value and the increasing shareholder opposition to such a structure, Glass Lewis supports the declassification of boards and the annual election of directors.

³⁸Lucian Bebchuk, John Coates IV, Guhan Subramanian, “The Powerful Antitakeover Force of Staggered Boards: Further Findings and a Reply to Symposium Participants,” 55 *Stanford Law Review* 885-917 (2002), page 1.

³⁹Id. at 2 (“Examining a sample of seventy-three negotiated transactions from 2000 to 2002, we find no systematic benefits in terms of higher premia to boards that have [staggered structures].”).

⁴⁰Lucian Bebchuk, Alma Cohen, “The Costs of Entrenched Boards” (2004).

⁴¹Lucian Bebchuk, Alma Cohen and Charles C.Y. Wang, “Staggered Boards and the Wealth of Shareholders: Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1706806> (2010), p. 26.

⁴²Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2010, p. 14

⁴³Lucian Bebchuk, John Coates IV and Guhan Subramanian, “The Powerful Antitakeover Force of Staggered Boards: Theory, Evidence, and Policy,” 54 *Stanford Law Review* 887-951 (2002).

MANDATORY DIRECTOR RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

Director Term and Age Limits

Glass Lewis believes that director age and term limits typically are not in shareholders' best interests. Too often age and term limits are used by boards as a crutch to remove board members who have served for an extended period of time. When used in that fashion, they are indicative of a board that has a difficult time making "tough decisions."

Academic literature suggests that there is no evidence of a correlation between either length of tenure or age and director performance. On occasion, term limits can be used as a means to remove a director for boards that are unwilling to police their membership and to enforce turnover. Some shareholders support term limits as a way to force change when boards are unwilling to do so.

While we understand that age limits can be a way to force change where boards are unwilling to make changes on their own, the long-term impact of age limits restricts experienced and potentially valuable board members from service through an arbitrary means. Further, age limits unfairly imply that older (or, in rare cases, younger) directors cannot contribute to company oversight.

In our view, a director's experience can be a valuable asset to shareholders because of the complex, critical issues that boards face. However, we support periodic director rotation to ensure a fresh perspective in the boardroom and the generation of new ideas and business strategies. We believe the board should implement such rotation instead of relying on arbitrary limits. When necessary, shareholders can address the issue of director rotation through director elections.

We believe that shareholders are better off monitoring the board's approach to corporate governance and the board's stewardship of company performance rather than imposing inflexible rules that don't necessarily correlate with returns or benefits for shareholders.

However, if a board adopts term/age limits, it should follow through and not waive such limits. If the board waives its term/age limits, Glass Lewis will consider recommending shareholders vote against the nominating and/or governance committees, unless the rule was waived with sufficient explanation, such as consummation of a corporate transaction like a merger.

REQUIRING TWO OR MORE NOMINEES PER BOARD SEAT

In an attempt to address lack of access to the ballot, shareholders sometimes propose that the board give shareholders a choice of directors for each open board seat in every election. However, we feel that policies requiring a selection of multiple nominees for each board seat would discourage prospective directors from accepting nominations. A prospective director could not be confident either that he or she is the board's clear choice or that he or she would be elected. Therefore, Glass Lewis generally will vote against such proposals.

SHAREHOLDER ACCESS

Shareholders have continuously sought a way to have a significant voice in director elections in recent years. While most of these efforts have centered on regulatory change at the SEC, Congress and the Obama Administration have successfully placed "Proxy Access" in the spotlight of the U.S. Government's most recent corporate-governance-related financial reforms.

In July 2010, President Obama signed into law the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act"). The Dodd-Frank Act provides the SEC with the authority to adopt

rules permitting shareholders to use issuer proxy solicitation materials to nominate director candidates.

The SEC received over 500 comments regarding its proposed proxy access rule, some of which questioned the agency's authority to adopt such a rule. Nonetheless, in August 2010 the SEC adopted final Rule 14a-11, which under certain circumstances, gives shareholders (and shareholder groups) who have three years collectively held at least 3% of the voting power of a company's securities continuously for at least three years, the right to nominate up to 25% of a board's directors and have such nominees included on the company's ballot and described (in up to 500 words per nominee) in its proxy statement.

While final Rule 14a-11 was originally scheduled to take effect on November 15, 2010, on October 4, 2010, the SEC announced that it would delay the rule's implementation following the filing of a lawsuit by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable on September 29, 2010. As a result, it is unlikely shareholders will have the opportunity to vote on access proposals during the 2011 proxy season.

MAJORITY VOTE FOR THE ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

In stark contrast to the failure of shareholder access to gain acceptance, majority voting for the election of directors is fast becoming the *de facto* standard in corporate board elections. In our view, the majority voting proposals are an effort to make the case for shareholder impact on director elections on a company-specific basis.

While this proposal would not give shareholders the opportunity to nominate directors or lead to elections where shareholders have a choice among director candidates, if implemented, the proposal would allow shareholders to have a voice in determining whether the nominees proposed by the board should actually serve as the overseer-representatives of shareholders in the boardroom. We believe this would be a favorable outcome for shareholders.

During 2010, Glass Lewis tracked just under 35 proposals to require a majority vote to elect directors at annual meetings in the U.S., a slight decline from 46 proposals in 2009, but a sharp contrast to the 147 proposals tracked during 2006. The general decline in the number of proposals being submitted was a result of many companies adopting some form of majority voting, including approximately 71% of companies in the S&P 500 index, up from 56% in 2008.⁴⁴ During 2009 these proposals received on average 59% shareholder support (based on for and against votes), up from 54% in 2008.

The plurality vote standard

Today, most US companies still elect directors by a plurality vote standard. Under that standard, if one shareholder holding only one share votes in favor of a nominee (including himself, if the director is a shareholder), that nominee "wins" the election and assumes a seat on the board. The common concern among companies with a plurality voting standard was the possibility that one or more directors would not receive a majority of votes, resulting in "failed elections." This was of particular concern during the 1980s, an era of frequent takeovers and contests for control of companies.

Advantages of a majority vote standard

If a majority vote standard were implemented, a nominee would have to receive the support of a majority of the shares voted in order to be elected. Thus, shareholders could collectively vote to reject a director they believe will not pursue their best interests. We think that this minimal amount of protection for shareholders is reasonable and will not upset the corporate structure nor reduce the willingness of qualified shareholder-focused directors to serve in the future.

We believe that a majority vote standard will likely lead to more attentive directors. Occasional use of this power will likely prevent the election of directors with a record of ignoring shareholder interests in favor of other interests that conflict with those of investors. Glass Lewis will generally support proposals calling for the election of directors by a majority vote except for use in contested director elections.

In response to the high level of support majority voting has garnered, many companies have voluntarily taken steps to implement majority voting or modified approaches to majority voting. These steps range from a modified approach requiring directors that receive a majority of withheld votes to resign (e.g., Ashland Inc.) to actually requiring a majority vote of outstanding shares to elect directors (e.g., Intel).

We feel that the modified approach does not go far enough because requiring a director to resign is not the same as requiring a majority vote to elect a director and does not allow shareholders a definitive voice in the election process. Further, under the modified approach, the corporate governance committee could reject a resignation and, even if it accepts the resignation, the corporate governance committee decides on the director's replacement. And since the modified approach is usually adopted as a policy by the board or a board committee, it could be altered by the same board or committee at any time.

AUDITOR RATIFICATION

The auditor's role as gatekeeper is crucial in ensuring the integrity and transparency of the financial information necessary for protecting shareholder value. Shareholders rely on the auditor to ask tough questions and to do a thorough analysis of a company's books to ensure that the information provided to shareholders is complete, accurate, fair, and that it is a reasonable representation of a company's financial position. The only way shareholders can make rational investment decisions is if the market is equipped with accurate information about a company's fiscal health. As stated in the October 6, 2008 Final Report of the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession to the U.S. Department of the Treasury:

"The auditor is expected to offer critical and objective judgment on the financial matters under consideration, and actual and perceived absence of conflicts is critical to that expectation. The Committee believes that auditors, investors, public companies, and other market participants must understand the independence requirements and their objectives, and that auditors must adopt a mindset of skepticism when facing situations that may compromise their independence."

As such, shareholders should demand an objective, competent and diligent auditor who performs at or above professional standards at every company in which the investors hold an interest. Like directors, auditors should be free from conflicts of interest and should avoid situations requiring a choice between the auditor's interests and the public's interests. Almost without exception, shareholders should be able to annually review an auditor's performance and to annually ratify a board's auditor selection. Moreover, in October 2008, the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession went even further, and recommended that "to further enhance audit committee oversight and auditor accountability ... disclosure in the company proxy statement regarding shareholder ratification [should] include the name(s) of the senior auditing partner(s) staffed on the engagement."⁴⁵

Voting Recommendations on Auditor Ratification

We generally support management's choice of auditor except when we believe the auditor's independence or audit integrity has been compromised. Where a board has not allowed shareholders to review and ratify an auditor, we typically recommend voting against the audit committee chairman. When there have been material restatements of annual financial statements or material weakness in internal controls, we usually recommend voting against the entire audit committee.

Reasons why we may not recommend ratification of an auditor include:

1. When audit fees plus audit-related fees total less than the tax fees and/or other non-audit fees.

⁴⁵Final Report of the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession to the U.S. Department of the Treasury." p. VIII:20, October 6, 2008.

2. Recent material restatements of annual financial statements, including those resulting in the reporting of material weaknesses in internal controls and including late filings by the company where the auditor bears some responsibility for the restatement or late filing.⁴⁶
3. When the auditor performs prohibited services such as tax-shelter work, tax services for the CEO or CFO, or contingent-fee work, such as a fee based on a percentage of economic benefit to the company.
4. When audit fees are excessively low, especially when compared with other companies in the same industry.
5. When the company has aggressive accounting policies.
6. When the company has poor disclosure or lack of transparency in its financial statements.
7. Where the auditor limited its liability through its contract with the company or the audit contract requires the corporation to use alternative dispute resolution procedures.
8. We also look for other relationships or concerns with the auditor that might suggest a conflict between the auditor's interests and shareholder interests.

We typically support audit-related proposals regarding mandatory auditor rotation when the proposal uses a reasonable period of time (usually not less than 5-7 years).

PENSION ACCOUNTING ISSUES

A pension accounting question often raised in proxy proposals is what effect, if any, projected returns on employee pension assets should have on a company's net income. This issue often arises in the executive-compensation context in a discussion of the extent to which pension accounting should be reflected in business performance for purposes of calculating payments to executives.

Glass Lewis believes that pension credits should not be included in measuring income that is used to award performance-based compensation. Because many of the assumptions used in accounting for retirement plans are subject to the company's discretion, management would have an obvious conflict of interest if pay were tied to pension income. In our view, projected income from pensions does not truly reflect a company's performance.

⁴⁶An auditor does not audit interim financial statements. Thus, we generally do not believe that an auditor should be opposed due to a restatement of interim financial statements unless the nature of the misstatement is clear from a reading of the incorrect financial statements.

III. The Link Between Compensation and Performance

Glass Lewis carefully reviews the compensation awarded to senior executives, as we believe that this is an important area in which the board's priorities are revealed. Glass Lewis strongly believes executive compensation should be linked directly with the performance of the business the executive is charged with managing. We believe the most effective compensation arrangements provide for an appropriate mix of performance-based short- and long-term incentives in addition to base salary.

Glass Lewis believes that comprehensive, timely and transparent disclosure of executive pay is critical to allowing shareholders to evaluate the extent to which the pay is keeping pace with company performance. When reviewing proxy materials, Glass Lewis examines whether the company discloses the performance metrics used to determine executive compensation. We recognize performance metrics must necessarily vary depending on the company and industry, among other factors, and may include items such as total shareholder return, earning per share growth, return on equity, return on assets and revenue growth. However, we believe companies should disclose why the specific performance metrics were selected and how the actions they are designed to incentivize will lead to better corporate performance.

Moreover, it is rarely in shareholders' interests to disclose competitive data about individual salaries below the senior executive level. Such disclosure could create internal personnel discord that would be counterproductive for the company and its shareholders. While we favor full disclosure for senior executives and we view pay disclosure at the aggregate level (e.g., the number of employees being paid over a certain amount or in certain categories) as potentially useful, we do not believe shareholders need or will benefit from detailed reports about individual management employees other than the most senior executives.

ADVISORY VOTE ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ("SAY-ON-PAY")

On July 21, 2010, President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act"), providing for sweeping financial and governance reforms. One of the most important reforms is found in Section 951(a) of the Dodd-Frank Act, which requires companies to hold an advisory vote on executive compensation at the first shareholder meeting that occurs six months after enactment (January 21, 2011). Further, since section 957 of the Dodd-Frank Act prohibits broker discretionary voting in connection with shareholder votes with respect to executive compensation, beginning in 2011 a majority vote in support of advisory votes on executive compensation may become more difficult for companies to obtain.

This practice of allowing shareholders a non-binding vote on a company's compensation report is standard practice in many non-US countries, and has been a requirement for most companies in the United Kingdom since 2003 and in Australia since 2005. Although Say-on-Pay proposals are non-binding, a high level of "against" or "abstain" votes indicate substantial shareholder concern about a company's compensation policies and procedures.

Given the complexity of most companies' compensation programs, Glass Lewis applies a highly nuanced approach when analyzing advisory votes on executive compensation. We review each company's compensation on a case-by-case basis, recognizing that each company must be examined in the context of industry, size, maturity, performance, financial condition, its historic pay for performance practices, and any other relevant internal or external factors.

We believe that each company should design and apply specific compensation policies and practices that are appropriate to the circumstances of the company and, in particular, will attract and retain competent executives and other staff, while motivating them to grow the company's long-term shareholder value.

Where we find those specific policies and practices serve to reasonably align compensation with performance, and such practices are adequately disclosed, Glass Lewis will recommend supporting the company's approach. If, however, those specific policies and practices fail to demonstrably link compensation with performance, Glass Lewis will generally recommend voting against the say-on-pay proposal.

Glass Lewis focuses on four main areas when reviewing Say-on-Pay proposals:

- The overall design and structure of the Company's executive compensation program including performance metrics;
- The quality and content of the Company's disclosure;
- The quantum paid to executives; and
- The link between compensation and performance as indicated by the Company's current and past pay-for-performance grades

We also review any significant changes or modifications, and rationale for such changes, made to the Company's compensation structure or award amounts, including base salaries.

Say-on-Pay Voting Recommendations

In cases where we find deficiencies in a company's compensation program's design, implementation or management, we will recommend that shareholders vote against the Say-on-Pay proposal. Generally such instances include evidence of a pattern of poor pay-for-performance practices (i.e., deficient or failing pay for performance grades), unclear or questionable disclosure regarding the overall compensation structure (e.g., limited information regarding benchmarking processes, limited rationale for bonus performance metrics and targets, etc.), questionable adjustments to certain aspects of the overall compensation structure (e.g., limited rationale for significant changes to performance targets or metrics, the payout of guaranteed bonuses or sizable retention grants, etc.), and/or other egregious compensation practices.

Although not an exhaustive list, the following issues when weighed together may cause Glass Lewis to recommend voting against a say-on-pay vote:

- Inappropriate peer group and/or benchmarking issues
- Inadequate or no rationale for changes to peer groups
- Egregious or excessive bonuses, equity awards or severance payments, including golden handshakes and golden parachutes
- Guaranteed bonuses
- Targeting overall levels of compensation at higher than median without adequate justification
- Bonus or long-term plan targets set at less than mean or negative performance levels
- Performance targets not sufficiently challenging, and/or providing for high potential payouts
- Performance targets lowered, without justification
- Discretionary bonuses paid when short- or long-term incentive plan targets were not met

- Executive pay high relative to peers not justified by outstanding company performance
- The terms of the long-term incentive plans are inappropriate (please see “Long-Term Incentives” below)

In the instance that a company has simply failed to provide sufficient disclosure of its policies, we may recommend shareholders vote against this proposal solely on this basis, regardless of the appropriateness of compensation levels.

In the case of companies that maintain poor compensation policies year after year without any showing they took steps to address the issues, we may also recommend that shareholders vote against the chairman and/or additional members of the compensation committee. We may also recommend voting against the compensation committee based on the practices or actions of its members, such as approving large one-off payments, the inappropriate use of discretion, or sustained poor pay for performance practices.

Short-Term Incentives

A short-term bonus or incentive (“STI”) should be demonstrably tied to performance. Whenever possible, we believe a mix of corporate and individual performance measures is appropriate. We would normally expect performance measures for STIs to be based on internal financial measures such as net profit after tax, EPS growth and divisional profitability as well as non-financial factors such as those related to safety, environmental issues, and customer satisfaction. However, we accept variations from these metrics if they are tied to the Company’s business drivers.

Further, the target and potential maximum awards that can be achieved under STI awards should be disclosed. Shareholders should expect stretching performance targets for the maximum award to be achieved. Any increase in the potential maximum award should be clearly justified to shareholders.

Glass Lewis recognizes that disclosure of some measures may include commercially confidential information. Therefore, we believe it may be reasonable to exclude such information in some cases as long as the company provides sufficient justification for non-disclosure. However, where a short-term bonus has been paid, companies should disclose the extent to which performance has been achieved against relevant targets, including disclosure of the actual target achieved.

Where management has received significant STIs but short-term performance as measured by such indicators as increase in profit and/or EPS growth over the previous year *prima facie* appears to be poor or negative, we believe the company should provide a clear explanation why these significant short-term payments were made.

Long-Term Incentives

Glass Lewis recognizes the value of equity-based incentive programs. When used appropriately, they can provide a vehicle for linking an executive’s pay to company performance, thereby aligning their interests with those of shareholders. In addition, equity-based compensation can be an effective way to attract, retain and motivate key employees.

There are certain elements that Glass Lewis believes are common to most well-structured long-term incentive (“LTI”) plans. These include:

- No re-testing or lowering of performance conditions
- Performance metrics that cannot be easily manipulated by management
- Two or more performance metrics

- At least one relative performance metric that compares the company's performance to a relevant peer group or index
- Performance periods of at least three years
- Stretching metrics that incentivize executives to strive for outstanding performance
- Individual limits expressed as a percentage of base salary

Performance measures should be carefully selected and should relate to the specific business/industry in which the company operates and, especially, the key value drivers of the company's business.

Glass Lewis believes that measuring a company's performance with multiple metrics serves to provide a more complete picture of the company's performance than a single metric, which may focus too much management attention on a single target and is therefore more susceptible to manipulation. External benchmarks should be disclosed and transparent, such as total shareholder return ("TSR") against a well-selected sector index, peer group or other performance hurdle. The rationale behind the selection of a specific index or peer group should be disclosed. Internal benchmarks (e.g. earnings per share growth) should also be disclosed and transparent, unless a cogent case for confidentiality is made and fully explained.

We also believe shareholders should evaluate the relative success of a company's compensation programs, particularly existing equity-based incentive plans, in linking pay and performance in evaluating new LTI plans to determine the impact of additional stock awards. We will therefore review the company's pay-for-performance grade, see below for more information, and specifically the proportion of total compensation that is stock-based.

Pay for Performance

Glass Lewis believes an integral part of a well-structured compensation package is a successful link between pay and performance. Therefore, Glass Lewis developed a proprietary pay-for-performance model to evaluate the link between pay and performance of the top five executives at US companies. Our model benchmarks these executives' pay and company performance against four peer groups and across seven performance metrics. Using a forced curve and a school letter-grade system, we grade companies from A-F according to their pay-for-performance linkage. The grades guide our evaluation of compensation committee effectiveness and we generally recommend voting against compensation committee of companies with a pattern of failing our pay-for-performance analysis.

We also use this analysis to inform our voting decisions on say-on-pay proposals. As such, if a company receives a failing grade from our proprietary model, we are likely to recommend shareholders to vote against the say-on-pay proposal. However, there may be exceptions to this rule such as when a company makes significant enhancements to its compensation programs.

Recoupment ("Clawback") Provisions

Section 954 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the SEC to create a rule requiring listed companies to adopt policies for recouping certain compensation during a three-year look-back period. The rule applies to incentive-based compensation paid to current or former executives if the company is required to prepare an accounting restatement due to erroneous data resulting from material non-compliance with any financial reporting requirements under the securities laws.

These recoupment provisions are more stringent than under Section 304 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in three respects: (i) the provisions extend to current or former executive officers rather than only to the

CEO and CFO; (ii) it has a three-year look-back period (rather than a twelve-month look-back period); and (iii) it allows for recovery of compensation based upon a financial restatement due to erroneous data, and therefore does not require misconduct on the part of the executive or other employees.

Frequency of Say-on-Pay

The Dodd-Frank Act also requires companies to allow shareholders a non-binding vote on the frequency of say-on-pay votes, i.e. every one, two or three years. Additionally, Dodd-Frank requires companies to hold such votes on the frequency of say-on-pay votes at least once every six years.

We believe companies should submit say-on-pay votes to shareholders every year. We believe that the time and financial burdens to a company with regard to an annual vote are relatively small and incremental and are outweighed by the benefits to shareholders through more frequent accountability. Implementing biannual or triennial votes on executive compensation limits shareholders' ability to hold the board accountable for its compensation practices through means other than voting against the compensation committee. Unless a company provides a compelling rationale or unique circumstances for say-on-pay votes less frequent than annually, we will generally recommend that shareholders support annual votes on compensation.

Vote on Golden Parachute Arrangements

The Dodd-Frank Act also requires companies to provide shareholders with a separate non-binding vote on approval of golden parachute compensation arrangements in connection with certain change-in-control transactions. However, if the golden parachute arrangements have previously been subject to a say-on-pay vote which shareholders approved, then this required vote is waived.

Glass Lewis believes the narrative and tabular disclosure of golden parachute arrangements will benefit all shareholders. Glass Lewis will analyze each golden parachute arrangement on a case-by-case basis, taking into account, among other items: the ultimate value of the payments, the tenure and position of the executives in question, and the type of triggers involved (single vs double).

EQUITY-BASED COMPENSATION PLAN PROPOSALS

We believe that equity compensation awards are useful, when not abused, for retaining employees and providing an incentive for them to act in a way that will improve company performance. Glass Lewis evaluates option- and other equity-based compensation plans using a detailed model and analytical review.

Equity-based compensation programs have important differences from cash compensation plans and bonus programs. Accordingly, our model and analysis takes into account factors such as plan administration, the method and terms of exercise, repricing history, express or implied rights to reprice, and the presence of evergreen provisions.

Our analysis is quantitative and focused on the plan's cost as compared with the business's operating metrics. We run twenty different analyses, comparing the program with absolute limits we believe are key to equity value creation and with a carefully chosen peer group. In general, our model seeks to determine whether the proposed plan is either absolutely excessive or is more than one standard deviation away from the average plan for the peer group on a range of criteria, including dilution to shareholders and the projected annual cost relative to the company's financial performance. Each of the twenty analyses (and their constituent parts) is weighted and the plan is scored in accordance with that weight.

In our analysis, we compare the program's expected annual expense with the business's operating metrics to help determine whether the plan is excessive in light of company performance. We also compare the option plan's expected annual cost to the enterprise value of the firm rather than to market capitalization because the employees, managers and directors of the firm contribute to the creation of enterprise value but not necessarily market capitalization (the biggest difference is seen where cash represents the vast majority of market capitalization). Finally, we do not rely exclusively on relative comparisons with averages because, in addition to creeping averages serving to inflate compensation, we believe that academic literature proves that some absolute limits are warranted.

We evaluate equity plans based on certain overarching principles:

1. Companies should seek more shares only when needed.
2. Requested share amounts should be small enough that companies seek shareholder approval every three to four years (or more frequently).
3. If a plan is relatively expensive, it should not grant options solely to senior executives and board members.
4. Annual net share count and voting power dilution should be limited.
5. Annual cost of the plan (especially if not shown on the income statement) should be reasonable as a percentage of financial results and should be in line with the peer group.
6. The expected annual cost of the plan should be proportional to the business's value.
7. The intrinsic value that option grantees received in the past should be reasonable compared with the business's financial results.
8. Plans should deliver value on a per-employee basis when compared with programs at peer companies.
9. Plans should not permit re-pricing of stock options.
10. Plans should not contain excessively liberal administrative or payment terms.
11. Selected performance metrics should be challenging and appropriate, and should be subject to relative performance measurements.
12. Stock grants should be subject to minimum vesting and/or holding periods sufficient to ensure sustainable performance and promote retention.

Option Exchanges

Glass Lewis views option repricing plans and option exchange programs with great skepticism. Shareholders have substantial risk in owning stock and we believe that the employees, officers, and directors who receive stock options should be similarly situated to align their interests with shareholder interests.

We are concerned that option grantees who believe they will be "rescued" from underwater options will be more inclined to take unjustifiable risks. Moreover, a predictable pattern of repricing or exchanges substantially alters a stock option's value because options that will practically never expire deeply out of the money are worth far more than options that carry a risk of expiration.

In short, repricings and option exchange programs change the bargain between shareholders and employees after the bargain has been struck. Re-pricing is tantamount to re-trading.

There is one circumstance in which a repricing or option exchange program is acceptable: if macroeconomic or industry trends, rather than specific company issues, cause a stock's value to decline dramatically and the repricing is necessary to motivate and retain employees. In this circumstance, we think it fair to conclude that option grantees may be suffering from a risk that was not foreseeable when the original "bargain" was struck. In such a circumstance, we will recommend supporting a repricing only if the following conditions are true:

- (i) officers and board members cannot not participate in the program;
- (ii) the stock decline mirrors the market or industry price decline in terms of timing and approximates the decline in magnitude;
- (iii) the exchange is value-neutral or value-creative to shareholders using very conservative assumptions and with a recognition of the adverse selection problems inherent in voluntary programs; and
- (iv) management and the board make a cogent case for needing to motivate and retain existing employees, such as being in a competitive employment market.

Option Backdating, Spring-Loading, and Bullet-Dodging

Glass Lewis views option backdating, and the related practices of spring-loading and bullet-dodging, as egregious actions that warrant holding the appropriate management and board members responsible. These practices are similar to re-pricing options and eliminate much of the downside risk inherent in an option grant that is designed to induce recipients to maximize shareholder return.

Backdating an option is the act of changing an option's grant date from the actual grant date to an earlier date when the market price of the underlying stock was lower, resulting in a lower exercise price for the option. Glass Lewis has identified over 270 companies that have disclosed internal or government investigations into their past stock-option grants.

Spring-loading is granting stock options while in possession of material, positive information that has not been disclosed publicly. Bullet-dodging is delaying the grants of stock options until after the release of material, negative information. This can allow option grants to be made at a lower price either before the release of positive news or following the release of negative news, assuming the stock's price will move up or down in response to the information. This raises a concern similar to that of insider trading, or the trading on material non-public information.

The exercise price for an option is determined on the day of grant, providing the recipient with the same market risk as an investor who bought shares on that date. However, where options were backdated, the executive or the board (or the compensation committee) changed the grant date retroactively. The new date may be at or near the lowest price for the year or period. This would be like allowing an investor to look back and select the lowest price of the year at which to buy shares.

A 2006 study of option grants made between 1996 and 2005 at 8,000 companies found that option backdating can be an indication of poor internal controls. The study found that option backdating was more likely to occur at companies without a majority independent board and with a long-serving CEO; both factors, the study concluded, were associated with greater CEO influence on the company's compensation and governance practices.⁴⁷

Where a company granted backdated options to an executive who is also a director, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against that executive/director, regardless of who decided to make the award. In

addition, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against those directors who either approved or allowed the backdating. Glass Lewis feels that executives and directors who either benefited from backdated options or authorized the practice have breached their fiduciary responsibility to shareholders.

Given the severe tax and legal liabilities to the company from backdating, Glass Lewis will consider recommending voting against members of the audit committee who served when options were backdated, a restatement occurs, material weaknesses in internal controls exist and disclosures indicate there was a lack of documentation. These committee members failed in their responsibility to ensure the integrity of the company's financial reports.

When a company has engaged in spring-loading or bullet-dodging, Glass Lewis will consider recommending voting against the compensation committee members where there has been a pattern of granting options at or near historic lows. Glass Lewis will also recommend voting against executives serving on the board who benefited from the spring-loading or bullet-dodging.

162(m) Plans

Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code allows companies to deduct compensation in excess of \$1 million for the CEO and the next three most highly compensated executive officers, excluding the CFO, upon shareholder approval of the excess compensation. Glass Lewis recognizes the value of executive incentive programs and the tax benefit of shareholder-approved incentive plans.

We believe the best practice for companies is to provide robust disclosure to shareholders so that they can make fully-informed judgments about the reasonableness of the proposed compensation plan. To allow for meaningful shareholder review, we prefer that disclosure should include specific performance metrics, a maximum award pool, and a maximum award amount per employee. We also believe it is important to analyze the estimated grants to see if they are reasonable and in line with the company's peers.

We typically recommend voting against a 162(m) plan where: a company fails to provide at least a list of performance targets; a company fails to provide one of either a total pool or an individual maximum; or the proposed plan is excessive when compared with the plans of the company's peers.

The company's record of aligning pay with performance (as evaluated using our proprietary pay-for-performance model) also plays a role in our recommendation. Where a company has a record of setting reasonable pay relative to business performance, we generally recommend voting in favor of a plan even if the plan caps seem large relative to peers because we recognize the value in special pay arrangements for continued exceptional performance.

As with all other issues we review, our goal is to provide consistent but contextual advice given the specifics of the company and ongoing performance. Overall, we recognize that it is generally not in shareholders' best interests to vote against such a plan and forgo the potential tax benefit since shareholder rejection of such plans will not curtail the awards; it will only prevent the tax deduction associated with them.

Director Compensation Plans

Glass Lewis believes that non-employee directors should receive reasonable and appropriate compensation for the time and effort they spend serving on the board and its committees. Director fees should be competitive in order to retain and attract qualified individuals. But excessive fees represent a financial cost to the company and threaten to compromise the objectivity and independence of

interests of outside directors with those of shareholders. However, equity grants to directors should not be performance-based to ensure directors are not incentivized in the same manner as executives but rather serve as a check on imprudent risk-taking in executive compensation plan design.

Glass Lewis uses a proprietary model and analyst review to evaluate the costs of equity plans compared to the plans of peer companies with similar market capitalizations. We use the results of this model to guide our voting recommendations on stock-based director compensation plans.

ANTI-TAKEOVER MEASURES

Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans)

Glass Lewis believes that poison pill plans are not generally in shareholders' best interests. They can reduce management accountability by substantially limiting opportunities for corporate takeovers. Rights plans can thus prevent shareholders from receiving a buy-out premium for their stock. Typically we recommend that shareholders vote against these plans to protect their financial interests and ensure that they have an opportunity to consider any offer for their shares, especially those at a premium.

We believe boards should be given wide latitude in directing company activities and in charting the company's course. However, on an issue such as this, where the link between the shareholders' financial interests and their right to consider and accept buyout offers is substantial, we believe that shareholders should be allowed to vote on whether they support such a plan's implementation. This issue is different from other matters that are typically left to board discretion. Its potential impact on and relation to shareholders is direct and substantial. It is also an issue in which management interests may be different from those of shareholders; thus, ensuring that shareholders have a voice is the only way to safeguard their interests.

I
n certain circumstances, we will support a poison pill that is limited in scope to accomplish a particular objective, such as the closing of an important merger, or a pill that contains what we believe to be a reasonable qualifying offer clause. We will consider supporting a poison pill plan if the qualifying offer clause includes the following attributes: (i) The form of offer is not required to be an all-cash transaction; (ii) the offer is not required to remain open for more than 90 business days; (iii) the offeror is permitted to amend the offer, reduce the offer, or otherwise change the terms; (iv) there is no fairness opinion requirement; and (v) there is a low to no premium requirement. Where these requirements are met, we typically feel comfortable that shareholders will have the opportunity to voice their opinion on any legitimate offer.

NOL Poison Pills

Similarly, Glass Lewis may consider supporting a limited poison pill in the unique event that a company seeks shareholder approval of a rights plan for the express purpose of preserving Net Operating Losses (NOLs). While companies with NOLs can generally carry these losses forward to offset future taxable income, Section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code limits companies' ability to use NOLs in the event of a "change of ownership."⁴⁸ In this case, a company may adopt or amend a poison pill ("NOL pill") in order to prevent an inadvertent change of ownership by multiple investors purchasing small chunks of stock at the same time, and thereby preserve the ability to carry the NOLs forward. Often such NOL pills have trigger thresholds much lower than the common 15% or 20% thresholds, with some NOL pill triggers as low as 5%.

Glass Lewis evaluates NOL pills on a strictly case-by-case basis taking into consideration, among other factors, the value of the NOLs to the company, the likelihood of a change of ownership based on the size

