

---

# THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

---

FOURTH EDITION

EDITOR  
WILLEM J L CALKOEN

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

# THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

---

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Corporate Governance Review, 4th edition  
(published in March 2014 – editor Willem J L Calkoen).

For further information please email  
[nick.barette@lbresearch.com](mailto:nick.barette@lbresearch.com)

# THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

---

Fourth Edition

Editor  
WILLEM J L CALKOEN

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

# THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND  
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW

THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW

THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW

THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW

THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW

THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW

THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW

THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW

THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INSOLVENCY REVIEW

THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW

THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW

[www.TheLawReviews.co.uk](http://www.TheLawReviews.co.uk)

PUBLISHER  
Gideon Robertson

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS  
Adam Sargent, Nick Barette

ACCOUNT MANAGERS  
Katherine Jablonowska, Thomas Lee, James Spearing, Felicity Bown

PUBLISHING ASSISTANT  
Lucy Brewer

MARKETING ASSISTANT  
Chloe Mclauchlan

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT  
Eve Ryle-Hodges

HEAD OF PRODUCTION  
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR  
Robbie Kelly

SUBEDITOR  
Jonathan Allen

MANAGING DIRECTOR  
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom  
by Law Business Research Ltd, London  
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK  
© 2014 Law Business Research Ltd  
[www.TheLawReviews.co.uk](http://www.TheLawReviews.co.uk)

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients.

Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of March 2014, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – [gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com](mailto:gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com)

ISBN 978-1-907606-99-1

Printed in Great Britain by  
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire  
Tel: 0844 2480 112

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

A&L GOODBODY

BAHAR & PARTNERS

BÄR & KARRER AG

BREDIN PRAT

CARRILLO Y ASOCIADOS

THE DELAWARE COUNSEL GROUP LLP

GILBERT + TOBIN

GRAF PATSCH TAUCHER RECHTSANWÄLTE

HANNES SNELLMAN ATTORNEYS LTD

HENGELER MUELLER PARTNERSCHAFT VON RECHTSANWÄLTEN

HERGÜNER BILGEN ÖZEKE ATTORNEY PARTNERSHIP

J SAGAR ASSOCIATES

LEE AND LI ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

MANNHEIMER SWARTLING ADVOKATBYRÅ

NAUTADUTILH

NISHIMURA & ASAHI

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP

PLESNER LAW FIRM

SLAUGHTER AND MAY  
STEPHENSON HARWOOD  
STUDIO LEGALE PAVESI GITTI VERZONI  
TSIBANOULIS & PARTNERS  
ȚUCA ZBÂRCEA & ASOCIAȚII  
URÍA MENÉNDEZ  
WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ

# CONTENTS

---

<b>Editor's Preface</b> .....	vii
<i>Willem J L Calkoen</i>	
<b>Chapter 1</b> AUSTRALIA.....	1
<i>John Williamson-Noble and Tim Gordon</i>	
<b>Chapter 2</b> AUSTRIA .....	13
<i>Wolfgang Thomas Graf</i>	
<b>Chapter 3</b> BELGIUM.....	24
<i>Elke Janssens and Virginie Ciers</i>	
<b>Chapter 4</b> CANADA .....	49
<i>Andrew MacDougall, Robert Yalden and Elizabeth Walker</i>	
<b>Chapter 5</b> DENMARK.....	62
<i>Jacob Christensen, Søren Toft Bjerreskov and Nicholas William Boe Stenderup</i>	
<b>Chapter 6</b> FINLAND .....	75
<i>Klaus Ilmonen, Micaela Thorström, Antti Kuba and Anniina Järvinen</i>	
<b>Chapter 7</b> FRANCE .....	87
<i>Didier Martin</i>	
<b>Chapter 8</b> GERMANY .....	102
<i>Carsten van de Sande</i>	
<b>Chapter 9</b> GREECE .....	118
<i>Evy C Kyttari and Sofia Kizantidi</i>	

<b>Chapter 10</b>	GUATEMALA.....	129
	<i>Rodolfo Alegria and Christian Michelangeli</i>	
<b>Chapter 11</b>	HONG KONG .....	139
	<i>Lai Voon Keat, Victor Lee and Fiona Cheng</i>	
<b>Chapter 12</b>	INDIA .....	161
	<i>Murali Ananthasivan and Lalit Kumar</i>	
<b>Chapter 13</b>	INDONESIA.....	172
	<i>Wahyuni Bahar and Melanie Hadel</i>	
<b>Chapter 14</b>	IRELAND.....	185
	<i>Paul White</i>	
<b>Chapter 15</b>	ITALY .....	200
	<i>Gregorio Gitti, Diego Riva, Camilla Ferrari and Luca Bernini</i>	
<b>Chapter 16</b>	JAPAN .....	214
	<i>Mitsuhiro Harada and Tatsuya Nakayama</i>	
<b>Chapter 17</b>	LUXEMBOURG .....	227
	<i>Margaretha Wilkenhuysen and Louisa Silcox</i>	
<b>Chapter 18</b>	NETHERLANDS .....	248
	<i>Geert Raaijmakers and Marlies Stek</i>	
<b>Chapter 19</b>	PORTUGAL.....	273
	<i>Francisco Brito e Abreu and Joana Torres Ereio</i>	
<b>Chapter 20</b>	ROMANIA .....	291
	<i>Cristian Radu</i>	
<b>Chapter 21</b>	SPAIN.....	307
	<i>Carlos Paredes and Rafael Núñez-Lagos</i>	

<b>Chapter 22</b>	SWEDEN .....319 <i>Hans Petersson and Emma Kratz</i>
<b>Chapter 23</b>	SWITZERLAND .....334 <i>Rolf Watter and Katja Roth Pellanda</i>
<b>Chapter 24</b>	TAIWAN .....351 <i>Stephen C Wu, Benjamin Y Li and Derrick C Yang</i>
<b>Chapter 25</b>	TURKEY .....363 <i>Ümit Hergüner and Zeynep Ahu Sazci</i>
<b>Chapter 26</b>	UNITED KINGDOM.....376 <i>Andy Ryde and Murray Cox</i>
<b>Chapter 27</b>	UNITED STATES .....389 <i>Adam O Emmerich, William Savitt, Sabastian V Niles and S Iliana Ongun</i>
<b>Chapter 28</b>	UNITED STATES: DELAWARE .....403 <i>Ellisa O Habbart and Lisa R Stark</i>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....415
<b>Appendix 2</b>	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS ...435

# EDITOR'S PREFACE

---

I am proud to present this new edition of *The Corporate Governance Review* to you.

In this fourth edition, we can see that corporate governance is becoming a more vital and all-encompassing topic with each year. We all realise that the modern corporation is one of the most ingenious concepts ever devised. Our lives are dominated by corporations. We eat and breathe through them, we travel with them, we are entertained by them, most of us work there. Most corporations aim to add value to society and they very often do. Some, however, are exploiting, polluting, poisoning and impoverishing us. A lot depends on the commitment, direction and aims of a corporation's founders, shareholders, boards and vital staff members. Do they show commitment to all stakeholders or to long-term shareholders only, or mainly to short-term shareholders? There are many variations of structure of corporations and boards within each country and between countries. All will agree that much depends on the personalities and commitment of the persons of influence in the corporation.

We see that everyone wants to be involved in 'better corporate governance': parliaments, governments, the European Commission, the SEC, the OECD, the UN's Ruggie reports, the media, supervising national banks, shareholder activists and other stakeholders. The business world is getting more complex and overregulated, and there are more black swans, while good strategies can quite quickly become outdated. Most directors are working diligently, many with even more diligence. Nevertheless, there have been failures in some sectors, so trust has to be regained. How can directors do all their increasingly complex work and communicate with all the parties mentioned above?

What should executive directors know? What should outside directors know? What systems should they set up for better enterprise risk management? How can chairs create a balance against imperial CEOs? Can lead or senior directors create sufficient balance? Should most outside directors understand the business? How much time should they spend on the function? How independent must they be? What about diversity? Should their pay be lower? What are the stewardship responsibilities of shareholders?

Governments, the European Commission and the SEC are all pressing for more formal inflexible legislative acts, especially in the area of remuneration. Acts set minimum standards, while codes of best practice set aspirational standards.

More international investors, voting advisory associations and shareholder activists want to be involved in dialogue with boards about strategy, succession and income. Indeed, wise boards have 'selected engagements' with stewardship shareholders to create trust. What more can they do to show all stakeholders that they are improving their enterprises other than through setting a better 'tone from the top'? Should they put big signs on the buildings emphasising integrity, stewardship and respect?

Interest in corporate governance has been increasing since 1992, when shareholder activists forced out the CEO at General Motors and the first corporate governance code – the Cadbury Code – was written. The OECD produced a model code and many countries produced national versions along the lines of the Cadbury 'comply or explain' model. This has generally led to more transparency, accountability, fairness and responsibility. However, there have been instances where CEOs gradually amassed too much power or companies have not developed new strategies and have fallen into bad results – and sometimes even failure. More are failing in the financial crisis than in other times, hence the increased outside interest in legislation, further supervision and new corporate governance codes for boards, and stewardship codes for shareholders and shareholder activists.

This all implies that executive and non-executive directors should work harder and more as a team on policy, strategy and entrepreneurship. It remains a fact that more money is lost through lax directorship than through mistakes. On the other hand, corporate risk management is an essential part of directors' responsibilities, and sets the tone from the top.

Each country has its own measures; however, the chapters of this book show a convergence. The concept underlying the book is of a one-volume text containing a series of reasonably short, but sufficiently detailed, jurisdictional overviews that permit convenient comparisons, where a quick 'first look' at key issues would be helpful to general counsel and their clients.

My aim as editor has been to achieve a high quality of content so that *The Corporate Governance Review* will be seen, in time, as an essential reference work in our field.

To meet the all-important content quality objective, it was a condition *sine qua non* to attract as contributors colleagues who are among the recognised leaders in the field of corporate governance law from each jurisdiction.

I thank all the contributors who helped with this project. I hope that this book will give the reader food for thought; you always learn about your own law by reading about the laws of others.

Further editions of this work will obviously benefit from the thoughts and suggestions of our readers. We will be extremely grateful to receive comments and proposals on how we might improve the next edition.

**Willem J L Calkoen**

NautaDutilh

Rotterdam

March 2014

## Chapter 4

---

# CANADA

*Andrew MacDougall, Robert Yalden and Elizabeth Walker<sup>1</sup>*

### I OVERVIEW OF GOVERNANCE REGIME

Canada's system of corporate governance is derived from the British common law model and strongly influenced by developments in the United States. While corporate governance practices in the United Kingdom and the United States are similar in many respects, where there are differences Canadian practice usually falls somewhere in between. For example, a Canadian corporation is more likely than a US corporation to have a chair who is not the CEO, and typically has fewer executives on the board than a UK corporation.<sup>2</sup>

Under Canada's Constitution, provincial governments have exclusive power over property and civil rights within the province. As a result, corporations may choose to incorporate under federal corporate law or under the corporate laws of any of the 10 provinces in Canada. In addition, securities law in Canada is regulated by securities administrators in Canada's 10 provinces and three territories. The most recent initiative to create a federal securities act and national securities regulator was declared unconstitutional in late 2011 by the Supreme Court of Canada. However, the Ministers of Finance of British Columbia, Ontario and Canada announced in September 2013

---

1 Andrew MacDougall, Robert Yalden and Elizabeth Walker are partners at Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP.

2 According to reports by Spencer Stuart, in Canada 85 per cent of corporations had a chair who is not the CEO and 81 per cent of directors were independent; in the UK the CEO rarely serves as chair but only 71 per cent of the directors are non-executives; and in the US only 42 per cent of corporations have a chair who is not the CEO but 84 per cent of directors are independent. See the Canadian Spencer Stuart Board Index for 2012 and the Spencer Stuart 2012 UK Board Index.

they are collaborating on a cooperative capital markets regulatory system.<sup>3</sup> Regulation of Canada's national stock exchange is divided between the Province of Ontario for the senior exchange, the Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta for the venture exchange and the Province of Quebec for the derivatives exchange.

Corporate governance practices in Canada are shaped by legal rules and best practices promoted by institutional shareholder groups, the media and professional director associations such as the Institute of Corporate Directors (ICD). Sources of legal rules include provincial corporate statutes, securities laws and rules, stock exchange requirements and the common law, as well as a wide variety of other regulatory statutes, regulations and policies. The 10 provincial securities commissions are very active in corporate governance matters, which often overlap corporate law areas of concern. Canadian corporate governance has also been influenced by the high proportion of public corporations in Canada that have a dominant or controlling shareholder, either through equity ownership or the ownership of multiple voting rights.

Canadian institutional investors have a profound influence on Canadian corporate governance practices and Canada may be unique in that has a national institutional investor organisation formed to promote good governance practices in corporations whose shares members own. The Canadian Coalition for Good Governance (CCGG) comprises 47 members, including many of Canada's largest institutional investors, collectively managing nearly C\$2 trillion in assets, and has pursued an organised programme of articulating its views and encouraging best practices generally without resorting to proxy battles.

#### **i Recent developments**

At the request of the government of the Province of Ontario, in July 2013 the Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) issued a consultation paper seeking input on proposed disclosure rules for public issuers (other than issuers listed on the TSX Venture Exchange and investment funds) to encourage them to increase the number of women on boards and in senior management. Submissions made to the OSC in writing and at a public roundtable discussion held on 16 October 2013 generally supported the initiative and, on 16 January 2014, the OSC issued for comment proposed changes to corporate governance disclosure requirements that would apply to all issuers subject to the public company reporting obligations of the Province of Ontario, again other than TSX Venture Exchange issuers and investment funds.

Issuers subject to the proposed requirements would be required to disclose annually in the proxy circular for the annual meeting (or the annual information form if the issuer does not send a proxy circular to its investors) the number and percentage of women directors and women who are executive officers. Such issuers would be

---

3 The cooperative capital markets regulatory system would involve uniform provincial capital markets legislation of participating provinces and complementary federal legislation. The jurisdictions participating in this initiative are working towards a 1 July 2015 implementation date.

required to disclose whether the issuer has adopted each of the following practices or explain why not:

- a* term limits for board service;
- b* a policy for the identification and nomination of women candidates for director;
- c* consideration of the level of representation of women on the board in identifying and nominating candidates for director;
- d* consideration of the level of representation of women in executive officer positions when making executive officer appointments;
- e* targets respecting the number or percentage of women on the board; and
- f* targets respecting the number or percentage of women in executive officer positions.

If an issuer has adopted a policy for the identification and nomination of women candidates for director, the issuer would be required to provide a summary of the policy and its objectives, the measures taken to implement it, the annual and cumulative progress made on achieving the objectives and whether, and if so how, the board or nominating committee measures the policy's effectiveness. If targets regarding women on the board or in executive officer positions have been adopted, the issuer would need to disclose the annual and cumulative progress made on achieving the targets. The comment period on the proposal expires 16 April 2014.

In August 2013, the Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA) issued a consultation paper regarding the effectiveness of the proxy voting system in Canada. The paper sought feedback on the two areas that the CSA believed would have the greatest potential to enhance the accuracy and reliability of the proxy voting system. The first was the system for determining voting entitlements for securities held through intermediaries on behalf of beneficial owners, including consideration of the impact of share lending, documentation errors and the nature and extent of over-reporting and over-voting. The second was the possibility of implementing an end-to-end vote confirmation system so that beneficial owners could receive assurance that their votes were received and recorded as cast. In January 2014, the OSC convened a public round-table panel discussion on the proposals with representatives from the issuer, institutional investor, brokerage and proxy advisory communities.

The Minister of Industry for the government of Canada launched in December 2013 a public consultation on changes to the Canada Business Corporations Act, which applies to federally incorporated companies. Comments are being sought with respect to whether changes should be made regarding a wide range of matters including:

- a* executive compensation disclosure, including whether to require 'say on pay' votes;
- b* voting rights, including possible mandatory ballot voting, individual election of directors versus slate voting, a prohibition on staggered boards, majority voting and proxy voting generally;
- c* facilitation of board and shareholder communications, including increasing the transparency of share ownership;
- d* board accountability, including separation of the CEO and board chair roles, shareholder approval of dilutive acquisitions, and disclosure on social and environmental matters;

- e* possible adoption of rules for the establishment of hybrid enterprises that have both profit-making and non-profit goals; and
- f* measures to enhance board diversity, including gender diversity.

The consultation period ends in March, 2014.

In January 2014, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, Canada's federal regulator of financial institutions, issued an advisory requiring regulated financial institutions to give prior notification of potential changes to their board or senior management.

## II CORPORATE LEADERSHIP

### i Board structure and practices

Responsibility for the governance of a corporation is vested in the corporation's board of directors (the board). The board is a single-tier body elected by the shareholders that supervises the management of the corporation. If shareholders are not satisfied with the performance of the board, they may remove the directors or refuse to re-elect them.

The role of directors is one of stewardship and oversight. Directors have complete discretion to exercise their powers as they deem appropriate, subject to the constraints imposed by law. The board discharges its responsibilities through majority approval of the directors at board meetings.

Directors are neither required nor expected to devote their full time and attention to the corporation's affairs. Instead, responsibility for the day-to-day management of a corporation's affairs is delegated to the CEO and other senior executives who are responsible to, and report back to, the board. Appointing these senior executives and evaluating their performance are among the most important functions of the board. Notwithstanding such delegation, the board retains the ability to intervene in management's decisions and must exercise final judgement on matters that are material to the corporation. National Policy 58-201 Corporate Governance Guidelines (NP 58-201), issued by the Canadian securities administrators (a group composed of the 10 provincial regulators) (CSA), recommends that a board adopt a written mandate in which it acknowledges responsibility for stewardship of the corporation.

### *Committees*

The board may delegate certain of its responsibilities to committees of directors. Certain responsibilities may not be delegated to a committee of the board, including (under the Canada Business Corporations Act):

- a* making changes to the by-laws;
- b* approving the annual financial statements, a management proxy circular, a takeover bid circular or directors' circular;
- c* issuing securities (except on terms already approved by the board);
- d* declaring dividends; and
- e* purchasing or redeeming shares of the corporation.

In practice, the committees of many boards do not formally approve the matters before them but return the matter to the full board with their recommendation.

All public corporations are required by statute to have an audit committee. Private corporations frequently choose to have an audit committee as a matter of good practice. Most public corporations also have separate committees to deal with compensation matters and director nominations and corporate governance. Corporations with larger boards may also have an executive committee. Boards also strike *ad hoc* or special committees from time to time to address specific issues or transactions.

Under the corporate statutes, the audit committee of a public corporation must be composed of at least three directors, a majority of whom must not be employees of the corporation or any of its affiliates. However, National Instrument 52-110 Audit Committees (NI 52-110) of the CSA requires that public corporation audit committees be composed of at least three members, all of whom must be 'independent' directors, as defined in that instrument. NI 52-110 also requires that all members of the audit committee be 'financially literate' – that is, that they have the ability to read and understand a set of financial statements that present a breadth and level of complexity of accounting issues that are generally comparable to the breadth and complexity of the issues that can reasonably be expected to be raised by the corporation's financial statements. Furthermore, corporations must disclose the education and experience of each audit committee member that is relevant to the performance of his or her responsibilities as an audit committee member.

Public corporations are required to disclose publicly on an annual basis the processes by which a board determines compensation for the corporation's directors and officers, including the responsibilities, powers, experience and operation of the compensation committee of the board, if any, and the identity, mandate and compensation paid to any advisers retained by the committee in the past financial year. The overwhelming majority of Canadian public corporations establish a board committee that has responsibility for overseeing compensation matters. NP 58-201 of the CSA recommends that a board appoint a compensation committee composed entirely of independent directors with responsibilities for oversight of the compensation payable to senior executives. The members of the compensation committee are not required to be independent or to have any particular expertise. However, if the compensation committee is not comprised solely of 'independent' directors as defined in Section 1.4 of NI 52-110, the corporation must disclose what steps the board takes to ensure an objective process for determining executive compensation.

Most Canadian public corporations also have a board committee that has responsibility for overseeing the process for nominating directors for election by shareholders. NP 58-201 recommends that, before an individual is nominated as a director, the board, with advice and input from the nominating committee, should consider the competencies and skills that the board, as a whole, should possess; the competencies and skills of each existing director and of each new nominee; and whether the new nominee can devote sufficient time and resources to serving as a director. Public corporations are required to disclose publicly on an annual basis the process by which the board identifies new candidates for nomination and the responsibilities, powers and operation of the nominating committee. The members of the nominating committee are not required to be independent or to have any particular expertise. However, if the

nomination committee is not comprised solely of ‘independent’ directors as defined in Section 1.4 of NI 52-110, the corporation must disclose what steps the board takes to ensure an objective nominating process.

### *Board chair*

Boards appoint a chair from among the directors with responsibility to provide leadership to the board to enhance board effectiveness. The chair is responsible for, among other things, managing the board, setting the agenda, ensuring that directors are kept informed, presiding at director and shareholder meetings, and acting as a key liaison between the board and senior management.

Canadian boards typically do not appoint the CEO as board chair. Concerns about board accountability and process and the desire to provide independent leadership to the board have led most larger public corporation boards in Canada to appoint an independent director as board chair. NP 58-201 recommends that the chair of the board should be an independent director and, where this is not appropriate, an independent director be appointed as lead director. Public corporations are required to disclose whether or not the chair is an independent director and, if not, to disclose whether the board has a lead director. If there is no independent chair or independent lead director, a corporation must then disclose what the board does to provide leadership for its independent directors.

## **ii Directors**

Directors are fiduciaries of the corporation they serve. This obligation and duty arises under common law and is codified in the corporate statutes in the requirement that directors act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation, and must exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances. This fiduciary relationship requires a strict standard of conduct that includes loyalty and good faith and requires directors to avoid putting themselves in a position where their duty to act in the best interests of the corporation conflicts with their other obligations.

Directors are required by corporate statutes to discharge their fiduciary duty ‘with a view to the best interests of the corporation’. The Supreme Court of Canada has stated that directors owe their fiduciary duty to the corporation and that the best interests of the corporation must not be confused with the interests of the corporation’s shareholders or any other stakeholders of the corporation.

### *Director qualifications*

Canadian corporate statutes impose minimal qualifications for directors. Any individual who is 18 or over and of sound mind and who is not bankrupt may serve as a director. Some Canadian corporate statutes also require that a certain percentage of directors of the board and committees be resident Canadians.

The ability of the board to exercise independent judgement is of fundamental importance to the governance of public corporations. As a result, most public corporation boards have a number of ‘independent’ directors. Independent directors and the role they play in ensuring the board is able to exercise independent judgement have been

a focus for those concerned with accountability in corporate governance. Rules for the determination of who may be considered to be an independent director are set out in both corporate and securities legislation in Canada. In addition, some Canadian institutional shareholders set their own standards for assessing director independence.

The corporate statutes define an independent director as any director who is not employed by the corporation or one of its affiliates. Under this definition, recently retired employees of the corporation and representatives of a controlling shareholder of the corporation would qualify as ‘independent’. Further, as the term ‘affiliates’ involves the concept of control, directors or employees of a major, but not controlling, shareholder are technically independent under the corporate statutes.

The TSX requires a listed corporation to have at least two independent directors. For this purpose, an independent director is a person who:

- a* is not a member of management and is free from any interest and any business or other relationship that could reasonably be perceived to materially interfere with the director’s ability to act in the best interest of the corporation; and
- b* is a beneficial holder, directly or indirectly, or is a nominee or associate of a beneficial holder, collectively of 10 per cent or less of the votes attaching to all issued and outstanding securities of the corporation.

However, the TSX does not consider a person to be independent if within the past three years they have served as an employee or service provider to the listed corporation or its affiliates or they currently serve as an employee or controlling shareholder of a company that has a material business relationship with the listed corporation.

For publicly traded corporations, there is yet another definition of ‘independent director’. The definition is set out in Section 1.4 of NI 52-110 of the CSA and requires the board to consider whether there is a material relationship between the director and the corporation that could, in the board’s view, be reasonably expected to interfere with the exercise of that director’s independent judgement. In making its determination, the board must consider all direct and indirect relationships between a director and the corporation – past, present and anticipated – both individually and collectively. The board’s determination is subject to certain ‘bright-line’ tests that are similar to the director independence tests under the New York Stock Exchange’s corporate governance listing requirements. Under such tests, recently retired employees and employees of a parent of the corporation are not independent. Public corporations are required to disclose annually which of the directors on the board are independent and which are not, and describe the basis for determining that a director was not independent. For audit committee purposes, there are additional bright-line director independence tests set out in Section 1.5 of NI 52-110 that correspond to requirements under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 in the United States.

### *Election and term*

Directors are usually elected by shareholders at the corporation’s annual meeting. Most Canadian corporations provide shareholders with the opportunity to vote on each director individually, instead of *en bloc* for a slate of directors. Slate voting for directors is rare in Canada since the TSX senior exchange requires all its listed companies to provide for individual voting for directors. Shareholders may vote for directors or withhold

their vote but cannot vote ‘against’ a director. A corporation’s articles may provide for cumulative voting for directors, whereby each shareholder may cast one vote for each share held multiplied by the number of directors to be elected. However, this is very rare. The articles of a corporation may also permit a particular class of security holders, such as preferred shareholders, to elect one or more directors, or may permit a particular class of security holders to hold multiple voting rights, such as 10 votes per share.

Directors are generally elected annually. Although corporate statutes permit directors to be elected for terms of up to three years and on a staggered basis, such practices are rare since most Canadian corporate statutes permit shareholders to remove one or more directors from office mid-term and elect their replacements. In addition, the TSX senior exchange now requires all its listed companies to elect directors annually.

### III DISCLOSURE

All Canadian corporations are subject to periodic reporting to shareholders. In the case of a private corporation, periodic reporting may consist solely of the delivery of annual financial statements and a notice of an annual shareholder meeting. Public corporations are also subject to continuous disclosure reporting requirements under Canadian securities laws.

Periodic disclosure requirements require public corporations to file publicly certain documents on the System for Electronic Document Analysis and Retrieval (SEDAR) including:

- a* annual and quarterly financial statements, and related management’s discussion and analysis;
- b* an annual information form describing the corporation and its business; and
- c* information circulars in respect of shareholder meetings, including disclosure respecting compensation paid or payable to the directors and certain named executive officers.

Canadian public corporations are also subject to timely disclosure obligations. Under Canadian securities laws, public corporations must issue and file on SEDAR a press release as soon as there has been a material change in the business, operations or capital of the corporation that would reasonably be expected to have a significant effect on the market price or value of any of the corporation’s securities. They must also file a material change report on SEDAR within 10 days of the date of such material change. TSX rules also require listed corporations to promptly disclose by press release any fact that would reasonably be expected to have a significant effect on the market price or value of any of the corporation’s securities.

Failure to comply with periodic filing requirements and timely disclosure obligations may lead to enforcement proceedings by securities administrators. In addition, investors in most jurisdictions in Canada may have a statutory right of action against the corporation and its directors and officers for damages in the event that written or oral disclosure by the corporation is misleading or untimely. Although there are statutory limits on such liability, class action proceedings alleging misleading or untimely disclosure are becoming increasingly prevalent in Canada.

Directors, certain officers, 10 per cent shareholders and certain others are required to file on the System for Electronic Disclosure by Insiders (SEDI) insider reports detailing their holdings of securities and related financial instruments, including equity-based compensation holdings, and other arrangements involving, directly or indirectly, a security of the public corporation or related financial instrument. Persons acquiring more than 10 per cent of any class of securities of the public corporation are required to issue a press release and file a report disclosing their holdings. However, Canadian securities regulators have issued a proposal to update such rules and lower the threshold for reporting.<sup>4</sup>

Many Canadian corporations also provide a range of supplemental voluntary disclosures that they publish on their corporate websites. Public corporation websites typically include links to documents filed on SEDAR and press releases issued by the corporation, as well as supplemental information provided to analysts, recordings or transcripts of analyst or investor calls, and key corporate governance documents (such as the board and committee charters and code of conduct).

#### IV CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

Directors are permitted to consider various stakeholder interests in determining whether they are acting in the best interests of the corporation. In the Supreme Court of Canada's recent decision in *BCE Inc v. 1976 Debentureholders*, the Court stated that where there are conflicting stakeholder interests, it falls to the directors to resolve them in accordance with their fiduciary duty to act in the best interests of the corporation, viewed as a 'good corporate citizen'. By this reference, together with the Court's focus on what is in the corporation's best interests, the Supreme Court of Canada has rejected a purely shareholder-centric understanding of the duties of a board. Rather, there is recognition that corporations have a duty to the community in which they operate and boards have to balance many competing factors and interests when making decisions.

Many Canadian corporations seek to enhance stakeholder trust including through voluntary participation in initiatives such as the Global Reporting Initiative's Sustainability Reporting Guidelines.

---

4 The CSA has suggested decreasing the reporting threshold from 10 per cent to 5 per cent. It would also require the filing of an early warning update not only in the event of an increase of a reportable position by 2 per cent or more, but also in the event that a reportable position is either decreased by an increment of 2 per cent or more, or falls below the 5 per cent reportable threshold. The CSA believes that providing investors with an earlier 'early warning' about accumulations of ownership positions is appropriate given that 5 per cent is the threshold under Canadian corporate law for a shareholder to requisition a special meeting of shareholders (a course of action that shareholder activists have shown a growing willingness to undertake). The change would also harmonise Canadian reporting thresholds with the standards seen in several major foreign jurisdictions, including the United States and the United Kingdom. If adopted, the proposed changes would not be likely to come into force before late 2013.

Boards are responsible for setting the tone at the top by approving codes of conduct for employees and directors that set out the board's expectations regarding compliance with laws, handling of conflicts of interest and use of resources and stakeholder relations. NP 58-201 states that the board is responsible for satisfying itself as to the integrity of the CEO and other executive officers of the corporation and that the CEO and other executive officers create a culture of integrity throughout the organisation. The audit committee is required under NI 52-110 to establish procedures for the receipt, retention and treatment of complaints received by the corporation regarding accounting, internal accounting controls or auditing matters and the confidential, anonymous submission by employees of the corporation of concerns regarding questionable accounting or auditing matters. Most corporations satisfy this requirement by adopting a whistle-blowing policy that addresses not only reporting of such matters, but also reporting of potential violations of the corporation's code of conduct.

## **V SHAREHOLDERS**

Although directors owe a duty to the corporation and not its individual shareholders, shareholders are accorded a special role in the governance of Canadian corporations. Increasingly, shareholders in Canada are taking steps to make their views known to the board and are exercising their rights when the board's response or corporate performance is not satisfactory.

### **i Shareholder rights and powers**

Under Canadian corporate statutes, shareholders elect the directors and appoint the external auditors of the corporation. Certain matters of fundamental importance are also required to be approved by shareholders, including changes to the articles and by-laws, amalgamations, reorganisations, the sale of all or substantially all of the corporation's assets and the continuance of the corporation to the laws of another jurisdiction. In addition, TSX rules require listed corporations to obtain shareholder approval of certain dilutive transactions and for share-based compensation arrangements involving new issuances of shares.

If a shareholder believes that the actions of the corporation have been unfairly prejudicial to its interests, the corporate statutes provide several ways for the shareholder to take action against directors. First, a shareholder may apply to the court for an order compelling the directors to comply with the corporation's articles, by-laws or governing statute. Second, a shareholder can pursue a derivative action, which allows the shareholder to require the corporation to take action against the directors in the name and on behalf of the corporation. Third, a shareholder may take advantage of the oppression remedy. The oppression remedy is a very broad remedy available to a complainant where the corporation, the board or the corporation's affiliate has acted in a manner that was oppressive or unfairly prejudicial to, or that unfairly disregarded, the complainant's interests. The remedy gives a court 'broad, equitable jurisdiction to enforce not just what is legal but what is fair' to protect the reasonable expectations of the shareholders.

In addition, shareholders have available to them a range of tools in Canada to exert pressure on corporations they feel are underperforming, all of which are intended to force a reluctant management or board to engage in a dialogue.

Canadian corporate statutes allow shareholders holding at least 5 per cent of the issued shares of a corporation to require directors to convene a shareholder meeting for a broad range of purposes relating to the business of the corporation so long as they respect certain prescribed criteria.

The corporate statutes also permit a shareholder to circulate a proposal to shareholders with a supporting paragraph containing not more than 500 words describing the topic the shareholder wishes to raise at an upcoming shareholder meeting. If the proposal meets time parameters and certain other limited criteria, it must be included in the management information circular sent to shareholders of the corporation. A shareholder proposal submitted by shareholders representing more than 5 per cent of the outstanding shares may include proposed director nominees. Although there is considerable opposition to proposed rules on 'proxy access' in the United States, the ability of shareholders to submit a shareholder proposal including director nominees has been a long-standing provision of Canadian corporate law.

Once a shareholder meeting has been called, any shareholder can solicit proxies either for or against any matter properly before the meeting, including the election of one or more directors, by providing a dissident proxy circular containing prescribed information to the person solicited prior to or contemporaneously with the solicitation. In recent years, rules respecting what constitutes solicitation and exempting certain practices from the proxy solicitation rules have been relaxed in favour of shareholders. For example, Canadian securities laws now allow a shareholder to solicit proxies by way of public broadcast or speech, or by way of publication, without having to incur the costs associated with preparing and mailing a dissident proxy circular, provided certain conditions are met.

## ii Shareholder activism

Shareholders of Canadian corporations now seem to be increasingly prepared to exercise voting rights and submit shareholder proposals as a means of encouraging change at corporations. In part, this reflects increased activity in Canada from a number of US-based funds that have traditionally been active in trying to influence the governance of US corporations and have come to realise that the Canadian environment is comparatively favourable to shareholder activist activity. For example, some Canadian companies have tangled with Carl Icahn (Fairmont Hotels, Lions Gate Entertainment), Crescendo Partners (Cott Corporation), Jana Partners (Agrium) and Pershing Capital (CP Rail). In addition, although Canadian fund managers have historically been more than comfortable making their views known to corporate boards and the public, they have recently demonstrated an increased appetite for formally opposing corporate activity. In 2010, the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan Board were highly vocal opponents of the terms on which Magna International proposed to eliminate its dual-class share structure (and launched an ultimately unsuccessful court challenge).

Some of the reasons the Canadian environment is more favourable to shareholder activists are:

- a* the use of staggered boards is ineffective as most Canadian corporations' directors may be removed at any time by a simple majority vote of shareholders;
- b* there are clear rights to requisition meetings with a 5 per cent ownership interest and a clear entitlement to a shareholder list;
- c* it is easier for shareholders to include proposals on the election of directors in management proxy circulars;
- d* the threshold for giving notice that a shareholder has accumulated a significant ownership position is higher at 10 per cent and the reporting regime after hitting that threshold is less onerous; and
- e* the TSX requires any listed issuer adopting a shareholder rights plan (i.e., poison pill) to obtain shareholder approval of the plan within six months of its adoption, which gives institutional shareholders the ability to influence the terms of these plans. Moreover, unlike the Delaware courts in the US, Canadian securities regulators have consistently been prepared to terminate rights plans once they have given a board time to pursue alternatives to a hostile bid, with the result that rights plans in Canada rarely provide a target with more than 45–65 days of protection. Canadian securities regulators are expected to propose changes to rules respecting such plans this year, which may result in somewhat more deference to a board's use of a rights plan, provided that it is approved annually by shareholders.

Shareholder activism has prompted a large number of Canadian companies to amend their by-laws recently to require advance notice in respect of nominations for director, previously this was not a common feature in the Canadian landscape.

### **iii Contact with shareholders**

Shareholder communication is a fundamental and long-standing aspect of the board's fiduciary oversight responsibility. Boards must take shareholder interests into consideration, and so they have an interest in understanding shareholder views about the corporation, its governance and its operations. Accordingly, Canadian corporations have a long-standing practice of consulting with their principal shareholders on matters that may be of interest to them. The importance of shareholder communications is recognised in NP 58-201, which states that the board is responsible for adopting a communication policy for the corporation.

All Canadian corporations have some form of shareholder communications programme through which the corporation communicates material information to shareholders. Typically, the corporation's disclosure practices are summarised in a disclosure policy and a management disclosure committee is tasked with responsibility for ensuring compliance with the disclosure policy and the corporation's disclosure controls and procedures.

However, traditional shareholder communication and investor relations practices no longer satisfy shareholder demands for increased transparency, more frequent communications and more opportunities to express their views on how the corporation should be run, as evidenced by recent shareholder-led initiatives on majority voting for

directors and say on pay. Some investors have actively sought the opportunity to meet with directors in addition to, or in lieu of, management. The CCGG has a regular annual programme through which its representatives meet with directors of approximately 50 Canadian corporations each year to share perspectives on the corporation, its strategies, performance and management. Generally, management is not present for these meetings.

## **VI OUTLOOK**

Shareholder activism as a tactical means of increasing shareholder returns is now part of the Canadian landscape and companies and directors are responding by taking a proactive approach involving advance communications to shareholders, engagement with activists and, with diminishing regularity among sophisticated boards, public proxy battles. Several Canadian regulatory initiatives under way are likely to result in new rules affecting corporate governance practices. In particular, new disclosure requirements regarding the representation of women on public company boards and in senior management are likely to come into effect this year, and will probably prompt changes in practice prior to implementation.

## Appendix 1

---

# ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### **ANDREW J MacDOUGALL**

*Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP*

Andrew J MacDougall is a partner in Osler's Toronto office and practises corporate and securities law, with a particular focus on mergers and acquisitions and corporate governance. In his corporate governance practice, he advises boards and management on a broad spectrum of corporate governance issues, including directors' duties, executive compensation, shareholder engagement and shareholder meeting matters, and he has written and spoken extensively on these topics. He has also advised Canadian securities regulators and various professional bodies in Canada that are active in the governance area.

### **ROBERT YALDEN**

*Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP*

Robert Yalden is a partner in Osler's Montreal office. He was co-chair of the firm's mergers and acquisitions group for 10 years prior to becoming a member of the firm's executive committee. His career with Osler spans 20 years, during which he has been involved with some of Canada's most innovative and groundbreaking transactions. Mr Yalden has advised boards of directors and senior management in connection with a wide range of corporate governance and M&A mandates. He was part of the Osler team that implemented the first poison pill in Canada. He led the Osler legal teams involved in Canada's largest-ever completed leveraged buyout, as well as the largest-ever buyout in the oil field services sector. He has recently been involved with a significant proxy fight that has seen the problems of 'empty voting' on the part of hedge funds receive considerable public scrutiny in Canada. He is the co-author of *Business Organizations, Policies and Practices* (2008) and teaches a course in comparative corporate governance at McGill University's faculty of law.

**ELIZABETH WALKER**

*Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP*

Elizabeth Walker is a partner in Osler's Ottawa office and practises corporate and securities law with an emphasis on private and public corporate finance matters, mergers and acquisitions and corporate governance. Her practice focuses on the areas of high-tech and biotech, Crown corporations and other government bodies. She advises a wide range of businesses and other entities, from start-up companies to public companies and public sector bodies, on corporate and securities matters, including a wide range of private and public M&A transactions, public and private financings and corporate governance.

**OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP**

100 King Street West  
1 First Canadian Place  
PO Box 50  
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1B8  
Canada  
Tel: +1 416 362 2111  
Fax: +1 416 862 6666  
amacdougall@osler.com  
ewalker@osler.com  
ryalden@osler.com  
www.osler.com