

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

The disinterested trustees (the “directors”) of AB Corporate Shares (the “Company”) unanimously approved the continuance of the Company’s Advisory Agreement with the Adviser in respect of AB Impact Municipal Income Shares (the “Fund”) at a meeting held by video conference on November 2-4, 2021 (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 noted that the Fund is designed as a vehicle for the wrap fee account market (where investors pay fees to a wrap fee sponsor which pays investment fees and expenses from such fee). The directors also noted that no advisory fee is payable by the Fund, that the Advisory Agreement does not include the reimbursement provision for certain administrative expenses included in the advisory agreements of most of the open-end AB Funds, and that the Adviser is responsible for payment of the Fund’s ordinary expenses. The directors noted that the Company acknowledges in the Advisory Agreement that the Adviser and its affiliates expect to receive compensation from third parties in connection with services provided under the Advisory Agreement. The directors further noted that the Adviser receives payments from the wrap fee program sponsors (the “Sponsors”) that use the Fund as an investment vehicle for their clients.

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 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 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 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. 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 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. The directors noted that the Adviser is compensated by the Sponsors. 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 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 the Fund’s performance against a broad-based securities market index, in each case for the 1- and 3-year periods ended July 31, 2021 and (in the case of comparisons with the broad-based securities market index) for the period from inception. The directors were cognizant that the Fund was neither designed nor offered as a standalone investment and was intended to serve solely as a component of certain separately managed accounts (“SMAs”). The Adviser had explained that this attribute made it difficult to select an appropriate benchmark for the Fund. At the directors’ request, the Adviser provided information showing the weighting of the Fund in a current SMA and the overall performance of the SMA versus its stated benchmark. Based on their review, the directors concluded that the Fund’s investment performance was acceptable.

Advisory Fees

The directors considered the advisory fee rate payable by the Fund to the Adviser (zero) and information provided 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 payable by other funds.

The directors noted the unusual arrangements in the Advisory Agreement providing for no advisory fee but were cognizant that the Adviser is indirectly compensated by the Sponsors for its services to the Fund. The directors reviewed the fee arrangements between the Adviser and each of the current Sponsors and noted that such fees were negotiated on an arm’s length basis and were within the range of fees paid by wrap fee sponsors to other advisers of similar funds. While the Adviser’s fee arrangements with the Sponsors vary, the directors acknowledged the

Adviser's view that a portion of such fees (less the expenses of the Fund paid by the Adviser) may reasonably be viewed as compensating the Adviser for advisory services it provides to the Fund (the "implied fee") and that the Adviser believes that while the Sponsors pay the Adviser different fee rates, the rate of fee attributable to Fund management at the Fund level is the same for all Sponsors. The directors also considered the fee rate schedules used by other registered investment companies that invest in fixed income securities that are advised by the Adviser.

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.

The directors did not consider comparative expense information for the Fund because the Fund does not bear ordinary expenses.

Economies of Scale

The directors did not consider the extent to which fee levels in the Advisory Agreement for the Fund reflect economies of scale because the Advisory Agreement does not provide for any compensation to be paid to the Adviser by the Fund and the Fund's expense ratio is zero. They did note, however, that the fee payable to the Adviser by the current Sponsors declines at a breakpoint based on either individual account sizes or on total assets managed by the Adviser for the Sponsor.