

SPROUTS FARMERS MARKET INC

MEETING DATE	Tue, 28 Apr 2020 8:00 am	TYPE	AGM	ISSUE DATE	Fri, 17 Apr 2020
MEETING LOCATION	Sprouts Farmers Market Store Support Office, 5455 East High Street, Suite 111, Phoenix, Arizona 85054				
CURRENT INDICES	PIRC Global				
SECTOR	Miscellaneous food stores				

PROPOSALS		ADVICE
1.1	Elect Director Joel D. Anderson Independent Non-Executive Director.	For
1.2	Elect Director Terri Funk Graham Independent Non-Executive Director.	For
1.3	Elect Director Doug G. Rauch Independent Non-Executive Director.	For
2	Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation The Company has submitted a proposal for shareholder ratification of its executive compensation policy and practices. The voting outcome for this resolution reflects the balance of opinion on the adequacy of disclosure, the balance of performance and reward and the terms of executive employment. Maximum long-term award opportunities are not limited to 200% of base salary, which raises concerns over the potential excessiveness of the remuneration structure. Retention awards made up less than one-third of the awards granted to executives, which is considered best practice. Performance shares have a three-year performance period, which is a market standard. Potential severance entitlements in a change of control scenario are considered excessive as they exceed three times the base salary. The Company does not appear to have double-trigger provisions in place, which is a concern as single-trigger vesting allows for awards to automatically vest in the event of a change-of-control. 'Good reason' is not defined appropriately, such that the Remuneration Committee is able to apply discretion when determining the status of a departing executive. The Compensation Committee has full discretion to accelerate the vesting of awards upon a change of control, which is a concern. The compensation rating is: ADC. Triodos abstains this resolution.	Abstain
3	Approve the Frequency of Future Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation The Company is providing shareholders with an advisory vote on whether the advisory vote on executive compensation should be held every one, two or three years. The Board is required by Section 951 of The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to offer this vote on the frequency of a say-on-pay proposal not less than every six years, although they have the option to offer this proposal more often. The Board of Directors recommends an annual vote. It is considered that an annual vote on executive compensation is best practice for companies. Executive compensation comprises both fixed and variable pay elements, with the variable including share based incentive awards and cash bonuses over which the compensation committee have discretion. Decisions affecting the quantum and design of variable pay are made annually by the committee and it is therefore appropriate that shareholder approval is sought at the maximum frequency permitted by the new legislation. Contentious compensation payments and issues could occur in the intervening years between votes, if the frequency is less than annually. Triodos recommends a one year frequency.	1

4 **Appoint the Auditors**

For

PwC proposed. Non-audit fees represented 0.19% of audit fees during the year under review and 1.10% on a three-year aggregate basis. This level of non-audit fees does not raise serious concerns about the independence of the statutory auditor.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RESOLUTIONS

Proposal 2 - Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation

Disclosure: A - The Company has failed to provide the fees it paid the Compensation Consultants. The disclosure of these fees is encouraged in the interests of greater transparency. The peer groups used for the purpose of pay comparison have been fully disclosed by the Company. The grant of performance awards was based on the achievement of set levels of specific performance targets. The performance-based long term incentive is subject to quantified performance targets.

Balance: D - The Company uses adjusted performance metrics for most elements of compensation. The use of non-GAAP metrics prevents shareholders from being able to assess fully whether the performance targets are sufficiently challenging. The Company included non-financial metrics into the annual bonus structure, which is considered best practice. The annual incentive award made during the year under review is not considered to be overly excessive as it amounts to less than 200% of base salary. The Company uses only one performance metrics to determine the payout of performance awards. Instead of the use of a sole performance metric, it would be preferred that payout be linked to at least two or more performance metrics, with the inclusion of non-financial performance criteria. Performance measures attached to long-term incentives do not duplicate those attached to other awards, which is considered acceptable practice. Maximum long-term award opportunities are not limited to 200% of base salary, which raises concerns over the potential excessiveness of the remuneration structure. Retention awards made up less than one-third of the awards granted to executives, which is considered best practice. Performance shares have a three-year performance period, which is a market standard. However, a five-year performance period is considered best practice. Executive compensation is aligned with peer group averages. In addition, executive compensation is aligned with companies of a similar market cap.

Contract: C - Potential severance entitlements in a change of control scenario are considered excessive as they exceed three times the base salary. The Company does not appear to have double-trigger provisions in place, which is a concern as single-trigger vesting allows for awards to automatically vest in the event of a change-of-control. 'Good reason' is not defined appropriately, such that the Remuneration Committee is able to apply discretion when determining the status of a departing executive. The Compensation Committee has full discretion to accelerate the vesting of awards upon a change of control, which is a concern. The claw-back policy is considered appropriate as it applies to short- and long-term incentives, and is not limited to cases of financial misstatement.

For Private Circulation only

©Copyright 2020 PIRC Ltd

Researcher: Adam Garside
Email: pircresearch@pirc.co.uk

Information is believed to be correct but cannot be guaranteed. Opinions and recommendations constitute our judgement as of this date and are subject to change without notice. The document is not intended as an offer, solicitation or advice to buy or sell securities. Clients of Pensions & Investment Research Consultants Ltd may have a position or engage in transaction in any of the securities mentioned.



Pensions & Investment Research Consultants Limited
8th Floor, Suite 8.02, Exchange Tower
2 Harbour Exchange Square
E14 9GE

Tel: 020 7247 2323
Fax: 020 7247 2457
<http://www.pirc.co.uk>

Regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority