Information Regarding the Review and Approval of the Fund's Proposed New Advisory Agreements and Interim Advisory Agreement in the Context of Potential Assignments

As described in more detail in the Proxy Statement for the AB Funds dated August 20, 2018, the Boards of the AB Funds, at a meeting held on July 31-August 2, 2018, approved new advisory agreements with the Adviser (the "Proposed Agreements") for the AB Funds, including AB Cap Fund, Inc. in respect of AB International Strategic Core Portfolio (the "Fund"), in connection with the planned disposition by AXA S.A. of its remaining shares of AXA Equitable Holdings, Inc. (the indirect holder of a majority of the partnership interests in the Adviser and the indirect parent of AllianceBernstein Corporation, the general partner of the Adviser) in one or more transactions and the related potential for one or more "assignments" (within the meaning of section 2(a)(4) of the Investment Company Act) of the advisory agreements for the AB Funds, including the Fund's Advisory Agreement, resulting in the automatic termination of such advisory agreements.

At the same meeting, the AB Boards also considered and approved interim advisory agreements with the Adviser (the "Interim Advisory Agreements") for the AB Funds, including the Fund, to be effective only in the event that stockholder approval of a Proposed Agreement had not been obtained as of the date of one or more transactions resulting in an "assignment" of the Adviser's advisory agreements, resulting in the automatic termination of such advisory agreements.

The shareholders of the Fund subsequently approved the Proposed Agreements at an annual meeting of shareholders called for the purpose of electing Directors and voting on the Proposed Agreements.

A discussion regarding the basis for the Boards' approvals at the meeting held on July 31-August 2, 2018 is set forth below.

At a meeting of the AB Boards held on July 31-August 2, 2018, the Adviser presented its recommendation that the Boards consider and approve the Proposed Agreements. Section 15(c) of the 1940 Act provides that, after an initial period, a Fund's Current Agreement and current sub-advisory agreement, as applicable, will remain in effect only if the Board, including a majority of the Independent Directors, annually reviews and approves them. Each of the Current Agreements had been approved by a Board within the one-year period prior to approval of its related Proposed Agreement, except that the Current Agreements for certain FlexFee funds were approved in February 2017. In connection with their approval of the Proposed Agreements, the Boards considered their conclusions in connection with their most recent approvals of the Current Agreements, in particular in cases where the last approval of a Current Agreement was relatively recent, including the Boards' general satisfaction with the nature and quality of services being provided and, as applicable, in the case of

certain Funds, actions taken or to be taken in an effort to improve investment performance or reduce expense ratios. The Directors also reviewed updated information provided by the Adviser in respect of each Fund. Also in connection with their approval of the Proposed Agreements, the Boards considered a representation made to them at that time by the Adviser that there were no additional developments not already disclosed to the Boards since their most recent approvals of the Current Agreements that would be a material consideration to the Boards in connection with their consideration of the Proposed Agreements, except for matters disclosed to the Boards by the Adviser. The Directors considered the fact that each Proposed Agreement would have corresponding terms and conditions identical to those of the corresponding Current Agreement with the exception of the effective date and initial term under the Proposed Agreement.

The Directors considered their knowledge of the nature and quality of the services provided by the Adviser to each Fund gained from their experience as directors or trustees of registered investment companies advised by the Adviser, their overall confidence in the Adviser's integrity and competence they have gained from that experience, the Adviser's initiative in identifying and raising potential issues with the Directors and its responsiveness, frankness and attention to concerns raised by the Directors in the past, including the Adviser's willingness to consider and implement organizational and operational changes designed to improve investment results and the services provided to the Funds. The Directors noted that they have four regular meetings each year, at each of which they review extensive materials and information from the Adviser, including information on the investment performance of each Fund.

The Directors also considered all factors they believed relevant, including the specific matters discussed below. During the course of their deliberations, the Directors evaluated, among other things, the reasonableness of the management fees of the Funds they oversee. The Directors did not identify any particular information that was all-important or controlling, and different Directors may have attributed different weights to the various factors. The Directors determined that the selection of the Adviser to manage the Funds, and the overall arrangements between the Funds and the Adviser, as provided in the Proposed Agreements, including the management fees, were fair and reasonable in light of the services performed under the Current Agreements and to be performed under the Proposed Agreements, expenses incurred and to be incurred and such other matters as the Directors considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment. The material factors and conclusions that formed the basis for the Directors' determinations included the following:

Nature, Extent and Quality of Services Provided

The Directors considered the scope and quality of services to be provided by the Adviser under the Proposed Agreements, including the quality of

the investment research capabilities of the Adviser and the other resources it has dedicated to performing services for the Funds. They also considered the information that had been provided to them by the Adviser concerning the anticipated implementation of the Plan and the Adviser's representation that it did not anticipate that such implementation would affect the management or structure of the Adviser, have a material adverse effect on the Adviser, or adversely affect the quality of the services provided to the Funds by the Adviser and its affiliates. The Directors noted that the Adviser from time to time reviews each Fund's investment strategies and from time to time proposes changes intended to improve the Fund's relative or absolute performance for the Directors' consideration. They also noted the professional experience and qualifications of each Fund's portfolio management team and other senior personnel of the Adviser. The Directors also considered that certain Proposed Agreements, similar to the corresponding Current Agreements, provide that the Funds will reimburse the Adviser for the cost to it of providing certain clerical, accounting, administrative and other services to the Funds by employees of the Adviser or its affiliates. Requests for these reimbursements are made on a quarterly basis and subject to approval by the Directors. The Directors noted that the Adviser did not request any reimbursements from certain Funds in the Fund's latest fiscal year reviewed. The Directors noted that the methodology to be used to determine the reimbursement amounts had been reviewed by an independent consultant retained by the Funds' former Senior Officer/Independent Compliance Officer. The quality of administrative and other services, including the Adviser's role in coordinating the activities of the Funds' other service providers, also was considered. The Directors of each Fund concluded that, overall, they were satisfied with the nature, extent and quality of services to be provided to the Funds under the Proposed Agreement for the Fund.

Costs of Services to be Provided and Profitability

The Directors reviewed a schedule of the revenues and expenses and related notes indicating the profitability of each Fund to the Adviser for calendar years 2016 and 2017, as applicable, that had been prepared with an expense allocation methodology arrived at in consultation with an independent consultant retained by the Funds' former Senior Officer/Independent Compliance Officer. The Directors noted the assumptions and methods of allocation used by the Adviser in preparing fund-specific profitability data and understood that there are a number of potentially acceptable allocation methodologies for information of this type. The Directors noted that the profitability information reflected all revenues and expenses of the Adviser's relationship with a Fund, including those relating to its subsidiaries that provide transfer agency, distribution and brokerage services to the Fund, as applicable. The Directors recognized that it is difficult to make comparisons of the profitability of the Proposed Agreements with the profitability of fund advisory contracts for unaffiliated funds because comparative information is not generally publicly available and is

affected by numerous factors. The Directors focused on the profitability of the Adviser's relationship with each Fund before taxes and distribution expenses, as applicable. The Directors noted that certain Funds were not profitable to the Adviser in one or more periods reviewed. The Directors concluded that the Adviser's level of profitability from its relationship with the other Funds was not unreasonable. The Directors were unable to consider historical information about the profitability of certain Funds that had recently commenced operations and for which historical profitability information was not available. The Adviser agreed to provide the Directors with profitability information in connection with future proposed continuances of the Proposed Agreements.

Fall-Out Benefits

The Directors considered the other benefits to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Funds, including, but not limited to, as applicable, benefits relating to soft dollar arrangements (whereby investment advisers receive brokerage and research services from brokers that execute agency transactions for their clients) in the case of certain Funds; 12b-1 fees and sales charges received by the principal underwriter (which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Adviser) in respect of certain classes of the shares of most of the Funds; brokerage commissions paid by certain Funds to brokers affiliated with the Adviser; and transfer agency fees paid by most of the Funds to a wholly owned subsidiary of the Adviser. The Directors recognized that the Adviser's profitability would be somewhat lower, and that a Fund's unprofitability to the Adviser would be exacerbated, without these benefits. The Directors understood that the Adviser also might derive reputational and other benefits from its association with the Funds.

Investment Results

In addition to the information reviewed by the Directors in connection with the Board meeting at which the Proposed Agreements were approved, the Directors receive detailed performance information for the Funds at each regular Board meeting during the year.

The Boards' consideration of each Proposed Agreement was informed by their most recent approval of the related Current Agreement, and, in the case of certain Funds, their discussion with the Adviser of the reasons for those Funds' underperformance in certain periods. The Directors also reviewed updated performance information and, in some cases, discussed with the Adviser the reasons for changes in performance or continued underperformance. On the basis of this review, the Directors concluded that each Fund's investment performance was acceptable.

Management Fees and Other Expenses

The Directors considered the management fee rate payable by each Fund to the Adviser and information prepared by an independent service provider

(the "15(c) provider") concerning management fee rates payable by other funds in the same category as the Fund. The Directors recognized that it is difficult to make comparisons of management fees because there are variations in the services that are included in the fees paid by other funds. The Directors compared each Fund's contractual management fee rate with a peer group median, and where applicable, took into account the impact on the management fee rate of the administrative expense reimbursement paid to the Adviser in the latest fiscal year. In the case of the ACS Funds, the Directors noted that the management fee rate is zero but also were cognizant that the Adviser is indirectly compensated by the wrap fee program sponsors that use the ACS Funds as an investment vehicle for their clients.

The Directors also considered the Adviser's fee schedule for other clients pursuing a similar investment style to each Fund. For this purpose, they reviewed the relevant advisory fee information from the Adviser's Form ADV and in a report from the Funds' Senior Analyst and noted the differences between a Fund's fee schedule, on the one hand, and the Adviser's institutional fee schedule and the schedule of fees charged by the Adviser to any offshore funds and for services to any sub-advised funds pursuing a similar investment strategy as the Fund, on the other, as applicable. The Directors noted that the Adviser may, in some cases, agree to fee rates with large institutional clients that are lower than those reviewed by the Directors and that they had previously discussed with the Adviser its policies in respect of such arrangements. The Adviser also informed the Directors that, in the case of certain Funds, there were no institutional products managed by the Adviser that have a substantially similar investment style. The Directors also discussed these matters with their independent fee consultant.

The Adviser reviewed with the Directors the significantly greater scope of the services it provides to each Fund relative to institutional, offshore fund and sub-advised fund clients, as applicable. In this regard, the Adviser noted, among other things, that, compared to institutional and offshore or sub-advisory accounts, each Fund, as applicable, (i) demands considerably more portfolio management, research and trading resources due to significantly higher daily cash flows (in the case of open-end Funds); (ii) has more tax and regulatory restrictions and compliance obligations; (iii) must prepare and file or distribute regulatory and other communications about fund operations; and (iv) must provide shareholder servicing to retail investors. The Adviser also reviewed the greater legal risks presented by the large and changing population of Fund shareholders who may assert claims against the Adviser in individual or class actions, and the greater entrepreneurial risk in offering new fund products, which require substantial investment to launch, may not succeed, and generally must be priced to compete with larger, more established funds resulting in lack of profitability to the Adviser until a new fund achieves scale. In light of the substantial differences in services rendered by the Adviser to institutional,

offshore fund and sub-advised fund clients as compared to the Funds, and the different risk profile, the Directors considered these fee comparisons inapt and did not place significant weight on them in their deliberations.

The Directors noted that many of the Funds may invest in shares of exchange-traded funds ("ETFs'), subject to the restrictions and limitations of the 1940 Act as these may be varied as a result of exemptive orders issued by the SEC. The Directors also noted that ETFs pay advisory fees pursuant to their advisory contracts. The Directors concluded, based on the Adviser's explanation of how it uses ETFs when they are the most cost-effective way to obtain desired exposures, in some cases pending purchases of underlying securities, that each Fund's management fee would be for services that would be in addition to, rather than duplicative of, the services provided under the advisory contracts of the ETFs.

With respect to each Fund's management fee, the Directors considered the total expense ratio of the Fund in comparison to a peer group and peer universe selected by the 15(c) service provider. The Directors also considered the Adviser's expense caps for certain Funds. The Directors view expense ratio information as relevant to their evaluation of the Adviser's services because the Adviser is responsible for coordinating services provided to a Fund by others.

The Boards' consideration of each Proposed Agreement was informed by their most recent approval of the related Current Agreement, and, in the case of certain Funds, their discussion with the Adviser of the reasons for those Funds' expense ratios in certain periods. The Directors also reviewed updated expense ratio information and, in some cases, discussed with the Adviser the reasons for the expense ratios of certain Funds. On the basis of this review, the Directors concluded that each Fund's expense ratio was acceptable.

The Directors did not consider comparative expense information for the ACS Funds because those Funds do not bear ordinary expenses.

Economies of Scale

The Directors noted that the management fee schedules for certain Funds do not contain breakpoints and that they had discussed their strong preference for breakpoints in advisory contracts with the Adviser. The Directors took into consideration prior presentations by an independent consultant on economies of scale in the mutual fund industry and for the Funds, and by the Adviser concerning certain of its views on economies of scale. The Directors also had requested and received from the Adviser certain updates on economies of scale in advance of the Board meeting. The Directors believe that economies of scale may be realized (if at all) by the Adviser across a variety of products and services, and not only in respect of a single fund. The Directors noted that there is no established methodology for setting breakpoints that give effect to the fund-specific

services provided by a fund's adviser and to the economies of scale that an adviser may realize in its overall mutual fund business or those components of it which directly or indirectly affect a fund's operations. The Directors observed that in the mutual fund industry as a whole, as well as among funds similar to each Fund, there is no uniformity or pattern in the fees and asset levels at which breakpoints (if any) apply. The Directors also noted that the advisory agreements for many funds do not have breakpoints at all. The Directors informed the Adviser that they would monitor the asset levels of the Funds without breakpoints and their profitability to the Adviser and anticipated revisiting the question of breakpoints in the future if circumstances warrant doing so.

The Directors did not consider the extent to which fee levels in the Advisory Agreement for the ACS Funds reflect economies of scale because that Advisory Agreement does not provide for any compensation to be paid to the Adviser by the ACS Funds and the expense ratio of each of those Funds is zero.

Interim Advisory Agreements

In approving the Interim Advisory Agreements, the Boards, with the assistance of independent counsel, considered similar factors to those considered in approving the Proposed Agreements. The Interim Advisory Agreements approved by the Boards are identical to the Proposed Agreements, as well as the Current Agreements, in all material respects except for their proposed effective and termination dates and provisions intended to comply with the requirements of the relevant SEC rule, such as provisions requiring escrow of advisory fees. Under the Interim Advisory Agreements, the Adviser would continue to manage a Fund pursuant to an Interim Advisory Agreement until a new advisory agreement was approved by stockholders or until the end of the 150-day period, whichever would occur earlier. All fees earned by the Adviser under an Interim Advisory Agreement would be held in escrow pending shareholder approval of the Proposed Agreement. Upon approval of a new advisory agreement by stockholders, the escrowed management fees would be paid to the Adviser, and the Interim Advisory Agreement would terminate.

Information Regarding the Review and Approval of the Fund's Current Advisory Agreement

The disinterested directors (the "directors") of AB Cap Fund, Inc. (the "Company") unanimously approved the continuance of the Company's Advisory Agreement with the Adviser in respect of AB International Strategic Core Portfolio (the "Fund") at a meeting held on May 7-9, 2019 (the "Meeting").

Prior to approval of the continuance of the Advisory Agreement, the directors had requested from the Adviser, and received and evaluated, extensive materials. They reviewed the proposed continuance of the Advisory Agreement with the Adviser and with experienced counsel who are

independent of the Adviser, who advised on the relevant legal standards. The directors also reviewed additional materials, including comparative analytical data prepared by the Senior Analyst for the Fund. The directors also discussed the proposed continuance in private sessions with counsel.

The directors considered their knowledge of the nature and quality of the services provided by the Adviser to the Fund gained from their experience as directors or trustees of most of the registered investment companies advised by the Adviser, their overall confidence in the Adviser's integrity and competence they have gained from that experience, the Adviser's initiative in identifying and raising potential issues with the directors and its responsiveness, frankness and attention to concerns raised by the directors in the past, including the Adviser's willingness to consider and implement organizational and operational changes designed to improve investment results and the services provided to the AB Funds. The directors noted that they have four regular meetings each year, at each of which they review extensive materials and information from the Adviser, including information on the investment performance of the Fund.

The directors also considered all factors they believed relevant, including the specific matters discussed below. During the course of their deliberations, the directors evaluated, among other things, the reasonableness of the advisory fee. The directors did not identify any particular information that was all-important or controlling, and different directors may have attributed different weights to the various factors. The directors determined that the selection of the Adviser to manage the Fund and the overall arrangements between the Fund and the Adviser, as provided in the Advisory Agreement, including the advisory fee, were fair and reasonable in light of the services performed, expenses incurred and such other matters as the directors considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment. The material factors and conclusions that formed the basis for the directors' determinations included the following:

Nature, Extent and Quality of Services Provided

The directors considered the scope and quality of services provided by the Adviser under the Advisory Agreement, including the quality of the investment research capabilities of the Adviser and the other resources it has dedicated to performing services for the Fund. The directors noted that the Adviser from time to time reviews the Fund's investment strategies and from time to time proposes changes intended to improve the Fund's relative or absolute performance for the directors' consideration. They also noted the professional experience and qualifications of the Fund's portfolio management team and other senior personnel of the Adviser. The directors also considered that the Advisory Agreement provides that the Fund will reimburse the Adviser for the cost to it of providing certain clerical, accounting, administrative and other services to the Fund by employees of the Adviser or its affiliates. Requests for these reimbursements are made on a quarterly basis and subject to approval by the directors. Reimbursements,

to the extent requested and paid, result in a higher rate of total compensation from the Fund to the Adviser than the fee rate stated in the Advisory Agreement. The Adviser did not request any reimbursements from the Fund in the Fund's latest fiscal year. The directors noted that the methodology used to determine the reimbursement amounts had been reviewed by an independent consultant retained by the Fund's former Senior Officer/Independent Compliance Officer. The quality of administrative and other services, including the Adviser's role in coordinating the activities of the Fund's other service providers, also was considered. The directors concluded that, overall, they were satisfied with the nature, extent and quality of services provided to the Fund under the Advisory Agreement.

Costs of Services Provided and Profitability

The directors reviewed a schedule of the revenues and expenses and related notes indicating the profitability of the Fund to the Adviser for calendar years 2017 and 2018 that had been prepared with an expense allocation methodology arrived at in consultation with an independent consultant retained by the Fund's former Senior Officer/Independent Compliance Officer. The directors noted the assumptions and methods of allocation used by the Adviser in preparing fund-specific profitability data and understood that there are a number of potentially acceptable allocation methodologies for information of this type. The directors noted that the profitability information reflected all revenues and expenses of the Adviser's relationship with the Fund, including those relating to its subsidiaries that provide transfer agency, distribution and brokerage services to the Fund. The directors recognized that it is difficult to make comparisons of the profitability of the Advisory Agreement with the profitability of advisory contracts for unaffiliated funds because comparative information is not generally publicly available and is affected by numerous factors. The directors focused on the profitability of the Adviser's relationship with the Fund before taxes and distribution expenses. The directors noted that the Fund was not profitable to the Adviser in the periods reviewed.

Fall-Out Benefits

The directors considered the other benefits to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Fund and the underlying fund advised by the Adviser in which the Fund invests, including, but not limited to, benefits relating to soft dollar arrangements (whereby investment advisers receive brokerage and research services from brokers that execute agency transactions for their clients); 12b-1 fees and sales charges received by the Fund's principal underwriter (which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Adviser) in respect of certain classes of the Fund's shares; brokerage commissions paid by the Fund to brokers affiliated with the Adviser; and transfer agency fees paid by the Fund to a wholly owned subsidiary of the Adviser. The directors recognized that the Fund's unprofitability to the Adviser would be exacerbated without these benefits. The directors understood that the Adviser also might derive reputational and other benefits from its association with the Fund.

Investment Results
In addition to the information reviewed by the directors in connection with the Meeting, the directors receive detailed performance information for the Fund at each regular Board meeting during the year.

At the Meeting, the directors reviewed performance information prepared by an independent service provider (the "15(c) service provider"), showing the performance of the Class A Shares of the Fund against a group of similar funds ("peer group") and a larger group of similar funds ("peer universe"), each selected by the 15(c) service provider, and information prepared by the Adviser showing performance of the Class A Shares against a broad-based securities market index, in each case for the 1- and 3-year periods ended February 28, 2019 and (in the case of comparisons with the broad-based securities market index) for the period from inception. Based on their review, the directors concluded that the Fund's investment performance was acceptable.

Advisory Fees and Other Expenses
The directors considered the advisory fee rate payable by the Fund to the Adviser and information prepared by the 15(c) service provider concerning advisory fee rates payable by other funds in the same category as the Fund. The directors recognized that it is difficult to make comparisons of advisory fees because there are variations in the services that are included in the fees paid by other funds. The directors compared the Fund's contractual effective advisory fee rate with a peer group median.

The directors also considered the Adviser's fee schedule for other clients pursuing an investment strategy similar to the Fund's. For this purpose, they reviewed the relevant advisory fee information from the Adviser's Form ADV and in a report from the Fund's Senior Analyst and noted the differences between the Fund's fee schedule, on the one hand, and the Adviser's institutional fee schedule and the schedule of fees charged by the Adviser to any offshore funds and for services to any sub-advised funds pursuing an investment strategy similar to the Fund's, on the other. The directors noted that the Adviser may, in some cases, agree to fee rates with large institutional clients that are lower than those reviewed by the directors and that they had previously discussed with the Adviser its policies in respect of such arrangements. The directors previously discussed these matters with an independent fee consultant. The directors also compared the advisory fee rate for the Fund with those for two other funds advised by the Adviser with a similar investment strategy.

The Adviser reviewed with the directors the significantly greater scope of the services it provides to the Fund relative to institutional, offshore fund and sub-advised fund clients. In this regard, the Adviser noted, among other things, that, compared to institutional and offshore or sub-advisory accounts, the Fund (i) demands considerably more portfolio management,

research and trading resources due to significantly higher daily cash flows; (ii) has more tax and regulatory restrictions and compliance obligations; (iii) must prepare and file or distribute regulatory and other communications about fund operations; and (iv) must provide shareholder servicing to retail investors. The Adviser also reviewed the greater legal risks presented by the large and changing population of Fund shareholders who may assert claims against the Adviser in individual or class actions, and the greater entrepreneurial risk in offering new fund products, which require substantial investment to launch, may not succeed, and generally must be priced to compete with larger, more established funds resulting in lack of profitability to the Adviser until a new fund achieves scale. In light of the substantial differences in services rendered by the Adviser to institutional, offshore fund and sub-advised fund clients as compared to the Fund, and the different risk profile, the directors considered these fee comparisons inapt and did not place significant weight on them in their deliberations.

The directors noted that the Fund may invest in shares of exchange-traded funds ("ETFs"), subject to the restrictions and limitations of the Investment Company Act of 1940 as these may be varied as a result of exemptive orders issued by the SEC. The directors also noted that ETFs pay advisory fees pursuant to their advisory contracts. The directors concluded, based on the Adviser's explanation of how it uses ETFs when they are the most cost-effective way to obtain desired exposures, in some cases pending purchases of underlying securities, that the advisory fee for the Fund would be for services that would be in addition to, rather than duplicative of, the services provided under the advisory contracts of the ETFs.

In connection with their review of the Fund's advisory fee, the directors also considered the total expense ratio of the Class A shares of the Fund in comparison to a peer group and a peer universe selected by the 15(c) service provider. The Class A expense ratio of the Fund was based on the Fund's latest fiscal year and the directors considered the Adviser's expense cap for the Fund. The directors noted that it was likely that the expense ratios of some of the other funds in the Fund's category were lowered by waivers or reimbursements by those funds' investment advisers, which in some cases might be voluntary or temporary. The directors view expense ratio information as relevant to their evaluation of the Adviser's services because the Adviser is responsible for coordinating services provided to the Fund by others. Based on their review, the directors concluded that the Fund's expense ratio was acceptable.

Economies of Scale

The directors noted that the advisory fee schedule for the Fund contains breakpoints that reduce the fee rates on assets above specified levels. The directors took into consideration prior presentations by an independent consultant on economies of scale in the mutual fund industry and for the AB Funds, and presentations from time to time by the Adviser concerning

certain of its views on economies of scale. The directors also previously discussed economies of scale with an independent fee consultant. The directors also had requested and received from the Adviser certain updates on economies of scale in advance of the Meeting. The directors believe that economies of scale may be realized (if at all) by the Adviser across a variety of products and services, and not only in respect of a single fund. The directors noted that there is no established methodology for setting breakpoints that give effect to the fund-specific services provided by a fund's adviser and to the economies of scale that an adviser may realize in its overall mutual fund business or those components of it which directly or indirectly affect a fund's operations. The directors observed that in the mutual fund industry as a whole, as well as among funds similar to the Fund, there is no uniformity or pattern in the fees and asset levels at which breakpoints (if any) apply. The directors also noted that the advisory agreements for many funds do not have breakpoints at all. Having taken these factors into account, the directors concluded that the Fund's shareholders would benefit from a sharing of economies of scale in the event the Fund's net assets exceed a breakpoint in the future.