

Douglas Camille J.  
Form 4  
October 05, 2017

**FORM 4**

**UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20549**

OMB APPROVAL

OMB Number: 3235-0287  
Expires: January 31, 2015  
Estimated average burden hours per response... 0.5

Check this box if no longer subject to Section 16. Form 4 or Form 5 obligations may continue. See Instruction 1(b).

**STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF SECURITIES**

Filed pursuant to Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Section 17(a) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 or Section 30(h) of the Investment Company Act of 1940

(Print or Type Responses)

1. Name and Address of Reporting Person \*  
Douglas Camille J.

2. Issuer Name and Ticker or Trading Symbol  
STARWOOD PROPERTY TRUST, INC. [STWD]

5. Relationship of Reporting Person(s) to Issuer

(Check all applicable)

(Last) (First) (Middle)

3. Date of Earliest Transaction (Month/Day/Year)  
10/04/2017

Director  10% Owner  
 Officer (give title below)  Other (specify below)

C/O STARWOOD PROPERTY TRUST, INC., 591 WEST PUTNAM AVENUE

(Street)

4. If Amendment, Date Original Filed(Month/Day/Year)

6. Individual or Joint/Group Filing(Check Applicable Line)  
 Form filed by One Reporting Person  
 Form filed by More than One Reporting Person

GREENWICH, CT 06830

(City) (State) (Zip)

**Table I - Non-Derivative Securities Acquired, Disposed of, or Beneficially Owned**

| 1. Title of Security (Instr. 3) | 2. Transaction Date (Month/Day/Year) | 2A. Deemed Execution Date, if any (Month/Day/Year) | 3. Transaction Code (Instr. 8) |   | 4. Securities Acquired (A) or Disposed of (D) (Instr. 3, 4 and 5) |       | 5. Amount of Securities Beneficially Owned Following Reported Transaction(s) (Instr. 3 and 4) | 6. Ownership Form: Direct (D) or Indirect (I) (Instr. 4) | 7. Nature of Ownership (Instr. 4) |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|---|-------|---|--|-----------------------------------|
|                                 |                                      |  | Code                           | V | Amount  | Price |   |  |                                   |
| Common Stock <sup>(1)</sup>     | 10/04/2017                           |  | A                              |   | 5,076   | A     | 26,020  | D  |                                   |

Reminder: Report on a separate line for each class of securities beneficially owned directly or indirectly.

**Persons who respond to the collection of information contained in this form are not required to respond unless the form displays a currently valid OMB control number.**

SEC 1474 (9-02)

**Table II - Derivative Securities Acquired, Disposed of, or Beneficially Owned (e.g., puts, calls, warrants, options, convertible securities)**

Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

| 1. Title of Derivative Security (Instr. 3) | 2. Conversion or Exercise Price of Derivative Security | 3. Transaction Date (Month/Day/Year) | 3A. Deemed Execution Date, if any (Month/Day/Year) | 4. Transaction Code (Instr. 8) | 5. Number of Derivative Securities Acquired (A) or Disposed of (D) (Instr. 3, 4, and 5) | 6. Date Exercisable and Expiration Date (Month/Day/Year) | 7. Title and Amount of Underlying Securities (Instr. 3 and 4) | 8. Price of Derivative Security (Instr. 5) | 9. Number of Derivative Securities Owned Following Reporting Transaction (Instr. 6) |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|

## Reporting Owners

| Reporting Owner Name / Address   | Relationships |           |         |       |
|--|---------------|-----------|---------|-------|
|  | Director      | 10% Owner | Officer | Other |
| Douglas Camille J.<br>C/O STARWOOD PROPERTY TRUST, INC.<br>591 WEST PUTNAM AVENUE<br>GREENWICH, CT 06830 | X             |           |         |       |

## Signatures

/s/ Camille J.  
Douglas 10/05/2017

\*\*Signature of Reporting Person Date

## Explanation of Responses:

- \* If the form is filed by more than one reporting person, see Instruction 4(b)(v).
  - \*\* Intentional misstatements or omissions of facts constitute Federal Criminal Violations. See 18 U.S.C. 1001 and 15 U.S.C. 78ff(a).
- (1) Represents restricted shares of the issuer's common stock vesting on October 4, 2018.
- (2) The issuer granted these shares to Ms. Douglas pursuant to the Starwood Property Trust, Inc. 2017 Equity Plan.

Note: File three copies of this Form, one of which must be manually signed. If space is insufficient, see Instruction 6 for procedure. Potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information contained in this form are not required to respond unless the form displays a currently valid OMB number. Federal income tax purposes \$633,302,824

**H) Determination of net asset** Net asset value of the common shares is determined by dividing the value of all assets of the fund, less all liabilities and the liquidation preference of any outstanding remarketed preferred shares, by the total number of common shares outstanding as of period end.

### Note 2: Management fee, administrative services and other transactions

Putnam Management is paid for management and investment advisory services quarterly based on the average net assets of the fund. Such fee is based on the lesser of (i) an annual rate of 0.55% of the average net assets of the fund attributable to common and preferred shares outstanding or (ii) the following annual rates expressed as a percentage of the fund's average net assets attributable to common and preferred shares outstanding: 0.65% of the first \$500 million, and 0.55% of the next \$500 million, with additional breakpoints at higher asset levels.

## Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

If dividends payable on remarketed preferred shares during any dividend payment period plus any expenses attributable to remarketed preferred shares for that period exceed the fund's gross income attributable to the proceeds of the remarketed preferred shares during that period, then the fee payable to Putnam Management for that period will be reduced by the amount of the excess (but not more than the effective management fee rate under the contract multiplied by the liquidation preference of the remarketed preferred shares outstanding during the period).

The fund reimburses Putnam Management an allocated amount for the compensation and related expenses of certain officers of the fund and their staff who provide administrative services to the fund. The aggregate amount of all such reimbursements is determined annually by the Trustees.

Custodial services for the fund's assets were provided by Putnam Fiduciary Trust Company ("PFTC"), an affiliate of Putnam Management, and by State Street Bank and Trust Company ("State Street"). Custody fees are based on the fund's asset level, the number of its security holdings, transaction volumes and with respect to PFTC, certain fees related to the transition of assets to State Street. Putnam Investor Services, a division of PFTC, provided investor servicing agent functions to the fund. Putnam Investor Services was paid a monthly fee for investor servicing at an annual rate of 0.05% of the fund's average net assets. During the year ended October 31, 2008, the fund incurred \$199,663 for custody and investor servicing agent functions provided by PFTC.

The fund has entered into expense offset arrangements with PFTC and State Street whereby PFTC's and State Street's fees are reduced by credits allowed on cash balances. For the year ended October 31, 2008, the fund's expenses were reduced by \$66,784 under the expense offset arrangements.

34

---

Each independent Trustee of the fund receives an annual Trustee fee, of which \$398, as a quarterly retainer, has been allocated to the fund, and an additional fee for each Trustees meeting attended. Trustees receive additional fees for attendance at certain committee meetings and industry seminars and for certain compliance-related matters. Trustees also are reimbursed for expenses they incur relating to their services as Trustees.

The fund has adopted a Trustee Fee Deferral Plan (the "Deferral Plan") which allows the Trustees to defer the receipt of all or a portion of Trustees fees payable on or after July 1, 1995. The deferred fees remain invested in certain Putnam funds until distribution in accordance with the Deferral Plan.

The fund has adopted an unfunded noncontributory defined benefit pension plan (the "Pension Plan") covering all Trustees of the fund who have served as a Trustee for at least five years and were first elected prior to 2004. Benefits under the Pension Plan are equal to 50% of the Trustee's average annual attendance and retainer fees for the three years ended December 31, 2005. The retirement benefit is payable during a Trustee's lifetime, beginning the year following retirement, for the number of years of service through December 31, 2006. Pension expense for the fund is included in Trustee compensation and expenses in the Statement of operations. Accrued pension liability is included in Payable for Trustee compensation and expenses in the Statement of assets and liabilities. The Trustees have terminated the Pension Plan with respect to any Trustee first elected after 2003.

### **Note 3: Purchases and sales of securities**

During the year ended October 31, 2008, cost of purchases and proceeds from sales of investment securities other than short-term investments aggregated \$234,531,885 and \$274,394,029, respectively. There were no purchases or sales of U.S. government securities.

### **Note 4: Preferred shares**

On February 19, 2008, Putnam High Yield Municipal Trust merged with and into the fund. A related two-for-one stock split of Series C remarketed preferred shares of Putnam Managed Municipal Income Trust reduced the liquidation preference of these shares from \$100,000 to \$50,000 per share. The stock split was necessary to accommodate the different per-share liquidation preferences of preferred shares of the merging series, and did not affect the aggregate liquidation preference of preferred shares held by any shareholder.

The Series A (495), Series B (495) and Series C (1,980) Remarketed Preferred shares are redeemable at the option of the fund on any dividend payment date at a redemption price of \$100,000 per share for Series A and B, and at \$50,000 per share for Series C, plus an amount equal to any dividends accumulated on a daily basis but unpaid through the redemption date (whether or not such dividends have been declared) and, in certain circumstances, a call premium.

In August and September 2008, the fund redeemed 55 Series A, 55 Series B and 220 Series C Remarketed Preferred shares. The redemption price was equal to the liquidation preference per share (\$100,000 for Series A and B; \$50,000 Series C) of each series

## Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

of preferred shares, plus accumulated but unpaid dividends as of the following redemption dates: September 3, 2008 for Series A, September 17, 2008 for Series B and August 20, 2008 for Series C Remarketed Preferred shares. The August and September 2008 preferred share redemptions represented 10% of the fund's \$220,000,000 in outstanding preferred shares.

It is anticipated that dividends paid to holders of remarketed preferred shares will be considered tax-exempt dividends under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. To the extent that the fund earns taxable income and capital gains by the conclusion of a fiscal year, it may be required to apportion to the holders of the remarketed preferred shares throughout that year additional dividends as necessary to result in an after-tax equivalent to the applicable dividend rate for the period. Total additional dividends for the fiscal year ended October 31, 2008 were \$22,976.

Under the Investment Company Act of 1940, the fund is required to maintain asset coverage of at least 200% with respect to the remarketed preferred shares. Additionally, the fund's bylaws impose more stringent asset coverage requirements and restrictions relating to the rating of the remarketed preferred shares by the shares' rating agencies. Should these requirements not be met, or should dividends accrued on the remarketed preferred shares not be paid, the fund may be restricted in its ability to declare dividends to common shareholders or may be required to redeem certain of the remarketed preferred shares. At October 31, 2008, no such restrictions have been placed on the fund.

On December 10, 2008 the fund redeemed the remaining 495 Series B Remarketed Preferred shares; this redemption represented approximately 25% of the fund's \$198,000,000 in outstanding preferred shares.

Following the December 2008 redemption the fund's outstanding preferred shares amounted to \$148,500,000.

### **Note 5: Shares repurchased**

In September 2008, the Trustees approved the renewal of the repurchase program to allow the fund to repurchase up to 10% of its outstanding common shares over the 12 month period ending October 7, 2009 (based on shares outstanding as of October 7, 2008). Prior to this renewal, the Trustees had approved a repurchase program to allow the fund to repurchase up to 10% of its outstanding common shares over the 12 month period ending October 7, 2008 (based on shares outstanding as of October 5, 2007). Repurchases are made when the fund's shares are trading at less than net asset value and in accordance with procedures approved by the fund's Trustees.

For the year ended October 31, 2008, the fund repurchased 789,594 common shares for an aggregate purchase price of \$5,522,844, which reflects a weighted-average discount from net asset value per share of 10.71% .

### **Note 6: Acquisition of Putnam HighYield MunicipalTrust**

On February 19, 2008, the fund issued 18,007,034 common shares, in exchange for common shares of Putnam High Yield Municipal Trust to acquire that fund's net assets in a tax-free exchange approved by the shareholders. The common net assets of the fund and Putnam High Yield Municipal Trust on February 15, 2008, were \$310,693,597 and \$141,608,656 respectively. On February 15, 2008, Putnam High Yield Municipal Trust had distributions in excess of net investment income of \$181,134, accumulated net realized loss of \$24,733,409 and unrealized appreciation of \$3,004,507. The aggregate common net assets of the fund immediately following the acquisition were \$452,302,253.

On February 19, 2008, the fund also issued 900 Series C remarketed preferred shares in exchange for 900 Series A remarketed preferred shares of Putnam High Yield Municipal Trust. The liquidation preference of these shares is \$45,000,000.

Information presented in the Statement of operations and changes in net assets reflect only the operations of Putnam Managed Municipal Income Trust.

### **Note 7: Regulatory matters and litigation**

In late 2003 and 2004, Putnam Management settled charges brought by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Massachusetts Securities Division in connection with excessive short-term trading in Putnam funds. Distribution of payments from Putnam Management to certain open-end Putnam funds and their shareholders is expected to be completed in the next several months. These allegations and related matters have served as the general basis for certain lawsuits, including purported class action lawsuits against Putnam Management and, in a limited number of cases, some Putnam funds. Putnam Management believes that these lawsuits will have no material adverse

35

---

effect on the funds or on Putnam Management's ability to provide investment management services. In addition, Putnam Management has agreed to bear any costs incurred by the Putnam funds as a result of these matters.

Explanation of Responses:

## Note 8: New accounting pronouncements

In June 2006, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued Interpretation No. 48, *Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes* (the Interpretation). The Interpretation prescribes a minimum threshold for financial statement recognition of the benefit of a tax position taken or expected to be taken by a filer in the filer's tax return. Upon adoption, the Interpretation did not have a material effect on the fund's financial statements. However, the conclusions regarding the Interpretation may be subject to review and adjustment at a later date based on factors including, but not limited to, further implementation guidance expected from the FASB, and on-going analysis of tax laws, regulations and interpretations thereof. Each of the fund's federal tax returns for the prior three fiscal years remains subject to examination by the Internal Revenue Service.

In September 2006, the FASB issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 157, *Fair Value Measurements* (the Standard). The Standard defines fair value, sets out a framework for measuring fair value and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. The Standard applies to fair value measurements already required or permitted by existing standards. The Standard is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007 and interim periods within those fiscal years. Putnam Management does not believe the adoption of the Standard will impact the amounts reported in the financial statements; however, additional disclosures will be required about the inputs used to develop the measurements of fair value.

In March 2008, Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 161, *Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities* (SFAS 161) (an amendment of FASB Statement No. 133, was issued and is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2008. SFAS 161 requires enhanced disclosures about how and why an entity uses derivative instruments and how derivative instruments affect an entity's financial position. Putnam Management is currently evaluating the impact the adoption of SFAS 161 will have on the fund's financial statement disclosures.

In September 2008, FASB Staff Position FAS 133-1 and FIN 45-4, *Disclosures about Credit Derivatives and Certain Guarantees: An Amendment of FASB Statement No. 133 and FASB Interpretation No. 45; and Clarification of the Effective Date of FASB Statement No. 161* (the Amendment) was issued and is effective for annual and interim reporting periods ending after November 15, 2008. The Amendment requires enhanced disclosures regarding a fund's credit derivatives holdings and hybrid financial instruments containing embedded credit derivatives. Putnam Management is currently evaluating the impact the adoption of the Amendment will have on the fund's financial statement disclosures.

## Note 9: Actions by Trustees

The Trustees of the Putnam Funds have approved a plan to merge the fund into Putnam Tax Free High Yield Fund. The transaction is scheduled to occur in 2009. It is subject to a number of conditions, including approval of a majority of the outstanding shareholders of the fund, and there is no guarantee it will occur.

# Federal tax information and compliance certifications (unaudited)

## Federal tax information

The fund has designated 99.26% of dividends paid from net investment income during the fiscal year as tax exempt for Federal income tax purposes.

The Form 1099 you receive in January 2009 will show the tax status of all distributions paid to your account in calendar 2008.

## Compliance certifications

On June 4, 2008, your fund submitted a CEO annual certification to the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) on which the fund's principal executive officer certified that he was not aware, as of that date, of any violation by the fund of the NYSE's Corporate Governance listing standards. In addition, as required by Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and related SEC rules, the fund's principal executive and principal financial officers have made quarterly certifications, included in filings with the SEC on Forms N-CSR and N-Q, relating to, among other things, the fund's disclosure controls and procedures and internal control over financial reporting.

## Shareholder meeting results (unaudited)

### May 8, 2008 meeting

At the meeting, each of the nominees for Trustees was elected, as follows:

|                          | Votes for  | Votes withheld | Abstentions      | Broker non votes |
|--------------------------|------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Jameson A. Baxter        | 49,883,109 | 2,193,577      | 14,764           | □                |
| Charles B. Curtis        | 49,873,109 | 2,203,577      | 14,764           | □                |
| Robert J. Darretta       | 49,875,182 | 2,201,504      | 14,764           | □                |
| Myra R. Drucker          | 49,869,468 | 2,207,218      | 14,764           | □                |
| Charles E. Haldeman, Jr. | 49,874,510 | 2,202,176      | 14,764           | □                |
| Paul L. Joskow           | 49,881,778 | 2,194,908      | 14,764           | □                |
| Elizabeth T. Kennan      | 49,844,020 | 2,232,666      | 14,764           | □                |
| Kenneth R. Leibler       | 49,853,839 | 2,222,847      | 14,764           | □                |
| George Putnam, III       | 49,885,246 | 2,191,440      | 14,764           | □                |
| Richard B. Worley        | 49,876,859 | 2,199,827      | 14,764           | □                |
|                          |            |                | Preferred shares |                  |
|                          | Votes for  | Votes withheld | Abstentions      | Broker non votes |
| John A. Hill             | 2,684      | 467            | □                | □                |
| Robert E. Patterson      | 2,684      | 467            | □                | □                |

All tabulations are rounded to the nearest whole number.

### December 12, 2007 special meeting of shareholders

A proposal to approve an agreement and plan of merger with Putnam High Yield Municipal Income Trust was approved as follows:

|  | Votes for  | Common shares<br>Votes withheld    | Abstentions |
|--|------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
|  | 23,228,606 | 949,930                            | 578,556     |
|  | Votes for  | Preferred shares<br>Votes withheld | Abstentions |

Explanation of Responses:

|       |    |    |
|-------|----|----|
| 1,661 | 36 | 25 |
|-------|----|----|

A proposal to approve (i) the authorization, creation and issuance of \$45 million in additional shares of preferred shares and (ii) a two-for-one stock split of Class C Remarketed Preferred shares was approved as follows:

| Remarketed Preferred shares Series A |                |             |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Votes for                            | Votes withheld | Abstentions |
| 522                                  | 6              | 17          |

| Remarketed Preferred shares Series B |                |             |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Votes for                            | Votes withheld | Abstentions |
| 515                                  | 30             | 5           |

| Remarketed Preferred shares Series C |                |             |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Votes for                            | Votes withheld | Abstentions |
| 627                                  | 0              | 0           |

37

## About the Trustees

### **Jameson A. Baxter**

*Born 1943, Trustee since 1994, Vice Chairman since 2005*

Ms. Baxter is the President of Baxter Associates, Inc., a private investment firm.

Ms. Baxter serves as a Director of ASHTA Chemicals, Inc., and the Mutual Fund Directors Forum. Until 2007, she was a Director of Banta Corporation (a printing and supply chain management company), Ryerson, Inc. (a metals service corporation), and Advocate Health Care. Until 2004, she was a Director of BoardSource (formerly the National Center for Nonprofit Boards); and until 2002, she was a Director of Intermatic Corporation (a manufacturer of energy control products). She is Chairman Emeritus of the Board of Trustees, Mount Holyoke College, having served as Chairman for five years.

Ms. Baxter has held various positions in investment banking and corporate finance, including Vice President of and Consultant to First Boston Corporation and Vice President and Principal of the Regency Group. She is a graduate of Mount Holyoke College.

### **Charles B. Curtis**

*Born 1940, Trustee since 2001*

## Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

Mr. Curtis is President and Chief Operating Officer of the Nuclear Threat Initiative (a private foundation dealing with national security issues), and serves as Senior Advisor to the United Nations Foundation.

Mr. Curtis is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and serves as Director of Edison International and Southern California Edison. Until 2006, Mr. Curtis served as a member of the Trustee Advisory Council of the Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Hopkins University. Until 2003, Mr. Curtis was a member of the Electric Power Research Institute Advisory Council and the University of Chicago Board of Governors for Argonne National Laboratory. Prior to 2002, Mr. Curtis was a member of the Board of Directors of the Gas Technology Institute and the Board of Directors of the Environment and Natural Resources Program Steering Committee, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Until 2001, Mr. Curtis was a member of the Department of Defense Policy Board and Director of EG&G Technical Services, Inc. (a fossil energy research and development support company).

From August 1997 to December 1999, Mr. Curtis was a Partner at Hogan & Hartson LLP, an international law firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Prior to May 1997, Mr. Curtis was Deputy Secretary of Energy and Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy. He served as Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from 1977 to 1981 and has held positions on the staff of the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Treasury Department, and the SEC.

### **Robert J. Darretta**

*Born 1946, Trustee since 2007*

Mr. Darretta serves as Director of United-Health Group, a diversified health-care company.

Until April 2007, Mr. Darretta was Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of Johnson & Johnson, one of the world's largest and most broadly based health-care companies. Prior to 2007, he had responsibility for Johnson & Johnson's finance, investor relations, information technology, and procurement function. He served as Johnson & Johnson Chief Financial Officer for a decade, prior to which he spent two years as Treasurer of the corporation and over ten years leading various Johnson & Johnson operating companies.

Mr. Darretta received a B.S. in Economics from Villanova University.

### **Myra R. Drucker**

*Born 1948, Trustee since 2004*

Ms. Drucker is Chair of the Board of Trustees of Commonfund (a not-for-profit firm specializing in managing assets for educational endowments and foundations), Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees of Sarah Lawrence College, and a member of the Investment Committee of the Kresge Foundation (a charitable trust). She is also a Director of New York Stock Exchange LLC (a wholly-owned subsidiary of NYSE Euronext), and a Director of Interactive Data Corporation (a provider of financial market data and analytics to financial institutions and investors).

Ms. Drucker is an ex-officio member of the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) Pension Managers Advisory Committee, having served as Chair for seven years. She serves as an advisor to RCM Capital Management (an investment management firm) and to the Employee Benefits Investment Committee of The Boeing Company (an aerospace firm).

From November 2001 until August 2004, Ms. Drucker was Managing Director and a member of the Board of Directors of General Motors Asset Management and Chief Investment Officer of General Motors Trust Bank. From December 1992 to November 2001, Ms. Drucker served as Chief Investment Officer of Xerox Corporation (a document company). Prior to December 1992, Ms. Drucker was Staff Vice President and Director of Trust Investments for International Paper (a paper and packaging company).

Ms. Drucker received a B.A. degree in Literature and Psychology from Sarah Lawrence College and pursued graduate studies in economics, statistics, and portfolio theory at Temple University.

**Charles E. Haldeman, Jr.\***

*Born 1948, Trustee since 2004 and  
President of the Funds since 2007*

Mr. Haldeman is Chairman of Putnam Investment Management, LLC and President of the Putnam Funds. Prior to July 2008, he was President and Chief Executive Officer of Putnam, LLC (Putnam Investments). Prior to November 2003, Mr. Haldeman served as Co-Head of Putnam Investments' Investment Division.

Prior to joining Putnam in 2002, he held executive positions in the investment management industry. He previously served as Chief Executive Officer of Delaware Investments and President and Chief Operating Officer of United Asset Management. Mr. Haldeman was also a

38

---

Partner and Director of Cooke & Bieler, Inc. (an investment management firm).

Mr. Haldeman currently serves on the Board of Governors of the Investment Company Institute and as Chair of the Board of Trustees of Dartmouth College. He also serves on the Partners HealthCare Investment Committee, the Tuck School of Business Overseers, and the Harvard Business School Board of Dean's Advisors. He is a graduate of Dartmouth College, Harvard Law School, and Harvard Business School. Mr. Haldeman is also a Chartered Financial Analyst (CFA) charterholder.

**John A. Hill**

*Born 1942, Trustee since 1985 and  
Chairman since 2000*

Mr. Hill is founder and Vice-Chairman of First Reserve Corporation, the leading private equity buyout firm specializing in the worldwide energy industry, with offices in Greenwich, Connecticut; Houston, Texas; London, England; and Shanghai, China. The firm's investments on behalf of some of the nation's largest pension and endowment funds are currently concentrated in 26 companies with annual revenues in excess of \$13 billion, which employ over 100,000 people in 23 countries.

Mr. Hill is Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Putnam Mutual Funds, a Director of Devon Energy Corporation and various private companies owned by First Reserve, and serves as a Trustee of Sarah Lawrence College where he chairs the Investment Committee.

Prior to forming First Reserve in 1983, Mr. Hill served as President of F. Eberstadt and Company, an investment banking and investment management firm. Between 1969 and 1976, Mr. Hill held various senior positions in Washington, D.C. with the federal government, including Deputy Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration during the Ford Administration.

Born and raised in Midland, Texas, he received his B.A. in Economics from Southern Methodist University and pursued graduate studies as a Woodrow Wilson Fellow.

**Paul L. Joskow**

*Born 1947, Trustee since 1997*

Dr. Joskow is an economist and President of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (a philanthropic institution focused primarily on research and education on issues related to science, technology, and economic performance). He is on leave from his position as the Elizabeth and James Killian Professor of Economics and Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), where he has been on the faculty since 1972. Dr. Joskow was the Director of the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research at MIT from 1999 through 2007.

Dr. Joskow serves as a Trustee of Yale University, as a Director of TransCanada Corporation (an energy company focused on natural gas transmission and power services) and of Exelon Corporation (an energy company focused on power services), and as a member of the Board of Overseers of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Prior to August 2007, he served as a Director of National Grid (a UK-based holding company with interests in electric and gas transmission and distribution and telecommunications infrastructure). Prior to July 2006, he served as President of the Yale University Council and continues to serve as a member of the Council. Prior to February 2005, he served on the board of the Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research (a non-profit research institution). Prior to February 2002, he was a Director of State Farm Indemnity Company (an automobile insurance company), and prior to March 2000, he was a Director of New England Electric System (a public utility holding company).

Dr. Joskow has published six books and numerous articles on industrial organization, government regulation of industry, and competition policy. He is active in industry restructuring, environmental, energy, competition, and privatization policies □ serving as an advisor to governments and corporations worldwide. Dr. Joskow holds a Ph.D. and MPhil from Yale University and a B.A. from Cornell University.

### **Elizabeth T. Kennan**

*Born 1938, Trustee since 1992*

Dr. Kennan is a Partner of Cambus-Kenneth Farm (thoroughbred horse and cattle breeding). She is President Emeritus of Mount Holyoke College.

Dr. Kennan served as Chairman and is now Lead Director of Northeast Utilities. She is a Trustee of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, of Centre College, and of Midway College in Midway, Kentucky. Until 2006, she was a member of The Trustees of Reservations. Prior to 2001, Dr. Kennan served on the oversight committee of the Folger Shakespeare Library. Prior to June 2005, she was a Director of Talbots, Inc., and she has served as Director on a number of other boards, including Bell Atlantic, Chastain Real Estate, Shawmut Bank, Berkshire Life Insurance, and Kentucky Home Life Insurance. Dr. Kennan has also served as President of Five Colleges Incorporated and as a Trustee of Notre Dame University, and is active in various educational and civic associations.

As a member of the faculty of Catholic University for twelve years, until 1978, Dr. Kennan directed the post-doctoral program in Patristic and Medieval Studies, taught history, and published numerous articles and two books. Dr. Kennan holds a Ph.D. from the University of Washington in Seattle, an M.S. from St. Hilda's College at Oxford University, and an A.B. from Mount Holyoke College. She holds several honorary doctorates.

### **Kenneth R. Leibler**

*Born 1949, Trustee since 2006*

Mr. Leibler is a founder and former Chairman of the Boston Options Exchange, an electronic marketplace for the trading of derivative securities.

Mr. Leibler currently serves as a Trustee of Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital in Boston. He is also Lead Director of Ruder Finn Group, a global communications and advertising firm, and a Director of Northeast Utilities, which operates New England's largest energy delivery system. Prior to December 2006, he served as a Director of the Optimum Funds group. Prior to October 2006, he served as a Director of ISO New England, the

39

---

organization responsible for the operation of the electric generation system in the New England states. Prior to 2000, Mr. Leibler was a Director of the Investment Company Institute in Washington, D.C.

Prior to January 2005, Mr. Leibler served as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Boston Stock Exchange. Prior to January 2000, he served as President and Chief Executive Officer of Liberty Financial Companies, a publicly traded diversified asset management organization. Prior to June 1990, Mr. Leibler served as President

and Chief Operating Officer of the American Stock Exchange (AMEX), and at the time was the youngest person in AMEX history to hold the title of President. Prior to serving as AMEX President, he held the position of Chief Financial Officer, and headed its management and marketing operations. Mr. Leibler graduated magna cum laude with a degree in Economics from Syracuse University, where he was elected Phi Beta Kappa.

**Robert E. Patterson**

*Born 1945, Trustee since 1984*

Mr. Patterson is Senior Partner of Cabot Properties, LP and Chairman of Cabot Properties, Inc. (a private equity firm investing in commercial real estate).

Mr. Patterson serves as Chairman Emeritus and Trustee of the Joslin Diabetes Center. Prior to June 2003, he was a Trustee of Sea Education Association. Prior to December 2001, Mr. Patterson was President and Trustee of Cabot Industrial Trust (a publicly traded real estate investment trust). Prior to February 1998, he was Executive Vice President and Director of Acquisitions of Cabot Partners Limited Partnership (a registered investment adviser involved in institutional real estate investments). Prior to 1990, he served as Executive Vice President of Cabot, Cabot & Forbes Realty Advisors, Inc. (the predecessor company of Cabot Partners).

Mr. Patterson practiced law and held various positions in state government, and was the founding Executive Director of the Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency. Mr. Patterson is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School.

**George Putnam, III**

*Born 1951, Trustee since 1984*

Mr. Putnam is Chairman of New Generation Research, Inc. (a publisher of financial advisory and other research services), and President of New Generation Advisers, Inc. (a registered investment adviser to private funds). Mr. Putnam founded the New Generation companies in 1986.

Mr. Putnam is a Director of The Boston Family Office, LLC (a registered investment adviser). He is a Trustee of St. Mark's School and a Trustee of the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Until 2006, he was a Trustee of Shore Country Day School, and until 2002, was a Trustee of the Sea Education Association.

Mr. Putnam previously worked as an attorney with the law firm of Dechert LLP (formerly known as Dechert Price & Rhoads) in Philadelphia. He is a graduate of Harvard College, Harvard Business School, and Harvard Law School.

**Robert L. Reynolds\***

*Born 1952, Trustee since 2008*

Mr. Reynolds is President and Chief Executive Officer of Putnam Investments, and a member of Putnam Investments' Executive Board of Directors. He has more than 30 years of investment and financial services experience.

Prior to joining Putnam Investments in 2008, Mr. Reynolds was Vice Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of Fidelity Investments from 2000 to 2007. During this time, he served on the Board of Directors for FMR Corporation, Fidelity Investments Insurance Ltd., Fidelity Investments Canada Ltd., and Fidelity Management Trust Company. He was also a Trustee of the Fidelity Family of Funds. From 1984 to 2000, Mr. Reynolds served in a number of increasingly responsible leadership roles at Fidelity.

Mr. Reynolds serves on several not-for-profit boards, including those of the West Virginia University Foundation, Concord Museum, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Lahey Clinic, and Initiative for a Competitive Inner City in Boston. He is a member of the Chief Executives Club of Boston, the National Innovation Initiative, and the Council on Competitiveness.

Mr. Reynolds received a B.S. in Business Administration/Finance from West Virginia University.

**Richard B. Worley**

*Born 1945, Trustee since 2004*

Mr. Worley is Managing Partner of Permit Capital LLC, an investment management firm.

Mr. Worley serves as a Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania Medical Center, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (a philanthropic organization devoted to health-care issues), and the National Constitution Center. He is also a Director of The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (a historical preservation organization), and the Philadelphia Orchestra Association. Mr. Worley also serves on the investment committees of Mount Holyoke College and World Wildlife Fund (a wildlife conservation organization).

Prior to joining Permit Capital LLC in 2002, Mr. Worley served as President, Chief Executive Officer, and Chief Investment Officer of Morgan Stanley Dean Witter Investment Management and as a Managing Director of Morgan Stanley, a financial services firm. Mr. Worley also was the Chairman of Miller Anderson & Sherrerd, an investment management firm that was acquired by Morgan Stanley in 1996.

Mr. Worley holds a B.S. degree from the University of Tennessee and pursued graduate studies in economics at the University of Texas.

*The address of each Trustee is One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109.*

*As of October 31, 2008, there were 99 Putnam funds. All Trustees serve as Trustees of all Putnam funds.*

*Each Trustee serves for an indefinite term, until his or her resignation, retirement at age 72, death, or removal.*

*\* Trustee who is an "interested person" (as defined in the Investment Company Act of 1940) of the fund, Putnam Management, and/or Putnam Retail Management. Mr. Reynolds is President and Chief Executive Officer of Putnam Investments. Mr. Haldeman is the President of your fund and each of the other Putnam funds and Chairman of Putnam Investment Management, LLC, and prior to July 2008 was President and Chief Executive Officer of Putnam Investments.*

40

---

## Officers

In addition to Charles E. Haldeman, Jr., the other officers of the fund are shown below:

**Charles E. Porter** (Born 1938)  
Executive Vice President, Principal Executive Officer, Associate Treasurer, and Compliance Liaison  
*Since 1989*

**Jonathan S. Horwitz** (Born 1955)  
Senior Vice President and Treasurer  
*Since 2004*  
Prior to 2004, Managing Director, Putnam Investments

**Steven D. Krichmar** (Born 1958)  
Vice President and Principal Financial Officer  
*Since 2002*  
Senior Managing Director, Putnam Investments

**James P. Pappas** (Born 1953)  
Vice President  
*Since 2004*  
Managing Director, Putnam Investments and Putnam Management. During 2002, Chief Operating Officer, Atalanta/Sosnoff Management Corporation

**Francis J. McNamara, III** (Born 1955)  
Vice President and Chief Legal Officer  
*Since 2004*  
Senior Managing Director, Putnam Investments, Putnam Management and Putnam Retail Management. Prior to 2004, General Counsel, State Street Research & Management Company

**Wanda M. McManus** (Born 1957)  
Vice President, Senior Associate and Assistant Clerk  
*Since 2005*  
Senior Associate Treasurer/Assistant of Funds

**Nancy E. Florek** (Born 1957)  
Vice President, Assistant Clerk, Treasurer and Proxy Manager  
*Since 2005*  
Manager, Mutual Fund Proxy

**Janet C. Smith** *(Born 1965)*

Vice President, Principal Accounting Officer  
and Assistant Treasurer  
*Since 2007*

Managing Director, Putnam Investments and  
Putnam Management

**Susan G. Malloy** *(Born 1957)*

Vice President and Assistant Treasurer  
*Since 2007*

Managing Director, Putnam Investments

**Beth S. Mazor** *(Born 1958)*

Vice President  
*Since 2002*

Managing Director, Putnam Investments

**Robert R. Leveille** *(Born 1969)*

Vice President and Chief Compliance Officer  
*Since 2007*

Managing Director, Putnam Investments,  
Putnam Management, and Putnam Retail  
Management. Prior to 2004, member of  
Bell Boyd & Lloyd LLC. Prior to 2003,  
Vice President and Senior Counsel,  
Liberty Funds Group LLC

**Mark C. Trenchard** *(Born 1962)*

Vice President and BSA Compliance Officer  
*Since 2002*

Managing Director, Putnam Investments

**Judith Cohen** *(Born 1945)*

Vice President, Clerk and Assistant Treasurer  
*Since 1993*

The address of each Officer is One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109.

41

---

## Fund information

### About Putnam Investments

Founded over 70 years ago, Putnam Investments was built around the concept that a balance between risk and reward is the hallmark of a well-rounded financial program. We manage nearly 100 mutual funds in growth, value, blend, fixed income, and international.

#### Investment Manager

Putnam Investment  
Management, LLC  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, MA 02109

#### Officers

Charles E. Haldeman, Jr.  
*President*

Wanda M. McManus

*Vice President, Senior Associate Treasurer  
and Assistant Clerk*

Charles E. Porter  
*Executive Vice President, Principal  
Executive Officer, Associate Treasurer  
and Compliance Liaison*

Nancy E. Florek

*Vice President, Assistant Clerk, Associate  
Treasurer and Proxy Manager*

#### Marketing Services

Putnam Retail Management  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, MA 02109

Jonathan S. Horwitz  
*Senior Vice President and Treasurer*

#### Custodian

State Street Bank and Trust Company

Steven D. Krichmar  
*Vice President and Principal Financial Officer*

#### Legal Counsel

Ropes & Gray LLP

Janet C. Smith  
*Vice President, Principal Accounting Officer  
and Assistant Treasurer*

#### Independent Registered Public

Explanation of Responses:

**Accounting Firm**

KPMG LLP

Susan G. Malloy

*Vice President and Assistant Treasurer*

**Trustees**

John A. Hill, *Chairman*

Jameson A. Baxter, *Vice Chairman*

Charles B. Curtis

Robert J. Darretta

Myra R. Drucker

Charles E. Haldeman, Jr.

Paul L. Joskow

Elizabeth T. Kennan

Kenneth R. Leibler

Robert E. Patterson

George Putnam, III

Robert L. Reynolds

Richard B. Worley

Beth S. Mazor

*Vice President*

James P. Pappas

*Vice President*

Francis J. McNamara, III

*Vice President and Chief Legal Officer*

Robert R. Leveille

*Vice President and Chief Compliance Officer*

Mark C. Trenchard

*Vice President and BSA Compliance Officer*

Judith Cohen

*Vice President, Clerk and Assistant Treasurer*

42

---

Call 1-800-225-1581 weekdays between 8:30 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. or on Saturday between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, or visit our Web site ([www.putnam.com](http://www.putnam.com)) anytime for up-to-date information about the fund's NAV.

---

---

Item 2. Code of Ethics:

(a) The Fund's principal executive, financial and accounting officers are employees of Putnam Investment Management, LLC, the Fund's investment manager. As such they are subject to a comprehensive Code of Ethics adopted and administered by Putnam Investments which is designed to protect the interests of the firm and its clients. The Fund has adopted a Code of Ethics which incorporates the Code of Ethics of Putnam Investments with respect to all of its officers and Trustees who are employees of Putnam Investment Management, LLC. For this reason, the Fund has not adopted a separate code of ethics governing its principal executive, financial and accounting officers.

(c ) In May 2008, the Code of Ethics of Putnam Investment Management, LLC was updated in its entirety to include the amendments adopted in August 2007 as well as a several additional technical, administrative and non-substantive changes.

Item 3. Audit Committee Financial Expert:

Explanation of Responses:

## Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

The Funds' Audit and Compliance Committee is comprised solely of Trustees who are "independent" (as such term has been defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") in regulations implementing Section 407 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (the "Regulations")). The Trustees believe that each of the members of the Audit and Compliance Committee also possess a combination of knowledge and experience with respect to financial accounting matters, as well as other attributes, that qualify them for service on the Committee. In addition, the Trustees have determined that each of Mr. Patterson, Mr. Leibler, Mr. Hill and Mr. Darretta meets the financial literacy requirements of the New York Stock Exchange's rules and qualifies as an "audit committee financial expert" (as such term has been defined by the Regulations) based on their review of his pertinent experience and education. Certain other Trustees, although not on the Audit and Compliance Committee, would also qualify as "audit committee financial experts." The SEC has stated that the designation or identification of a person as an audit committee financial expert pursuant to this Item 3 of Form N-CSR does not impose on such person any duties, obligations or liability that are greater than the duties, obligations and liability imposed on such person as a member of the Audit and Compliance Committee and the Board of Trustees in the absence of such designation or identification.

### Item 4. Principal Accountant Fees and Services:

The following table presents fees billed in each of the last two fiscal years for services rendered to the fund by the fund's independent auditor:

| Fiscal year ended | Audit Fees | Audit-Related Fees | Tax Fees | All Other Fees |
|-------------------|------------|--------------------|----------|----------------|
| October 31, 2008  | \$56,600   | \$42,806*          | \$6,000  | \$-            |
| October 31, 2007  | \$56,450   | \$25,317           | \$5,450  | \$-            |

\*Includes fees billed to the fund for services relating to a fund merger of \$16,872.

For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2008 and October 31, 2007, the fund's independent auditor billed aggregate non-audit fees in the amounts of \$117,539 and \$30,767 respectively, to the fund, Putnam Management and any entity controlling, controlled by or under common control with Putnam Management that provides ongoing services to the fund.

Audit Fees represent fees billed for the fund's last two fiscal years relating to the audit and review of the financial statements included in annual reports and registration statements, and other

services that are normally provided in connection with statutory and regulatory filings or engagements.

Audit-Related Fees represent fees billed in the fund's last two fiscal years for services traditionally performed by the fund's auditor, including accounting consultation for proposed transactions or concerning financial accounting and reporting standards and other audit or attest services not required by statute or regulation.

Tax Fees represent fees billed in the fund's last two fiscal years for tax compliance, tax planning and tax advice services. Tax planning and tax advice services include assistance with tax audits, employee benefit plans and requests for rulings or technical advice from taxing authorities.

Pre-Approval Policies of the Audit and Compliance Committee. The Audit and Compliance Committee of the Putnam funds has determined that, as a matter of policy, all work performed for the funds by the funds' independent auditors will be pre-approved by the Committee itself and thus will generally not be subject to pre-approval procedures.

## Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

The Audit and Compliance Committee also has adopted a policy to pre-approve the engagement by Putnam Management and certain of its affiliates of the funds' independent auditors, even in circumstances where pre-approval is not required by applicable law. Any such requests by Putnam Management or certain of its affiliates are typically submitted in writing to the Committee and explain, among other things, the nature of the proposed engagement, the estimated fees, and why this work should be performed by that particular audit firm as opposed to another one. In reviewing such requests, the Committee considers, among other things, whether the provision of such services by the audit firm are compatible with the independence of the audit firm.

The following table presents fees billed by the fund's independent auditor for services required to be approved pursuant to paragraph (c)(7)(ii) of Rule 2-01 of Regulation S-X.

| Fiscal year ended | Audit-Related Fees | Tax Fees | All Other Fees | Total Non-Audit Fees |
|-------------------|--------------------|----------|----------------|----------------------|
| October 31, 2008  | \$ -               | \$ -     | \$ -           | \$ -                 |
| October 31, 2007  | \$ -               | \$ -     | \$ -           | \$ -                 |

### Item 5. Audit Committee of Listed Registrants

(a) The fund has a separately-designated Audit and Compliance Committee established in accordance with Section 3(a)(58)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. The Audit and Compliance Committee of the fund's Board of Trustees is composed of the following persons:

Robert E. Patterson (Chairperson)  
Robert J. Darretta  
Myra R. Drucker  
John A. Hill  
Kenneth R. Leibler

(b) Not applicable

### Item 6. Schedule of Investments:

The registrant's schedule of investments in unaffiliated issuers is included in the report to shareholders in Item 1 above.

### Item 7. Disclosure of Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures For Closed-End Management Investment Companies:

## **Proxy voting guidelines of the Putnam funds**

The proxy voting guidelines below summarize the funds' positions on various issues of concern to investors, and give a general indication of how fund portfolio securities will be voted on proposals dealing with particular issues. The funds' proxy voting service is instructed to vote all proxies relating to fund portfolio securities in accordance with these guidelines, except as otherwise instructed by the Proxy Coordinator, a member of the Office of the Trustees who is appointed to assist in the coordination and voting of the funds' proxies.

The proxy voting guidelines are just that — guidelines. The guidelines are not exhaustive and do

not address all potential voting issues. Because the circumstances of individual companies are so varied, there may be instances when the funds do not vote in strict adherence to these guidelines. For example, the proxy voting service is expected to bring to the Proxy Coordinator's attention proxy questions that are company-specific and of a non-routine nature and that, even if covered by the guidelines, may be more appropriately handled on a case-by-case basis.

Similarly, Putnam Management's investment professionals, as part of their ongoing review and analysis of all fund portfolio holdings, are responsible for monitoring significant corporate developments, including proxy proposals submitted to shareholders, and notifying the Proxy Coordinator of circumstances where the interests of fund shareholders may warrant a vote contrary to these guidelines. In such instances, the investment professionals submit a written recommendation to the Proxy Coordinator and the person or persons designated by Putnam Management's Legal and Compliance Department to assist in processing referral items under the funds' Proxy Voting Procedures. The Proxy Coordinator, in consultation with the funds' Senior Vice President, Executive Vice President, and/or the Chair of the Board Policy and Nominating Committee, as appropriate, will determine how the funds' proxies will be voted. When indicated, the Chair of the Board Policy and Nominating Committee may consult with other members of the Committee or the full Board of Trustees.

The following guidelines are grouped according to the types of proposals generally presented to shareholders. Part I deals with proposals submitted by management and approved and recommended by a company's board of directors. Part II deals with proposals submitted by shareholders. Part III addresses unique considerations pertaining to non-U.S. issuers.

---

The Trustees of the Putnam funds are committed to promoting strong corporate governance practices and encouraging corporate actions that enhance shareholder value through the judicious voting of the funds' proxies. It is the funds' policy to vote their proxies at all shareholder meetings where it is practicable to do so. In furtherance of this, the funds' have requested that their securities lending agent recall each domestic issuer's voting securities that are on loan, in advance of the record date for the issuer's shareholder meetings, so that the funds may vote at the meetings.

The Putnam funds will disclose their proxy votes not later than August 31 of each year for the most recent 12-month period ended June 30, in accordance with the timetable established by SEC rules.

## **I. BOARD-APPROVED PROPOSALS**

The vast majority of matters presented to shareholders for a vote involve proposals made by a company itself (sometimes referred to as "management proposals"), which have been approved and recommended by its board of directors. In view of the enhanced corporate governance practices currently being implemented in public companies and of the funds' intent to hold corporate boards accountable for their actions in promoting shareholder interests, the funds' proxies generally will be voted **for** the decisions reached by majority independent boards of directors, except as otherwise indicated in these guidelines. Accordingly, the funds' proxies will be voted **for** board-approved proposals, except as follows:

### **Matters relating to the Board of Directors**

*Uncontested Election of Directors*

The funds' proxies will be voted **for** the election of a company's nominees for the board of directors, except as follows:

The funds will **withhold votes** for the entire board of directors if

the board does not have a majority of independent directors,

the board has not established independent nominating, audit, and compensation committees,

the board has more than 19 members or fewer than five members, absent special circumstances,

the board has not acted to implement a policy requested in a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the shares of the company cast at its previous two annual meetings, or

the board has adopted or renewed a shareholder rights plan (commonly referred to as a "poison pill") without shareholder approval during the current or prior calendar year.

---

The funds will on a **case-by-case basis withhold votes** from the entire board of directors, or from particular directors as may be appropriate, if the board has approved compensation arrangements for one or more company executives that the funds determine are unreasonably excessive relative to the company's performance.

The funds will **withhold votes** for any nominee for director:

who is considered an independent director by the company and who has received compensation from the company other than for service as a director (e.g., investment banking, consulting, legal, or financial advisory fees),

who attends less than 75% of board and committee meetings without valid reasons for the absences (e.g., illness, personal emergency, etc.),

of a public company (Company A) who is employed as a senior executive of another company (Company B), if a director of Company B serves as a senior executive of Company A (commonly referred to as an "interlocking directorate"), or

who serves on more than five unaffiliated public company boards (for the purpose of this guideline, boards of affiliated registered investment companies will count as one board).

Commentary:

**Board independence:** Unless otherwise indicated, for the purposes of determining whether a board has a majority of independent directors and independent nominating, audit, and compensation committees, an "independent director" is a director who (1) meets all requirements to serve as an independent director of a company under the NYSE Corporate Governance Rules (e.g., no material business relationships with the company and no present or recent employment relationship with the company including employment of an immediate

family member as an executive officer), and (2) has not accepted directly or indirectly any consulting, advisory, or other compensatory fee from the company other than in his or her capacity as a member of the board of directors or any board committee. The funds' Trustees believe that the receipt of any amount of compensation for services other than service as a director raises significant independence issues.

**Board size:** The funds' Trustees believe that the size of the board of directors can have a direct impact on the ability of the board to govern effectively. Boards that have too many members can be unwieldy and ultimately inhibit their ability to oversee management performance. Boards that have too few members can stifle innovation and lead to excessive influence by management.

**Time commitment:** Being a director of a company requires a significant time commitment to adequately prepare for and attend the company's board and committee meetings. Directors must be able to commit the time and attention necessary to perform their fiduciary duties in proper fashion, particularly in times of crisis. The funds'

---

Trustees are concerned about over-committed directors. In some cases, directors may serve on too many boards to make a meaningful contribution. This may be particularly true for senior executives of public companies (or other directors with substantially full-time employment) who serve on more than a few outside boards. The funds may withhold votes from such directors on a case-by-case basis where it appears that they may be unable to discharge their duties properly because of excessive commitments.

**Interlocking directorships:** The funds' Trustees believe that interlocking directorships are inconsistent with the degree of independence required for outside directors of public companies.

**Corporate governance practices:** Board independence depends not only on its members' individual relationships, but also on the board's overall attitude toward management. Independent boards are committed to good corporate governance practices and, by providing objective independent judgment, enhancing shareholder value. The funds may withhold votes on a case-by-case basis from some or all directors who, through their lack of independence or otherwise, have failed to observe good corporate governance practices or, through specific corporate action, have demonstrated a disregard for the interests of shareholders. Such instances may include cases where a board of directors has approved compensation arrangements for one or more members of management that, in the judgment of the funds' Trustees, are excessive by reasonable corporate standards relative to the company's record of performance.

#### *Contested Elections of Directors*

The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** in contested elections of directors.

#### *Classified Boards*

The funds will vote **against** proposals to classify a board, absent special circumstances indicating that shareholder interests would be better served by this structure.

Commentary: Under a typical classified board structure, the directors are divided into three classes, with each class serving a three-year term. The classified board structure results in directors serving staggered terms, with usually only a third of the directors up for re-election at any given annual meeting. The funds' Trustees generally believe that it is appropriate for directors to stand for election each year, but recognize that, in special circumstances, shareholder interests may be better served under a classified board structure.

#### *Other Board-Related Proposals*

The funds will generally vote **for** proposals that have been approved by a majority independent board, and on a **case-by-case basis** on proposals that have been approved by a board that fails to meet the guidelines' basic independence standards (i.e., majority of independent directors and independent nominating, audit, and compensation committees).

---

#### **Executive Compensation**

The funds generally favor compensation programs that relate executive compensation to a company's long-term performance. The funds will vote on **case-by-case basis** on board-approved proposals relating to executive compensation, except as follows:

☐ Except where the funds are otherwise withholding votes for the entire board of directors, the funds will vote **for** stock option and restricted stock plans that will result in an average annual dilution of 1.67% or less (based on the disclosed term of the plan and including all equity-based plans).

☐ The funds will vote **against** stock option and restricted stock plans that will result in an average annual dilution of greater than 1.67% (based on the disclosed term of the plan and including all equity-based plans).

☐ The funds will vote **against** any stock option or restricted stock plan where the company's actual grants of stock options and restricted stock under all equity-based compensation plans during the prior three (3) fiscal years have resulted in an average annual dilution of greater than 1.67%.

☐ The funds will vote **against** stock option plans that permit the replacing or repricing of underwater options (and against any proposal to authorize such replacement or repricing of underwater options).

☐ The funds will vote **against** stock option plans that permit issuance of options with an exercise price below the stock's current market price.

☐ Except where the funds are otherwise withholding votes for the entire board of directors, the funds will vote **for** an employee stock purchase plan that has the following features: (1) the shares purchased under the plan are acquired for no less than 85% of their market value; (2) the offering period under the plan is 27 months or less; and (3) dilution is 10% or less.

Commentary: Companies should have compensation programs that are reasonable and that align shareholder and management interests over the longer term. Further, disclosure of compensation programs should provide absolute transparency to shareholders regarding the sources and amounts of, and the factors influencing, executive compensation. Appropriately

designed equity-based compensation plans can be an effective way to align the interests of long-term shareholders with the interests of management. The funds may vote against executive compensation proposals on a case-by-case basis where compensation is excessive by reasonable corporate standards, or where a company fails to provide transparent disclosure of executive compensation. In voting on a proposal relating to executive compensation, the funds will consider whether the proposal has been approved by an independent compensation committee of the board.

---

## **Capitalization**

Many proxy proposals involve changes in a company's capitalization, including the authorization of additional stock, the issuance of stock, the repurchase of outstanding stock, or the approval of a stock split. The management of a company's capital structure involves a number of important issues, including cash flow, financing needs, and market conditions that are unique to the circumstances of the company. As a result, the funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on board-approved proposals involving changes to a company's capitalization, except that where the funds are not otherwise withholding votes from the entire board of directors:

☐The funds will vote **for** proposals relating to the authorization and issuance of additional common stock (except where such proposals relate to a specific transaction).

☐The funds will vote **for** proposals to effect stock splits (excluding reverse stock splits).

☐The funds will vote **for** proposals authorizing share repurchase programs.

**Commentary:** A company may decide to authorize additional shares of common stock for reasons relating to executive compensation or for routine business purposes. For the most part, these decisions are best left to the board of directors and senior management. The funds will vote on a case-by-case basis, however, on other proposals to change a company's capitalization, including the authorization of common stock with special voting rights, the authorization or issuance of common stock in connection with a specific transaction (e.g., an acquisition, merger or reorganization), or the authorization or issuance of preferred stock. Actions such as these involve a number of considerations that may affect a shareholder's investment and that warrant a case-by-case determination.

## **Acquisitions, Mergers, Reincorporations, Reorganizations and Other Transactions**

Shareholders may be confronted with a number of different types of transactions, including acquisitions, mergers, reorganizations involving business combinations, liquidations, and the sale of all or substantially all of a company's assets, which may require their consent. Voting on such proposals involves considerations unique to each transaction. As a result, the funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on board-approved proposals to effect these types of transactions, except as follows:

☐The funds will vote **for** mergers and reorganizations involving business combinations designed solely to reincorporate a company in Delaware.

**Commentary:** A company may reincorporate into another state through a merger or reorganization by setting up a "shell" company in a different state and then merging the

company into the new company. While reincorporation into states with extensive and established corporate laws — notably Delaware — provides companies and shareholders with a more well-defined legal framework, shareholders must carefully consider the

---

reasons for a reincorporation into another jurisdiction, including especially an offshore jurisdiction.

### **Anti-Takeover Measures**

Some proxy proposals involve efforts by management to make it more difficult for an outside party to take control of the company without the approval of the company's board of directors. These include the adoption of a shareholder rights plan, requiring supermajority voting on particular issues, the adoption of fair price provisions, the issuance of blank check preferred stock, and the creation of a separate class of stock with disparate voting rights. Such proposals may adversely affect shareholder rights, lead to management entrenchment, or create conflicts of interest. As a result, the funds will vote **against** board-approved proposals to adopt such anti-takeover measures, except as follows:

□ The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on proposals to ratify or approve shareholder rights plans; and

□ The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on proposals to adopt fair price provisions.

Commentary: The funds' Trustees recognize that poison pills and fair price provisions may enhance shareholder value under certain circumstances. As a result, the funds will consider proposals to approve such matters on a case-by-case basis.

### **Other Business Matters**

Many proxies involve approval of routine business matters, such as changing a company's name, ratifying the appointment of auditors, and procedural matters relating to the shareholder meeting. For the most part, these routine matters do not materially affect shareholder interests and are best left to the board of directors and senior management of the company. The funds will vote **for** board-approved proposals approving such matters, except as follows:

□ The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on proposals to amend a company's charter or bylaws (except for charter amendments necessary to effect stock splits, to change a company's name or to authorize additional shares of common stock).

□ The funds will vote **against** authorization to transact other unidentified, substantive business at the meeting.

□ The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on proposals to ratify the selection of independent auditors if there is evidence that the audit firm's independence or the integrity of an audit is compromised.

□ The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on other business matters where the funds are otherwise withholding votes for the entire board of directors.

Commentary: Charter and bylaw amendments and the transaction of other unidentified, substantive business at a shareholder meeting may directly affect shareholder rights and have a significant impact on shareholder value. As a result, the funds do not view these items as routine business matters. Putnam Management's investment professionals and the funds' proxy voting service may also bring to the Proxy Coordinator's attention company-specific items that they believe to be non-routine and warranting special consideration. Under these circumstances, the funds will vote on a case-by-case basis.

The fund's proxy voting service may identify circumstances that call into question an audit firm's independence or the integrity of an audit. These circumstances may include recent material restatements of financials, unusual audit fees, egregious contractual relationships, and aggressive accounting policies. The funds will consider proposals to ratify the selection of auditors in these circumstances on a case-by-case basis. In all other cases, given the existence of rules that enhance the independence of audit committees and auditors by, for example, prohibiting auditors from performing a range of non-audit services for audit clients, the funds will vote for the ratification of independent auditors.

## II. SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS

SEC regulations permit shareholders to submit proposals for inclusion in a company's proxy statement. These proposals generally seek to change some aspect of the company's corporate governance structure or to change some aspect of its business operations. The funds generally will vote **in accordance with the recommendation of the company's board of directors** on all shareholder proposals, except as follows:

☐The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals to declassify a board, absent special circumstances which would indicate that shareholder interests are better served by a classified board structure.

☐The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals to require shareholder approval of shareholder rights plans.

☐The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals requiring companies to make cash payments under management severance agreements only if both of the following conditions are met:

☐the company undergoes a change in control, and

☐the change in control results in the termination of employment for the person receiving the severance payment.

☐The funds will vote **on a case-by-case basis** on shareholder proposals requiring companies to accelerate vesting of equity awards under management severance agreements only if both of the following conditions are met:

☐the company undergoes a change in control, and

---

☐the change in control results in the termination of employment for the person receiving the

severance payment.

□The funds will vote **on a case-by-case basis** on shareholder proposals to limit a company's ability to make excise tax gross-up payments under management severance agreements.

□The funds will vote **on a case-by-case basis** on shareholder proposals requesting that the board adopt a policy to recoup, in the event of a significant restatement of financial results or significant extraordinary write-off, to the fullest extent practicable, for the benefit of the company, all performance-based bonuses or awards that were paid to senior executives based on the company having met or exceeded specific performance targets to the extent that the specific performance targets were not, in fact, met.

□The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals requiring a company to report on its executive retirement benefits (e.g., deferred compensation, split-dollar life insurance, SERPs and pension benefits).

□The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals requiring a company to disclose its relationships with executive compensation consultants (e.g., whether the company, the board or the compensation committee retained the consultant, the types of services provided by the consultant over the past five years, and a list of the consultant's clients on which any of the company's executives serve as a director).

□The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals that are consistent with the funds' proxy voting guidelines for board-approved proposals.

□The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on other shareholder proposals where the funds are otherwise withholding votes for the entire board of directors.

Commentary: In light of the substantial reforms in corporate governance that are currently underway, the funds' Trustees believe that effective corporate reforms should be promoted by holding boards of directors — and in particular their independent directors — accountable for their actions, rather than by imposing additional legal restrictions on board governance through piecemeal proposals. Generally speaking, shareholder proposals relating to business operations are often motivated primarily by political or social concerns, rather than the interests of shareholders as investors in an economic enterprise. As stated above, the funds' Trustees believe that boards of directors and management are responsible for ensuring that their businesses are operating in accordance with high legal and ethical standards and should be held accountable for resulting corporate behavior. Accordingly, the funds will generally support the recommendations of boards that meet the basic independence and governance standards established in these guidelines. Where boards fail to meet these standards, the funds will generally evaluate shareholder proposals on a case-by-case basis.

---

However, the funds generally support shareholder proposals to declassify a board or to require shareholder approval of shareholder rights plans. The funds' Trustees believe that these shareholder proposals further the goals of reducing management entrenchment and conflicts of interest, and aligning management's interests with shareholders' interests in evaluating proposed acquisitions of the company. The Trustees also believe that shareholder proposals to limit severance payments may further these goals in some instances. In general, the funds favor arrangements in which severance payments are made to an executive only when there is a change in control and the executive loses his or her job as a result.

Arrangements in which an executive receives a payment upon a change of control even if the executive retains employment introduce potential conflicts of interest and may distract management focus from the long term success of the company.

In evaluating shareholder proposals that address severance payments, the funds distinguish between cash and equity payments. The funds generally do not favor cash payments to executives upon a change in control transaction if the executive retains employment. However, the funds recognize that accelerated vesting of equity incentives, even without termination of employment, may help to align management and shareholder interests in some instances, and will evaluate shareholder proposals addressing accelerated vesting of equity incentive payments on a case-by-case basis.

When severance payments exceed a certain amount based on the executive's previous compensation, the payments may be subject to an excise tax. Some compensation arrangements provide for full excise tax gross-ups, which means that the company pays the executive sufficient additional amounts to cover the cost of the excise tax. The funds are concerned that the benefits of providing full excise tax gross-ups to executives may be outweighed by the cost to the company of the gross-up payments. Accordingly, the funds will vote on a case-by-case basis on shareholder proposals to curtail excise tax gross-up payments. The funds generally favor arrangements in which severance payments do not trigger an excise tax or in which the company's obligations with respect to gross-up payments are limited in a reasonable manner.

The funds' Trustees will also consider whether a company's severance payment arrangements, taking all of the pertinent circumstances into account, constitute excessive compensation.

The funds' Trustees believe that performance-based compensation can be an effective tool for aligning management and shareholder interests. However, to fulfill its purpose, performance compensation should only be paid to executives if the performance targets are actually met. A significant restatement of financial results or a significant extraordinary write-off may reveal that executives who were previously paid performance compensation did not actually deliver the required business performance to earn that compensation. In these circumstances, it may be appropriate for the company to recoup this performance compensation. The fund will consider on a case by case basis shareholder proposals requesting that the board adopt a policy to recoup, in the event of a significant restatement of financial results or significant extraordinary write-off, performance-based bonuses or awards paid to senior executives based on the company

---

having met or exceeded specific performance targets to the extent that the specific performance targets were not, in fact, met. The fund does not believe that such a policy should necessarily disadvantage a company in recruiting executives, as executives should understand that they are only entitled to performance compensation based on the actual performance they deliver.

The funds' Trustees also believe that shareholder proposals that are intended to increase transparency, particularly with respect to executive compensation, without establishing rigid restrictions upon a company's ability to attract and motivate talented executives, are generally beneficial to sound corporate governance without imposing undue burdens. The funds will generally support shareholder proposals calling for reasonable disclosure.

### III. VOTING SHARES OF NON-U.S. ISSUERS

Many of the Putnam funds invest on a global basis, and, as a result, they may hold, and have an opportunity to vote, shares in non-U.S. issuers [ i.e., issuers that are incorporated under the laws of foreign jurisdictions and whose shares are not listed on a U.S. securities exchange or the NASDAQ stock market.

In many non-U.S. markets, shareholders who vote proxies of a non-U.S. issuer are not able to trade in that company's stock on or around the shareholder meeting date. This practice is known as [share blocking.] In countries where share blocking is practiced, the funds will vote proxies only with direction from Putnam Management's investment professionals.

In addition, some non-U.S. markets require that a company's shares be re-registered out of the name of the local custodian or nominee into the name of the shareholder for the shareholder to be able to vote at the meeting. This practice is known as [share reregistration.] As a result, shareholders, including the funds, are not able to trade in that company's stock until the shares are re-registered back in the name of the local custodian or nominee following the meeting. In countries where share re-registration is practiced, the funds will generally not vote proxies.

Protection for shareholders of non-U.S. issuers may vary significantly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Laws governing non-U.S. issuers may, in some cases, provide substantially less protection for shareholders than do U.S. laws. As a result, the guidelines applicable to U.S. issuers, which are premised on the existence of a sound corporate governance and disclosure framework, may not be appropriate under some circumstances for non-U.S. issuers. However, the funds will vote proxies of non-U.S. issuers **in accordance with the guidelines applicable to U.S. issuers**, except as follows:

#### **Uncontested Election of Directors**

##### *Germany*

[For companies subject to [co-determination,] the funds will vote on **case by-case basis** for the election of nominees to the supervisory board.

---

[The funds will **withhold votes** for the election of a former member of the company's managerial board to chair of the supervisory board.

Commentary: German corporate governance is characterized by a two-tier board system—a managerial board composed of the company's executive officers, and a supervisory board. The supervisory board appoints the members of the managerial board. Shareholders elect members of the supervisory board, except that in the case of companies with more than 2,000 employees, company employees are allowed to elect half of the supervisory board members. This [co-determination] practice may increase the chances that the supervisory board of a large German company does not contain a majority of independent members. In this situation, under the Fund's proxy voting guidelines applicable to U.S. issuers, the funds would vote against all nominees. However, in the case of companies subject to [co-determination,] the Funds will vote for supervisory board members on a case-by-case basis, so that the funds can support independent nominees.

Consistent with the funds' belief that the interests of shareholders are best protected by boards with strong, independent leadership, the funds will withhold votes for the election of former chairs of the managerial board to chair of the supervisory board.

### *Japan*

For companies that have established a U.S.-style corporate governance structure, the funds will **withhold votes** for the entire board of directors if

The board does not have a majority of outside directors,

The board has not established nominating and compensation committees composed of a majority of outside directors, or

The board has not established an audit committee composed of a majority of independent directors.

The funds will **withhold votes** for the appointment of members of a company's board of statutory auditors if a majority of the members of the board of statutory auditors is not independent.

### Commentary:

**Board structure:** Recent amendments to the Japanese Commercial Code give companies the option to adopt a U.S.-style corporate governance structure (i.e., a board of directors and audit, nominating, and compensation committees). The funds will vote **for** proposals to amend a company's articles of incorporation to adopt the U.S.-style corporate structure.

**Definition of outside director and independent director:** Corporate governance principles in Japan focus on the distinction between outside directors and independent directors. Under these principles, an outside director is a director who is not and has

---

never been a director, executive, or employee of the company or its parent company, subsidiaries or affiliates. An outside director is "independent" if that person can make decisions completely independent from the managers of the company, its parent, subsidiaries, or affiliates and does not have a material relationship with the company (i.e., major client, trading partner, or other business relationship; familial relationship with current director or executive; etc.). The guidelines have incorporated these definitions in applying the board independence standards above.

### *Korea*

The funds will **withhold votes** for the entire board of directors if

The board does not have a majority of outside directors,

The board has not established a nominating committee composed of at least a majority of outside directors, or

The board has not established an audit committee composed of at least three members and in which at least two-thirds of its members are outside directors.

Commentary: For purposes of these guideline, an "outside director" is a director that is independent from the management or controlling shareholders of the company, and holds no interests that might impair performing his or her duties impartially from the company, management or controlling shareholder. In determining whether a director is an outside director, the funds will also apply the standards included in Article 415-2(2) of the Korean Commercial Code (i.e., no employment relationship with the company for a period of two years before serving on the committee, no director or employment relationship with the company's largest shareholder, etc.) and may consider other business relationships that would affect the independence of an outside director.

### *Russia*

The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** for the election of nominees to the board of directors.

Commentary: In Russia, director elections are typically handled through a cumulative voting process. Cumulative voting allows shareholders to cast all of their votes for a single nominee for the board of directors, or to allocate their votes among nominees in any other way. In contrast, in "regular" voting, shareholders may not give more than one vote per share to any single nominee. Cumulative voting can help to strengthen the ability of minority shareholders to elect a director.

In Russia, as in some other emerging markets, standards of corporate governance are usually behind those in developed markets. Rather than vote against the entire board of directors, as the funds generally would in the case of a company whose board fails to meet the funds' standards for independence, the funds may, on a case by case basis, cast all of their votes for one or more independent director nominees. The funds believe that

---

it is important to increase the number of independent directors on the boards of Russian companies to mitigate the risks associated with dominant shareholders.

### *United Kingdom*

The funds will **withhold votes** for the entire board of directors if

The board does not have at least a majority of independent non-executive directors,

The board has not established a nomination committee composed of a majority of independent non-executive directors, or

The board has not established compensation and audit committees composed of (1) at least three directors (in the case of smaller companies, two directors) and (2) solely independent non-executive directors.

The funds will **withhold votes** for any nominee for director who is considered an independent director by the company and who has received compensation from the company other than for service as a director, such as investment banking, consulting, legal, or financial

advisory fees.

Commentary:

**Application of guidelines:** Although the United Kingdom's Combined Code on Corporate Governance ("Combined Code") has adopted the "comply and explain" approach to corporate governance, the funds' Trustees believe that the guidelines discussed above with respect to board independence standards are integral to the protection of investors in U.K. companies. As a result, these guidelines will be applied in a prescriptive manner.

**Definition of independence:** For the purposes of these guidelines, a non-executive director shall be considered independent if the director meets the independence standards in section A.3.1 of the Combined Code (i.e., no material business or employment relationships with the company, no remuneration from the company for non-board services, no close family ties with senior employees or directors of the company, etc.), except that the funds do not view service on the board for more than nine years as affecting a director's independence.

**Smaller companies:** A smaller company is one that is below the FTSE 350 throughout the year immediately prior to the reporting year.

**Other Matters**

The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals calling for a majority of a company's directors to be independent of management.

---

The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals seeking to increase the independence of board nominating, audit, and compensation committees.

The funds will vote **for** shareholder proposals that implement corporate governance standards similar to those established under U.S. federal law and the listing requirements of U.S. stock exchanges, and that do not otherwise violate the laws of the jurisdiction under which the company is incorporated.

The funds will vote on a **case-by-case basis** on proposals relating to (1) the issuance of common stock in excess of 20% of the company's outstanding common stock where shareholders do not have preemptive rights, or (2) the issuance of common stock in excess of 100% of the company's outstanding common stock where shareholders have preemptive rights.

As adopted February 15, 2008

Proxy Voting Procedures of the Putnam Funds

The proxy voting procedures below explain the role of the funds' Trustees, the proxy voting service and the Proxy Coordinator, as well as how the process will work when a proxy question needs to be handled on a case-by-case basis, or when there may be a conflict of interest.

The role of the funds' Trustees

The Trustees of the Putnam funds exercise control of the voting of proxies through their Board Policy and Nominating Committee, which is composed entirely of independent Trustees. The Board Policy and Nominating

Explanation of Responses:

Committee oversees the proxy voting process and participates, as needed, in the resolution of issues that need to be handled on a case-by-case basis. The Committee annually reviews and recommends, for Trustee approval, guidelines governing the funds' proxy votes, including how the funds vote on specific proposals and which matters are to be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Trustees are assisted in this process by their independent administrative staff (the Office of the Trustees), independent legal counsel, and an independent proxy voting service. The Trustees also receive assistance from Putnam Investment Management, LLC (Putnam Management), the funds' investment advisor, on matters involving investment judgments. In all cases, the ultimate decision on voting proxies rests with the Trustees, acting as fiduciaries on behalf of the shareholders of the funds.

#### The role of the proxy voting service

The funds have engaged an independent proxy voting service to assist in the voting of proxies. The proxy voting service is responsible for coordinating with the funds' custodians to ensure that all proxy materials received by the custodians relating to the funds' portfolio securities are processed in a timely fashion. To the extent applicable, the proxy voting service votes all proxies in accordance with the proxy voting guidelines established by the Trustees. The proxy voting service will refer proxy questions to the Proxy Coordinator (described below) for instructions under circumstances where: (1) the application of the proxy voting guidelines is unclear; (2) a particular proxy question is not covered by the guidelines; or (3) the guidelines call for specific instructions on a case-by-case basis. The proxy voting service is also requested to call to the Proxy Coordinator's attention specific

---

proxy questions that, while governed by a guideline, appear to involve unusual or controversial issues. The funds also utilize research services relating to proxy questions provided by the proxy voting service and by other firms.

#### The role of the Proxy Coordinator

Each year, a member of the Office of the Trustees is appointed Proxy Coordinator to assist in the coordination and voting of the funds' proxies. The Proxy Coordinator will deal directly with the proxy voting service and, in the case of proxy questions referred by the proxy voting service, will solicit voting recommendations and instructions from the Office of the Trustees, the Chair of the Board Policy and Nominating Committee, and Putnam Management's investment professionals, as appropriate. The Proxy Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that these questions and referrals are responded to in a timely fashion and for transmitting appropriate voting instructions to the proxy voting service.

#### Voting procedures for referral items

As discussed above, the proxy voting service will refer proxy questions to the Proxy Coordinator under certain circumstances. When the application of the proxy voting guidelines is unclear or a particular proxy question is not covered by the guidelines (and does not involve investment considerations), the Proxy Coordinator will assist in interpreting the guidelines and, as appropriate, consult with one of more senior staff members of the Office of the Trustees and the Chair of the Board Policy and Nominating Committee on how the funds' shares will be voted.

For proxy questions that require a case-by-case analysis pursuant to the guidelines or that are not covered by the guidelines but involve investment considerations, the Proxy Coordinator will refer such questions, through a written request, to Putnam Management's investment professionals for a voting recommendation. Such referrals will be made in cooperation with the person or persons designated by Putnam Management's Legal and Compliance Department to assist in processing such referral items. In connection with each such referral item, the Legal and Compliance Department will conduct a conflicts of interest review, as described below under "Conflicts of Interest," and provide a conflicts of interest report (the "Conflicts Report") to the Proxy Coordinator describing the results of such review. After receiving a referral item from the Proxy Coordinator, Putnam Management's investment professionals will provide a written recommendation to the Proxy Coordinator and the person or persons designated by the Legal and Compliance Department to assist in processing referral items. Such recommendation will set forth (1) how the proxies should be voted; (2) the basis and rationale for such recommendation; and (3) any contacts the investment professionals have had with respect to the referral item with non-investment personnel of Putnam Management or with outside parties (except for routine communications from proxy solicitors). The Proxy Coordinator will then review the investment professionals' recommendation and the Conflicts Report with one of more senior staff members of the Office of the Trustees in determining how to vote the funds' proxies. The Proxy Coordinator will maintain a record of all proxy questions that have been referred to Putnam Management's investment professionals, the voting recommendation, and the Conflicts Report.

In some situations, the Proxy Coordinator and/or one of more senior staff members of the Office of the Trustees may determine that a particular proxy question raises policy issues requiring consultation with the Chair of the Board Policy and Nominating Committee, who, in turn, may decide to bring the particular proxy question to the Committee or the full Board of Trustees for consideration.

Conflicts of interest

Occasions may arise where a person or organization involved in the proxy voting process may have a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest may exist, for example, if Putnam Management has a business relationship with (or is actively soliciting business from) either the company soliciting the

proxy or a third party that has a material interest in the outcome of a proxy vote or that is actively lobbying for a particular outcome of a proxy vote. Any individual with knowledge of a personal conflict of interest (e.g., familial relationship with company management) relating to a particular referral item shall disclose that conflict to the Proxy Coordinator and the Legal and Compliance Department and otherwise remove himself or herself from the proxy voting process. The Legal and Compliance Department will review each item referred to Putnam Management's investment professionals to determine if a conflict of interest exists and will provide the Proxy Coordinator with a Conflicts Report for each referral item that (1) describes any conflict of interest; (2) discusses the procedures used to address such conflict of interest; and (3) discloses any contacts from parties outside Putnam Management (other than routine communications from proxy solicitors) with respect to the referral item not otherwise reported in an investment professional's recommendation. The Conflicts Report will also include written confirmation that any recommendation from an investment professional provided under circumstances where a conflict of interest exists was made solely on the investment merits and without regard to any other consideration.

As adopted March 11, 2005

Item 8. Portfolio Managers of Closed-End Management Investment Companies

(a)(1) **Portfolio Managers.** The officers of Putnam Management identified below are primarily responsible for the day-to-day management of the fund's portfolio .

| <b>Portfolio Managers</b> | <b>Joined Fund</b> | <b>Employer</b>          | <b>Positions Over Past Five Years</b>  |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Paul Drury                | 2002               | <b>Putnam Management</b> | Tax Exempt Specialist<br>Previously, Portfolio Manager; Senior<br>1989 - Present Trader  |
| Brad Libby                | 2006               | <b>Putnam Management</b> | Tax Exempt Specialist.<br>Previously, Analyst.<br>2001 - Present   |
| Susan McCormack           | 2002               | <b>Putnam Management</b> | Tax Exempt Specialist<br>Previously, Portfolio Manager<br>1994 - Present   |
| Thalia Meehan             | 2006               | <b>Putnam Management</b> | Team Leader, Tax Exempt Fixed Income<br>Team<br>1989 - Present Previously, Director, Tax Exempt Fixed<br>Income and Investment Grade Teams |

**(a)(2) Other Accounts Managed by the Fund's Portfolio Managers.**

The following table shows the number and approximate assets of other investment accounts (or portions of investment accounts) that the fund's Portfolio Managers managed as of the fund's most recent fiscal year-end. Unless noted, none of the other accounts pays a fee based on the account's performance.

| Portfolio<br>Manager | Other SEC-registered<br>open-end<br>and closed-end funds |                 | Other accounts that<br>pool assets<br>from more than one<br>client |            | Other accounts<br>(including<br>separate accounts,<br>managed<br>account programs and<br>single-sponsor<br>defined<br>contribution plan<br>offerings) |               |
|----------------------|--|-----------------|--|------------|---|---------------|
|                      | Number<br>of<br>accounts                                 | Assets          | Number<br>of<br>accounts   | Assets     | Number<br>of<br>accounts  | Assets        |
| Paul Drury           | 13   | \$6,904,500,000 | 3  | \$ 900,000 | 1   | \$246,100,000 |
| Susan<br>McCormack   | 13   | \$6,904,500,000 | 3  | \$ 900,000 | 2   | \$246,600,000 |
| Thalia Meehan        | 13   | \$6,904,500,000 | 3  | \$ 900,000 | 1   | \$246,100,000 |
| Brad Libby           | 13   | \$6,904,500,000 | 3  | \$ 900,000 | 1   | \$246,100,000 |

Potential conflicts of interest in managing multiple accounts. Like other investment professionals with multiple clients, the fund's Portfolio Managers may face certain potential conflicts of interest in connection with managing both the fund and the other accounts listed under "Other Accounts Managed by the Fund's Portfolio Managers" at the same time. The paragraphs below describe some of these potential conflicts, which Putnam Management believes are faced by investment professionals at most major financial firms. As described below, Putnam Management and the Trustees of the Putnam funds have adopted compliance policies and procedures that attempt to address certain of these potential conflicts.

The management of accounts with different advisory fee rates and/or fee structures, including accounts that pay advisory fees based on account performance ("performance fee accounts"), may raise potential conflicts of interest by creating an incentive to favor higher-fee accounts. These potential conflicts may include, among others:

□ The most attractive investments could be allocated to higher-fee accounts or performance fee accounts.

□ The trading of higher-fee accounts could be favored as to timing and/or execution price. For example, higher-fee accounts could be permitted to sell securities earlier than other accounts

when a prompt sale is desirable or to buy securities at an earlier and more opportune time.

□ The trading of other accounts could be used to benefit higher-fee accounts (front- running).

□ The investment management team could focus their time and efforts primarily on higher-fee accounts due to a personal stake in compensation.

Putnam Management attempts to address these potential conflicts of interest relating to higher-fee accounts through various compliance policies that are generally intended to

---

place all accounts, regardless of fee structure, on the same footing for investment management purposes. For example, under Putnam Management's policies:

□ Performance fee accounts must be included in all standard trading and allocation procedures with all other accounts.

□ All accounts must be allocated to a specific category of account and trade in parallel with allocations of similar accounts based on the procedures generally applicable to all accounts in those groups (e.g., based on relative risk budgets of accounts).

□ All trading must be effected through Putnam's trading desks and normal queues and procedures must be followed (i.e., no special treatment is permitted for performance fee accounts or higher-fee accounts based on account fee structure).

□ Front running is strictly prohibited.

□ The fund's Portfolio Manager(s) may not be guaranteed or specifically allocated any portion of a performance fee.

As part of these policies, Putnam Management has also implemented trade oversight and review procedures in order to monitor whether particular accounts (including higher-fee accounts or performance fee accounts) are being favored over time.

Potential conflicts of interest may also arise when the Portfolio Manager(s) have personal investments in other accounts that may create an incentive to favor those accounts. As a general matter and subject to limited exceptions, Putnam Management's investment professionals do not have the opportunity to invest in client accounts, other than the Putnam funds. However, in the ordinary course of business, Putnam Management or related persons may from time to time establish "pilot" or "incubator" funds for the purpose of testing proposed investment strategies and products prior to offering them to clients. These pilot accounts may be in the form of registered investment companies, private funds such as partnerships or separate accounts established by Putnam Management or an affiliate. Putnam Management or an affiliate supplies the funding for these accounts. Putnam employees, including the fund's Portfolio Manager(s), may also invest in certain pilot accounts. Putnam Management, and to the extent applicable, the Portfolio Manager(s) will benefit from the favorable investment performance of those funds and accounts. Pilot funds and accounts may, and frequently do, invest in the same securities as the client accounts. Putnam Management's policy is to treat pilot accounts in the same manner as client accounts for purposes of trading allocation — neither favoring nor disfavoring them except as is legally required. For example, pilot accounts are normally included in Putnam Management's daily block trades to the same

extent as client accounts (except that pilot accounts do not participate in initial public offerings).

A potential conflict of interest may arise when the fund and other accounts purchase or sell the same securities. On occasions when the Portfolio Manager(s) consider the purchase or sale of a security to be in the best interests of the fund as well as other accounts, Putnam Management's trading desk may, to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations, aggregate the securities to be sold or purchased in order to seek to obtain the best execution and lower brokerage commissions, if any. Aggregation of

---

trades may create the potential for unfairness to the fund or another account if one account is favored over another in allocating the securities purchased or sold — for example, by allocating a disproportionate amount of a security that is likely to increase in value to a favored account. Putnam Management's trade allocation policies generally provide that each day's transactions in securities that are purchased or sold by multiple accounts are, insofar as possible, averaged as to price and allocated between such accounts (including the fund) in a manner which in Putnam Management's opinion is equitable to each account and in accordance with the amount being purchased or sold by each account. Certain exceptions exist for specialty, regional or sector accounts. Trade allocations are reviewed on a periodic basis as part of Putnam Management's trade oversight procedures in an attempt to ensure fairness over time across accounts.

—Cross trades,— in which one Putnam account sells a particular security to another account (potentially saving transaction costs for both accounts), may also pose a potential conflict of interest. Cross trades may be seen to involve a potential conflict of interest if, for example, one account is permitted to sell a security to another account at a higher price than an independent third party would pay. Putnam Management and the fund's Trustees have adopted compliance procedures that provide that any transactions between the fund and another Putnam-advised account are to be made at an independent current market price, as required by law.

Another potential conflict of interest may arise based on the different investment objectives and strategies of the fund and other accounts. For example, another account may have a shorter-term investment horizon or different investment objectives, policies or restrictions than the fund. Depending on another account's objectives or other factors, the Portfolio Manager(s) may give advice and make decisions that may differ from advice given, or the timing or nature of decisions made, with respect to the fund. In addition, investment decisions are the product of many factors in addition to basic suitability for the particular account involved. Thus, a particular security may be bought or sold for certain accounts even though it could have been bought or sold for other accounts at the same time. More rarely, a particular security may be bought for one or more accounts managed by the Portfolio Manager(s) when one or more other accounts are selling the security (including short sales). There may be circumstances when purchases or sales of portfolio securities for one or more accounts may have an adverse effect on other accounts. As noted above, Putnam Management has implemented trade oversight and review procedures to monitor whether any account is systematically favored over time.

The fund's Portfolio Manager(s) may also face other potential conflicts of interest in managing the fund, and the description above is not a complete description of every conflict that could be deemed to exist in managing both the fund and other accounts.

(a)(3) **Compensation of portfolio managers.** Putnam’s goal for our products and investors is to deliver top quartile or better performance over a rolling 3-year period versus peers on a pre-tax basis. For this fund, the peer group Putnam compares fund

performance against is its broad investment category as determined by Lipper Inc. and identified in the shareholder report included in Item 1. Each portfolio manager is assigned an industry competitive incentive compensation target for achieving this goal. The target is based in part on the type and amount of assets the individual manages. The target increases or decreases depending on whether the portfolio manager’s performance is higher or lower than the top quartile, subject to a maximum increase of 50%, for a portfolio manager who outperforms at least 90% of his or her peer group, and a maximum decrease of 100%, for a portfolio manager who outperforms less than 25% of his or her peer group. For example, the target of a portfolio manager who outperforms 50% of his or her peer group would decrease 50%. Investment performance of a portfolio manager is asset-weighted across the products he or she manages.

Portfolio manager incentive compensation targets are also adjusted for company performance/economics. Actual incentive compensation may be greater or less than a portfolio manager’s target, as it takes into consideration team/group performance and qualitative performance factors. Incentive compensation includes a cash bonus and may also include grants of restricted stock or options. In addition to incentive compensation, portfolio managers receive fixed annual salaries typically based on level of responsibility and experience.

(a)(4) **Fund ownership.** The following table shows the dollar ranges of shares of the fund owned by the professionals listed above at the end of the fund’s last two fiscal years, including investments by their immediate family members and amounts invested through retirement and deferred compensation plans.

(b) Not applicable

Item 9. Purchases of Equity Securities by Closed-End Management Investment Companies and Affiliated Purchasers:

Registrant Purchase of Equity Securities

| Period | Total Number<br>of Shares<br>Purchased | Average<br>Price Paid<br>per Share | Total Number<br>of Shares<br>Purchased<br>as Part<br>of Publicly<br>Announced<br>Plans or<br>Programs* | Maximum<br>Number (or<br>Approximate<br>Dollar Value )<br>of Shares<br>that May Yet Be<br>Purchased<br>under the Plans<br>or Programs** |
|--------|--|------------------------------------|--|---|
|--------|--|------------------------------------|--|---|

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

|                    |         |        |         |              |
|--------------------|---------|--------|---------|--------------|
| November 1 -       |         |        |         |              |
| November 30, 2007  | 302,101 | \$6.53 | 302,101 | 3,597,157    |
| December 1 -       |         |        |         |              |
| December 31, 2007  | 260,800 | \$7.62 | 260,800 | 3,336,357    |
| January 1 -        |         |        |         |              |
| January 31, 2008   | -       | -      | -       | 3,336,357    |
| February 1 -       |         |        |         |              |
| February 29, 2008  | 20,452  | \$7.12 | 20,452  | 4,915,429*** |
| March 1 -          |         |        |         |              |
| March 31, 2008     | 206,241 | \$6.87 | 206,241 | 4,709,188    |
| April 1 -          |         |        |         |              |
| April 30, 2008     | -       | -      | -       | 4,709,188    |
| May 1 -            |         |        |         |              |
| May 31, 2008       | -       | -      | -       | 4,709,188    |
| June 1 -           |         |        |         |              |
| June 30, 2008      | -       | -      | -       | 4,709,188    |
| July 1 -           |         |        |         |              |
| July 31, 2008      | -       | -      | -       | 4,709,188    |
| August 1 -         |         |        |         |              |
| August 31, 2008    | -       | -      | -       | 4,709,188    |
| September 1 -      |         |        |         |              |
| September 30, 2008 | -       | -      | -       | 4,709,188    |
| October 1 -        |         |        |         |              |
| October 7, 2008    | -       | -      | -       | 4,709,188    |
| October 8 -        |         |        |         |              |
| October 31, 2008   | -       | -      | -       | 5,728,836    |

\*The Board of Trustees announced a repurchase plan on October 7, 2005 for which **2,360,317** shares were approved for repurchase by the fund. The repurchase plan was approved through October 6, 2006. On March 10, 2006, the Trustees announced that the repurchase program was increased to allow repurchases of up to a total of 4,720,634 shares over the original term of the program. On September 15, 2006, the Trustees voted to extend the term of the repurchase program through October 6, 2007. In September 2007, the Trustees announced that the repurchase program was increased to allow repurchases up to a total 4,019,074 shares through October 7, 2008. In September 2008, the Trustees announced that the repurchase program was increased to allow repurchases up to a total 5,728,836 shares through October 7, 2009.

\*\*Information prior to October 7, 2008 is based on the total number of shares eligible for repurchase under the program, as amended through September 2007. Information from October 8, 2008 forward is based on the total number of shares eligible for repurchase under the program, as amended through September 2008.

\*\*\*\* Includes 1,599,524 additional shares eligible for repurchase under the program resulting from the merger of Putnam High Yield Municipal Trust into the Fund in February 2008.

Item 10. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders:

Not applicable

Item 11. Controls and Procedures:

(a) The registrant's principal executive officer and principal financial officer have concluded, based on their evaluation of the effectiveness of the design and operation of the registrant's disclosure controls and procedures as of a date within 90 days of the filing date of this report, that the design and operation of such procedures are

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: Douglas Camille J. - Form 4

generally effective to provide reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed by the registrant in this report is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the Commission's rules and forms.

(b) Changes in internal control over financial reporting: Not applicable

Item 12. Exhibits:

(a)(1) The Code of Ethics of The Putnam Funds, which incorporates the Code of Ethics of Putnam Investments, is filed herewith.

(a)(2) Separate certifications for the principal executive officer and principal financial officer of the registrant as required by Rule 30a-2(a) under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, are filed herewith.

(b) The certifications required by Rule 30a-2(b) under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, are filed herewith.

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Putnam Managed Municipal Income Trust

By (Signature and Title):

/s/Janet C. Smith

Janet C. Smith  
Principal Accounting Officer

Date: December 29, 2008

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

By (Signature and Title):

/s/Charles E. Porter

Charles E. Porter  
Principal Executive Officer

Date: December 29, 2008

---

By (Signature and Title):

/s/Steven D. Krichmar

Steven D. Krichmar  
Principal Financial Officer

Date: December 29, 2008

---