

# A Case to Exclude the Triennial Say-on-Pay Shareholder Proposal

December 14, 2012 | Client Update | 2-minute read

The United Brotherhood of Carpenters has sent a number of companies shareholder proposals seeking (a) triennial say-on-pay votes and (b) a vote not only on the overall executive compensation but also on different components, such as annual pay, long-term incentives and post-employment compensation.

The SEC has posted the first of the likely many no-action [letters](#) to exclude the proposal. In the letter, BorgWarner refers to the SEC final release in adopting Rule 14a-21, which implemented both the say-on-pay vote and the vote required once every six years on how frequently the say-on-pay vote should occur (the frequency vote).

At that time, the SEC adopted an amendment to Rule 14a-8(i)(10) to allow companies to exclude a shareholder proposal that seeks advisory votes to approve the compensation of executives as disclosed under Item 402 of Regulation S-K, or that relates to the frequency vote, so long as the company adopted a policy to implement the frequency that is consistent with the choice of the majority of votes cast. In this case, BorgWarner decided to adopt annual say-on-pay votes consistent with the selection made by more than 70% of shareholders.

The company also argues that the annual say-on-pay vote that it is currently providing is substantially duplicative of the approach in the shareholder proposal that seeks a view on multiple parts of the executive compensation, and that a number of questions raised by the language of the proposal renders it vague and indefinite under Rule 14a-8(i)(3).

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.

**Ning Chiu**

+1 212 450 4908

[ning.chiu@davispolk.com](mailto:ning.chiu@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.*