

Presenting the genocide-free investing shareholder proposal at the Voya shareholder meeting on May 26, 2016

This is the second year Investors Against Genocide has submitted a shareholder proposal on genocide-free investing. Anyone unfamiliar with the issue should review the whitepaper on our web site.

This year we made a simple request - to explain how investments in PetroChina and Sinopec are consistent with Voya's published corporate values. This is not complicated or unreasonable. We didn't ask for any change in policy. Yet the request was opposed and remains unanswered.

Is it because you think shareholders don't want this? When expressing themselves in an unbiased vote, 84% of your shareholders voted in favor of genocide-free investing yet Voya continues to invest in all the worst companies. Is this how you listen to shareholders and respond with urgency? How can shareholders not wonder why you've ignored their request since 2012?

Is it because you doubt any companies are problems? Research going back a decade, by Human Rights Watch and others, clearly identifies PetroChina and Sinopec's responsibility for the genocide in Sudan and extraordinary human rights violations in Syria. Every one of the 30 states, 61 colleges, and many mutual funds that acted on Sudan has targeted PetroChina. Do you have superior information?

Is it because you worry about targeted funds that invest in these companies in order to meet their investment objectives? If so, why not act on general funds where this is not an issue?

Is it because you believe addressing the issue conflicts with your fiduciary responsibilities? If so, how have your competitors acted without ramification?

Is it because you worry about the slippery slope and losing your independence? TIAA-CREF used its action on genocide-free investing to rebut extreme shareholder requests and prevailed when challenged at the SEC.

None of these explanations make sense. Your response to the proposal says it "is unnecessary because our business practices already reflect our recognition and support for the protection of fundamental human rights and the prevention of crimes against humanity". How can this be when you invest in multiple companies funding genocide?

Please finally explain how investments in PetroChina and Sinopec are consistent with your published corporate values. Please don't just repeat the material in the proxy statement that doesn't address our concerns. If you're unwilling to have an open dialog here today please suggest a venue you prefer.