

Updated Say-on-Pay Scorecard

May 23, 2011 | Client Update | 2-minute read

May is high season for annual shareholder meetings for U.S. public companies, so we wanted to update the findings that we shared in our [last memo](#) on the subject. As of the end of last week, 802 large accelerated filers reported the voting results from their shareholder meetings.

Regarding approval of “say-on-pay”, so far:

Large Accelerated Filers by Say-on-Pay Vote (as of May 20, 2011)

90-100% Approval	540
80-89% Approval	126
70-79% Approval	65
60-69% Approval	40
50-59% Approval	14
40-49% Approval	9
30-39% Approval	7
20-29% Approval	1
0-19% Approval	0
Total	802

In other words, less than 17% of large accelerated filers reported say-on-pay results below the 80% approval level, and less than 9% reported results below the 70% approval level.

A total of 16 large accelerated filers have lost their say-on-pay votes, and all of them received “against” recommendations from ISS. To date, large accelerated filers with “against” recommendations have averaged 64% approval, while those with “for” recommendations have averaged 92% approval. We believe the total number of public companies, including large accelerated filers, that have lost their say-on-pay votes is 26.

On the “say-when-on-pay” front, shareholders at 729 large accelerated filers voted in favor of an annual frequency (*i.e.*, almost 91% of all large accelerated filers). Less than a quarter of all large accelerated filers that recommended a triennial frequency have had their recommendation endorsed by shareholders, and, in the great bulk of these cases, the vote was supported by a controlling or at least very substantial insider shareholder.

If you have any questions regarding the matters covered in this publication, please reach out to any of the lawyers listed below or your usual Davis Polk contact.

Kyoko Takahashi Lin

+1 212 450 4706

kyoko.lin@davispolk.com

This communication, which we believe may be of interest to our clients and friends of the firm, is for general information only. It is not a full analysis of the matters presented and should not be relied upon as legal advice. This may be considered attorney advertising in some jurisdictions. Please refer to the firm's privacy notice for further details.