

**SOUTHEASTERN ASSET MANAGEMENT, INC.
LONGLY PARTNERS FUNDS
PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

INTRODUCTION

As an investment adviser registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under Section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the “Advisers Act”), Southeastern Asset Management, Inc. (“Southeastern”) must adopt and implement written policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure that Southeastern votes client securities in the best interest of clients. The proxy voting policies and procedures set forth herein (the “Proxy Policy”) are an update to policies and procedures followed by Southeastern for many years and have been revised to comply with the terms of Rule 206(4)-6 under the Advisers Act. The Proxy Policy sets forth the general principles to be applied in voting proxies of companies held in client portfolios, and is intended for distribution to all clients for informational and disclosure purposes.

In addition, Southeastern has been granted discretionary authority to manage the assets of the separate series of Longleaf Partners Funds Trust (“Longleaf”), an open-end management investment company registered with the SEC under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the “40 Act”). Pursuant to its discretionary authority to manage Longleaf’s assets, and under the supervision of the Longleaf Boards of Trustees, Southeastern votes proxies of companies held in Longleaf’s portfolios. Effective August 1, 2003, the Boards of Trustees of Longleaf’s four series have authorized Southeastern to vote securities in the Longleaf Partners Funds according to this updated Proxy Policy, and instructed Southeastern as Administrator of the Funds to implement for Longleaf the procedures necessary to comply with proxy rules applicable to investment companies under the 40 Act. Accordingly, Southeastern will make disclosure of Longleaf’s proxy voting record on Form N-PX, when and as required by Investment Company Act Rule 30b1-4, and will disclose in Longleaf’s public filings information regarding the proxy policies applicable to Longleaf, as required by Items 17(f), and 27(d) of Form N-1A.

I.
INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO CLIENTS AND
LONLEAF SHAREHOLDERS

In order to comply with Adviser's Act Rule 206(4)-6(c), Southeastern will describe these proxy voting policies and procedures in Part 2 of its Form ADV, an updated copy of which will be provided to all existing private account clients and all new clients prior to their conducting business with Southeastern. Upon request, Southeastern will provide any private account client with a copy of these proxy voting policies and procedures as well as complete information on how Southeastern voted proxies of companies in the client's portfolio.

Shareholders of the Longleaf Partners Funds may find a description of this Proxy Policy in the Funds' Statement of Additional Information (SAI). The SAI may be obtained free of charge from, www.southeasternasset.com/account-resources, by calling (800) 445-9469 or on the Securities and Exchange Commission website, www.sec.gov. Information regarding how the Funds voted proxies relating to portfolio securities during the most recent 12-month period ended June 30 is available on www.southeasternasset.com, by calling (800) 445-9469, or on the Funds' Form N-PX available on the Securities and Exchange Commission website, www.sec.gov.

II.
STATEMENT OF GENERAL POLICIES AFFECTING PROXY VOTING

Proposal Must Benefit Shareholders. Southeastern's single general strategy is long-term equity investing. One of the principles used by Southeastern in selecting stocks for investment is the presence of shareholder-oriented management. This is defined as management which takes actions and supports policies designed to increase the value of the company's shares and thereby enhance shareholder wealth. As a result, all proposals submitted for shareholder approval are analyzed in light of their long-term benefit to current shareholders.

Management Must Be Responsive. Southeastern's portfolio management group is active in meeting with top management of portfolio companies and in discussing its views on policies or actions which could enhance shareholder value. To facilitate such discussions, Southeastern may convert a Schedule 13G filing (which is used by passive institutional investors) to a Schedule 13D filing in order to be more active in encouraging management of a company to take particular steps which could further

enhance shareholder value. Whether management of a company will consider reasonable shareholder suggestions is a factor to be taken into consideration in proxy voting.

General Policies With Respect to Routine Proposals. Under the statutes of its state of incorporation, a company usually must hold meetings of shareholders annually for the purpose of electing or re-electing directors. In addition, the Securities and Exchange Commission requires that publicly held corporations ratify the selection of the independent auditing firm each year if an annual meeting of shareholders is being held. In many situations, these two matters are the only matters submitted to shareholders for a vote at the company's Annual Meeting of Shareholders and are therefore viewed by the investment community as being routine in nature. Southeastern's general policy is to support the Board's recommendations to vote in favor of these annually recurring matters, particularly where the Board has a record of supporting shareholder rights and is otherwise shareholder oriented.

Exceptions to General Policy. In some circumstances, Southeastern may oppose the routine re-election of a Board of Directors. As a technical matter, a shareholder opposed to re-election must express such opposition by voting the proxy for purposes of establishing the presence of a quorum, but "withholding" the vote for a particular director or the entire slate of directors. Using this procedure, Southeastern may withhold the vote for re-election of the Board in circumstances such as the following:

- A Board of Directors may have adopted policies or taken actions during the prior year which are within its discretionary authority and, as such, are not matters which must be submitted to shareholders for approval. If such policies or actions have the effect of limiting or diminishing shareholder value, Southeastern may voice its opposition to the Board's positions by withholding the votes for re-election of the Board or any director.
- There may be situations where top management of a company, after having discussions with Southeastern's portfolio management group and perhaps with other institutional shareholders, may have failed or refused to adopt policies or take actions which would enhance shareholder value. Depending on the circumstances, Southeastern may also exercise its proxy voting authority by withholding an affirmative vote for re-election of the Board.

General Policies With Respect to Special Management Proposals. In addition to election or re-election of directors and ratification of the selection of auditors, there may be additional, specific management proposals submitted to shareholders for approval. Southeastern's general policy is to vote in favor of specific or non-recurring proposals submitted where such proposals are reasonable and appear to be in the best interest of shareholders.

Exceptions to General Policy. There may be situations where a Board of Directors has submitted to shareholders for approval various amendments to the corporate charter or other specific proposals which have the effect of restricting shareholder rights or otherwise diminishing shareholder value. Southeastern may decide to oppose these specific proposals and, as an integral part of such opposition, may also oppose the re-election of the Board of Directors. In the alternative, Southeastern may vote against the special proposals but may vote in favor of re-election of the Board where the Board is otherwise shareholder-oriented and the special proposals do not materially harm shareholder rights.

General Policies With Respect to Shareholder Proposals. There may be situations when a company's proxy statement contains minority shareholder proposals, which might include eliminating staggered terms for members of boards of directors, eliminating other anti-takeover defenses, adopting cumulative voting rights, or establishing operating rules or policies which are of primary interest to special interest groups. Southeastern votes these proposals on a case-by case basis with the primary objective of supporting corporate operating policies which provide the maximum financial benefit to shareholders. In Southeastern's opinion, if a company's management has demonstrated that it is shareholder-oriented by adopting operating policies and procedures which are beneficial to shareholders, Southeastern may oppose minority shareholder proposals, particularly when the adoption of such proposals could inhibit normal operations or might be disruptive.

III.

DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC CORPORATE POLICIES AND PROPOSALS

The determination as to whether a particular policy or shareholder proposal is likely to enhance or diminish shareholder wealth may be relatively clear or, in the alternative, could be subjective. Below is a list of specific issues which may be presented for a vote and how Southeastern is likely to treat such matters. Because proxy issues and the circumstances of individual companies are so varied, there may be instances when

Southeastern does not vote in strict adherence to the guidelines set forth below. In addition, the discussion is not exhaustive and does not include all potential voting issues. To the extent issues are not covered by this Proxy Policy, or in situations where Southeastern does not vote as described below, Southeastern will be governed by what it considers to be in the best interests of its clients.

- "One share, one vote."

Explanation. Southeastern believes that good corporate governance usually requires that all shareholders have an equal voice in electing a Board of Directors and in voting on other proposals submitted to shareholders. Southeastern generally would oppose proposals to create separate classes of shares with disproportionate voting rights which may be designed primarily to empower shareholders affiliated with existing management at the expense of non-management affiliated shareholders. Recognizing that certain corporate finance proposals may require that new shareholders receive stronger voting rights or more beneficial conversion rights in consideration for the price per share of a new offering, Southeastern would give consideration to supporting reasonable disproportionate voting or conversion rights in situations where the proposal would raise necessary capital without undue dilution of the voting or ownership rights of existing shareholders.

- Reasonable Stock Option Plans and Reasonable Cash Incentives.

Explanation. Southeastern believes that management of a portfolio company will tend to make decisions and support policies which enhance shareholder wealth if management is a significant owner of the company. In addition, management will tend to be shareholder oriented if a primary method of ongoing management compensation is through the granting of options for the purchase of additional shares rather than through the award of substantial cash bonuses. Recognizing that compensation derived solely from stock options could be dilutive over time, Southeastern believes that there should be an appropriate balance between stock option grants and cash compensation, and that both should be related to the achievement of overall corporate profitability. Southeastern will therefore favor the adoption or continuation of reasonable, non super-dilutive stock option plans and will support the election of directors who couple granting of stock options and annual cash compensation with improved corporate profitability.

- Super-dilutive Stock Option Plans.

Explanation. Stock option plans with excessively large authorizations to issue additional shares at the discretion of the Board of Directors can be harmful to existing shareholders in two respects. First, such plans may be used to increase the ownership position of current management on terms and conditions not available to non-management affiliated minority shareholders; second, such plans may be used to ward off a hostile takeover by issuing additional shares to current management on a basis which is more favorable than is available to other shareholders. The appropriate number of unissued shares allocated to a stock option plan as a percentage of outstanding shares may vary and can be discretionary, depending on the circumstances. Southeastern generally will oppose the adoption of stock option plans providing for unusually large share authorizations which appear to exceed the needs for reasonable executive compensation.

- Reasonable Employment Contracts and "Golden Parachutes."

Explanation. To retain effective top management teams, a company needs to provide protection against the fear of preemptory dismissal should a hostile takeover attempt be successful. Although Southeastern generally opposes structural anti-takeover measures, it will support a Board of Directors which enters into employment contracts for limited, rolling time periods (such as 3 years), and provides reasonable "parachutes" or termination compensation for an effective top management group.

- Share Repurchase Programs.

Explanation. During periods when a portfolio company's shares are materially underpriced, the best allocation of capital may be the repurchase of shares rather than expansion of the company's businesses or an increase in corporate dividends. Shrinkage of the company's common capitalization can have the effect of substantially increasing shareholder wealth for those shareholders able to continue their investment. Southeastern will accordingly support Boards of Directors entering into share repurchase programs during periods when common shares are materially underpriced.

- Cumulative Voting and Pre-emptive Rights.

Explanation. Cumulative voting enables minority shareholders, including an investment adviser casting votes for its clients, to aggregate the number of votes available for all

directors and assign these votes to a single director. Thus, some minority shareholders might own sufficient shares to be able to elect a designated representative to the Board, and thereby achieve a larger voice in the corporate management process. The presence of pre-emptive rights preserves a right of first refusal for existing shareholders to acquire newly issued shares on the same terms as the shares might be offered to a majority or control group, thereby enabling minority shareholders to maintain the same pro-rata percentage of voting control.

The charters of most corporations formed in recent years do not contain provisions for cumulative voting or pre-emptive rights. Because these provisions protect the rights of minority shareholders, Southeastern would usually oppose a proposal for elimination of such rights in situations where they presently exist.

- "Blank Check" Preference Stock.

Explanation. "Blank Check" preference stock allows a Board of Directors, without subsequent shareholder approval, to issue unlimited series of preference stock under terms and conditions determined wholly by the Board. Such terms and conditions may include preferential voting rights, dividends, and conversion rights which could be substantially dilutive for common shareholders. Such preference shares could also be issued by the Board to support questionable corporate financing proposals or as an anti-takeover measure. Because of the potential for dilution of common shareholders, Southeastern will generally oppose the adoption of "blank check" preference stock provisions.

- "Greenmail" Share Repurchases.

Explanation. Unlike normal share repurchase programs which are implemented when a company's shares are materially underpriced, "greenmail" repurchases of outstanding shares are usually made at inflated share prices for the purpose of eliminating a potential acquirer. As a result, such "greenmail" payments usually have both the immediate and long-term effect of limiting rather than enhancing shareholder value and may interfere with natural market forces. Southeastern will generally oppose the re-election of Boards of Directors which engage in "greenmail" repurchases in circumstances which would not enhance long-term shareholder value.

- Structural Anti-takeover Defenses.

Explanation. In most situations, the adoption of anti-takeover defenses which become part of the corporation's organizational structure have the effect of limiting natural market forces on the trading price of a company's stock. Such structural or permanent provisions include the following: staggered terms for the Board of Directors, under which Board terms run for more than one year and less than all directors are elected each year; supermajority shareholder approval for merger or acquisition proposals not approved by the Board of Directors; and adoption of "poison pills" designed to damage the capital structure of either the acquiring or the acquired corporation in a non Board approved merger or takeover.

Southeastern generally will oppose the adoption of these types of structural anti-takeover defenses, and would generally favor their removal in corporate charters where they presently exist. There may be exceptions to this policy, however, if management has demonstrated that it pursues policies to create shareholder value and is otherwise shareholder-oriented.

- Right to Call Meetings

Explanation. Southeastern generally opposes proposals seeking to limit the ability of shareholders to call special meetings and vote on issues outside of the company's annual meeting. Limiting the forum in which shareholders are able to vote on proposals could adversely affect shareholder value

- Mergers, Acquisitions, Reorganizations, and other Transactions

Explanation. Shareholders may be faced with a number of different types of transactions, including acquisitions, mergers, reorganizations involving business combinations, liquidations and sale of all or substantially all of a company's assets, which may require shareholder consent. Voting on such proposals involves considerations unique to each transaction, so Southeastern votes such matters on a case-by-case basis.

- Environmental, Social, and Ethical Issues

Explanation. Southeastern recognizes the overall benefit that is provided to society in general when its portfolio companies act in a responsible manner as a good corporate steward in areas of environmental, social and ethical matters. Therefore, as a general policy, Southeastern will be supportive of and vote in favor of proposals that, in

Southeastern's opinion, would further such causes. However, such areas can be highly subjective and can, at times, be in conflict with what we consider to be in the long-term best interests of the shareholders. Therefore, Southeastern will give due regard to such proposals and will consider these matters on a case-by-case basis and members of Southeastern's ESG Committee review and share additional information with the analysts where appropriate on ESG-specific proxy matters.

IV. SOUTHEASTERN'S PROXY VOTING PROCEDURES

Monitoring for Proxies and Corporate Actions. Southeastern has implemented procedures designed to ensure that it receives the proxies and corporate actions for which it is responsible, and that these proxies and corporate actions are reconciled with the reported holdings of its clients as of the record date for voting, and then voted prior to applicable deadlines.

Regarding proxies, Southeastern has hired a third-party service provider to assist in monitoring for meetings. Each business day, Southeastern sends an updated file of holdings in each client portfolio where Southeastern has voting discretion to this administrator. The administrator has undertaken the task of collecting ballots and notifying Southeastern of all record and meeting dates for these holdings. Upon notification of upcoming meetings, Southeastern's Proxy Coordinator identifies all clients who hold the security as of the record date, and the number of shares held. It is the Proxy Coordinator's job to ensure that voting decisions are made with respect to each client account and that such decisions are transmitted prior to applicable deadlines. The administrator assists and follows through with the implementation of Southeastern's voting decisions for each of its client accounts where voting discretion has been granted. It should be noted that ballots are not pre-populated by the administrator on the voting platform utilized by the Proxy Coordinator and automated voting is not utilized.

It should be noted that if Southeastern or its clients enter into a securities lending arrangement with respect to securities in a client's portfolio, Southeastern may not be able to vote proxies on those particular shares. In addition, with respect to non-US holdings, record and meeting dates may be announced with very little time to respond or may be in jurisdictions requiring unique additional documentation (e.g., powers of attorney) from Southeastern or its clients. In such circumstances, Southeastern will vote on a best efforts basis. In some non-US markets, shareholders who vote proxies

are not able to sell in the company's stock within a given period of time surrounding the meeting date. Southeastern coordinates voting such proxies with its trading activity, and in some cases may not vote such proxies where doing so would impair its trading flexibility. Southeastern may also refrain from voting where shares of a particular holding have been sold out of all client accounts prior to the meeting date. In summary, Southeastern may refrain from voting in situations where the cost of voting exceeds the expected benefit.

Regarding corporate transactions, information is available from a number of sources. Information usually comes first to the Southeastern portfolio management group and specifically to the particular co-manager or analyst primarily responsible for the portfolio holding. This information generally comes through press releases reported on electronic media services or in financial media. In addition, Southeastern personnel routinely monitor news and events relating to portfolio holdings of clients, and accordingly learn of corporate actions which may require a response. Similarly, custodian banks receiving notification of corporate actions from issuers in turn notify Southeastern. Not all corporate actions require a response (such as dividend payments or stock splits), and Southeastern will not normally respond where the default action is the desired outcome. Corporate actions which do require a response are handled by Southeastern's Head of Portfolio Accounting or his designee.

Decisions on Proxy Voting. Proxy Statements issued by portfolio companies are reviewed by the investment analyst assigned responsibility for the particular portfolio company. Proxies are voted in accordance with the general policies as described in Part II above. Any internal recommendation to consider voting in a manner contrary to the recommendations of the company's Board of Directors is presented to Southeastern's CEO or Chairman for final decision before implementation. In addition, a conflict of interest review is performed with respect to each vote (see "Conflicts of Interest" below). Although analysts may review the voting research and recommendations of an independent proxy service provider, such research is not determinative and must not be relied on if the analyst feels the advice is based on materially inaccurate or incomplete information. This would include any material additional soliciting materials filed by the issuer prior to the voting submission deadline.

Attendance at Shareholders' Meetings. A representative of Southeastern may attend shareholders meetings where there are special or unusual issues to be presented to shareholders. If Southeastern has determined to oppose management's position, the

representative may vote the shares of its clients in person rather than using the normal proxy voting procedures to return proxies to management.

Conflicts of Interest. Occasions may arise where Southeastern or one of its personnel could have a conflict of interest with respect to a particular proxy vote. For example, there may be occasions where Southeastern has invested client assets in a company for which Southeastern also provides investment management services, or one of Southeastern's clients may have a material interest in the outcome of a vote. It is also possible that Southeastern's personnel may have a personal conflict of interest with respect to a vote, such as familial relationship with company management.

Southeastern considers potential conflicts of interest with respect to each voting decision. Any individual participating in a voting decision who has a personal conflict of interest shall disclose that conflict to the Proxy Coordinator and the Proxy Conflict Committee for review, and shall otherwise remove himself or herself from the proxy voting process. In addition, personnel involved in voting decisions must consider any Southeastern conflict of interest and report such conflicts to the Proxy Coordinator and the Proxy Conflict Committee, which also separately considers conflicts of interest which may be applicable to a vote. Before the Proxy Coordinator can submit voting decisions for execution, a representative of the portfolio management team and two representatives of the Proxy Conflict Committee must initial Southeastern's internal proxy form indicating that they are not aware of a conflict of interest.

In cases where a conflict of interest has been identified, Southeastern's Proxy Conflict Committee will prepare a report prior to execution of a voting decision which contains the following:

- the nature of the conflict;
- an evaluation of the materiality of the conflict; and
- if the conflict is material, the procedures used to address the conflict.

Two out of three members of the Proxy Conflict Committee must approve the report. Such reports will be kept pursuant to the policies set forth under "Record Retention" below.

If a conflict is material, Southeastern will attempt to disclose the conflict to affected clients, including private account clients and/or the Longleaf Partners Funds' Boards of Trustees, and either obtain consent to vote on a given voting occasion or vote in

accordance with instructions from the client and/or Lingleaf Board of Trustees. Where consent has been given for Southeastern to vote, it will treat a proxy vote as it would any other and vote according to the principles stated herein, with the governing principle being what is in the best interest of the company's shareholders. If Southeastern is not able to reach affected clients in time to obtain consent, or obtaining consent is not otherwise feasible, Southeastern may vote in accord with guidance provided by a proxy service provider independent of Southeastern.

In evaluating the materiality of a conflict, Southeastern will consider a number of factors, including:

- whether Southeastern has been solicited by the person or entity creating the conflict;
- whether the size of Southeastern's business relationship with the source of the conflict is material in light of Southeastern's total business;
- whether Southeastern's voting power or voting decision is material from the perspective of the source of the conflict;
- other factors which indicate Southeastern's voting decision has not been impaired or tainted by the conflict.

If Southeastern concludes that the conflict is not material, the conflict of interest report will state the basis for this determination, and Southeastern will vote in the manner it deems in its clients' best interest.

Record Retention. As required by Adviser's Act Rule 204-2(c)(2), Southeastern maintains with respect to its clients:

- copies of its proxy policies and procedures;
- copies of proxy statements received regarding client securities (Southeastern will either keep a copy, rely on a copy obtained from the SEC's EDGAR system, or will hire a third-party service provider to retain copies and provide them promptly upon request);
- a record of each vote cast on behalf of a client (Southeastern will either retain this record itself or hire a third-party service provider to make and retain such records and provide them promptly upon request);
- copies of documents created by Southeastern that are material to a voting decision or that memorialize the basis for the decision (including conflict of interest reports);

- copies of each written client request for information on how Southeastern voted on behalf of a client, and a copy of Southeastern's written response to any written or oral client request for information on how Southeastern voted its proxy.

Adopted August 1, 2003

Amended December 18, 2006

Amended December 4, 2007

Amended June 9, 2008

Amended December 17, 2010

Amended October 31, 2011

Amended October 3, 2012

Amended November 4, 2014

Amended November 2, 2015

Amended November 9, 2016

Amended November 15, 2017

Amended December 6, 2019

Amended December 3, 2020

Amended December 2, 2022