

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

The disinterested directors (the “directors”) of AB Fixed-Income Shares, Inc. (the “Company”) unanimously approved the continuance of the Company’s Advisory Agreement with the Adviser in respect of AB Government Money Market Portfolio (the “Fund”) at a meeting held on November 4-6, 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

* Following transactions completed on November 13, 2019 that may have been deemed to have been an “assignment” causing termination of the Fund’s investment advisory agreement, a new investment advisory agreement, having the same terms as the prior one, was entered into by the Fund and the Adviser.

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 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 and distribution 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 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 the Fund before taxes and

distribution expenses. The directors concluded that the Adviser's level of profitability from its relationship with the Fund in 2017 was not unreasonable. The directors noted that the Fund was not profitable to the Adviser in 2018.

Fall-Out Benefits

The directors considered the other benefits to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Fund, including, but not limited to, benefits relating to 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; and transfer agency fees paid by the Fund to a wholly owned subsidiary of the Adviser. The directors recognized that the Fund's recent 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 AB 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 AB Shares against a broad-based securities market index, in each case for the 1-, 3-, 5- and 10-year periods ended July 31, 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 advisory fee rate (reflecting a 10 basis point advisory fee waiver implemented by the Adviser) with a peer group median and took into account the impact on the advisory fee rate of the administrative expense reimbursement paid to the Adviser in the latest fiscal year.

The directors also considered the Adviser's fee schedule for other clients utilizing investment strategies similar to those of the Fund. 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 utilizing investment strategies similar to those of the Fund, 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 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 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.

In connection with their review of the Fund's advisory fee, the directors also considered the total expense ratio of the Class AB shares of the Fund in comparison to a peer group and a peer universe selected by the 15(c) service provider. The Class AB expense ratio of the Fund was based on the Fund's latest fiscal year and the directors considered the impact of the Adviser's 10 basis point advisory fee waiver. 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 does 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 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. The directors informed the Adviser that they would monitor the Fund's asset levels and its profitability to the Adviser and anticipated revisiting the question of breakpoints in the future if circumstances warranted doing so.