

Information Regarding the Review and Approval of the Fund's Advisory and Administration Agreements

The disinterested directors (the “directors”) of AllianceBernstein Global High Income Fund, Inc. (the “Fund”) unanimously approved the continuance of the Fund's Advisory Agreement with the Adviser and the continuance of the Fund's Administration Agreement with the Adviser (in such capacity, the “Administrator”) at a meeting held by video conference on November 2-4, 2021 (the “Meeting”).

Prior to approval of the continuance of the Advisory Agreement and the Administration Agreement, the directors had requested from the Adviser, and received and evaluated, extensive materials. They reviewed the proposed continuance of the Advisory Agreement and Administration 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 and the money market fund advised by the Adviser in which the Fund invests a portion of its assets.

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 Administrator to provide administrative services to the Fund and the overall arrangements (i) between the Fund and the Adviser, as provided in the Advisory Agreement, including the advisory fee and (ii) between the Fund and the Administrator, as provided in the Administration Agreement, including the administration fee, were fair and reasonable in light of the services per-

formed, 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 and by the Administrator under the Administration 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 and the resources the Administrator has devoted to providing services to 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 noted that the Adviser receives reimbursements for certain clerical, accounting, administrative and other services provided to the Fund by the Adviser pursuant to the Administration Agreement. The directors noted that the methodology used to determine the reimbursement amounts had been reviewed by an independent consultant at the request of the directors. 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 and the Administration 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 (including in its capacity as Administrator) for calendar years 2019 and 2020 that had been prepared with an expense allocation methodology arrived at in consultation with an independent consultant at the request of the directors. 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 subsidiary that provides shareholder 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. The directors concluded

that the Adviser's level of profitability from its relationship with the Fund was not unreasonable.

Fall-Out Benefits

The directors considered the other benefits to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Fund and the money market fund advised by the Adviser in which the Fund invests, including, but not limited to, benefits relating to shareholder servicing fees paid by the Fund to a wholly owned subsidiary of the Adviser. The directors recognized that the Adviser's profitability would be somewhat lower 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 Fund's performance 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 the Fund's performance against a broad-based securities market index, in each case for the 1-, 3-, 5- and 10-year periods ended July 31, 2021. Based on their review, the directors concluded that the Fund's investment performance was acceptable.

Advisory Fees and Other Expenses

The directors considered the management fee rate payable by the Fund (the combined advisory fee payable to the Adviser and administration fee payable to the Administrator) and information prepared by the 15(c) service provider concerning advisory fee rates payable by other funds in the same category as the Fund. They compared the combined advisory and administration fees payable by the Fund to the advisory fees of other funds where there is no separate administrator. 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 payable by other funds. The directors compared the Fund's contractual total management fee rate (the combined advisory fee payable to the Adviser plus the administration fee payable to the Administrator) with a peer group median. The directors noted that the total management fee rate was expressed as a percentage of net assets and would have been lower if expressed as a percentage of average total assets (*i.e.*, net assets plus assets supported by leverage).

The directors also compared the Fund's contractual advisory fee rate with the fee rate charged by the Adviser for advising an open-end high income

fund that also invested globally, and noted historical differences in their fee structures.

The Adviser informed the directors that there were no institutional products managed by the Adviser that utilize investment strategies similar to those of the Fund.

In connection with their review of the Fund's advisory fee, the directors also considered the total expense ratio of the Fund in comparison to a peer group selected by the 15(c) service provider. The expense ratio of the Fund was based on the Fund's latest fiscal year. 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 advisory fee schedule for the Fund does not contain breakpoints that reduce the fee rates on assets above specified levels. The directors considered that the Fund is a closed-end fixed-income fund and was not expected to have meaningful asset growth (absent a rights offering or an acquisition). In such circumstances, the directors did not view the potential for realization of economies of scale as the Fund's assets grow to be a material factor in their deliberations. They noted that, if the Fund's net assets were to increase materially, they would review whether potential economies of scale were being realized.