

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ROTHSCHILD LARCH LANE ALTERNATIVES FUND
(Investor Class shares Ticker Symbol: RLLBX)
(Institutional Class shares Ticker Symbol: RLLIX)

a series of
THE ADVISORS' INNER CIRCLE FUND III

March 1, 2016

Investment Adviser:

ROTHSCHILD LARCH LANE MANAGEMENT COMPANY LLC

This Statement of Additional Information (“SAI”) is not a prospectus. This SAI is intended to provide additional information regarding the activities and operations of The Advisors’ Inner Circle Fund III (the “Trust”) and the Rothschild Larch Lane Alternatives Fund (the “Fund”). This SAI is incorporated by reference into and should be read in conjunction with the Fund’s prospectus dated March 1, 2016 (the “Prospectus”). Capitalized terms not defined herein are defined in the Prospectus. The Fund’s financial statements, including notes thereto, and the report of KPMG LLP for the fiscal year ended October 31, 2015 are contained in the 2015 Annual Report to Shareholders and are incorporated by reference into and are deemed to be part of this SAI. A copy of the Fund’s 2015 Annual Report to Shareholders accompanies the delivery of this SAI. Shareholders may obtain copies of the Prospectus or Annual Report free of charge by writing to the Fund at Rothschild Larch Lane Alternatives Fund, P.O. Box 219009, Kansas City, MO 64121-9009 (Express Mail Address: Rothschild Larch Lane Alternatives Fund, c/o DST Systems, Inc., 430 W 7th Street, Kansas City, MO 64105) or calling the Fund at 1-844-RLL-FUND (1-844-755-3863).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE TRUST	S-1
DESCRIPTION OF PERMITTED INVESTMENTS	S-1
INVESTMENT LIMITATIONS	S-29
THE ADVISER AND SUB-ADVISERS	S-32
THE PORTFOLIO MANAGERS	S-34
THE ADMINISTRATOR.....	S-42
THE DISTRIBUTOR	S-43
PAYMENTS TO FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES.....	S-43
THE TRANSFER AGENT.....	S-45
THE CUSTODIAN.....	S-45
INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM	S-45
LEGAL COUNSEL	S-46
TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS OF THE TRUST	S-46
PURCHASING AND REDEEMING SHARES.....	S-53
DETERMINATION OF NET ASSET VALUE	S-53
TAXES	S-55
FUND TRANSACTIONS	S-63
PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS	S-66
DESCRIPTION OF SHARES	S-67
LIMITATION OF TRUSTEES' LIABILITY	S-67
PROXY VOTING.....	S-67
CODES OF ETHICS	S-68
5% AND 25% SHAREHOLDERS.....	S-68
APPENDIX A – DESCRIPTION OF RATINGS.....	A-1
APPENDIX B – PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	B-1

RLL-SX-001-0300

THE TRUST

General. The Fund is a separate series of the Trust. The Trust is an open-end investment management company established under Delaware law as a Delaware statutory trust under a Declaration of Trust dated December 4, 2013 (the “Declaration of Trust”). The Declaration of Trust permits the Trust to offer separate series (“funds”) of shares of beneficial interest (“shares”). The Trust reserves the right to create and issue shares of additional funds. Each fund is a separate mutual fund, and each share of each fund represents an equal proportionate interest in that fund. All consideration received by the Trust for shares of any fund, and all assets of such fund, belong solely to that fund and would be subject to any liabilities related thereto. Each fund of the Trust pays its (i) operating expenses, including fees of its service providers, expenses of preparing prospectuses, proxy solicitation material and reports to shareholders, costs of custodial services and registering its shares under federal and state securities laws, pricing and insurance expenses, brokerage costs, interest charges, taxes and organization expenses and (ii) pro rata share of the fund’s other expenses, including audit and legal expenses. Expenses attributable to a specific fund shall be payable solely out of the assets of that fund. Expenses not attributable to a specific fund are allocated across all of the funds on the basis of relative net assets. The other funds of the Trust are described in one or more separate statements of additional information.

Description of Multiple Classes of Shares. The Trust is authorized to offer shares of the Fund in Investor Class shares and Institutional Class shares. The different classes provide for variations in distribution and shareholder servicing fees and minimum investment requirements. Minimum investment requirements and investor eligibility are described in the Prospectus. The Trust reserves the right to create and issue additional classes of shares. For more information on distribution and shareholder servicing expenses, see “The Distributor” and “Shareholder Services” sections in this SAI.

Voting Rights. Each shareholder of record is entitled to one vote for each share held on the record date for the meeting. The Fund will vote separately on matters relating solely to it. As a Delaware statutory trust, the Trust is not required, and does not intend, to hold annual meetings of shareholders. Approval of shareholders will be sought, however, for certain changes in the operation of the Trust and for the election of members of the Board of Trustees (each, a “Trustee” and collectively, the “Trustees” or the “Board”) under certain circumstances. Under the Declaration of Trust, the Trustees have the power to liquidate the Fund without shareholder approval. While the Trustees have no present intention of exercising this power, they may do so if the Fund fails to reach a viable size within a reasonable amount of time or for such other reasons as may be determined by the Board.

In addition, a Trustee may be removed by the remaining Trustees or by shareholders at a special meeting called upon written request of shareholders owning at least 10% of the outstanding shares of the Trust. In the event that such a meeting is requested, the Trust will provide appropriate assistance and information to the shareholders requesting the meeting.

Any series of the Trust may reorganize or merge with one or more other series of the Trust or of another investment company. Any such reorganization or merger shall be pursuant to the terms and conditions specified in an agreement and plan of reorganization authorized and approved by the Trustees and entered into by the relevant series in connection therewith. In addition, such reorganization or merger may be authorized by vote of a majority of the Trustees then in office and, to the extent permitted by applicable law and the Declaration of Trust, without the approval of shareholders of any series.

DESCRIPTION OF PERMITTED INVESTMENTS

The Fund’s investment objective and principal investment strategies are described in the Prospectus. The Fund is classified as a “diversified” investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “1940 Act”). The following information supplements, and should be read in conjunction with, the Prospectus.

The following are descriptions of the permitted investments and investment practices of the Fund and the associated risk factors. The Fund may invest in any of the following instruments or engage in any of the following investment practices unless such investment or activity is inconsistent with or is not permitted by the Fund's stated investment policies, including those stated below.

American Depositary Receipts ("ADRs"). ADRs, as well as other "hybrid" forms of ADRs, including European Depositary Receipts ("EDRs") and Global Depositary Receipts ("GDRs"), are certificates evidencing ownership of shares of a foreign issuer. Depositary receipts are securities that evidence ownership interests in a security or a pool of securities that have been deposited with a "depository" and may be sponsored or unsponsored. These certificates are issued by depository banks and generally trade on an established market in the United States or elsewhere. The underlying shares are held in trust by a custodian bank or similar financial institution in the issuer's home country. The depository bank may not have physical custody of the underlying securities at all times and may charge fees for various services, including forwarding dividends and interest and corporate actions. ADRs are alternatives to directly purchasing the underlying foreign securities in their national markets and currencies. However, ADRs continue to be subject to many of the risks associated with investing directly in foreign securities.

For ADRs, the depository is typically a U.S. financial institution and the underlying securities are issued by a foreign issuer. For other depositary receipts, the depository may be a foreign or a U.S. entity, and the underlying securities may have a foreign or a U.S. issuer. Depositary receipts will not necessarily be denominated in the same currency as their underlying securities. Generally, ADRs are issued in registered form, denominated in U.S. dollars, and designed for use in the U.S. securities markets. Other depositary receipts, such as GDRs and EDRs, may be issued in bearer form and denominated in other currencies, and are generally designed for use in securities markets outside the U.S. While the two types of depositary receipt facilities (unsponsored or sponsored) are similar, there are differences regarding a holder's rights and obligations and the practices of market participants. A depository may establish an unsponsored facility without participation by (or acquiescence of) the underlying issuer; typically, however, the depository requests a letter of non-objection from the underlying issuer prior to establishing the facility. Holders of unsponsored depositary receipts generally bear all the costs of the facility. The depository usually charges fees upon deposit and withdrawal of the underlying securities, the conversion of dividends into U.S. dollars or other currency, the disposition of non-cash distributions, and the performance of other services. The depository of an unsponsored facility frequently is under no obligation to distribute shareholder communications received from the underlying issuer or to pass through voting rights to depositary receipt holders with respect to the underlying securities.

Sponsored depositary receipt facilities are created in generally the same manner as unsponsored facilities, except that sponsored depositary receipts are established jointly by a depository and the underlying issuer through a deposit agreement. The deposit agreement sets out the rights and responsibilities of the underlying issuer, the depository, and the depositary receipt holders. With sponsored facilities, the underlying issuer typically bears some of the costs of the depositary receipts (such as dividend payment fees of the depository), although most sponsored depositary receipts agree to distribute notices of shareholders meetings, voting instructions, and other shareholder communications and information to the depositary receipt holders at the underlying issuer's request. The depository of an unsponsored facility frequently is under no obligation to distribute shareholder communications received from the issuer of the deposited security or to pass through, to the holders of the receipts, voting rights with respect to the deposited securities.

For purposes of the Fund's investment policies, investments in depositary receipts will be deemed to be investments in the underlying securities. Thus, a depositary receipt representing ownership of common stock will be treated as common stock. Depositary receipts do not eliminate all of the risks associated with directly investing in the securities of foreign issuers.

Investments in the securities of foreign issuers may subject the Fund to investment risks that differ in some respects from those related to investments in securities of U.S. issuers. Such risks include future adverse political and economic developments, possible imposition of withholding taxes on income, possible seizure, nationalization or expropriation of foreign deposits, possible establishment of exchange controls or taxation at the source or greater fluctuation in value due to changes in exchange rates. Foreign issuers of securities often engage in business practices different from those of domestic issuers of similar securities, and there may be less information publicly available about foreign issuers. In addition, foreign issuers are, generally speaking, subject to less government supervision and regulation and different accounting treatment than are those in the United States.

Equity Securities. Equity securities represent ownership interests in a company or partnership and consist of common stocks, preferred stocks, warrants and rights to acquire common stock, securities convertible into common stock, and investments in master limited partnerships (“MLPs”). Investments in equity securities in general are subject to market risks that may cause their prices to fluctuate over time. Fluctuations in the value of equity securities in which the Fund invests will cause the net asset value (“NAV”) of the Fund to fluctuate. The Fund purchases equity securities traded on global securities exchanges or the over-the-counter market. Equity securities are described in more detail below:

- **Common Stock.** Common stock represents an equity or ownership interest in an issuer. In the event an issuer is liquidated or declares bankruptcy, the claims of owners of bonds and preferred stock take precedence over the claims of those who own common stock.
- **Preferred Stock.** Preferred stock represents an equity or ownership interest in an issuer that pays dividends at a specified rate and that has precedence over common stock in the payment of dividends. In the event an issuer is liquidated or declares bankruptcy, the claims of owners of bonds take precedence over the claims of those who own preferred and common stock.
- **Alternative Entity Securities.** Alternative entity securities are the securities of entities that are formed as limited partnerships, limited liability companies, business trusts or other non-corporate entities that are similar to common or preferred stock of corporations.
- **Exchange-Traded Funds (“ETFs”).** An ETF is a fund whose shares are bought and sold on a securities exchange as if it were a single security. An ETF holds a portfolio of securities designed to track a particular market segment or index. Some examples of ETFs are SPDRs[®], DIAMONDSSM, NASDAQ 100 Index Tracking StockSM (“QQQsSM”), and iShares[®]. The Fund could purchase an ETF to temporarily gain exposure to a portion of the U.S. or foreign market while awaiting an opportunity to purchase securities directly. Similarly, the Fund may establish a short position in an ETF to gain inverse exposure to a portion of the U.S. or foreign markets. The risks of owning an ETF generally reflect the risks of owning the underlying securities they are designed to track, although lack of liquidity in an ETF could result in it being more volatile than the underlying portfolio of securities and ETFs have management fees that increase their costs versus the costs of owning the underlying securities directly. See also “Securities of Other Investment Companies” below.
- **Warrants.** Warrants are instruments that entitle the holder to buy an equity security at a specific price for a specific period of time. Changes in the value of a warrant do not necessarily correspond to changes in the value of its underlying security. The price of a warrant may be more volatile than the price of its underlying security, and a warrant may offer greater potential for capital appreciation as well as capital loss. Warrants do not entitle a holder to dividends or voting rights with respect to the underlying security and do not represent any rights in the assets of the issuing company. A warrant ceases to have value if it is not exercised prior to its expiration date. These factors can make warrants more speculative than other types of investments.

- **Convertible Securities.** Convertible securities are bonds, debentures, notes, preferred stocks or other securities that may be converted or exchanged (by the holder or by the issuer) into shares of the underlying common stock (or cash or securities of equivalent value) at a stated exchange ratio. A convertible security may also be called for redemption or conversion by the issuer after a particular date and under certain circumstances (including a specified price) established upon issue. If a convertible security held by the Fund is called for redemption or conversion, the Fund could be required to tender it for redemption, convert it into the underlying common stock, or sell it to a third party.

Convertible securities generally have less potential for gain or loss than common stocks. Convertible securities generally provide yields higher than the underlying common stocks, but generally lower than comparable non-convertible securities. Because of this higher yield, convertible securities generally sell at a price above their “conversion value,” which is the current market value of the stock to be received upon conversion. The difference between this conversion value and the price of convertible securities will vary over time depending on changes in the value of the underlying common stocks and interest rates. When the underlying common stocks decline in value, convertible securities will tend not to decline to the same extent because of the interest or dividend payments and the repayment of principal at maturity for certain types of convertible securities. However, securities that are convertible other than at the option of the holder generally do not limit the potential for loss to the same extent as securities convertible at the option of the holder. When the underlying common stocks rise in value, the value of convertible securities may also be expected to increase. At the same time, however, the difference between the market value of convertible securities and their conversion value will narrow, which means that the value of convertible securities will generally not increase to the same extent as the value of the underlying common stocks. Because convertible securities may also be interest-rate sensitive, their value may increase as interest rates fall and decrease as interest rates rise. Convertible securities are also subject to credit risk, and are often lower-quality securities.

General Risks of Investing in Stocks - While investing in stocks allows investors to participate in the benefits of owning a company, such investors must accept the risks of ownership. Unlike bondholders, who have preference to a company’s earnings and cash flow, preferred stockholders, followed by common stockholders in order of priority, are entitled only to the residual amount after a company meets its other obligations. For this reason, the value of a company’s stock will usually react more strongly to actual or perceived changes in the company’s financial condition or prospects than its debt obligations. Stockholders of a company that fares poorly can lose money.

Stock markets tend to move in cycles with short or extended periods of rising and falling stock prices. The value of a company’s stock may fall because of:

- Factors that directly relate to that company, such as decisions made by its management or lower demand for the company’s products or services;
- Factors affecting an entire industry, such as increases in production costs; and
- Changes in general financial market conditions that are relatively unrelated to the company or its industry, such as changes in interest rates, currency exchange rates or inflation rates.

Because preferred stock is generally junior to debt securities and other obligations of the issuer, deterioration in the credit quality of the issuer will cause greater changes in the value of a preferred stock than in a more senior debt security with similar stated yield characteristics.

Real Estate Investment Trusts (“REITs”). A REIT is a corporation or business trust (that would otherwise be taxed as a corporation) which meets the definitional requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as

amended (the “Code”). The Code permits a qualifying REIT to deduct from taxable income the dividends paid, thereby effectively eliminating corporate level federal income tax and making the REIT a pass-through vehicle for federal income tax purposes. To meet the definitional requirements of the Code, a REIT must, among other things: invest substantially all of its assets in interests in real estate (including mortgages and other REITs), cash and government securities; derive most of its income from rents from real property or interest on loans secured by mortgages on real property; and distribute annually 90% or more of its otherwise taxable income to shareholders.

REITs are sometimes informally characterized as Equity REITs and Mortgage REITs. An Equity REIT invests primarily in the fee ownership or leasehold ownership of land and buildings; a Mortgage REIT invests primarily in mortgages on real property, which may secure construction, development or long-term loans.

REITs may be affected by changes in underlying real estate values, which may have an exaggerated effect to the extent that REITs in which the Fund invests may concentrate investments in particular geographic regions or property types. Certain REITs have relatively small market capitalization, which may tend to increase the volatility of the market price of securities issued by such REITs. Additionally, rising interest rates may cause investors in REITs to demand a higher annual yield from future distributions, which may in turn decrease market prices for equity securities issued by REITs. Rising interest rates also generally increase the costs of obtaining financing, which could cause the value of the Fund’s investments to decline. During periods of declining interest rates, certain Mortgage REITs may hold mortgages that the mortgagors elect to prepay, which prepayment may diminish the yield on securities issued by such Mortgage REITs. Equity and Mortgage REITs are also subject to heavy cash flow dependency defaults by borrowers and self-liquidation. In addition, Mortgage REITs may be affected by the ability of borrowers to repay when due the debt extended by the REIT and Equity REITs may be affected by the ability of tenants to pay rent. The above factors may adversely affect a borrower’s or a lessee’s ability to meet its obligations to the REIT. In the event of default by a borrower or lessee, the REIT may experience delays in enforcing its rights as a mortgagee or lessor and may incur substantial costs associated with protecting its investments.

Furthermore, REITs are dependent upon specialized management skills, have limited diversification and are, therefore, subject to risks inherent in operating and financing a limited number of projects. By investing in REITs indirectly through the Fund, a shareholder will bear not only his proportionate share of the expenses of the Fund, but also, indirectly, similar expenses of the REITs. REITs depend generally on their ability to generate cash flow to make distributions to shareholders. In addition, REITs could possibly fail to qualify for tax free pass-through of income under the Code or to maintain their exemptions from registration under the 1940 Act.

Real Estate Companies’ Securities. The Funds may be subject to the risks associated with the direct ownership of real estate. For example, real estate values may fluctuate as a result of general and local economic conditions, overbuilding and increased competition, increases in property taxes and operating expenses, demographic trends and variations in rental income, changes in zoning laws, casualty or condemnation losses, regulatory limitations on rents, changes in neighborhood values, related party risks, changes in how appealing properties are to tenants, changes in interest rates and other real estate capital market influences.

Micro, Small and Medium Capitalization Issuers. Investing in equity securities of micro, small and medium capitalization companies often involves greater risk than is customarily associated with investments in larger capitalization companies. This increased risk may be due to the greater business risks of smaller size, limited markets and financial resources, narrow product lines and frequent lack of depth of management. The securities of micro and smaller companies are often traded in the over-the-counter market and even if listed on a national securities exchange may not be traded in volumes typical for that exchange. Consequently, the securities of micro and smaller companies are less likely to be liquid, may have limited market stability, and may be subject to more abrupt or erratic market movements than securities of larger, more established growth companies or the market averages in general.

Initial Public Offerings (“IPOs”). The Fund may invest a portion of its assets in securities of companies offering shares in IPOs. IPOs may have a magnified performance impact on a fund with a small asset base. The Fund may hold IPO shares for a very short period of time, which may increase the turnover of the Fund’s portfolio and may lead to increased expenses for the Fund, such as commissions and transaction costs. By selling IPO shares, the Fund may realize taxable gains it will subsequently distribute to shareholders. In addition, the market for IPO shares can be speculative and/or inactive for extended periods of time. The limited number of shares available for trading in some IPOs may make it more difficult for the Fund to buy or sell significant amounts of shares without an unfavorable impact on prevailing prices. Holders of IPO shares can be affected by substantial dilution in the value of their shares, by sales of additional shares and by concentration of control in existing management and principal shareholders.

The Fund’s investment in IPO shares may include the securities of unseasoned companies (companies with less than three years of continuous operations), which presents risks considerably greater than common stocks of more established companies. These companies may have limited operating histories and their prospects for profitability may be uncertain. These companies may be involved in new and evolving businesses and, compared to their better-established, larger cap peers, may be more vulnerable to competition and changes in technology, markets and economic conditions. They may be more dependent on key managers and third parties and may have limited product lines.

Master Limited Partnerships. MLPs are limited partnerships or limited liability companies, whose partnership units or limited liability interests are listed and traded on a U.S. securities exchange, and are treated as publicly traded partnerships for federal income tax purposes. To qualify to be treated as a partnership for tax purposes, an MLP must receive at least 90% of its income from qualifying sources as set forth in Section 7704(d) of the Code. These qualifying sources include activities such as the exploration, development, mining, production, processing, refining, transportation, storage and marketing of mineral or natural resources. MLPs that are formed as limited partnerships generally have two classes of owners, the general partner and limited partners, while MLPs that are formed as limited liability companies generally have two analogous classes of owners, the managing member and the members. For purposes of this section, references to general partners also apply to managing members and references to limited partners also apply to members.

The general partner is typically owned by a major energy company, an investment fund, the direct management of the MLP or is an entity owned by one or more of such parties. The general partner may be structured as a private or publicly traded corporation or other entity. The general partner typically controls the operations and management of the MLP through an equity interest of as much as 2% in the MLP plus, in many cases, ownership of common units and subordinated units. A holder of general partner interests can be liable under certain circumstances for amounts greater than the amount of the holder’s investment in the general partner interest. General partner interests are not publicly traded and generally cannot be converted into common units. The general partner interest can be redeemed by the MLP if the MLP unitholders choose to remove the general partner, typically with a supermajority vote by limited partner unitholders.

Limited partners own the remainder of the MLP through ownership of common units and have a limited role in the MLP’s operations and management. Common units are listed and traded on U.S. securities exchanges, with their value fluctuating predominantly based on prevailing market conditions and the success of the MLP. Unlike owners of common stock of a corporation, owners of common units have limited voting rights and have no ability annually to elect directors. In the event of liquidation, common units have preference over subordinated units, but not over debt or preferred units, to the remaining assets of the MLP.

MLPs are typically structured such that common units and general partner interests have first priority to receive quarterly cash distributions up to an established minimum amount (“minimum quarterly distributions” or “MQD”). Common and general partner interests also accrue arrearages in distributions to the extent the MQD is not paid. Once common and general partner interests have been paid, subordinated units receive distributions of

up to the MQD; however, subordinated units do not accrue arrearages. Distributable cash in excess of the MQD paid to both common and subordinated units is distributed to both common and subordinated units generally on a pro rata basis. The general partner is also eligible to receive incentive distributions if the general partner operates the business in a manner which results in distributions paid per common unit surpassing specified target levels. As the general partner increases cash distributions to the limited partners, the general partner receives an increasingly higher percentage of the incremental cash distributions. A common arrangement provides that the general partner can reach a tier where it receives 50% of every incremental dollar paid to common and subordinated unit holders. These incentive distributions encourage the general partner to streamline costs, increase capital expenditures and acquire assets in order to increase the partnership's cash flow and raise the quarterly cash distribution in order to reach higher tiers. Such results benefit all security holders of the MLP.

Foreign Securities. Foreign securities include equity securities of foreign entities, obligations of foreign branches of U.S. banks and of foreign banks, including, without limitation, European Certificates of Deposit, European Time Deposits, European Bankers' Acceptances, Canadian Time Deposits, Europaper and Yankee Certificates of Deposit, and investments in Canadian Commercial Paper and foreign securities. These instruments have investment risks that differ in some respects from those related to investments in obligations of U.S. domestic issuers. Such risks include future adverse political and economic developments, the possible imposition of withholding taxes on interest or other income, possible seizure, nationalization, or expropriation of foreign deposits, the possible establishment of exchange controls or taxation at the source, greater fluctuations in value due to changes in exchange rates, or the adoption of other foreign governmental restrictions which might adversely affect the payment of principal and interest on such obligations. Such investments may also entail higher custodial fees and sales commissions than domestic investments. Foreign issuers of securities or obligations are often subject to accounting treatment and engage in business practices different from those respecting domestic issuers of similar securities or obligations. Foreign branches of U.S. banks and foreign banks may be subject to less stringent reserve requirements than those applicable to domestic branches of U.S. banks.

Emerging Markets. An "emerging market" country is generally a country that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) and the International Finance Corporation would consider to be an emerging or developing country. Typically, emerging markets are in countries that are in the process of industrialization, with lower gross national products ("GNPs") than more developed countries. There are currently over 130 countries that the international financial community generally considers to be emerging or developing countries, approximately 40 of which currently have stock markets. These countries generally include every nation in the world except the United States, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and most nations located in Western Europe.

Investment Funds. Some emerging countries currently prohibit direct foreign investment in the securities of their companies. Certain emerging countries, however, permit indirect foreign investment in the securities of companies listed and traded on their stock exchanges through investment funds that they have specifically authorized. Investments in these investment funds are subject to the provisions of the 1940 Act. If the Fund invests in such investment funds, shareholders will bear not only their proportionate share of the expenses (including operating expenses and the fees of the Adviser), but also will indirectly bear similar expenses of the underlying investment funds. In addition, these investment funds may trade at a premium over their NAV.

Risks of Foreign Securities:

Foreign securities, foreign currencies, and securities issued by U.S. entities with substantial foreign operations may involve significant risks in addition to the risks inherent in U.S. investments.

Political and Economic Factors – Local political, economic, regulatory, or social instability, military action or unrest, or adverse diplomatic developments may affect the value of foreign investments. Listed below are some of

the more important political and economic factors that could negatively affect an investment in foreign securities:

- The economies of foreign countries may differ from the economy of the United States in such areas as growth of GNP, rate of inflation, capital reinvestment, resource self-sufficiency, budget deficits and national debt;
- Foreign governments sometimes participate to a significant degree, through ownership interests or regulation, in their respective economies. Actions by these governments could significantly influence the market prices of securities and payment of dividends;
- The economies of many foreign countries are dependent on international trade and their trading partners and they could be severely affected if their trading partners were to enact protective trade barriers and economic conditions;
- The internal policies of a particular foreign country may be less stable than in the United States. Other countries face significant external political risks, such as possible claims of sovereignty by other countries or tense and sometimes hostile border clashes; and
- A foreign government may act adversely to the interests of U.S. investors, including expropriation or nationalization of assets, confiscatory taxation and other restrictions on U.S. investment. A country may restrict or control foreign investments in its securities markets. These restrictions could limit the Fund's ability to invest in a particular country or make it very expensive for the Fund to invest in that country. Some countries require prior governmental approval, limit the types or amount of securities or companies in which a foreigner can invest or may restrict the ability of foreign investors to repatriate their investment income and capital gains.

Information and Supervision – There is generally less publicly available information about foreign companies than companies based in the United States. For example, there are often no reports and ratings published about foreign companies comparable to the ones written about U.S. companies. Foreign companies are typically not subject to uniform accounting, auditing and financial reporting standards, practices and requirements comparable to those applicable to U.S. companies. The lack of comparable information makes investment decisions concerning foreign companies more difficult and less reliable than those concerning domestic companies.

Stock Exchange and Market Risk – The Fund's investment managers anticipate that in most cases an exchange or over-the-counter market located outside of the United States will be the best available market for foreign securities. Foreign stock markets, while growing in volume and sophistication, are generally not as developed as the markets in the United States. Foreign stock markets tend to differ from those in the United States in a number of ways.

Foreign stock markets:

- Are generally more volatile than, and not as developed or efficient as, those in the United States;
- Have substantially less volume;
- Trade securities that tend to be less liquid and experience rapid and erratic price movements;
- Have generally higher commissions and are subject to set minimum rates, as opposed to negotiated rates;
- Employ trading, settlement and custodial practices less developed than those in U.S. markets; and
- May have different settlement practices, which may cause delays and increase the potential for failed settlements.

Foreign markets may offer less protection to shareholders than U.S. markets because:

- Foreign accounting, auditing, and financial reporting requirements may render a foreign corporate balance sheet more difficult to understand and interpret than one subject to U.S. law and standards;
- Adequate public information on foreign issuers may not be available, and it may be difficult to secure dividends and information regarding corporate actions on a timely basis;

- In general, there is less overall governmental supervision and regulation of securities exchanges, brokers, and listed companies than in the United States;
- Over-the-counter markets tend to be less regulated than stock exchange markets and, in certain countries, may be totally unregulated;
- Economic or political concerns may influence regulatory enforcement and may make it difficult for shareholders to enforce their legal rights; and
- Restrictions on transferring securities within the United States or to U.S. persons may make a particular security less liquid than foreign securities of the same class that are not subject to such restrictions.

Foreign Currency Risk – While the Fund denominates its NAV in U.S. dollars, the securities of foreign companies are frequently denominated in foreign currencies. Thus, a change in the value of a foreign currency against the U.S. dollar will result in a corresponding change in value of securities denominated in that currency. Some of the factors that may impair the investments denominated in a foreign currency are:

- It may be expensive to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars and vice versa;
- Complex political and economic factors may significantly affect the values of various currencies, including the U.S. dollar, and their exchange rates;
- Government intervention may increase risks involved in purchasing or selling foreign currency options, forward contracts and futures contracts, since exchange rates may not be free to fluctuate in response to other market forces;
- There may be no systematic reporting of last sale information for foreign currencies or regulatory requirement that quotations available through dealers or other market sources be firm or revised on a timely basis;
- Available quotation information is generally representative of very large round-lot transactions in the inter-bank market and thus may not reflect exchange rates for smaller odd-lot transactions (less than \$1 million) where rates may be less favorable; and
- The inter-bank market in foreign currencies is a global, around-the-clock market. To the extent that a market is closed while the markets for the underlying currencies remain open, certain markets may not always reflect significant price and rate movements.

Taxes – Certain foreign governments levy withholding taxes on dividend and interest income. Although in some countries it is possible for the Fund to recover a portion of these taxes, the portion that cannot be recovered will reduce the income the Fund receives from its investments.

Emerging Markets – Investing in emerging markets may magnify the risks of foreign investing. Security prices in emerging markets can be significantly more volatile than those in more developed markets, reflecting the greater uncertainties of investing in less established markets and economies. In particular, countries with emerging markets may:

- Have relatively unstable governments;
- Present greater risks of nationalization of businesses, restrictions on foreign ownership and prohibitions on the repatriation of assets;
- Offer less protection of property rights than more developed countries; and
- Have economies that are based on only a few industries, may be highly vulnerable to changes in local or global trade conditions, and may suffer from extreme and volatile debt burdens or inflation rates.

Local securities markets may trade a small number of securities and may be unable to respond effectively to increases in trading volume, potentially making prompt liquidation of holdings difficult or impossible at times.

Money Market Securities. Money market securities include short-term U.S. government securities; custodial

receipts evidencing separately traded interest and principal components of securities issued by the U.S. Treasury; commercial paper rated in the highest short-term rating category by a nationally recognized statistical ratings organization (“NRSRO”), such as Standard & Poor’s Rating Services (“S&P”) or Moody’s Investor Services, Inc. (“Moody’s”), or determined by the Adviser to be of comparable quality at the time of purchase; short-term bank obligations (certificates of deposit, time deposits and bankers’ acceptances) of U.S. commercial banks with assets of at least \$1 billion as of the end of their most recent fiscal year; and repurchase agreements involving such securities. Each of these money market securities are described below. For a description of ratings, see “Appendix A – Description of Ratings” to this SAI.

U.S. Government Securities. The Fund may invest in U.S. government securities. Securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. government or its agencies or instrumentalities include U.S. Treasury securities, which are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Treasury and which differ only in their interest rates, maturities, and times of issuance. U.S. Treasury bills have initial maturities of one-year or less; U.S. Treasury notes have initial maturities of one to ten years; and U.S. Treasury bonds generally have initial maturities of greater than ten years. U.S. Treasury notes and bonds typically pay coupon interest semi-annually and repay the principal at maturity. Certain U.S. government securities are issued or guaranteed by agencies or instrumentalities of the U.S. government including, but not limited to, obligations of U.S. government agencies or instrumentalities such as the Federal National Mortgage Association (“Fannie Mae”), the Government National Mortgage Association (“Ginnie Mae”), the Small Business Administration, the Federal Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Home Loan Banks, Banks for Cooperatives (including the Central Bank for Cooperatives), the Federal Land Banks, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Financing Bank, the Student Loan Marketing Association, the National Credit Union Administration and the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation (“Farmer Mac”).

Some obligations issued or guaranteed by U.S. government agencies and instrumentalities, including, for example, Ginnie Mae pass-through certificates, are supported by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Treasury. Other obligations issued by or guaranteed by federal agencies, such as those securities issued by Fannie Mae, are supported by the discretionary authority of the U.S. government to purchase certain obligations of the federal agency. Additionally, some obligations are issued by or guaranteed by federal agencies, such as those of the Federal Home Loan Banks, which are supported by the right of the issuer to borrow from the U.S. Treasury. While the U.S. government provides financial support to such U.S. government-sponsored federal agencies, no assurance can be given that the U.S. government will always do so, since the U.S. government is not so obligated by law. Guarantees of principal by U.S. government agencies or instrumentalities may be a guarantee of payment at the maturity of the obligation so that in the event of a default prior to maturity there might not be a market and thus no means of realizing on the obligation prior to maturity. Guarantees as to the timely payment of principal and interest do not extend to the value or yield of these securities nor to the value of the Fund’s shares.

On September 7, 2008, the U.S. Treasury announced a federal takeover of Fannie Mae and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (“Freddie Mac”), placing the two federal instrumentalities in conservatorship. Under the takeover, the U.S. Treasury agreed to acquire \$1 billion of senior preferred stock of each instrumentality and obtained warrants for the purchase of common stock of each instrumentality (the “Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement” or “Agreement”). Under the Agreement, the U.S. Treasury pledged to provide up to \$200 billion per instrumentality as needed, including the contribution of cash capital to the instrumentalities in the event their liabilities exceed their assets. This was intended to ensure that the instrumentalities maintain a positive net worth and meet their financial obligations, preventing mandatory triggering of receivership. On December 24, 2009, the U.S. Treasury announced that it was amending the Agreement to allow the \$200 billion cap on the U.S. Treasury’s funding commitment to increase as necessary to accommodate any cumulative reduction in net worth through the end of 2012. The unlimited support the U.S. Treasury extended to the two companies expired at the beginning of 2013 – Fannie Mae’s support is now capped at \$125 billion and Freddie Mac has a limit of \$149 billion.

On August 17, 2012, the U.S. Treasury announced that it was again amending the Agreement to terminate the requirement that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac each pay a 10% annual dividend. Instead, the companies will transfer to the U.S. Treasury on a quarterly basis all profits earned during a quarter that exceed a capital reserve amount of \$3 billion. It is believed that the new amendment puts Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in a better position to service their debt because the companies no longer have to borrow from the U.S. Treasury to make fixed dividend payments. As part of the new terms, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac also will be required to reduce their investment portfolios at an annual rate of 15 percent instead of the previous 10 percent, which puts each of them on track to cut their portfolios to a targeted \$250 billion in 2018.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are the subject of several continuing class action lawsuits and investigations by federal regulators over certain accounting, disclosure or corporate governance matters, which (along with any resulting financial restatements) may adversely affect the guaranteeing entities. Importantly, the future of the entities is in serious question as the U.S. government reportedly is considering multiple options, ranging from nationalization, privatization, consolidation, or abolishment of the entities.

- **U.S. Treasury Obligations.** U.S. Treasury obligations consist of direct obligations of the U.S. Treasury, including Treasury bills, notes and bonds, and separately traded interest and principal component parts of such obligations, including those transferable through the Federal book-entry system known as Separate Trading of Registered Interest and Principal of Securities (“STRIPS”). The STRIPS program lets investors hold and trade the individual interest and principal components of eligible Treasury notes and bonds as separate securities. Under the STRIPS program, the principal and interest components are separately issued by the U.S. Treasury at the request of depository financial institutions, which then trade the component parts separately.

Commercial Paper. Commercial paper is the term used to designate unsecured short-term promissory notes issued by corporations and other entities. Maturities on these issues vary from a few to 270 days.

Investment Grade Fixed Income Securities. Fixed income securities are considered investment grade if they are rated in one of the four highest rating categories by an NRSRO, or, if not rated, are determined to be of comparable quality by the Fund’s adviser or sub-adviser. See “Appendix A -Description of Ratings” for a description of the bond rating categories of several NRSROs. Ratings of each NRSRO represent its opinion of the safety of principal and interest payments (and not the market risk) of bonds and other fixed income securities it undertakes to rate at the time of issuance. Ratings are not absolute standards of quality and may not reflect changes in an issuer’s creditworthiness. Fixed income securities rated BBB- or Baa3 lack outstanding investment characteristics, and have speculative characteristics as well. Securities rated Baa3 by Moody’s or BBB- by S&P or higher are considered by those rating agencies to be “investment grade” securities, although Moody’s considers securities rated in the Baa category to have speculative characteristics. While issuers of bonds rated BBB by S&P are considered to have adequate capacity to meet their financial commitments, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity to pay interest and principal for debt in this category than debt in higher rated categories. In the event a security owned by the Fund is downgraded below investment grade, the Adviser will review the situation and take appropriate action with regard to the security, including the actions discussed below.

Debt Securities. Corporations and governments use debt securities to borrow money from investors. Most debt securities promise a variable or fixed rate of return and repayment of the amount borrowed at maturity. Some debt securities, such as zero-coupon bonds, do not pay current interest and are purchased at a discount from their face value.

Types of Debt Securities:

- **Corporate Bonds.** Corporations issue bonds and notes to raise money for working capital or for capital expenditures such as plant construction, equipment purchases and expansion. In return for the money loaned to the corporation by investors, the corporation promises to pay investors interest, and repay the principal amount of the bond or note.
- **Mortgage-Backed Securities.** Mortgage-backed securities are interests in pools of mortgage loans that various governmental, government-related and private organizations assemble as securities for sale to investors. Unlike most debt securities, which pay interest periodically and repay principal at maturity or on specified call dates, mortgage-backed securities make monthly payments that consist of both interest and principal payments. In effect, these payments are a “pass-through” of the monthly payments made by the individual borrowers on their mortgage loans, net of any fees paid to the issuer or guarantor of such securities. Since homeowners usually have the option of paying either part or all of the loan balance before maturity, the effective maturity of a mortgage-backed security is often shorter than is stated.

Governmental entities, private insurers and mortgage poolers may insure or guarantee the timely payment of interest and principal of these pools through various forms of insurance or guarantees, including individual loan, title, pool and hazard insurance and letters of credit. The Adviser will consider such insurance and guarantees and the creditworthiness of the issuers thereof in determining whether a mortgage-related security meets its investment quality standards. It is possible that the private insurers or guarantors will not meet their obligations under the insurance policies or guarantee arrangements.

Although the market for such securities is becoming increasingly liquid, securities issued by certain private organizations may not be readily marketable.

Commercial Banks, Savings and Loan Institutions, Private Mortgage Insurance Companies, Mortgage Bankers and other Secondary Market Issuers. Commercial banks, savings and loan institutions, private mortgage insurance companies, mortgage bankers and other secondary market issuers also create pass-through pools of conventional mortgage loans. In addition to guaranteeing the mortgage-related security, such issuers may service and/or have originated the underlying mortgage loans. Pools created by these issuers generally offer a higher rate of interest than pools created by Ginnie Mae, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac because they are not guaranteed by a government agency.

Risks of Mortgage-Backed Securities - Yield characteristics of mortgage-backed securities differ from those of traditional debt securities in a variety of ways. The most significant differences of mortgage-backed securities are: 1) payments of interest and principal are more frequent (usually monthly) and 2) falling interest rates generally cause individual borrowers to pay off their mortgage earlier than expected, which results in prepayments of principal on the securities, thus forcing the Fund to reinvest the money at a lower interest rate. In addition to risks associated with changes in interest rates, a variety of economic, geographic, social and other factors, such as the sale of the underlying property, refinancing or foreclosure, can cause investors to repay the loans underlying a mortgage-backed security sooner than expected. When prepayment occurs, the Fund may have to reinvest its principal at a rate of interest that is lower than the rate on existing mortgage-backed securities.

Other Asset-Backed Securities. These securities are interests in pools of a broad range of assets other than mortgages, such as automobile loans, computer leases and credit card receivables. Like mortgage-backed securities, these securities are pass-through. In general, the collateral supporting these securities is of shorter maturity than mortgage loans and is less likely to experience substantial prepayments with interest rate fluctuations, but may still be subject to prepayment risk.

Asset-backed securities present certain risks that are not presented by mortgage-backed securities. Primarily, these securities may not have the benefit of any security interest in the related assets, which raises the possibility that recoveries on repossessed collateral may not be available to support payments on these securities. For example, credit card receivables are generally unsecured and the debtors are entitled to the protection of a number of state and federal consumer credit laws, many of which allow debtors to reduce their balances by offsetting certain amounts owed on the credit cards. Most issuers of asset-backed securities backed by automobile receivables permit the servicers of such receivables to retain possession of the underlying obligations. If the servicer were to sell these obligations to another party, there is a risk that the purchaser would acquire an interest superior to that of the holders of the related asset-backed securities. Due to the quantity of vehicles involved and requirements under state laws, asset-backed securities backed by automobile receivables may not have a proper security interest in all of the obligations backing such receivables.

To lessen the effect of failures by obligors on underlying assets to make payments, the entity administering the pool of assets may agree to ensure the receipt of payments on the underlying pool occurs in a timely fashion (“liquidity protection”). In addition, asset-backed securities may obtain insurance, such as guarantees, policies or letters of credit obtained by the issuer or sponsor from third parties, for some or all of the assets in the pool (“credit support”). Delinquency or loss more than that anticipated or failure of the credit support could adversely affect the return on an investment in such a security.

The Fund may also invest in residual interests in asset-backed securities, which consist of the excess cash flow remaining after making required payments on the securities and paying related administrative expenses. The amount of residual cash flow resulting from a particular issue of asset-backed securities depends in part on the characteristics of the underlying assets, the coupon rates on the securities, prevailing interest rates, the amount of administrative expenses and the actual prepayment experience on the underlying assets.

Senior Loans and Bank Loans. Senior loans and bank loans typically are arranged through private negotiations between a borrower and several financial institutions or a group of lenders which are represented by one or more lenders acting as agent. The agent is often a commercial bank that originates the loan and invites other parties to join the lending syndicate. The agent will be primarily responsible for negotiating the loan agreement and will have responsibility for the documentation and ongoing administration of the loan on behalf of the lenders after completion of the loan transaction. The Fund can invest in a senior loan or bank loan either as a direct lender or through an assignment or participation.

When the Fund acts as a direct lender, it will have a direct contractual relationship with the borrower and may participate in structuring the loan, may enforce compliance by the borrower with the terms of the loan agreement and may have voting, consent and set-off rights under the loan agreement.

Loan assignments are investments in all or a portion of certain senior loans or bank loans purchased from the lenders or from other third parties. The purchaser of an assignment typically will acquire direct rights against the borrower under the loan. While the purchaser of an assignment typically succeeds to all the rights and obligations of the assigning lender under the loan agreement, because assignments are arranged through private negotiations between potential assignees and assignors, or other third parties whose interests are being assigned, the rights and obligations acquired by the Fund may differ from and be more limited than those held by the assigning lender.

A holder of a loan participation typically has only a contractual right with the seller of the participation and not with the borrower or any other entities interpositioned between the seller of the participation and the borrower. As such, the purchaser of a loan participation assumes the credit risk of the seller of the participation, and any intermediary entities between the seller and the borrower, in addition to the credit risk of the borrower. When the Fund holds a loan participation, it will have the right to receive payments of principal, interest and fees to which it may be entitled only from the seller of the participation and only upon receipt of the seller of such payments from the borrower or from any intermediary parties between the seller and the borrower. Additionally, the Fund

generally will have no right to enforce compliance by the borrower with the terms of the loan agreement, will have no voting, consent or set-off rights under the loan agreement and may not directly benefit from the collateral supporting the loan although lenders that sell participations generally are required to distribute liquidation proceeds received by them pro rata among the holders of such participations. In the event of the bankruptcy or insolvency of the borrower, a loan participation may be subject to certain defenses that can be asserted by the borrower as a result of improper conduct by the seller or intermediary. If the borrower fails to pay principal and interest when due, the Fund may be subject to greater delays, expenses and risks that those that would have been involved if the Fund had purchased a direct obligation of such borrower.

Direct loans, assignments and loan participations may be considered liquid, as determined by the investment managers based on criteria approved by the Board.

The investment managers may from time to time have the opportunity to receive material, non-public information (“Confidential Information”) about the borrower, including financial information and related documentation regarding the borrower that is not publicly available. Pursuant to applicable policies and procedures, the investment managers may (but are not required to) seek to avoid receipt of Confidential Information from the borrower so as to avoid possible restrictions on their ability to purchase and sell investments on behalf of the Fund and other clients to which such Confidential Information relates (e.g., publicly traded securities issued by the borrower). In such circumstances, the Fund (and other clients of the investment managers) may be disadvantaged in comparison to other investors, including with respect to the price the Fund pays or receives when it buys or sells a senior loan or bank loan. Further, the investment managers’ abilities to assess the desirability of proposed consents, waivers or amendments with respect to certain senior loans or bank loans may be compromised if they are not privy to available Confidential Information. The investment managers may also determine to receive such Confidential Information in certain circumstances under their applicable policies and procedures. If the investment managers intentionally or unintentionally come into possession of Confidential Information, it may be unable, potentially for a substantial period of time, to purchase or sell publicly traded securities to which such Confidential Information relates.

Repurchase Agreements. The Fund may enter into repurchase agreements with financial institutions. A repurchase agreement is an agreement under which the Fund acquires a fixed income security (generally a security issued by the U.S. government or an agency thereof, a banker’s acceptance, or a certificate of deposit) from a commercial bank, broker, or dealer, and simultaneously agrees to resell such security to the seller at an agreed upon price and date (normally, the next business day). Because the security purchased constitutes collateral for the repurchase obligation, a repurchase agreement may be considered a loan that is collateralized by the security purchased. The acquisition of a repurchase agreement may be deemed to be an acquisition of the underlying securities as long as the obligation of the seller to repurchase the securities is collateralized fully. The Fund follows certain procedures designed to minimize the risks inherent in such agreements. These procedures include effecting repurchase transactions only with creditworthy financial institutions whose condition will be continually monitored by the Adviser. The repurchase agreements entered into by the Fund will provide that the underlying collateral at all times shall have a value at least equal to 102% of the resale price stated in the agreement and consist only of securities permissible under Section 101(47)(A)(i) of the Bankruptcy Code (the Adviser monitors compliance with this requirement). Under all repurchase agreements entered into by the Fund, the custodian or its agent must take possession of the underlying collateral. In the event of a default or bankruptcy by a selling financial institution, the Fund will seek to liquidate such collateral. However, the exercising of the Fund’s right to liquidate such collateral could involve certain costs or delays and, to the extent that proceeds from any sale upon a default of the obligation to repurchase were less than the repurchase price, the Fund could suffer a loss. The Fund may enter into “tri-party” repurchase agreements. In “tri-party” repurchase agreements, an unaffiliated third party custodian maintains accounts to hold collateral for the Fund and its counterparties and, therefore, the Fund may be subject to the credit risk of those custodians.” It is the current policy of the Fund not to invest in repurchase agreements that do not mature within seven days if any such investment, together with any

other illiquid assets held by the Fund, amounts to more than 15% of the Fund's total assets. The investments of the Fund in repurchase agreements, at times, may be substantial when, in the view of the portfolio managers, liquidity or other considerations so warrant.

Reverse Repurchase Agreements. Reverse repurchase agreements are transactions in which the Fund sells portfolio securities to financial institutions, such as banks and broker-dealers, and agrees to repurchase them at a mutually agreed-upon date and price that is higher than the original sale price. Reverse repurchase agreements are similar to a fully collateralized borrowing by the Fund. At the time the Fund enters into a reverse repurchase agreement, it will earmark on the books of the Fund or place in a segregated account cash or liquid securities having a value equal to the repurchase price (including accrued interest) and will subsequently monitor the account to ensure that such equivalent value is maintained.

Reverse repurchase agreements involve risks. Reverse repurchase agreements are a form of leverage, and the use of reverse repurchase agreements by the Fund may increase the Fund's volatility. Reverse repurchase agreements are also subject to the risk that the other party to the reverse repurchase agreement will be unable or unwilling to complete the transaction as scheduled, which may result in losses to the Fund. Reverse repurchase agreements also involve the risk that the market value of the securities sold by the Fund may decline below the price at which it is obligated to repurchase the securities. In addition, when the Fund invests the proceeds it receives in a reverse repurchase transaction, there is a risk that those investments may decline in value. In this circumstance, the Fund could be required to sell other investments in order to meet its obligations to repurchase the securities.

Securities of Other Investment Companies. The Fund may invest in shares of other investment companies, to the extent permitted by applicable law and subject to certain restrictions. These investment companies typically incur fees that are separate from those fees incurred directly by the Fund. The Fund's purchase of such investment company securities results in the layering of expenses, such that shareholders would indirectly bear a proportionate share of the operating expenses of such investment companies, including advisory fees, in addition to paying the Fund's expenses. Unless an exception is available, Section 12(d)(1)(A) of the 1940 Act prohibits a fund from (i) acquiring more than 3% of the voting shares of any one investment company, (ii) investing more than 5% of its total assets in any one investment company, and (iii) investing more than 10% of its total assets in all investment companies combined, including its ETF investments.

For hedging or other purposes, the Fund may invest in investment companies that seek to track the composition and/or performance of specific indexes or portions of specific indexes. Certain of these investment companies, known as ETFs, are traded on a securities exchange. (See "Exchange Traded Funds" above). The market prices of index-based investments will fluctuate in accordance with changes in the underlying portfolio securities of the investment company and also due to supply and demand of the investment company's shares on the exchange upon which the shares are traded. Index-based investments may not replicate or otherwise match the composition or performance of their specified index due to transaction costs, among other things.

Pursuant to orders issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") to each of certain iShares, Market Vectors, Vanguard, ProShares, PowerShares, Guggenheim (formerly, Claymore), Direxion, Wisdom Tree, Rydex, First Trust and SPDR ETFs (collectively, the "ETFs") and procedures approved by the Board, the Fund may invest in the ETFs in excess of the 3% limit described above, provided that the Fund otherwise complies with the conditions of the SEC order, as it may be amended, and any other applicable investment limitations. Neither the ETFs nor their investment advisers make any representations regarding the advisability of investing in the ETFs.

Derivatives

Derivatives are financial instruments whose value is based on an underlying asset (such as a stock or a bond), an underlying economic factor (such as interest rates) or a market benchmark. Unless otherwise stated in the Prospectus, the Fund may use derivatives for a number of purposes including managing risk, gaining exposure to various markets in a cost-efficient manner, reducing transaction costs, remaining fully invested and speculating. The Fund may also invest in derivatives with the goal of protecting itself from broad fluctuations in market prices, interest rates or foreign currency exchange rates (a practice known as “hedging”). When hedging is successful, the Fund will have offset any depreciation in the value of its portfolio securities by the appreciation in the value of the derivative position. Although techniques other than the sale and purchase of derivatives could be used to control the exposure of the Fund to market fluctuations, the use of derivatives may be a more effective means of hedging this exposure. In the future, to the extent such use is consistent with the Fund’s investment objective and is legally permissible, the Fund may use instruments and techniques that are not presently contemplated, but that may be subsequently developed.

There can be no assurance that a derivative strategy, if employed, will be successful. Because many derivatives have a leverage or borrowing component, adverse changes in the value or level of the underlying asset, reference rate or index can result in a loss substantially greater than the amount invested in the derivative itself. Certain derivatives have the potential for unlimited loss, regardless of the size of the initial investment. Accordingly, certain derivative transactions may be considered to constitute borrowing transactions for purposes of the 1940 Act. Such a derivative transaction will not be considered to constitute the issuance of a “senior security” by the Fund, and therefore such transaction will not be subject to the 300% asset coverage requirement otherwise applicable to borrowings by the Fund, if the Fund covers the transaction or segregates sufficient liquid assets (or such assets are “earmarked” on the Fund’s books) in accordance with the requirements and interpretations of the SEC and its staff. The Fund may enter into agreements with broker-dealers that require the broker-dealers to accept physical settlement for certain types of derivatives instruments. If this occurs, the Fund would treat such derivative instruments as being cash settled for purposes of determining the Fund’s coverage requirements.

As a result of recent amendments to rules under the Commodity Exchange Act (“CEA”) by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (“CFTC”), the Fund must either operate within certain guidelines and restrictions with respect to the Fund’s use of futures, options on such futures, commodity options and certain swaps, or the Adviser will be subject to registration with the CFTC as a “commodity pool operator” (“CPO”). As discussed in the Prospectus, the Adviser has registered as a CPO under the CEA with respect to the Fund.

Types of Derivatives:

Futures. A futures contract is an agreement between two parties whereby one party agrees to sell and the other party agrees to buy a specified amount of a financial instrument at an agreed upon price and time. The financial instrument underlying the contract may be a stock, stock index, bond, bond index, interest rate, foreign exchange rate or other similar instrument. Agreeing to buy the underlying financial instrument is called buying a futures contract or taking a long position in the contract. Likewise, agreeing to sell the underlying financial instrument is called selling a futures contract or taking a short position in the contract.

Futures contracts are traded in the United States on commodity exchanges or boards of trade (known as “contract markets”) approved for such trading and regulated by the CFTC. These contract markets standardize the terms, including the maturity date and underlying financial instrument, of all futures contracts.

Unlike other securities, the parties to a futures contract do not have to pay for or deliver the underlying financial instrument until some future date (the delivery date). Contract markets require both the purchaser and seller to deposit “initial margin” with a futures broker, known as a futures commission merchant or custodian bank, when they enter into the contract. Initial margin deposits are typically equal to a percentage of the contract’s value.

Initial margin is similar to a performance bond or good faith deposit on a contract and is returned to the depositing party upon termination of the futures contract if all contractual obligations have been satisfied. After they open a futures contract, the parties to the transaction must compare the purchase price of the contract to its daily market value. If the value of the futures contract changes in such a way that a party's position declines, that party must make additional "variation margin" payments so that the margin payment is adequate. On the other hand, the value of the contract may change in such a way that there is excess margin on deposit, possibly entitling the party that has a gain to receive all or a portion of this amount. This process is known as "marking to the market." Variation margin does not represent a borrowing or loan by a party but is instead a settlement between the party and the futures broker of the amount one party would owe the other if the futures contract terminated. In computing daily NAV, each party marks to market its open futures positions.

Although the terms of a futures contract call for the actual delivery of and payment for the underlying security, in many cases the parties may close the contract early by taking an opposite position in an identical contract. If the sale price upon closing out the contract is less than the original purchase price, the party closing out the contract will realize a loss. If the sale price upon closing out the contract is more than the original purchase price, the party closing out the contract will realize a gain. Conversely, if the purchase price upon closing out the contract is more than the original sale price, the party closing out the contract will realize a loss. If the purchase price upon closing out the contract is less than the original sale price, the party closing out the contract will realize a gain.

The Fund may incur commission expenses when it opens or closes a futures position.

Options. An option is a contract between two parties for the purchase and sale of a financial instrument for a specified price (known as the "strike price" or "exercise price") at any time during the option period. Unlike a futures contract, an option grants a right (not an obligation) to buy or sell a financial instrument. Generally, a seller of an option can grant a buyer two kinds of rights: a "call" (the right to buy the security) or a "put" (the right to sell the security). Options have various types of underlying instruments, including specific securities, indices of securities prices, foreign currencies, interest rates and futures contracts. Options may be traded on an exchange (exchange-traded options) or may be customized agreements between the parties (over-the-counter or "OTC" options). Like futures, a financial intermediary, known as a clearing corporation, financially backs exchange-traded options. However, OTC options have no such intermediary and are subject to the risk that the counterparty will not fulfill its obligations under the contract. The principal factors affecting the market value of an option include supply and demand, interest rates, the current market value of the underlying instrument relative to the exercise price of the option, the volatility of the underlying instrument, and the time remaining until the option expires.

▪ **Purchasing Put and Call Options**

When the Fund purchases a put option, it buys the right to sell the instrument underlying the option at a fixed strike price. In return for this right, the Fund pays the current market price for the option (known as the "option premium"). The Fund may purchase put options to offset or hedge against a decline in the market value of its securities ("protective puts") or to benefit from a decline in the price of securities that it does not own. The Fund would ordinarily realize a gain if, during the option period, the value of the underlying securities decreased below the exercise price sufficiently to cover the premium and transaction costs. However, if the price of the underlying instrument does not fall enough to offset the cost of purchasing the option, a put buyer would lose the premium and related transaction costs.

Call options are similar to put options, except that the Fund obtains the right to purchase, rather than sell, the underlying instrument at the option's strike price. The Fund would normally purchase call options in anticipation of an increase in the market value of securities it owns or wants to buy. The Fund would ordinarily realize a gain if, during the option period, the value of the underlying instrument exceeded the exercise price plus the premium

paid and related transaction costs. Otherwise, the Fund would realize either no gain or a loss on the purchase of the call option.

The purchaser of an option may terminate its position by:

- Allowing it to expire and losing its entire premium;
 - Exercising the option and either selling (in the case of a put option) or buying (in the case of a call option) the underlying instrument at the strike price; or
 - Closing it out in the secondary market at its current price.
- **Selling (Writing) Put and Call Options**

When the Fund writes a call option it assumes an obligation to sell specified securities to the holder of the option at a fixed strike price if the option is exercised at any time before the expiration date. Similarly, when the Fund writes a put option it assumes an obligation to purchase specified securities from the option holder at a fixed strike price if the option is exercised at any time before the expiration date. The Fund may terminate its position in an exchange-traded put option before exercise by buying an option identical to the one it has written. Similarly, it may cancel an OTC option by entering into an offsetting transaction with the counterparty to the option.

The Fund could try to hedge against an increase in the value of securities it would like to acquire by writing a put option on those securities. If security prices rise, the Fund would expect the put option to expire and the premium it received to offset the increase in the security's value. If security prices remain the same over time, the Fund would hope to profit by closing out the put option at a lower price. If security prices fall, the Fund may lose an amount of money equal to the difference between the value of the security and the premium it received. Writing covered put options may deprive the Fund of the opportunity to profit from a decrease in the market price of the securities it would like to acquire.

The characteristics of writing call options are similar to those of writing put options, except that call writers expect to profit if prices remain the same or fall. The Fund could try to hedge against a decline in the value of securities it already owns by writing a call option. If the price of that security falls as expected, the Fund would expect the option to expire and the premium it received to offset the decline of the security's value. However, the Fund must be prepared to deliver the underlying instrument in return for the strike price, which may deprive it of the opportunity to profit from an increase in the market price of the securities it holds.

The Fund is permitted to write only "covered" options. At the time of selling a call option, the Fund may cover the option by owning, among other things:

- The underlying security (or securities convertible into the underlying security without additional consideration), index, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract;
- A call option on the same security or index with the same or lesser exercise price;
- A call option on the same security or index with a greater exercise price, provided that the Fund also segregates cash or liquid securities in an amount equal to the difference between the exercise prices;
- Cash or liquid securities equal to at least the market value of the optioned securities, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract; or
- In the case of an index, the portfolio of securities that corresponds to the index.

At the time of selling a put option, the Fund may cover the option by, among other things:

- Entering into a short position in the underlying security;
 - Purchasing a put option on the same security, index, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract with the same or greater exercise price;
 - Purchasing a put option on the same security, index, interest rate, foreign currency or futures contract with a lesser exercise price and segregating cash or liquid securities in an amount equal to the difference between the exercise prices; or
 - Maintaining the entire exercise price in liquid securities.
- **Options on Securities Indices**

Options on securities indices are similar to options on securities, except that the exercise of securities index options requires cash settlement payments and does not involve the actual purchase or sale of securities. In addition, securities index options are designed to reflect price fluctuations in a group of securities or segment of the securities market rather than price fluctuations in a single security.

• **Options on Credit Default Swaps**

An option on a credit default swap (“CDS”) gives the holder the right to enter into a CDS at a specified future date and under specified terms in exchange for a purchase price or premium. The writer of the option bears the risk of any unfavorable move in the value of the CDS relative to the market value on the exercise date, while the purchaser may allow the option to expire unexercised.

▪ **Options on Futures**

An option on a futures contract provides the holder with the right to buy a futures contract (in the case of a call option) or sell a futures contract (in the case of a put option) at a fixed time and price. Upon exercise of the option by the holder, the contract market clearing house establishes a corresponding short position for the writer of the option (in the case of a call option) or a corresponding long position (in the case of a put option). If the option is exercised, the parties will be subject to the futures contracts. In addition, the writer of an option on a futures contract is subject to initial and variation margin requirements on the option position. Options on futures contracts are traded on the same contract market as the underlying futures contract.

The buyer or seller of an option on a futures contract may terminate the option early by purchasing or selling an option of the same series (i.e., the same exercise price and expiration date) as the option previously purchased or sold. The difference between the premiums paid and received represents the trader’s profit or loss on the transaction.

The Fund may purchase put and call options on futures contracts instead of selling or buying futures contracts. The Fund may buy a put option on a futures contract for the same reasons it would sell a futures contract. It also may purchase such a put option in order to hedge a long position in the underlying futures contract. The Fund may buy a call option on a futures contract for the same purpose as the actual purchase of a futures contract, such as in anticipation of favorable market conditions.

The Fund may write a call option on a futures contract to hedge against a decline in the prices of the instrument underlying the futures contracts. If the price of the futures contract at expiration were below the exercise price, the

Fund would retain the option premium, which would offset, in part, any decline in the value of its portfolio securities.

The writing of a put option on a futures contract is similar to the purchase of the futures contracts, except that, if the market price declines, the Fund would pay more than the market price for the underlying instrument. The premium received on the sale of the put option, less any transaction costs, would reduce the net cost to the Fund.

▪ **Options on Foreign Currencies**

A put option on a foreign currency gives the purchaser of the option the right to sell a foreign currency at the exercise price until the option expires. A call option on a foreign currency gives the purchaser of the option the right to purchase the currency at the exercise price until the option expires. The Fund may purchase or write put and call options on foreign currencies for the purpose of hedging against changes in future currency exchange rates.

The Fund may use foreign currency options given the same circumstances under which it could use forward foreign currency exchange contracts. For example, a decline in the U.S. dollar value of a foreign currency in which the Fund's securities are denominated would reduce the U.S. dollar value of the securities, even if their value in the foreign currency remained constant. In order to hedge against such a risk, the Fund may purchase a put option on the foreign currency. If the value of the currency then declined, the Fund could sell the currency for a fixed amount in U.S. dollars and thereby offset, at least partially, the negative effect on its securities that otherwise would have resulted. Conversely, if the Fund anticipates a rise in the U.S. dollar value of a currency in which securities to be acquired are denominated, the Fund may purchase call options on the currency in order to offset, at least partially, the effects of negative movements in exchange rates. If currency exchange rates do not move in the direction or to the extent anticipated, the Fund could sustain losses on transactions in foreign currency options.

▪ **Combined Positions**

The Fund may purchase and write options in combination with each other, or in combination with futures or forward contracts or swap agreements, to adjust the risk and return characteristics of the overall position. For example, the Fund could construct a combined position whose risk and return characteristics are similar to selling a futures contract by purchasing a put option and writing a call option on the same underlying instrument. Alternatively, the Fund could write a call option at one strike price and buy a call option at a lower price to reduce the risk of the written call option in the event of a substantial price increase. Because combined options positions involve multiple trades, they result in higher transaction costs and may be more difficult to open and close out.

Forward Foreign Currency Exchange Contracts. A forward foreign currency contract involves an obligation to purchase or sell a specific amount of currency at a future date or date range at a specific price. In the case of a cancelable forward contract, the holder has the unilateral right to cancel the contract at maturity by paying a specified fee. Forward foreign currency exchange contracts differ from foreign currency futures contracts in certain respects. Unlike futures contracts, forward contracts:

- Do not have standard maturity dates or amounts (i.e., the parties to the contract may fix the maturity date and the amount);
- Are typically traded directly between currency traders (usually large commercial banks) and their customers in the inter-bank markets, as opposed to on exchanges regulated by the CFTC (note, however, that under new definitions adopted by the CFTC and SEC, many non-deliverable foreign currency forwards will be considered swaps for certain purposes, including determination of whether such instruments must be traded on exchanges and centrally cleared);

- Do not require an initial margin deposit; and
- May be closed by entering into a closing transaction with the currency trader who is a party to the original forward contract, as opposed to with a commodities exchange.

- **Foreign Currency Hedging Strategies**

A “settlement hedge” or “transaction hedge” is designed to protect the Fund against an adverse change in foreign currency values between the date a security is purchased or sold and the date on which payment is made or received. Entering into a forward contract for the purchase or sale of the amount of foreign currency involved in an underlying security transaction for a fixed amount of U.S. dollars “locks in” the U.S. dollar price of the security. The Fund may also use forward contracts to purchase or sell a foreign currency when it anticipates purchasing or selling securities denominated in foreign currency, even if it has not yet selected the specific investments.

The Fund may use forward contracts to hedge against a decline in the value of existing investments denominated in foreign currency. Such a hedge, sometimes referred to as a “position hedge,” would tend to offset both positive and negative currency fluctuations, but would not offset changes in security values caused by other factors. The Fund could also hedge the position by selling another currency expected to perform similarly to the currency in which the Fund’s investment is denominated. This type of hedge, sometimes referred to as a “proxy hedge,” could offer advantages in terms of cost, yield, or efficiency, but generally would not hedge currency exposure as effectively as a direct hedge into U.S. dollars. Proxy hedges may result in losses if the currency used to hedge does not perform similarly to the currency in which the hedged securities are denominated.

Transaction and position hedging do not eliminate fluctuations in the underlying prices of the securities that the Fund owns or intends to purchase or sell. They simply establish a rate of exchange that one can achieve at some future point in time. Additionally, these techniques tend to minimize the risk of loss due to a decline in the value of the hedged currency and to limit any potential gain that might result from the increase in value of such currency.

The Fund may enter into forward contracts to shift its investment exposure from one currency into another. Such transactions may call for the delivery of one foreign currency in exchange for another foreign currency, including currencies in which its securities are not then denominated. This may include shifting exposure from U.S. dollars to a foreign currency, or from one foreign currency to another foreign currency. This type of strategy, sometimes known as a “cross-hedge,” will tend to reduce or eliminate exposure to the currency that is sold, and increase exposure to the currency that is purchased. Cross-hedges may protect against losses resulting from a decline in the hedged currency but will cause the Fund to assume the risk of fluctuations in the value of the currency it purchases. Cross-hedging transactions also involve the risk of imperfect correlation between changes in the values of the currencies involved.

It is difficult to forecast with precision the market value of portfolio securities at the expiration or maturity of a forward or futures contract. Accordingly, the Fund may have to purchase additional foreign currency on the spot (cash) market if the market value of a security it is hedging is less than the amount of foreign currency it is obligated to deliver. Conversely, the Fund may have to sell on the spot market some of the foreign currency it received upon the sale of a security if the market value of such security exceeds the amount of foreign currency it is obligated to deliver.

Equity-Linked Securities. The Fund may invest in privately issued securities whose investment results are designed to correspond generally to the performance of a specified stock index or “basket” of securities, or sometimes a single stock (referred to as “equity-linked securities”). These securities are used for many of the

same purposes as derivative instruments and share many of the same risks. Equity-linked securities may be considered illiquid and thus subject to the Fund's restrictions on investments in illiquid securities.

Swap Agreements. A swap agreement is a financial instrument that typically involves the exchange of cash flows between two parties on specified dates (settlement dates), where the cash flows are based on agreed-upon prices, rates, indices, etc. The nominal amount on which the cash flows are calculated is called the notional amount. Swap agreements are individually negotiated and structured to include exposure to a variety of different types of investments or market factors, such as interest rates, foreign currency rates, mortgage securities, corporate borrowing rates, security prices or inflation rates.

Swap agreements may increase or decrease the overall volatility of the investments of the Fund and its share price. The performance of swap agreements may be affected by a change in the specific interest rate, currency, or other factors that determine the amounts of payments due to and from the Fund. If a swap agreement calls for payments by the Fund, the Fund must be prepared to make such payments when due. In addition, if the counterparty's creditworthiness declined, the value of a swap agreement would be likely to decline, potentially resulting in losses.

Generally, swap agreements have a fixed maturity date that will be agreed upon by the parties. The agreement can be terminated before the maturity date under certain circumstances, such as default by one of the parties or insolvency, among others, and can be transferred by a party only with the prior written consent of the other party. The Fund may be able to eliminate its exposure under a swap agreement either by assignment or by other disposition, or by entering into an offsetting swap agreement with the same party or a similarly creditworthy party. If the counterparty is unable to meet its obligations under the contract, declares bankruptcy, defaults or becomes insolvent, the Fund may not be able to recover the money it expected to receive under the swap agreement. The Fund will not enter into any swap agreement unless the investment managers believe that the counterparty to the transaction is creditworthy.

A swap agreement can be a form of leverage, which can magnify the Fund's gains or losses. In order to reduce the risk associated with leveraging, the Fund may cover its current obligations under swap agreements according to guidelines established by the SEC. If the Fund enters into a swap agreement on a net basis, it will segregate assets with a daily value at least equal to the excess, if any, of the Fund's accrued obligations under the swap agreement over the accrued amount the Fund is entitled to receive under the agreement. If the Fund enters into a swap agreement on other than a net basis, it will segregate assets with a value equal to the full amount of the Fund's accrued obligations under the swap agreement.

- **Equity Swaps**

In a typical equity swap, one party agrees to pay another party the return on a stock, stock index or basket of stocks in return for a specified interest rate. By entering into an equity index swap, for example, the index receiver can gain exposure to stocks making up the index of securities without actually purchasing those stocks. Equity index swaps involve not only the risk associated with investment in the securities represented in the index, but also the risk that the performance of such securities, including dividends, will not exceed the return on the interest rate that the Fund will be committed to pay.

- **Total Return Swaps**

Total return swaps are contracts in which one party agrees to make payments of the total return from a reference instrument—which may be a single asset, a pool of assets or an index of assets—during a specified period, in return for payments equal to a fixed or floating rate of interest or the total return from another underlying reference instrument. The total return includes appreciation or depreciation on the underlying asset, plus any interest or dividend payments. Payments under the swap are based upon an agreed upon principal amount but,

since the principal amount is not exchanged, it represents neither an asset nor a liability to either counterparty, and is referred to as notional. Total return swaps are marked to market daily using different sources, including quotations from counterparties, pricing services, brokers or market makers. The unrealized appreciation or depreciation related to the change in the valuation of the notional amount of the swap is combined with the amount due to the Fund at termination or settlement. The primary risks associated with total return swaps are credit risks (if the counterparty fails to meet its obligations) and market risk (if there is no liquid market for the swap or unfavorable changes occur to the underlying reference instrument).

- **Interest Rate Swaps**

Interest rate swaps are financial instruments that involve the exchange of one type of interest rate for another type of interest rate cash flow on specified dates in the future. Some of the different types of interest rate swaps are “fixed-for-floating rate swaps,” “termed basis swaps” and “index amortizing swaps.” Fixed-for floating rate swaps involve the exchange of fixed interest rate cash flows for floating rate cash flows. Termed basis swaps entail cash flows to both parties based on floating interest rates, where the interest rate indices are different. Index amortizing swaps are typically fixed-for-floating rate swaps where the notional amount changes if certain conditions are met.

As with a traditional investment in a debt security, the Fund could lose money by investing in an interest rate swap if interest rates change adversely. For example, if the Fund enters into a swap where it agrees to exchange a floating rate of interest for a fixed rate of interest, the Fund may have to pay more money than it receives. Similarly, if the Fund enters into a swap where it agrees to exchange a fixed rate of interest for a floating rate of interest, the Fund may receive less money than it has agreed to pay.

- **Currency Swaps**

A currency swap is an agreement between two parties in which one party agrees to make interest rate payments in one currency and the other promises to make interest rate payments in another currency. The Fund may enter into a currency swap when it has one currency and desires a different currency. Typically, the interest rates that determine the currency swap payments are fixed, although occasionally one or both parties may pay a floating rate of interest. Unlike an interest rate swap, however, the principal amounts are exchanged at the beginning of the agreement and returned at the end of the agreement. Changes in foreign exchange rates and changes in interest rates, as described above, may negatively affect currency swaps.

- **Inflation Swaps**

Inflation swaps are fixed-maturity, over-the-counter derivatives where one party pays a fixed rate in exchange for payments tied to an inflation index, such as the Consumer Price Index. The fixed rate, which is set by the parties at the initiation of the swap, is often referred to as the “breakeven inflation” rate and generally represents the current difference between treasury yields and Treasury Inflation Protected Securities yields of similar maturities at the initiation of the swap agreement. Inflation swaps are typically designated as “zero coupon,” where all cash flows are exchanged at maturity. The value of an inflation swap is expected to fluctuate in response to changes in the relationship between nominal interest rates and the rate of inflation. An inflation swap can lose value if the realized rate of inflation over the life of the swap is less than the fixed market implied inflation rate (the breakeven inflation rate) the investor agreed to pay at the initiation of the swap.

- **Credit Default Swaps**

A credit default swap is an agreement between a “buyer” and a “seller” for credit protection. The credit default swap agreement may have as reference obligations one or more securities that are not then held by the Fund. The protection buyer is generally obligated to pay the protection seller an upfront payment and/or a periodic stream of

payments over the term of the agreement until a credit event on a reference obligation has occurred. If no default occurs, the seller would keep the stream of payments and would have no payment obligations. If a credit event occurs, the seller generally must pay the buyer the full notional amount (the “par value”) of the swap.

- **Caps, Collars and Floors**

Caps and floors have an effect similar to buying or writing options. In a typical cap or floor agreement, one party agrees to make payments only under specified circumstances, usually in return for payment of a fee by the other party. For example, the buyer of an interest rate cap obtains the right to receive payments to the extent that a specified interest rate exceeds an agreed-upon level. The seller of an interest rate floor is obligated to make payments to the extent that a specified interest rate falls below an agreed-upon level. An interest rate collar combines elements of buying a cap and selling a floor.

Risks of Derivatives:

While transactions in derivatives may reduce certain risks, these transactions themselves entail certain other risks. For example, unanticipated changes in interest rates, securities prices or currency exchange rates may result in a poorer overall performance of the Fund than if it had not entered into any derivatives transactions. Derivatives may magnify the Fund’s gains or losses, causing it to make or lose substantially more than it invested.

When used for hedging purposes, increases in the value of the securities the Fund holds or intends to acquire should offset any losses incurred with a derivative. Purchasing derivatives for purposes other than hedging could expose the Fund to greater risks.

Use of derivatives involves transaction costs, which may be significant, and may also increase the amount of taxable income to shareholders.

Correlation of Prices. The Fund’s ability to hedge its securities through derivatives depends on the degree to which price movements in the underlying index or instrument correlate with price movements in the relevant securities. In the case of poor correlation, the price of the securities the Fund is hedging may not move in the same amount, or even in the same direction as the hedging instrument. The investment managers will try to minimize this risk by investing in only those contracts whose behavior they expect to correlate with the behavior of the portfolio securities they are trying to hedge. However, if the investment managers’ prediction of interest and currency rates, market value, volatility or other economic factors is incorrect, the Fund may lose money, or may not make as much money as it expected.

Derivative prices can diverge from the prices of their underlying instruments, even if the characteristics of the underlying instruments are very similar to the derivative. Listed below are some of the factors that may cause such a divergence:

- Current and anticipated short-term interest rates, changes in volatility of the underlying instrument, and the time remaining until expiration of the contract;
- A difference between the derivatives and securities markets, including different levels of demand, how the instruments are traded, the imposition of daily price fluctuation limits or discontinued trading of an instrument; and
- Differences between the derivatives, such as different margin requirements, different liquidity of such markets and the participation of speculators in such markets.

Derivatives based upon a narrower index of securities, such as those of a particular industry group, may present greater risk than derivatives based on a broad market index. Since narrower indices are made up of a smaller number of securities, they are more susceptible to rapid and extreme price fluctuations because of changes in the value of those securities.

While currency futures and options values are expected to correlate with exchange rates, they may not reflect other factors that affect the value of the investments of the Fund. A currency hedge, for example, should protect a yen-denominated security from a decline in the yen, but will not protect the Fund against a price decline resulting from deterioration in the issuer's creditworthiness. Because the value of the Fund's foreign-denominated investments changes in response to many factors other than exchange rates, it may not be possible to match the amount of currency options and futures to the value of the Fund's investments precisely over time.

Lack of Liquidity. Before a futures contract or option is exercised or expires, the Fund can terminate it only by entering into a closing purchase or sale transaction. Moreover, the Fund may close out a futures contract only on the exchange the contract was initially traded. Although the Fund intends to purchase options and futures only where there appears to be an active market, there is no guarantee that such a liquid market will exist. If there is no secondary market for the contract, or the market is illiquid, the Fund may not be able to close out its position. In an illiquid market, the Fund may:

- Have to sell securities to meet its daily margin requirements at a time when it is disadvantageous to do so;
- Have to purchase or sell the instrument underlying the contract;
- Not be able to hedge its investments; and/or
- Not be able to realize profits or limit its losses.

Derivatives may become illiquid (i.e., difficult to sell at a desired time and price) under a variety of market conditions. For example:

- An exchange may suspend or limit trading in a particular derivative instrument, an entire category of derivatives or all derivatives, which sometimes occurs because of increased market volatility;
- Unusual or unforeseen circumstances may interrupt normal operations of an exchange;
- The facilities of the exchange may not be adequate to handle current trading volume;
- Equipment failures, government intervention, insolvency of a brokerage firm or clearing house or other occurrences may disrupt normal trading activity; or
- Investors may lose interest in a particular derivative or category of derivatives.

Management Risk. Successful use of derivatives by the Fund is subject to the ability of the investment managers to forecast stock market and interest rate trends. If the investment managers incorrectly predict stock market and interest rate trends, the Fund may lose money by investing in derivatives. For example, if the Fund were to write a call option based on the investment managers' expectation that the price of the underlying security would fall, but the price were to rise instead, the Fund could be required to sell the security upon exercise at a price below the current market price. Similarly, if the Fund were to write a put option based on the investment managers' expectation that the price of the underlying security would rise, but the price were to fall instead, the Fund could be required to purchase the security upon exercise at a price higher than the current market price.

Pricing Risk. At times, market conditions might make it hard to value some investments. For example, if the Fund has valued its securities too high, shareholders may end up paying too much for Fund shares when they buy into the Fund. If the Fund underestimates its price, shareholders may not receive the full market value for their Fund shares when they sell.

Margin. Because of the low margin deposits required upon the opening of a derivative position, such transactions involve an extremely high degree of leverage. Consequently, a relatively small price movement in a derivative may result in an immediate and substantial loss (as well as gain) to the Fund and it may lose more than it originally invested in the derivative.

If the price of a futures contract changes adversely, the Fund may have to sell securities at a time when it is disadvantageous to do so to meet its minimum daily margin requirement. The Fund may lose its margin deposits if a broker-dealer with whom it has an open futures contract or related option becomes insolvent or declares bankruptcy.

Volatility and Leverage. The Fund's use of derivatives may have a leveraging effect. Leverage generally magnifies the effect of any increase or decrease in value of an underlying asset and results in increased volatility, which means the Fund will have the potential for greater gains, as well as the potential for greater losses, than if the Fund does not use derivative instruments that have a leveraging effect. The prices of derivatives are volatile (i.e., they may change rapidly, substantially and unpredictably) and are influenced by a variety of factors, including:

- Actual and anticipated changes in interest rates;
- Fiscal and monetary policies; and
- National and international political events.

Most exchanges limit the amount by which the price of a derivative can change during a single trading day. Daily trading limits establish the maximum amount that the price of a derivative may vary from the settlement price of that derivative at the end of trading on the previous day. Once the price of a derivative reaches that value, the Fund may not trade that derivative at a price beyond that limit. The daily limit governs only price movements during a given day and does not limit potential gains or losses. Derivative prices have occasionally moved to the daily limit for several consecutive trading days, preventing prompt liquidation of the derivative.

Government Regulation. The regulation of derivatives markets in the U.S. is a rapidly changing area of law and is subject to modification by government and judicial action. In particular, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, signed into law in 2010, grants significant new authority to the SEC and the CFTC to impose comprehensive regulations on the over-the-counter and cleared derivatives markets. These regulations include, but are not limited to, mandatory clearing of certain derivatives and requirements relating to disclosure, margin and trade reporting. The new law and regulations may negatively impact the Fund by increasing transaction and/or regulatory compliance costs, limiting the availability of certain derivatives or otherwise adversely affecting the value or performance of the derivatives the Fund trades. In addition, the SEC proposed new derivatives rules in December 2015 that could limit the Fund's use of derivatives, and adversely impact the Fund's ability to achieve its investment objectives. Other potentially adverse regulatory obligations can develop suddenly and without notice.

Illiquid Securities. Illiquid securities are securities that cannot be sold or disposed of in the ordinary course of business (i.e. within seven days) at approximately the prices at which they are valued. Because of their illiquid nature, illiquid securities must be priced at fair value as determined in good faith pursuant to procedures approved by the Board. Despite such good faith efforts to determine fair value prices, the Fund's illiquid securities are

subject to the risk that the security's fair value price may differ from the actual price which the Fund may ultimately realize upon its sale or disposition. Difficulty in selling illiquid securities may result in a loss or may be costly to the Fund. Under the supervision of the Board, the Adviser determines the liquidity of the Fund's investments. In determining the liquidity of the Fund's investments, the Adviser may consider various factors, including (1) the frequency and volume of trades and quotations, (2) the number of dealers and prospective purchasers in the marketplace, (3) dealer undertakings to make a market, and (4) the nature of the security and the market in which it trades (including any demand, put or tender features, the mechanics and other requirements for transfer, any letters of credit or other credit enhancement features, any ratings, the number of holders, the method of soliciting offers, the time required to dispose of the security, and the ability to assign or offset the rights and obligations of the security). The Fund will not hold more than 15% of its net assets in illiquid securities.

Securities Lending. The Fund may lend portfolio securities to brokers, dealers and other financial organizations that meet capital and other credit requirements or other criteria established by the Board. These loans, if and when made, may not exceed 33 1/3% of the total asset value of the Fund (including the loan collateral). The Fund will not lend portfolio securities to the Adviser or a Sub-Adviser or their affiliates unless permissible under the 1940 Act and the rules and promulgations thereunder. Loans of portfolio securities will be fully collateralized by cash, letters of credit or U.S. government securities, and the collateral will be maintained in an amount equal to at least 100% of the current market value of the loaned securities by marking to market daily. Any gain or loss in the market price of the securities loaned that might occur during the term of the loan would be for the account of the Fund.

The Fund may pay a part of the interest earned from the investment of collateral, or other fee, to an unaffiliated third party for acting as the Fund's securities lending agent, but will bear all of any losses from the investment of collateral.

By lending its securities, the Fund may increase its income by receiving payments from the borrower that reflect the amount of any interest or any dividends payable on the loaned securities as well as by either investing cash collateral received from the borrower in short-term instruments or obtaining a fee from the borrower when U.S. government securities or letters of credit are used as collateral. Investing cash collateral subjects the Fund to market risk. The Fund remains obligated to return all collateral to the borrower under the terms of its securities lending arrangements, even if the value of investments made with the collateral decline. Accordingly, if the value of a security in which the cash collateral has been invested declines, the loss would be borne by the Fund, and the Fund may be required to liquidate other investments in order to return collateral to the borrower at the end of the loan. The Fund will adhere to the following conditions whenever its portfolio securities are loaned: (i) the Fund must receive at least 100% cash collateral or equivalent securities of the type discussed in the preceding paragraph from the borrower; (ii) the borrower must increase such collateral whenever the market value of the securities rises above the level of such collateral; (iii) the Fund must be able to terminate the loan on demand; (iv) the Fund must receive reasonable interest on the loan, as well as any dividends, interest or other distributions on the loaned securities and any increase in market value; (v) the Fund may pay only reasonable fees in connection with the loan (which fees may include fees payable to the lending agent, the borrower, the Fund's administrator and the custodian); and (vi) voting rights on the loaned securities may pass to the borrower, provided, however, that if a material event adversely affecting the investment occurs, the Fund must terminate the loan and regain the right to vote the securities. In such instances, the Adviser will vote the securities in accordance with its proxy voting policies and procedures. The Board has adopted procedures reasonably designed to ensure that the foregoing criteria will be met. Loan agreements involve certain risks in the event of default or insolvency of the borrower, including possible delays or restrictions upon the Fund's ability to recover the loaned securities or dispose of the collateral for the loan, which could give rise to loss because of adverse market action, expenses and/or delays in connection with the disposition of the underlying securities.

Restricted Securities. The Fund may purchase restricted securities. Restricted securities are securities that may not be sold freely to the public absent registration under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the “1933 Act”) or an exemption from registration. This generally includes securities that are unregistered that can be sold to qualified institutional buyers in accordance with Rule 144A under the 1933 Act or securities that are exempt from registration under the 1933 Act, such as commercial paper. Institutional markets for restricted securities have developed as a result of the promulgation of Rule 144A under the 1933 Act, which provides a “safe harbor” from 1933 Act registration requirements for qualifying sales to institutional investors. When Rule 144A restricted securities present an attractive investment opportunity and meet other selection criteria, the Fund may make such investments whether or not such securities are “illiquid” depending on the market that exists for the particular security. The Board has delegated the responsibility for determining the liquidity of Rule 144A restricted securities that the Fund may invest in to the Adviser.

Short Sales. The Fund may engage in short sales that are either “uncovered” or “against the box.” A short sale is “against the box” if at all times during which the short position is open, the Fund owns at least an equal amount of the securities or securities convertible into, or exchangeable without further consideration for, securities of the same issue as the securities that are sold short. A short sale against the box is a taxable transaction to the Fund with respect to the securities that are sold short. The Fund will not sell a security short if, as a result of such short sale, the aggregate market value of all securities sold short exceeds 10% of the Fund’s total assets. This limitation does not apply to short sales against the box.

Uncovered short sales are transactions under which the Fund sells a security it does not own. To complete such a transaction, the Fund must borrow the security to make delivery to the buyer. The Fund then is obligated to replace the security borrowed by purchasing the security at the market price at the time of the replacement. The price at such time may be more or less than the price at which the security was sold by the Fund. Until the security is replaced, the Fund is required to pay the lender amounts equal to any dividends or interest that accrue during the period of the loan. To borrow the security, the Fund also may be required to pay a premium, which would increase the cost of the security sold. The proceeds of the short sale will be retained by the broker, to the extent necessary to meet margin requirements, until the short position is closed out.

Until the Fund closes its short position or replaces the borrowed security, the Fund may: (a) segregate cash or liquid securities at such a level that the amount segregated plus the amount deposited with the broker as collateral will equal the current value of the security sold short; or (b) otherwise cover the Fund’s short position.

When-Issued, Delayed-Delivery and Forward-Delivery Transactions. A when-issued security is one whose terms are available and for which a market exists, but which have not been issued. In a forward-delivery transaction, the Fund contracts to purchase securities for a fixed price at a future date beyond customary settlement time. “Delayed-delivery” refers to securities transactions on the secondary market where settlement occurs in the future. In each of these transactions, the parties fix the payment obligation and the interest rate that they will receive on the securities at the time the parties enter the commitment; however, they do not pay money or deliver securities until a later date. Typically, no income accrues on securities the Fund has committed to purchase before the securities are delivered, although the Fund may earn income on securities it has in a segregated account to cover its position. The Fund will only enter into these types of transactions with the intention of actually acquiring the securities, but may sell them before the settlement date.

The Fund may use when-issued, delayed-delivery and forward-delivery transactions to secure what it considers an advantageous price and yield at the time of purchase. When the Fund engages in when-issued, delayed-delivery or forward-delivery transactions, it relies on the other party to consummate the sale. If the other party fails to complete the sale, the Fund may miss the opportunity to obtain the security at a favorable price or yield.

When purchasing a security on a when-issued, delayed-delivery, or forward-delivery basis, the Fund assumes the rights and risks of ownership of the security, including the risk of price and yield changes. At the time of settlement, the market value of the security may be more or less than the purchase price. The yield available in the market when the delivery takes place also may be higher than those obtained in the transaction itself. Because the Fund does not pay for the security until the delivery date, these risks are in addition to the risks associated with its other investments.

The Fund will segregate cash or liquid securities equal in value to commitments for the when-issued, delayed-delivery or forward-delivery transactions. The Fund will segregate additional liquid assets daily so that the value of such assets is equal to the amount of the commitments.

Special Risks of Cyber Attacks. As with any entity that conducts business through electronic means in the modern marketplace, the Fund, and its service providers, may be susceptible to operational and information security risks resulting from cyber attacks. Cyber attacks include, among other behaviors, stealing or corrupting data maintained online or digitally, denial of service attacks on websites, the unauthorized monitoring, release, misuse, loss, destruction or corruption of confidential information, unauthorized access to relevant systems, compromises to networks or devices that the Fund and its service providers use to service the Fund's operations, operational disruption or failures in the physical infrastructure or operating systems that support the Fund and its service providers, or various other forms of cyber security breaches. Cyber attacks affecting the Fund or the Adviser, a Sub-Adviser, the Fund's distributor, custodian, or any other of the Fund's intermediaries or service providers may adversely impact the Fund and its shareholders, potentially resulting in, among other things, financial losses or the inability of Fund shareholders to transact business. For instance, cyber attacks may interfere with the processing of shareholder transactions, impact the Fund's ability to calculate its NAV, cause the release of private shareholder information or confidential business information, impede trading, subject the Fund to regulatory fines or financial losses and/or cause reputational damage. The Fund may also incur additional costs for cyber security risk management purposes designed to mitigate or prevent the risk of cyber attacks. Such costs may be ongoing because threats of cyber attacks are constantly evolving as cyber attackers become more sophisticated and their techniques become more complex. Similar types of cyber security risks are also present for issuers of securities in which the Fund may invest, which could result in material adverse consequences for such issuers and may cause the Fund's investments in such companies to lose value. There can be no assurance that the Fund, the Fund's service providers, or the issuers of the securities in which the Fund invests will not suffer losses relating to cyber attacks or other information security breaches in the future.

INVESTMENT LIMITATIONS

Fundamental Policies

In addition to the investment objective of the Fund, the following investment limitations are fundamental, which means that the Fund cannot change them without approval by the vote of a majority of the outstanding shares of the Fund. The phrase "majority of the outstanding shares" means the vote of (i) 67% or more of the Fund's shares present at a meeting, if more than 50% of the outstanding shares of the Fund are present or represented by proxy, or (ii) more than 50% of the Fund's outstanding shares, whichever is less.

The Fund may not:

1. Purchase securities of an issuer that would cause the Fund to fail to satisfy the diversification requirement for a diversified management company under the 1940 Act, the rules or regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.

2. Concentrate investments in a particular industry or group of industries, as concentration is defined under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
3. Borrow money or issue senior securities (as defined under the 1940 Act), except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
4. Make loans, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
5. Purchase or sell commodities or real estate, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.
6. Underwrite securities issued by other persons, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, the rules and regulations thereunder or any exemption therefrom, as such statute, rules or regulations may be amended or interpreted from time to time.

Non-Fundamental Policies

The following limitations are non-fundamental and may be changed by the Board without shareholder approval.

The Fund may not:

1. Purchase securities of any issuer (except securities of other investment companies, securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. government, its agencies or instrumentalities and repurchase agreements involving such securities) if, as a result, more than 5% of the total assets of the Fund would be invested in the securities of such issuer; or (ii) acquire more than 10% of the outstanding voting securities of any one issuer. This restriction applies to 75% of the Fund's total assets.
2. Purchase any securities which would cause 25% or more of the total assets of the Fund to be invested in the securities of one or more issuers conducting their principal business activities in the same industry, provided that this limitation does not apply to investments in obligations issued or guaranteed by the U.S. government, its agencies or instrumentalities and repurchase agreements involving such securities. For purposes of this limitation, (i) utility companies will be classified according to their services, for example, gas distribution, gas transmission, electric and telephone will each be considered a separate industry; and (ii) financial service companies will be classified according to the end users of their services, for example, automobile finance, bank finance and diversified finance will each be considered a separate industry.
3. Borrow money from a bank in an amount exceeding 33 1/3% of the value of its total assets, provided that, for purposes of this limitation, investment strategies that either obligate the Fund to purchase securities or require the Fund to segregate assets are not considered to be borrowing.
4. Make loans if, as a result, more than 33 1/3% of its total assets would be lent to other parties, except that the Fund may: (i) purchase or hold debt instruments in accordance with its investment objective and policies; (ii) enter into repurchase agreements; and (iii) engage in securities lending as described in the SAI.

5. Purchase or sell real estate or real estate limited partnership interests, except that the Fund may purchase marketable securities issued by companies which own or invest in real estate (including REITs).
6. Purchase an investment if, as a result, more than 15% of the value of the Fund's net assets would be invested in illiquid securities.

In addition:

1. The Fund may purchase or sell financial and physical commodities, commodity contracts based on (or relating to) physical commodities or financial commodities and securities and derivative instruments whose values are derived from (in whole or in part) physical commodities or financial commodities.

The following descriptions of certain provisions of the 1940 Act may assist investors in understanding the above policies and restrictions:

Borrowing. The 1940 Act presently allows a fund to borrow from any bank in an amount up to 33 1/3% of its total assets (including the amount borrowed) and to borrow for temporary purposes in an amount not exceeding 5% of the value of its total assets. Transactions that are fully collateralized in a manner that does not involve the prohibited issuance of a "senior security" within the meaning of Section 18(f) of the 1940 Act, shall not be regarded as borrowings for the purposes of the Fund's investment restriction. Section 18(f) of the 1940 Act permits an investment company to borrow only from banks.

Concentration. The SEC has defined concentration as investing 25% or more of an investment company's total assets in any particular industry or group of industries, with certain exceptions. For purposes of the Fund's concentration policy, the Fund may classify and re-classify companies in a particular industry and define and re-define industries in any reasonable manner.

Diversification. Under the 1940 Act and the rules, regulations and interpretations thereunder, a "diversified company," as to 75% of its total assets, may not purchase securities of any issuer (other than obligations of, or guaranteed by, the U.S. government or its agencies, or instrumentalities or securities of other investment companies) if, as a result, more than 5% of its total assets would be invested in the securities of such issuer, or more than 10% of the issuer's voting securities would be held by a fund.

Lending. Under the 1940 Act, an investment company may only make loans if expressly permitted by its investment policies.

Senior Securities. Senior securities may include any obligation or instrument issued by a fund evidencing indebtedness. The 1940 Act generally prohibits funds from issuing senior securities, although it does not treat certain transactions as senior securities, such as certain borrowings, short sales, reverse repurchase agreements, firm commitment agreements and standby commitments, with appropriate earmarking or segregation of assets to cover such obligation.

Underwriting. Under the 1940 Act, underwriting securities involves an investment company purchasing securities directly from an issuer for the purpose of selling (distributing) them or participating in any such activity either directly or indirectly. Under the 1940 Act, a diversified fund may not make any commitment as underwriter, if immediately thereafter the amount of its outstanding underwriting commitments, plus the value of its investments in securities of issuers (other than investment companies) of which it owns more than 10% of the outstanding voting securities, exceeds 25% of the value of its total assets.

Real Estate and Commodities. The 1940 Act does not directly restrict an investment company's ability to invest in real estate or commodities, but does require that every investment company have a fundamental investment policy governing such investments.

Except with respect to Fund policies concerning borrowing, if a percentage restriction is adhered to at the time of an investment, a later increase or decrease in percentage resulting from changes in values or assets will not constitute a violation of such restriction. With respect to the limitation on illiquid securities, in the event that a subsequent change in net assets or other circumstances causes the Fund to exceed its limitation, the Fund will take steps to bring the aggregate amount of illiquid instruments back within the limitations as soon as reasonably practicable. With respect to the limitation on borrowing, in the event that a subsequent change in net assets or other circumstances cause the Fund to exceed its limitation, the Fund will take steps to bring the aggregate amount of borrowing back within the limitations within three days thereafter (not including Sundays and holidays).

THE ADVISER AND SUB-ADVISERS

The Adviser.

General. Rothschild Larch Lane Management Company LLC (the "Adviser"), a Delaware limited liability company formed in 2014, located at 800 Westchester Ave., S-528, Rye Brook, New York 10573, is a joint venture of Rothschild Asset Management Inc. ("Rothschild") and Larch Lane Advisors LLC ("Larch Lane"). As of December 31, 2015, the Adviser had approximately \$53.9 million in assets under management.

Manager of Managers Structure. **The Adviser acts as the manager of managers of the Fund and is responsible for the investment performance of the Fund, since it allocates the Fund's assets to the sub-advisers and recommends hiring or changing sub-advisers to the Board of the Trust. The Adviser has ultimate responsibility (subject to oversight by the Board) to oversee the sub-advisers and recommend their hiring, termination, and replacement.** The Trust and the Adviser have obtained an exemptive order from the SEC that permits the Adviser, subject to certain conditions, to select new sub-advisers with the approval of the Board but without obtaining shareholder approval, although any sub-advisory agreements with affiliates of the Trust, the Fund or the Adviser ("Affiliated Sub-Advisers") require shareholder approval. Except with respect to Affiliated Sub-Advisers, the order also permits (i) the Adviser to materially change the terms of agreements with the sub-advisers or to continue the employment of a sub-adviser after an event that would otherwise cause the automatic termination of services and (ii) the Fund to disclose sub-advisers' fees only in the aggregate in its registration statement. Any new sub-advisory agreement or any amendment to the Fund's existing investment advisory agreement or existing sub-advisory agreements that directly or indirectly results in an increase in the aggregate advisory fee rate payable by the Fund will be submitted to shareholders for approval. Further, the structure does not permit investment advisory fees paid by the Fund to the Adviser to be increased or to materially change the Adviser's obligations under the investment advisory agreement, including the Adviser's responsibility to monitor and oversee sub-advisory services furnished to the Fund, without shareholder approval. The manager of managers structure enables the Fund to operate with greater efficiency by not incurring the expense and delays associated with obtaining shareholder approval of sub-advisory agreements. This arrangement has been approved by the Board and the Fund's initial shareholder. Within 90 days of retaining a new sub-adviser for the Fund, shareholders of the Fund will receive notification of the change.

An affiliate of Mizuho Alternative Investments, LLC ("MAI"), one of the Fund's sub-advisers discussed below, provided seed capital to the Fund, and such seeding resulted in MAI being an Affiliated Sub-Adviser. Such seeding also raises a potential conflict of interest with respect to the Adviser's decisions to allocate Fund assets to, retain and/or terminate MAI. The Adviser believes that these conflicts are mitigated because: (i) the Adviser and MAI have agreed that MAI will be subject to the same retention, monitoring and oversight standards as any other

Fund sub-adviser; (ii) the anticipated seed investment is not subject to any conditions relating to the Fund's initial or continued asset allocation to MAI; and (iii) initial approval of the MAI sub-advisory agreement (and all other sub-advisory agreements) and the agreement's continuation beyond a 2 year term remain, by law, subject to the separate review and approval by the Board, including its independent Trustees, and the Board expects to subject its review and consideration of the MAI sub-advisory agreement to at least the same standards it applies to the Fund's other sub-advisers.

Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements. The Trust and the Adviser have entered into an investment advisory agreement (the "Advisory Agreement"). Pursuant to the Advisory Agreement, the Adviser oversees the investment advisory services provided to the Fund and may directly manage a portion of the Fund's assets under certain circumstances. Pursuant to separate sub-advisory agreements (the "Sub-Advisory Agreements" and, together with the Advisory Agreement, the "Investment Advisory Agreements") with the Adviser, and under the supervision of the Adviser and the Board, one or more sub-advisers (the "Sub-Advisers") are responsible for the day-to-day investment management of all or a distinct portion of the assets of the Fund. The Sub-Advisers are also responsible for managing their employees who provide services to the Fund.

After its initial two year term, the continuance of each Investment Advisory Agreement must be specifically approved at least annually: (i) by the vote of a majority of the outstanding shares of the Fund or by the Trustees; and (ii) by the vote of a majority of the Trustees who are not parties to such Investment Advisory Agreement or "interested persons" (as defined under the 1940 Act) of any party thereto, cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on such approval. Each Investment Advisory Agreement will terminate automatically in the event of its assignment and is terminable at any time without penalty by the Trustees or, with respect to the Fund, by a majority of the outstanding shares of the Fund, on not less than 30 days' nor more than 60 days' written notice to the Adviser or a Sub-Adviser, as applicable, or by the Adviser or a Sub-Adviser, as applicable, on 90 days' written notice to the Trust.

Advisory Fees Paid to the Adviser and the Sub-Advisers. For its services to the Fund, the Adviser is entitled to a fee, which is calculated daily and paid monthly, at an annual rate of 1.75% based on the average daily net assets of the Fund. The Adviser pays the sub-advisers out of the advisory fees it receives from the Fund, and pays MAI a fee, which is calculated daily and paid monthly, at an annual rate of 1.00% based on the average daily net assets that MAI manages for the Fund. MAI and Ellington Management Group, L.L.C. ("Ellington") participate in a capital allocation program that allows the excess cash held by one Fund sub-adviser ("Sub-Adviser A") to be reallocated to another sub-adviser ("Sub-Adviser B") at the direction of the Adviser and provides that the Adviser will compensate both Sub-Adviser A and Sub-Adviser B without regard to the amount of excess cash allocated from Sub-Adviser A or allocated to Sub-Adviser B.

The Adviser has contractually agreed to reduce fees and reimburse expenses to the extent necessary to keep Total Annual Fund Operating Expenses after Fee Reductions and/or Expense Reimbursements (excluding any class-specific expenses, Dividend and Interest Expenses on Securities Sold Short, interest, taxes, brokerage commissions, acquired fund fees and expenses and non-routine expenses) from exceeding 2.50% with respect to Investor Class shares and Institutional Class shares of the Fund's average daily net assets until February 28, 2017 (the "Expense Limitation"). The Adviser may recover all or a portion of its fee reductions or expense reimbursements within a three-year period from the year in which it reduced its fee or reimbursed expenses if the Fund's Total Annual Fund Operating Expenses are below the Expense Limitation. This agreement may be terminated: (i) by the Board for any reason at any time, or (ii) by the Adviser, upon ninety (90) days' prior written notice to the Trust, effective as of the close of business on February 28, 2017.

For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014 and 2015, the following advisory fees were paid to the Adviser and the sub-advisers:

Contractual Fees Paid by Fund to Adviser		Fees Paid by Adviser to MAI		Fees Paid by Adviser to Unaffiliated Sub-Advisers		Fees Waived by Adviser		Fees Retained by Adviser		Fees Paid to Adviser and MAI	
2014 ¹	2015	2014 ¹	2015	2014 ¹	2015	2014 ¹	2015	2014 ¹	2015	2014 ¹	2015
\$225,212	\$1,025,999	\$32,671	\$143,790	\$79,219	\$357,582	\$135,556	\$361,441	\$0 ²	\$163,186	\$32,671	\$306,976

1 Represents the period from July 25, 2014 (commencement of Fund operations) to October 31, 2014.

2 For the fiscal period from July 25, 2014 (commencement of Fund operations) to October 31, 2014, the Adviser additionally reimbursed fees of \$22,234 for the Fund to maintain the stated expense cap under its contractual expense limitation agreement with the Fund.

The Sub-Advisers.

Ellington Management Group, L.L.C. Ellington, a Delaware limited liability company formed in 1995, located at 53 Forest Avenue, Old Greenwich, Connecticut 06870, serves as investment sub-adviser to a portion of the Fund’s assets. Ellington has been in business since 1995 and is owned primarily by Michael Vranos indirectly through his ownership interest in Ellington’s majority owner, EMG Holdings, L.P. As of December 31, 2015, Ellington had approximately \$6.1 billion in assets under management.

Karya Capital Management LP. Karya Capital Management LP (“Karya”), a Delaware limited partnership formed in 2011, located at 1330 Avenue of the Americas, Suite 520, New York, New York 10019, serves as investment sub-adviser to a portion of the Fund’s assets. Karya is principally owned by Dr. Rajiv Sobti. Dr. Sobti is also Karya’s Chief Investment Officer. As of December 31, 2015, Karya had approximately \$911 million in assets under management.

Mizuho Alternative Investments, LLC. MAI, a Delaware limited liability company formed in 2007, located at 757 Third Avenue, 8th Floor, New York, New York 10017, serves as investment sub-adviser to a portion of the Fund’s assets. MAI was founded in 2007 and is owned by Mizuho Bank, Ltd. (“MHBK”), a bank headquartered in Tokyo, Japan, and Mizuho Securities Company Co., Ltd. (“MSC”), a broker-dealer headquartered in Tokyo, Japan. MHBK and MSC are subsidiaries of Mizuho Financial Group, Inc., a publicly-traded company listed on the Tokyo Stock Exchange and New York Stock Exchange (American Depositary Receipts). MHBK, as majority shareholder of MAI, has the legal authority to exercise control over MAI’s operations. As of December 31, 2015, MAI had assets under management of approximately \$971 million on a discretionary basis and approximately \$2.154 billion on a non-discretionary basis.

Winton Capital US LLC. Winton Capital US LLC (“Winton”), a Delaware limited liability company formed in 2014, located at 375 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10152 serves as investment sub-adviser to a portion of the Fund’s assets. Winton is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Winton Capital Group Limited, an English limited liability company located at Grove House, 27 Hammersmith Grove, London W6 0NE, United Kingdom. As of December 31, 2015, Winton Capital Group Limited and its affiliated companies had approximately \$33.8 billion in assets under advisement.

THE PORTFOLIO MANAGERS

This section includes information about the Fund’s portfolio managers, including information about other accounts they manage, the dollar range of Fund shares they own and how they are compensated.

The Adviser.

Compensation. Compensation for the portfolio managers is a combination of a fixed salary and a bonus. The bonus paid to a portfolio manager for any year may be tied, in part, to the performance of the Fund or any other fund managed by the Adviser during such year as compared to the performance of the HFRX Global Hedge Fund Index or another index or indices deemed relevant by the senior management of the Adviser. The amount of salary and bonus paid to the portfolio managers is based on a variety of factors, including the financial performance of the Adviser, execution of managerial responsibilities, client interactions and teamwork support. As part of their compensation, the portfolio managers also have 401(k) plans that enable them to direct a percentage of their pre-tax salary and bonus without any contribution from the Adviser into a tax-qualified retirement plan and are also eligible to participate in profit-sharing plans with the Adviser.

Fund Shares Owned by Portfolio Managers. The Fund is required to show the dollar amount range of each portfolio manager’s “beneficial ownership” of shares of the Fund as of the end of the most recently completed fiscal year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. “Beneficial ownership” is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “1934 Act”).

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares ¹
<u>Rothschild Larch Lane Management Company LLC</u>	
Ki Akrami	\$10,001-\$50,000
Nicolas de Croisset	\$10,001-\$50,000
Geoffrey B. Doyle	\$50,001-\$100,000
Mark A. Jurish	\$100,001-\$500,000
Charles Korchinski	\$10,001-\$50,000
Shakil Riaz	None

1 Valuation date is October 31, 2015.

Other Accounts. In addition to the Fund, the portfolio managers are responsible for the day-to-day management of certain other accounts, as listed below. The information below is provided as of October 31, 2015.

Name	Registered Investment Companies		Other Pooled Investment Vehicles		Other Accounts	
	Number of Accounts	Total Assets	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets
Ki Akrami	0	\$0	3	\$616	0	\$0
Nicolas de Croisset	0	\$0	3	\$616	0	\$0
Geoffrey B. Doyle	0	\$0	12 ¹	\$650	0	\$0
Mark A. Jurish	0	\$0	12 ¹	\$650	0	\$0
Charles Korchinski	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Shakil Riaz	0	\$0	8 ²	\$801	0	\$0

- 1 Includes 2 accounts with assets under management of \$244 million that are subject to performance-based advisory fees. Note that these are accounts managed by Larch Lane.
- 2 Certain classes of these accounts, with assets under management of \$801 million, are subject to performance-based advisory fees. Note that these are accounts managed by Rothschild.

Conflicts of Interest. A potential conflict of interest may arise as a result of the Adviser’s portfolio managers’ management of the Fund and other accounts managed by the portfolio managers in their respective roles at Larch Lane and Rothschild (“Other Accounts”), which, in theory, may allow them to allocate investment opportunities in a way that favors Other Accounts over the Fund. This conflict of interest may be exacerbated to the extent that the Adviser or its portfolio managers receive, or expect to receive, greater compensation from their management of the Other Accounts (many of which receive a base and incentive fee) than from the Fund. Notwithstanding this theoretical conflict of interest, it is the Adviser’s policy to manage each account based on its investment objectives and related restrictions and the Adviser (and each of Larch Lane and Rothschild) has adopted policies and procedures reasonably designed to allocate investment opportunities on a fair and equitable basis over time and in a manner consistent with each account’s investment objectives and related restrictions. For example, while the Adviser’s portfolio managers may buy for Other Accounts securities that differ in identity or quantity from securities bought for the Fund, such securities might not be suitable for the Fund given its structure, investment objectives and related restrictions.

Ellington.

Compensation. Compensation for the portfolio manager is a combination of a fixed salary and a bonus. The bonus paid to the portfolio manager for any year may be tied, in part, to the performance of the Fund or any other fund managed by Ellington using the portfolio manager’s investment strategies. In addition, a portion of the salary and bonus paid to the portfolio manager may be based on a variety of factors, including the financial performance of Ellington, execution of the portfolio manager’s responsibilities, client interactions and the collaboration of the portfolio manager with other of Ellington’s personnel.

Fund Shares Owned by Portfolio Manager. The Fund is required to show the dollar amount range of the portfolio manager’s “beneficial ownership” of shares of the Fund as of the end of the most recently completed fiscal year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. “Beneficial ownership” is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the 1934 Act.

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares ¹
<u>Ellington</u>	
Rasheed Sabar	None

¹ Valuation date is December 31, 2015.

Other Accounts. In addition to the Fund, the portfolio manager is responsible for the day-to-day management of certain other accounts, as listed below. The information below is provided as of December 31, 2015.

Name	Registered Investment Companies		Other Pooled Investment Vehicles		Other Accounts	
	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)
Rasheed Sabar	2	\$107.07	3 ¹	\$37.35	3 ²	\$179.39

- 1 Includes 2 accounts with assets under management of \$26.55 million that are subject to performance-based advisory fees.
- 2 These accounts are subject to performance-based advisory fees.

Conflicts of Interest. In addition to the sub-advisory services provided to the Fund, Ellington Management Group, L.L.C. and its affiliates (together “Ellington” or the “Ellington Group”) provide investment management services to private, pooled investment vehicles, public companies, and institutional managed accounts (together “Clients” or “Client Accounts”). Ellington, other members of the Ellington Group, and Ellington’s employees and other related persons have interests in certain of these Client Accounts. In some cases, the Ellington Group may have invested in or hold shares of a Client Account, or may own most or all of an Account. In some cases, members of the Ellington Group may receive performance-based fees from a Client Account though Ellington does not receive such fees from the Fund. For all these reasons, Ellington may have differing interests with respect to different Client Accounts, including the Fund, or with respect to individual transactions or investments made by or contemplated for those Accounts. Conflicts of interest among Client Accounts, for example when they compete for limited investment opportunities, may be more pronounced because of differing direct or indirect interests of Ellington or its affiliates with respect to those Accounts.

Set forth below is a summary of some of the circumstances in which such conflicts of interest may and do arise:

Allocation of Investment Opportunities and Order Aggregation

Ellington exercises reasonable, good faith judgment when determining which investment opportunities are appropriate for each Client Account. Investment opportunities are generally allocated on the basis of capital available for such opportunities and other relevant factors particular to an Account, including, but not limited to, the strategy pursued for the Account and applicable investment restrictions, tax considerations, Employee Retirement Income Security Act and other regulatory considerations, risk parameters, a Client’s pre-existing position, and the appropriate overall composition of each Client Account. Ellington may at times allocate opportunities on a preferential basis to Client Accounts that are in a “start-up” or “ramp-up” phase or to re-balance Accounts following the addition of capital to or withdrawal of capital from one or more Client Accounts.

Because Ellington allocates investment opportunities among multiple Client Accounts, conflicts may arise when certain Client Accounts seek to sell investments when other Client Accounts hold similar or the same investments. For example, Client Accounts in liquidation or wind-down, or Client Accounts with differing liquidity or redemption terms, may seek to sell commonly held investments before other Client Accounts. Sale by such Client Accounts of the same or similar investments, depending upon the volume of sales and the nature of the market, may affect the market value of investments that continue to be held by other Client Accounts, including the Fund.

Transactions executed for Client Accounts may be effected independently or on an aggregated basis. Aggregation of Client orders can achieve better execution or result in more favorable commission rates. Such aggregation of orders, however, may not always be to the benefit of every Client Account with regard to the price or quantity executed for each individual transaction. Ellington’s policy is to allocate executions of aggregated Client orders on a fair and equitable basis among participating Clients.

Receipt of Material Non-public Information

The Ellington Group may come into possession of material non-public information or other confidential information as a result of its business activities. Ellington has adopted policies with respect to insider trading and receipt of confidential information which include restrictions on trading for personal and Client Accounts in circumstances in which the firm has received material, confidential information. As a consequence, the possession of such information may limit the ability of Ellington’s Client Accounts to buy or sell a security or otherwise to participate in an investment opportunity.

Differing Advice

Client Accounts may buy or sell securities of an issuer that are also bought or sold by the Ellington Group, other Client Accounts of the Ellington Group, or by Ellington employees for their own accounts. In this regard, Ellington may give advice and recommend securities, derivatives, and other financial instruments to a Client Account which may be identical to or may differ from advice given to or instruments recommended or bought or sold for or by other Accounts, affiliates, or employees, even though their investment objectives may be the same or similar.

Cross or Principal Transactions

Ellington, an Ellington Client Account, or a member or principal account of the Ellington Group may buy securities from or sell securities to a Client Account where consistent with the best interests of participating Clients, applicable law (including the 1940 Act) and the governing, advisory, and other documents related to the participating Clients.

Differing Interests in an Issuer

Client Accounts may, from time to time, make an investment in an issuer in a different level of whose capital structure the Ellington Group or one or more other Client Accounts has invested. Such circumstances may result in a conflict among or with such Client Accounts to the extent that a Client Account holds securities with rights, preferences, or privileges with respect to an issuer that are different than those held by other Client Accounts or the Ellington Group. In such instances, Ellington, in its sole discretion when acting in the best interests of each Client, may make recommendations and decisions regarding such rights or privileges for other entities that may be the same as or different from those made by or on behalf a Client Account and may take actions (or elect to take no action) in the context of these other economic interests or relationships the consequences of which may be adverse to the interests of a particular Client Account.

Other Activities and Affiliations

Ellington and the Ellington Group are not restricted from forming additional funds or vehicles, from entering into other investment advisory relationships, or from engaging in other business, academic, public policy, or charitable activities, even though such activities may be in competition with a Client Account or its interests or may involve substantial time and resources of Ellington's principals or employees. Although Ellington and its principals and employees will devote as much of their time to the activities of Client Accounts as they deem necessary and appropriate, these other activities could be viewed as creating a conflict of interest in that the time and effort of Ellington and its related persons will be allocated among various Client Accounts and business activities.

Other Relationships with Brokers and Counterparties

The Ellington Group may have other interests in or business arrangements with brokers and dealers used to execute transactions for Client Accounts, including the Fund.

Certain brokers or other counterparties for Ellington's Client Accounts may offer capital introduction services. Capital introduction is a service designed to introduce fund managers to potential investors, typically through individual meetings or in a conference format. Although capital introduction is customarily offered as a free service, various conflicts of interest are presented by such arrangements. Ellington may, for example, have an incentive to use the services of a specific broker due to the broker's ability to raise capital for management by Ellington or another member of the Ellington Group.

The Ellington Group may have other business arrangements with brokers and dealers used to execute transactions for Clients. For example, brokerage firms and their affiliates and representatives may also be Ellington Clients or invest in pooled investment vehicles managed by the Ellington Group. Brokerage firms may also provide financing, underwriting, placement or other services to the Ellington Group or other Client Accounts.

In addition, brokerage firms and their employees may offer gifts to Ellington’s employees, and may invite employees to entertainment and social events. Acceptance of such gifts and entertainment is subject to policies set forth in Ellington’s Code of Ethics. Ellington policy prohibits consideration of factors such as receipt of gifts and entertainment when selecting brokers and counterparties to execute transactions for Client Accounts.

Karya.

Compensation. The portfolio manager, Rajiv Sobti, directly or indirectly owns 100% of Karya. Since the company’s inception in 2011, Dr. Sobti has received no salary or bonus from Karya or its affiliates, as his compensation has come exclusively from the increase in value of Karya and its affiliates.

Fund Shares Owned by Portfolio Manager. The Fund is required to show the dollar amount range of the portfolio manager’s “beneficial ownership” of shares of the Fund as of the end of the most recently completed fiscal year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. “Beneficial ownership” is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the 1934 Act.

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares ¹
<u>Karya</u>	
Dr. Rajiv Sobti	\$100,001-\$500,000

¹ Valuation date is October 31, 2015.

Other Accounts. In addition to the Fund, the portfolio manager is responsible for the day-to-day management of certain other accounts, as listed below. The information below is provided as of October 31, 2015.

	Registered Investment Companies		Other Pooled Investment Vehicles		Other Accounts	
	Number of Accounts	Total Assets	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)
Dr. Rajiv Sobti	0	\$0	3 ¹	\$559	4 ²	\$341

¹ These accounts are subject to performance-based advisory fees.

² Includes 3 accounts with assets under management of \$241 million that are subject to performance-based advisory fees.

Conflicts of Interest. Karya’s portfolio manager’s management of other accounts (collectively, the “Other Accounts”) may give rise to potential conflicts of interest in connection with his management of the Fund’s investments, on the one hand, and the investments of the Other Accounts, on the other. The Other Accounts might have similar investment objectives as the Fund or hold, purchase or sell securities that are eligible to be held, purchased or sold by the Fund. Karya does not believe that these conflicts, if any, are material or, to the extent any such conflicts are material, Karya believes that it has designed policies and procedures to manage those conflicts in an appropriate way.

A potential conflict of interest may arise as a result of Karya’s portfolio manager’s day-to-day management of the Fund. Because of his position with the Fund, the portfolio manager knows the size, timing and possible market impact of Fund trades. It is theoretically possible that Karya’s portfolio manager could use this information to the advantage of Other Accounts he manages and to the possible detriment of the Fund. However, Karya has adopted policies and procedures reasonably designed to allocate investment opportunities on a fair and equitable basis over time.

A potential conflict of interest may arise as a result of Karya’s portfolio manager’s management of the Fund and Other Accounts, which, in theory, may allow him to allocate investment opportunities in a way that favors Other Accounts over the Fund. This conflict of interest may be exacerbated to the extent that Karya or its portfolio manager receive, or expect to receive, greater compensation from management of the Other Accounts (many of which receive a base and incentive fee) than from the Fund. Notwithstanding this theoretical conflict of interest, it is Karya’s policy to manage each account based on its investment objectives and related restrictions and, as discussed above, Karya has adopted policies and procedures reasonably designed to allocate investment opportunities on a fair and equitable basis over time and in a manner consistent with each account’s investment objectives and related restrictions. For example, while Karya’s portfolio manager may buy for Other Accounts securities that differ in identity or quantity from securities bought for the Fund, such securities might not be suitable for the Fund given its investment objective and related restrictions.

MAI.

Compensation. The portfolio manager, Kazuhiro Shimbo, receives a combination of a fixed salary and an annual, discretionary bonus. In determining the amount of the bonus, MAI considers, among other things, the performance of the investment funds advised by MAI and the overall performance of MAI. The portfolio manager also participates in an employee 401(k) plan, which enables him to direct a percentage of his pre-tax salary and bonus into a qualified retirement plan, with an employer contribution of a certain percentage of total compensation, subject to applicable limits. There is no material difference between the portfolio manager’s compensation with respect to the Fund and the Other Accounts (as defined below).

Fund Shares Owned by Portfolio Manager. The Fund is required to show the dollar amount range of the portfolio manager’s “beneficial ownership” of shares of the Fund as of the end of the most recently completed fiscal year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. “Beneficial ownership” is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the 1934 Act.

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares ¹
<u>MAI</u>	
Kazuhiro Shimbo	\$50,001 - \$100,000

¹ Valuation date is October 31, 2015.

Other Accounts. In addition to the Fund, the portfolio manager is responsible for the day-to-day management of certain other accounts, as listed below. The information below is provided as of October 31, 2015.

	Registered Investment Companies		Other Pooled Investment Vehicles		Other Accounts	
	Number of Accounts	Total Assets	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets
Kazuhiro Shimbo	0	\$0	15 ¹	\$1,003	0	\$0

¹ Includes 6 accounts with assets under management of \$316 million that are subject to performance-based advisory fees.

Conflicts of Interest. In addition to managing the activities of the Fund, MAI, its affiliates and managers, members, officers, directors, agents, and employees act as investment manager, investment adviser, sponsor, manager, general partner or managing member for other clients, investment funds, accounts and collective

investment vehicles (“Other Accounts”) and give advice, and take action, with respect to any of those Other Accounts (including, without limitation, Mizuho Bank Ltd. and its affiliates) that may differ from the advice given, or the timing or nature of action taken, with respect to the Fund. MAI and its affiliates may advise Other Accounts that trade in identical or similar underlying investments, or similar strategies, as the Fund and that are generally classified as the same type of fund product, even though such activities may be in competition with the Fund and/or may involve substantial time and resources of MAI or its affiliates. These activities could be viewed as creating a conflict of interest in that the time and effort of the members of MAI and its officers and employees will not be devoted exclusively to the business of the Fund, but will be allocated between the business of the Fund and the management of the Other Accounts of MAI. Moreover, in contrast to the Fund, such Other Accounts may pay MAI a performance fee, which could create an incentive for MAI to allocate more profitable trades and investment opportunities to such Other Accounts instead of to the Fund. MAI has adopted policies and procedures reasonably designed to allocate investment opportunities on a fair and equitable basis over time and in a manner consistent with each account’s investment objectives and related restrictions. To that end, MAI may bunch or aggregate orders for the Fund with orders for the Other Accounts.

Winton.

Compensation. Compensation for Messrs. Harding and Beddall includes a fixed salary and (in the case of Mr. Beddall) may include a quarterly bonus (a portion of which may be deferred). The bonuses may be tied, in part, to the performance of the Fund or any other funds advised by the Winton group. In addition, a portion of the salary and bonus may be based on a variety of factors, including the financial performance of the Winton group and execution of the individual’s responsibilities. Compensation is assessed in accordance a remuneration policy (designed to support key business strategies without creating incentives for undue risk-taking) and is subject to approval by a remuneration committee chaired by an independent non-executive director of Winton’s parent company, Winton Capital Group Limited.

Fund Shares Owned. The following table shows the dollar amount range of each of Messrs. Harding’s and Beddall’s “beneficial ownership” of shares of the Fund as of the end of the most recently completed fiscal year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. “Beneficial ownership” is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the 1934 Act.

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares ¹
David Winton Harding	None
Matthew David Beddall	None

¹ Valuation date is October 31, 2015.

Other Accounts. In addition to the Fund, Messrs. Harding and Beddall are primarily responsible for the day-to-day advisement of certain other accounts, as listed below. The information below is provided as of October 31, 2015, and excludes accounts where the Winton group has advisory but not discretionary authority.

Name	Registered Investment Companies		Other Pooled Investment Vehicles		Other Accounts	
	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)	Number of Accounts	Total Assets (in Millions)
David Winton Harding	3 ¹	\$51.5	64 ²	\$31,613.0	9 ³	\$1,060.4
Matthew David Beddall	3 ¹	\$51.5	64 ²	\$31,613.0	9 ³	\$1,060.4

- 1 Includes 1 account with assets under management of \$9.7 million that is subject to performance-based advisory fees.
- 2 Includes 62 accounts with assets under management of \$31,243.2 million that are subject to performance-based advisory fees.
- 3 Includes 3 accounts with assets under management of \$415.8 million that are subject to performance-based advisory fees.

Conflicts of Interest. A potential conflict of interest may arise as a result of Winton's provision of advisory services to Other Accounts. Other Accounts may pay higher management fees than the Fund or may pay performance fees (which the Fund does not) and this could create an incentive for Winton to favor such funds in the allocation of investment opportunities.

Winton has implemented procedures that are designed to ensure that investment opportunities are allocated in a manner that: (i) treats all of its clients fairly and equitably; (ii) prevents conflict regarding allocation of investment opportunities among its clients; and (iii) complies with applicable regulatory requirements. For example, Winton uses an allocation algorithm designed to allocate all filled orders ratably based on a defined allocation procedure. Notwithstanding the foregoing, an aggregated order may be allocated on a different basis under certain circumstances depending on factors which include, but are not limited to, available cash, liquidity requirements, risk parameters and legal and/or regulatory requirements.

Winton and its investment personnel may hold investments in Other Accounts. This may create an incentive for Winton and its investment personnel to take investment actions based on those investment interests which might diverge, in some cases, from the interests of other clients or to favor or disfavor certain funds over other funds. Any potential conflict that arises from these circumstances is mitigated by several factors, including: (i) the requirement that any material changes to Winton's investment system must be tested and reviewed and approved by Winton's investment management meeting; (ii) the fact that Winton's investment system is designed to achieve long-term capital appreciation as opposed to short-term profits; and (iii) the fact that most of Winton's investments are made in accordance with the signals produced by its investment system.

Certain broker-dealers that Winton may use to execute Fund transactions are also clients of Winton and/or may refer clients to Winton, which creates potential conflicts of interest. These conflicts are addressed by the fact that Winton adheres to a policy that prohibits Winton from considering any factor other than best execution for its clients when Winton executes client transactions.

THE ADMINISTRATOR

General. SEI Investments Global Funds Services (the "Administrator"), a Delaware statutory trust, has its principal business offices at One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456. SEI Investments Management Corporation ("SIMC"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of SEI Investments Company ("SEI Investments"), is the owner of all beneficial interest in the Administrator. SEI Investments and its subsidiaries and affiliates, including the Administrator, are leading providers of fund evaluation services, trust accounting systems, and brokerage and information services to financial institutions, institutional investors, and money managers. The Administrator and its affiliates also serve as administrator or sub-administrator to other mutual funds.

Administration Agreement with the Trust. The Trust and the Administrator have entered into an administration agreement dated February 12, 2014 (the "Administration Agreement"). Under the Administration Agreement, the Administrator provides the Trust with administrative services, including regulatory reporting and all necessary office space, equipment, personnel and facilities.

The Administration Agreement provides that the Administrator shall not be liable for any error of judgment or mistake of law or for any loss suffered by the Trust in connection with the matters to which the Administration

Agreement relates, except a loss resulting from willful misfeasance, bad faith or gross negligence on the part of the Administrator in the performance of its duties or from reckless disregard by it of its duties and obligations thereunder.

Administration Fees Paid to the Administrator. For its services under the Administration Agreement, the Administrator is paid a fee, which varies based on the average daily net assets of the Fund, subject to certain minimums. For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014 and 2015, the Fund paid the following amounts for these services:

Administration Fees Paid	
2014¹	2015
\$63,288	\$225,001

1 Represents the period from July 25, 2014 (commencement of Fund operations) to October 31, 2014.

THE DISTRIBUTOR

The Trust and SEI Investments Distribution Co. (the “Distributor”), a wholly-owned subsidiary of SEI Investments, and an affiliate of the Administrator, are parties to a distribution agreement dated February 12, 2014 (“Distribution Agreement”), whereby the Distributor acts as principal underwriter for the Trust’s shares. The principal business address of the Distributor is One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456.

The continuance of the Distribution Agreement must be specifically approved at least annually (i) by the vote of the Trustees or by a vote of the majority of the shareholders of the Trust and (ii) by the vote of a majority of the Trustees who are not “interested persons” of the Trust and have no direct or indirect financial interest in the operations of the Distribution Agreement or any related agreement, cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on such approval. The Distribution Agreement will terminate automatically in the event of its assignment (as such term is defined in the 1940 Act), and is terminable at any time without penalty by the Board or by a majority of the outstanding shares of the Trust, upon not more than 60 days’ written notice by either party.

PAYMENTS TO FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES

Distribution Plan. The Trust has adopted a Distribution Plan with respect to the Investor Class Shares (the “Plan”) in accordance with the provisions of Rule 12b-1 under the 1940 Act, which regulates circumstances under which an investment company may directly or indirectly bear expenses relating to the distribution of its shares. Continuance of the Plan must be approved annually by a majority of the Trustees and by a majority of the Trustees who are not interested persons (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Trust and have no direct or indirect financial interest in the Plan or in any agreements related to the Plan (“Qualified Trustees”). The Plan requires that quarterly written reports of amounts spent under the Plan and the purposes of such expenditures be furnished to and reviewed by the Trustees. The Plan may not be amended to increase materially the amount that may be spent thereunder without approval by a majority of the outstanding shares of the Fund. All material amendments of the Plan will require approval by a majority of the Trustees and of the Qualified Trustees.

The Plan provides a method of paying for distribution and shareholder services, which may help the Fund grow or maintain asset levels to provide operational efficiencies and economies of scale, provided by the Distributor or other financial intermediaries that enter into agreements with the Distributor. The Fund may make payments to financial intermediaries, such as banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, investment counselors, broker-dealers, mutual fund “supermarkets” and the Distributor’s affiliates and subsidiaries, as compensation for services, reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with distribution assistance or provision of shareholder services. The Distributor may, at its discretion, retain a portion of such payments to compensate itself for distribution services and distribution related expenses such as the costs of preparation,

printing, mailing or otherwise disseminating sales literature, advertising, and prospectuses (other than those furnished to current shareholders of the Fund), promotional and incentive programs, and such other marketing expenses that the Distributor may incur.

Under the Plan, the Distributor or financial intermediaries may receive up to 0.25% of the average daily net assets of the Investor Class Shares as compensation for distribution and shareholder services. The Plan is characterized as a compensation plan since the distribution fee will be paid to the Distributor without regard to the distribution or shareholder service expenses incurred by the Distributor or the amount of payments made to financial intermediaries. The Trust intends to operate the Plan in accordance with its terms and with Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (“FINRA”) rules concerning sales charges.

For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014 and 2015, the Fund paid the Distributor the following distribution fees:

Share Class	12b-1 Fees Paid		12b-1 Fees Retained by the Distributor	
	2014 ¹	2015	2014 ¹	2015
Investor Class	\$6	\$3,328	\$0	\$38.32

1 Represents the period from July 25, 2014 (commencement of Fund operations) to October 31, 2014.

Shareholder Servicing Plan. The Fund has adopted a shareholder servicing plan under which a shareholder servicing fee of up to 0.10% of average daily net assets of Investor Class Shares of the Fund will be paid to financial intermediaries. Under the plan, financial intermediaries may perform, or may compensate other financial intermediaries for performing, certain shareholder and administrative services, including: (i) maintaining shareholder accounts; (ii) arranging for bank wires; (iii) responding to shareholder inquiries relating to the services performed by the financial intermediaries; (iv) responding to inquiries from shareholders concerning their investment in the Fund; (v) assisting shareholders in changing dividend options, account designations and addresses; (vi) providing information periodically to shareholders showing their position in the Fund; (vii) forwarding shareholder communications from the Fund such as proxies, shareholder reports, annual reports, and dividend and capital gain distribution and tax notices to shareholders; (viii) processing purchase, exchange and redemption requests from shareholders and placing orders with the Fund or its service providers; (ix) providing sub-accounting services; (x) processing dividend and capital gain payments from the Fund on behalf of shareholders; (xi) preparing tax reports; and (xii) providing such other similar non-distribution services as the Fund may reasonably request to the extent that the financial intermediary is permitted to do so under applicable laws or regulations.

Other Payments by the Fund. The Fund may enter into agreements with financial intermediaries pursuant to which the Fund may pay financial intermediaries for non-distribution-related sub-transfer agency, administrative, sub-accounting, and other shareholder services. Payments made pursuant to such agreements are generally based on either (1) a percentage of the average daily net assets of Fund shareholders serviced by a financial intermediary, or (2) the number of Fund shareholders serviced by a financial intermediary. Any payments made pursuant to such agreements may be in addition to, rather than in lieu of, distribution or shareholder services fees the Fund may pay to financial intermediaries pursuant to the Fund’s distribution plan or shareholder servicing plan.

Other Payments by the Adviser and Sub-Advisers. The Adviser, the Sub-Advisers and/or their affiliates, in their discretion, may make payments from their own resources and not from Fund assets to affiliated or unaffiliated brokers, dealers, banks (including bank trust departments), trust companies, registered investment advisers, financial planners, retirement plan administrators, insurance companies, and any other institution having

a service, administration, or any similar arrangement with the Fund, its service providers or their respective affiliates, as incentives to help market and promote the Fund and/or in recognition of their distribution, marketing, administrative services, and/or processing support.

These additional payments may be made to financial intermediaries that sell Fund shares or provide services to the Fund, the Distributor or shareholders of the Fund through the financial intermediary's retail distribution channel and/or fund supermarkets. Payments may also be made through the financial intermediary's retirement, qualified tuition, fee-based advisory, wrap fee bank trust, or insurance (e.g., individual or group annuity) programs. These payments may include, but are not limited to, placing the Fund in a financial intermediary's retail distribution channel or on a preferred or recommended fund list; providing business or shareholder financial planning assistance; educating financial intermediary personnel about the Fund; providing access to sales and management representatives of the financial intermediary; promoting sales of Fund shares; providing marketing and educational support; maintaining share balances and/or for sub-accounting, administrative or shareholder transaction processing services. A financial intermediary may perform the services itself or may arrange with a third party to perform the services.

The Adviser, the Sub-Advisers and/or their affiliates may also make payments from their own resources to financial intermediaries for costs associated with the purchase of products or services used in connection with sales and marketing, participation in and/or presentation at conferences or seminars, sales or training programs, client and investor entertainment and other sponsored events. The costs and expenses associated with these efforts may include travel, lodging, sponsorship at educational seminars and conferences, entertainment and meals to the extent permitted by law.

Revenue sharing payments may be negotiated based on a variety of factors, including the level of sales, the amount of Fund assets attributable to investments in the Fund by financial intermediaries customers, a flat fee or other measures as determined from time to time by the Adviser, the Sub-Advisers and/or their affiliates. A significant purpose of these payments is to increase the sales of Fund shares, which in turn may benefit the Adviser and the Sub-Advisers through increased fees as Fund assets grow.

Investors should understand that some financial intermediaries may also charge their clients fees in connection with purchases of shares or the provision of shareholder services.

THE TRANSFER AGENT

DST Systems, Inc., 333 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64105 (the "Transfer Agent"), serves as the Fund's transfer agent.

THE CUSTODIAN

MUFG Union Bank, N.A., 350 California Street, 6th Floor, San Francisco, California 94104 (the "Custodian"), acts as custodian of the Fund. The Custodian holds cash, securities and other assets of the Fund as required by the 1940 Act.

INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

KPMG LLP, 1601 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103, serves as the independent registered public accounting firm for the Fund. The financial statements and notes thereto incorporated by reference have been audited by KPMG LLP, as indicated in their report with respect thereto, and are incorporated by reference in reliance on the authority of their report as experts in accounting and auditing.

LEGAL COUNSEL

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, 1701 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2921, serves as legal counsel to the Trust.

TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS OF THE TRUST

Board Responsibilities. The management and affairs of the Trust and its series, including the Fund described in this SAI, are overseen by the Trustees. The Board has approved contracts, as described above, under which certain companies provide essential management services to the Trust.

Like most mutual funds, the day-to-day business of the Trust, including the management of risk, is performed by third party service providers, such as the Adviser, the Sub-Advisers, the Distributor and the Administrator. The Trustees are responsible for overseeing the Trust's service providers and, thus, have oversight responsibility with respect to risk management performed by those service providers. Risk management seeks to identify and address risks, i.e., events or circumstances that could have material adverse effects on the business, operations, shareholder services, investment performance or reputation of the funds. The funds and their service providers employ a variety of processes, procedures and controls to identify various possible events or circumstances, to lessen the probability of their occurrence and/or to mitigate the effects of such events or circumstances if they do occur. Each service provider is responsible for one or more discrete aspects of the Trust's business (e.g., the Adviser and the Sub-Advisers are responsible for the day-to-day management of the Fund's portfolio investments) and, consequently, for managing the risks associated with that business. The Board has emphasized to the funds' service providers the importance of maintaining vigorous risk management.

The Trustees' role in risk oversight begins before the inception of a fund, at which time certain of the fund's service providers present the Board with information concerning the investment objectives, strategies and risks of the fund as well as proposed investment limitations for the fund. Additionally, the fund's adviser provides the Board with an overview of, among other things, its investment philosophy, brokerage practices and compliance infrastructure. Thereafter, the Board continues its oversight function as various personnel, including the Trust's Chief Compliance Officer, as well as personnel of the adviser and other service providers, such as the fund's independent accountants, make periodic reports to the Audit Committee or to the Board with respect to various aspects of risk management. The Board and the Audit Committee oversee efforts by management and service providers to manage risks to which the funds may be exposed.

The Board is responsible for overseeing the nature, extent and quality of the services provided to the funds by the adviser and receives information about those services at its regular meetings. In addition, on an annual basis, in connection with its consideration of whether to renew the advisory agreement with the adviser, the Board meets with the adviser to review such services. Among other things, the Board regularly considers the adviser's adherence to the funds' investment restrictions and compliance with various fund policies and procedures and with applicable securities regulations. The Board also reviews information about the funds' investments, including, for example, portfolio holdings schedules and reports on the adviser's use of derivatives in managing the funds, if any, as well as reports on the funds' investments in ETFs, if any.

The Trust's Chief Compliance Officer reports regularly to the Board to review and discuss compliance issues and fund and adviser risk assessments. At least annually, the Trust's Chief Compliance Officer provides the Board with a report reviewing the adequacy and effectiveness of the Trust's policies and procedures and those of its service providers, including the adviser. The report addresses the operation of the policies and procedures of the Trust and each service provider since the date of the last report; any material changes to the policies and procedures since the date of the last report; any recommendations for material changes to the policies and procedures; and any material compliance matters since the date of the last report.

The Board receives reports from the funds' service providers regarding operational risks and risks related to the valuation and liquidity of portfolio securities. The Trust's Fair Value Pricing Committee makes regular reports to the Board concerning investments for which market quotations are not readily available. Annually, the independent registered public accounting firm reviews with the Audit Committee its audit of the funds' financial statements, focusing on major areas of risk encountered by the funds and noting any significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in the funds' internal controls. Additionally, in connection with its oversight function, the Board oversees fund management's implementation of disclosure controls and procedures, which are designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed by the Trust in its periodic reports with the SEC are recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the required time periods. The Board also oversees the Trust's internal controls over financial reporting, which comprise policies and procedures designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of the Trust's financial reporting and the preparation of the Trust's financial statements.

From their review of these reports and discussions with the adviser, the Chief Compliance Officer, the independent registered public accounting firm and other service providers, the Board and the Audit Committee learn in detail about the material risks of the funds, thereby facilitating a dialogue about how management and service providers identify and mitigate those risks.

The Board recognizes that not all risks that may affect the funds can be identified and/or quantified, that it may not be practical or cost-effective to eliminate or mitigate certain risks, that it may be necessary to bear certain risks (such as investment-related risks) to achieve the funds' goals, and that the processes, procedures and controls employed to address certain risks may be limited in their effectiveness. Moreover, reports received by the Trustees as to risk management matters are typically summaries of the relevant information. Most of the funds' investment management and business affairs are carried out by or through the funds' advisers and other service providers, each of which has an independent interest in risk management but whose policies and the methods by which one or more risk management functions are carried out may differ from the funds' and each other's in the setting of priorities, the resources available or the effectiveness of relevant controls. As a result of the foregoing and other factors, the Board's ability to monitor and manage risk, as a practical matter, is subject to limitations.

Members of the Board. There are four members of the Board, three of whom are not interested persons of the Trust, as that term is defined in the 1940 Act ("independent Trustees"). Mr. Doran, an interested person of the Trust, serves as Chairman of the Board. Mr. Hunt, an independent Trustee, serves as the lead independent Trustee. The Trust has determined its leadership structure is appropriate given the specific characteristics and circumstances of the Trust. The Trust made this determination in consideration of, among other things, the fact that the independent Trustees constitute three-quarters of the Board, the fact that the chairperson of each Committee of the Board is an independent Trustee, the amount of assets under management in the Trust, and the number of funds (and classes of shares) overseen by the Board. The Board also believes that its leadership structure facilitates the orderly and efficient flow of information to the independent Trustees from fund management.

The Board has two standing committees: the Audit Committee and Governance Committee. The Audit Committee and Governance Committee are chaired by an independent Trustee and composed of all of the independent Trustees. In addition, the Board has a lead independent Trustee.

In his role as lead independent Trustee, Mr. Hunt, among other things: (i) presides over Board meetings in the absence of the Chairman of the Board; (ii) presides over executive sessions of the independent Trustees; (iii) along with the Chairman of the Board, oversees the development of agendas for Board meetings; (iv) facilitates communication between the independent Trustees and management, and among the independent Trustees; (v)

serves as a key point person for dealings between the independent Trustees and management; and (vi) has such other responsibilities as the Board or independent Trustees determine from time to time.

Set forth below are the names, years of birth, position with the Trust, and the principal occupations and other directorships held during at least the last five years of each of the persons currently serving as a Trustee. There is no stated term of office for the Trustees. Unless otherwise noted, the business address of each Trustee is SEI Investments Company, One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456.

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust	Principal Occupations in the Past 5 Years	Other Directorships Held in the Past 5 Years
<u>Interested Trustee</u>			
William M. Doran (Born: 1940)	Chairman of the Board of Trustees ¹ (since 2014)	Self-Employed Consultant since 2003. Partner at Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP (law firm) from 1976 to 2003. Counsel to the Trust, SEI Investments, SIMC, the Administrator and the Distributor.	Current Directorships: Trustee of The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund, The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund II, Bishop Street Funds, The KP Funds, O'Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company), Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company), Gallery Trust, SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Liquid Asset Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. Director of SEI Investments (Europe), Limited, SEI Investments—Global Funds Services, Limited, SEI Investments Global, Limited, SEI Investments (Asia), Limited, SEI Global Nominee Ltd., SEI Investments – Unit Trust Management (UK) Limited and SEI Investments Co. Director of the Distributor since 2003. Former Directorships: Director of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP to 2013.
<u>Independent Trustees</u>			
Jon C. Hunt (Born: 1951)	Trustee (since 2014)	Retired since 2013. Consultant to Management, Convergent Capital	Current Directorships: Trustee of City National Rochdale Funds, O'Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company), Winton Series

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust	Principal Occupations in the Past 5 Years	Other Directorships Held in the Past 5 Years
		Management, LLC (“CCM”) from 2012 to 2013. Managing Director and Chief Operating Officer, CCM from 1998 to 2012.	Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company) and Gallery Trust. Member of Independent Committee of Nuveen Commodities Asset Management.
Thomas P. Lemke (Born: 1954)	Trustee (since 2014)	Retired since 2013. Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Legg Mason, Inc. from 2005 to 2013.	Current Directorships: Trustee of AXA Premier VIP Trust, O’Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company), Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company), Gallery Trust and JP Morgan Active ETFs. Former Directorship: Director of Victory Funds to 2015.
Randall S. Yanker (Born: 1960)	Trustee (since 2014)	Co-Founder and Senior Partner, Alternative Asset Managers, L.P. since 2004.	Current Directorships: Trustee of O’Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company), Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company) and Gallery Trust. Independent Non-Executive Director of HFA Holdings Limited.

1 Mr. Doran may be deemed to be an “interested” person of the Fund as that term is defined in the 1940 Act by virtue of his affiliation with the Distributor and/or its affiliates.

Individual Trustee Qualifications

The Trust has concluded that each of the Trustees should serve on the Board because of their ability to review and understand information about the Fund provided to them by management, to identify and request other information they may deem relevant to the performance of their duties, to question management and other service providers regarding material factors bearing on the management and administration of the Fund, and to exercise their business judgment in a manner that serves the best interests of the Fund’s shareholders. The Trust has concluded that each of the Trustees should serve as a Trustee based on their own experience, qualifications, attributes and skills as described below.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Doran should serve as Trustee because of the experience he gained serving as a Partner in the Investment Management and Securities Industry Practice of a large law firm, his experience in and knowledge of the financial services industry, and the experience he has gained serving on other mutual fund boards.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Hunt should serve as Trustee because of the experience he gained in a variety of leadership roles with different investment management institutions, his experience in and knowledge of the

financial services industry, and the experience he has gained as a board member of open-end, closed-end and private funds investing in a broad range of asset classes, including alternative asset classes.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Lemke should serve as Trustee because of the extensive experience he gained in the financial services industry, including experience in various senior management positions with financial services firms and multiple years of service with a regulatory agency, his background in controls, including legal, compliance and risk management, and his service as general counsel for several financial services firms.

The Trust has concluded that Mr. Yanker should serve as Trustee because of the experience he gained in a variety of leadership roles with the alternative asset management divisions of various financial services firms, his experience in and knowledge of the financial services industry, and the experience he has gained advising institutions on alternative asset management.

In its periodic assessment of the effectiveness of the Board, the Board considers the complementary individual skills and experience of the individual Trustees primarily in the broader context of the Board's overall composition so that the Board, as a body, possesses the appropriate (and appropriately diverse) skills and experience to oversee the business of the funds.

Board Committees. The Board has established the following standing committees:

- **Audit Committee.** The Board has a standing Audit Committee that is composed of each of the independent Trustees of the Trust. The Audit Committee operates under a written charter approved by the Board. The principal responsibilities of the Audit Committee include: (i) recommending which firm to engage as each fund's independent registered public accounting firm and whether to terminate this relationship; (ii) reviewing the independent registered public accounting firm's compensation, the proposed scope and terms of its engagement, and the firm's independence; (iii) pre-approving audit and non-audit services provided by each fund's independent registered public accounting firm to the Trust and certain other affiliated entities; (iv) serving as a channel of communication between the independent registered public accounting firm and the Trustees; (v) reviewing the results of each external audit, including any qualifications in the independent registered public accounting firm's opinion, any related management letter, management's responses to recommendations made by the independent registered public accounting firm in connection with the audit, reports submitted to the Committee by the internal auditing department of the Administrator that are material to the Trust as a whole, if any, and management's responses to any such reports; (vi) reviewing each fund's audited financial statements and considering any significant disputes between the Trust's management and the independent registered public accounting firm that arose in connection with the preparation of those financial statements; (vii) considering, in consultation with the independent registered public accounting firm and the Trust's senior internal accounting executive, if any, the independent registered public accounting firms' reports on the adequacy of the Trust's internal financial controls; (viii) reviewing, in consultation with each fund's independent registered public accounting firm, major changes regarding auditing and accounting principles and practices to be followed when preparing each fund's financial statements; and (ix) other audit related matters. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Lemke and Mr. Yanker currently serve as members of the Audit Committee. Mr. Lemke serves as the Chairman of the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee meets periodically, as necessary, and met four (4) times during the most recently completed fiscal year.
- **Governance Committee.** The Board has a standing Governance Committee that is composed of each of the independent Trustees of the Trust. The Governance Committee operates under a written charter approved by the Board. The principal responsibilities of the Governance Committee include: (i) considering and reviewing Board governance and compensation issues; (ii) conducting a self-assessment of the Board's operations; (iii) selecting and nominating all persons to serve as independent Trustees and

evaluating the qualifications of “interested” Trustee candidates; and (iv) reviewing shareholder recommendations for nominations to fill vacancies on the Board if such recommendations are submitted in writing and addressed to the Committee at the Trust’s office. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Lemke and Mr. Yanker currently serve as members of the Governance Committee. Mr. Lemke serves as the Chairman of the Governance Committee. The Governance Committee meets periodically, as necessary, and met four (4) times during the most recently completed fiscal year.

Fair Value Pricing Committee. The Board has also established a standing Fair Value Pricing Committee that is composed of various representatives of the Trust’s service providers, as appointed by the Board. The Fair Value Pricing Committee operates under procedures approved by the Board. The principal responsibility of the Fair Value Pricing Committee is to determine the fair value of securities for which current market quotations are not readily available. The Fair Value Pricing Committee’s determinations are reviewed by the Board.

Fund Shares Owned by Board Members. The following table shows the dollar amount range of each Trustee’s “beneficial ownership” of shares of the Fund as of the end of the most recently completed calendar year. Dollar amount ranges disclosed are established by the SEC. “Beneficial ownership” is determined in accordance with Rule 16a-1(a)(2) under the 1934 Act. The Trustees and officers of the Trust own less than 1% of the outstanding shares of the Trust.

Name	Dollar Range of Fund Shares (Fund) ¹	Aggregate Dollar Range of Shares (All Funds in the Fund Complex) ^{1, 2}
Interested Trustee		
Doran	None	None
Independent Trustees		
Hunt	None	None
Lemke	None	\$10,001-\$50,000
Yanker	None	None

1 Valuation date is December 31, 2015.

2 The Trust is the only investment company in the Fund Complex.

Board Compensation. The Trust paid the following fees to the Trustees during the Fund’s most recently completed fiscal year.

Name	Aggregate Compensation from the Trust	Total Compensation from the Trust
Interested Trustee		
William M. Doran	\$0	\$0 for service on one (1) board
Independent Trustees		
Jon C. Hunt	\$23,833	\$23,833 for service on one (1) board
Terrence O. Jones ¹	\$16,500	\$16,500 for service on one (1) board
Thomas P. Lemke	\$23,833	\$23,833 for service on one (1) board
Randall S. Yanker	\$23,833	\$23,833 for service on one (1) board

1 Resigned from the Board effective September 16, 2015.

Trust Officers. Set forth below are the names, year of birth, position with the Trust, and the principal occupations for the last five years of each of the persons currently serving as executive officers of the Trust. There is no stated term of office for the officers of the Trust. Unless otherwise noted, the business address of each officer is SEI Investments Company, One Freedom Valley Drive, Oaks, Pennsylvania 19456. The Chief Compliance Officer is the only officer who receives compensation from the Trust for his services.

Certain officers of the Trust also serve as officers of one or more mutual funds for which SEI Investments Company or its affiliates act as investment manager, administrator or distributor.

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust	Principal Occupations in Past 5 Years
Michael Beattie (Born: 1965)	President (since 2014)	Director of Client Service, SEI Investments Company, since 2004.
Robert Nesher (Born: 1946)	Vice Chairman (since 2014)	SEI employee 1974 to present; currently performs various services on behalf of SEI Investments for which Mr. Nesher is compensated. Vice Chairman of O'Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company), Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company) and Gallery Trust. President, Chief Executive Officer and Trustee of SEI Daily Income Trust, SEI Liquid Asset Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. President and Director of SEI Structured Credit Fund, LP. President, Chief Executive Officer and Director of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP, June 2007 to September 2013. President and Director of SEI Opportunity Fund, L.P. to 2010.
Stephen Connors (Born: 1984)	Treasurer, Controller and Chief Financial Officer (since 2015)	Director, SEI Investments, Fund Accounting since December 2014. Audit Manager, Deloitte & Touche LLP, from 2011 to 2014. Audit Supervisor, BBD, LLP (formerly Briggs, Bunting & Dougherty, LLP), from 2007 to 2011.
Dianne M. Descoteaux (Born: 1977)	Vice President and Secretary (since 2014)	Counsel at SEI Investments since 2010. Associate at Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP from 2006 to 2010.
Russell Emery (Born: 1962)	Chief Compliance Officer (since 2014)	Chief Compliance Officer of SEI Structured Credit Fund, LP since June 2007. Chief Compliance Officer of SEI Alpha Strategy Portfolios, LP from June 2007 to September 2013. Chief Compliance Officer of The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund, The Advisors' Inner Circle Fund II, Bishop Street Funds, The KP Funds, O'Connor EQUUS (closed-end investment company), Winton Series Trust, Winton Diversified Opportunities Fund (closed-end investment company), Gallery Trust, SEI Institutional Managed Trust, SEI Asset Allocation Trust, SEI Institutional International Trust, SEI Institutional Investments Trust, SEI Daily Income

Name and Year of Birth	Position with Trust	Principal Occupations in Past 5 Years
		Trust, SEI Liquid Asset Trust, SEI Tax Exempt Trust, Adviser Managed Trust, New Covenant Funds, SEI Insurance Products Trust and SEI Catholic Values Trust. Chief Compliance Officer of SEI Opportunity Fund, L.P. until 2010.
Lisa Whittaker (Born: 1978)	Vice President and Assistant Secretary (since 2014)	Attorney, SEI Investments Company (2012-present). Associate Counsel and Compliance Officer, The Glenmede Trust Company, N.A. (2011-2012). Associate, Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP (2006-2011).
John Y. Kim (Born: 1981)	Vice President and Assistant Secretary (since 2014)	Attorney, SEI Investments Company (2014-present). Associate, Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP (2009-2014).
Bridget E. Sudall (Born: 1980)	Privacy Officer (since 2015) Anti-Money Laundering Officer (since 2015)	Senior Associate and AML Officer, Morgan Stanley Alternative Investment Partners (2011-2015). Investor Services Team Lead, Morgan Stanley Alternative Investment Partners (2007-2011).

PURCHASING AND REDEEMING SHARES

Purchases and redemptions may be made through the Transfer Agent on any day the New York Stock Exchange (the “NYSE”) is open for business. Shares of the Fund are offered and redeemed on a continuous basis. Currently, the Trust is closed for business when the following holidays are observed: New Year’s Day, Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Presidents’ Day, Good Friday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas.

It is currently the Trust’s policy to pay all redemptions in cash. The Trust retains the right, however, to alter this policy to provide for redemptions in whole or in part by a distribution in-kind of securities held by the Fund in lieu of cash. Shareholders may incur brokerage charges on the sale of any such securities so received in payment of redemptions.

The Trust reserves the right to suspend the right of redemption and/or to postpone the date of payment upon redemption during times when the NYSE is closed, other than during customary weekends or holidays, for any period on which trading on the NYSE is restricted (as determined by the SEC by rule or regulation), or during the existence of an emergency (as determined by the SEC by rule or regulation) as a result of which disposal or valuation of the Fund’s securities is not reasonably practicable, or for such other periods as the SEC has by order permitted. The Trust also reserves the right to suspend sales of shares of the Fund for any period during which the NYSE, the Adviser, the Sub-Advisers, the Administrator, the Transfer Agent and/or the Custodian are not open for business.

DETERMINATION OF NET ASSET VALUE

General Policy. The Fund adheres to Section 2(a)(41), and Rule 2a-4 thereunder, of the 1940 Act with respect to the valuation of portfolio securities. In general, securities for which market quotations are readily available are valued at current market value, and all other securities are valued at fair value in accordance with procedures

adopted by the Board. In complying with the 1940 Act, the Trust relies on guidance provided by the SEC and by the SEC staff in various interpretive letters and other guidance.

Equity Securities. Securities listed on a securities exchange, market or automated quotation system for which quotations are readily available (except for securities traded on NASDAQ), including securities traded over the counter, are valued at the last quoted sale price on an exchange or market (foreign or domestic) on which they are traded on the valuation date (or at approximately 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time if such exchange is normally open at that time), or, if there is no such reported sale on the valuation date, at the most recent quoted bid price. For securities traded on NASDAQ, the NASDAQ Official Closing Price will be used. If such prices are not available or determined to not represent the fair value of the security as of the Fund's pricing time, the security will be valued at fair value as determined in good faith using methods approved by the Board.

Money Market Securities and other Debt Securities. If available, money market securities and other debt securities are priced based upon valuations provided by recognized independent, third-party pricing agents. Such values generally reflect the last reported sales price if the security is actively traded. The third-party pricing agents may also value debt securities by employing methodologies that utilize actual market transactions, broker-supplied valuations, or other methodologies designed to identify the market value for such securities. Such methodologies generally consider such factors as security prices, yields, maturities, call features, ratings and developments relating to specific securities in arriving at valuations. Money market securities and other debt securities with remaining maturities of sixty days or less may be valued at their amortized cost, which approximates market value. If such prices are not available or determined to not represent the fair value of the security as of the Fund's pricing time, the security will be valued at fair value as determined in good faith using methods approved by the Board.

Foreign Securities. The prices for foreign securities are reported in local currency and converted to U.S. dollars using currency exchange rates. Exchange rates are provided daily by recognized independent pricing agents.

Derivatives and Other Complex Securities. Exchange traded options on securities and indices purchased by the Fund generally are valued at their last trade price or, if there is no last trade price, the last bid price. Exchange traded options on securities and indices written by the Fund generally are valued at their last trade price or, if there is no last trade price, the last asked price. In the case of options traded in the over-the-counter market, if the OTC option is also an exchange traded option, the Fund will follow the rules regarding the valuation of exchange traded options. If the OTC option is not also an exchange traded option, the Fund will value the option at fair value in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board.

Futures and swaps cleared through a central clearing house ("centrally cleared swaps") are valued at the settlement price established each day by the board of exchange on which they are traded. The daily settlement prices for financial futures are provided by an independent source. On days when there is excessive volume or market volatility, or the future or centrally cleared swap does not end trading by the time the Fund calculates NAV, the settlement price may not be available at the time at which the Fund calculates its NAV. On such days, the best available price (which is typically the last sales price) may be used to value the Fund's futures or centrally cleared swaps position.

Foreign currency forward contracts are valued at the current day's interpolated foreign exchange rate, as calculated using the current day's spot rate, and the thirty, sixty, ninety and one-hundred eighty day forward rates provided by an independent source.

If available, non-centrally cleared swaps, collateralized debt obligations, collateralized loan obligations and bank loans are priced based on valuations provided by an independent third party pricing agent. If a price is not available from an independent third party pricing agent, the security will be valued at fair value as determined in

good faith using methods approved by the Board.

Use of Third-Party Independent Pricing Agents and Independent Brokers. Pursuant to contracts with the Administrator, prices for most securities held by the Fund are provided daily by third-party independent pricing agents that are approved by the Board. The valuations provided by third-party independent pricing agents are reviewed daily by the Administrator.

If a security price cannot be obtained from an independent, third-party pricing agent, the Administrator shall seek to obtain a bid price from at least one independent broker.

Fair Value Procedures. Securities for which market prices are not “readily available” or which cannot be valued using the methodologies described above are valued in accordance with Fair Value Procedures established by the Board and implemented through the Fair Value Pricing Committee. The members of the Fair Valuation Committee report, as necessary, to the Board regarding portfolio valuation determinations. The Board, from time to time, will review these methods of valuation and will recommend changes which may be necessary to assure that the investments of the Fund are valued at fair value.

Some of the more common reasons that may necessitate a security being valued using Fair Value Procedures include: the security’s trading has been halted or suspended; the security has been de-listed from a national exchange; the security’s primary trading market is temporarily closed at a time when under normal conditions it would be open; the security has not been traded for an extended period of time; the security’s primary pricing source is not able or willing to provide a price; trading of the security is subject to local government-imposed restrictions; or a significant event with respect to a security has occurred after the close of the market or exchange on which the security principally trades and before the time the Fund calculates NAV. When a security is valued in accordance with the Fair Value Procedures, the Fair Value Pricing Committee will determine the value after taking into consideration relevant information reasonably available to the Fair Value Pricing Committee.

TAXES

The following is only a summary of certain additional U.S. federal income tax considerations generally affecting the Fund and its shareholders that is intended to supplement the discussion contained in the Prospectus. No attempt is made to present a detailed explanation of the tax treatment of the Fund or its shareholders, and the discussion here and in the Prospectus is not intended as a substitute for careful tax planning. Shareholders are urged to consult their tax advisors with specific reference to their own tax situations, including their state, local, and foreign tax liabilities.

The following general discussion of certain federal income tax consequences is based on the Code and the regulations issued thereunder as in effect on the date of this SAI. New legislation, as well as administrative changes or court decisions, may significantly change the conclusions expressed herein, and may have a retroactive effect with respect to the transactions contemplated herein.

Qualification as a Regulated Investment Company (“RIC”). The Fund intends to qualify and elects to be treated as a RIC. By following such a policy, the Fund expects to eliminate or reduce to a nominal amount the federal taxes to which it may be subject. If the Fund qualifies as a RIC, it will generally not be subject to federal income taxes on the net investment income and net realized capital gains that it timely distributes to its shareholders. The Board reserves the right not to maintain the qualification of the Fund as a RIC if it determines such course of action to be beneficial to shareholders.

In order to qualify as a RIC under the Code, the Fund must distribute annually to its shareholders at least 90% of its net investment income (which, includes dividends, taxable interest, and the excess of net short-term capital

gains over net long-term capital losses, less operating expenses) and at least 90% of its net tax exempt interest income, for each tax year, if any (the “Distribution Requirement”) and also must meet certain additional requirements. Among these requirements are the following: (i) at least 90% of the Fund’s gross income each taxable year must be derived from dividends, interest, payments with respect to certain securities loans, and gains from the sale or other disposition of stock, securities, or foreign currencies, or other income (including but not limited to gains from options, futures or forward contracts) derived with respect to its business of investing in such stock, securities, or currencies, and net income derived from an interest in a qualified publicly traded partnership (the “Qualifying Income Test”); and (ii) at the close of each quarter of the Fund’s taxable year: (A) at least 50% of the value of its total assets must be represented by cash and cash items, U.S. government securities, securities of other RICs and other securities, with such other securities limited, in respect to any one issuer, to an amount not greater than 5% of the value of the Fund’s total assets and that does not represent more than 10% of the outstanding voting securities of such issuer, including the equity securities of a qualified publicly traded partnership, and (B) not more than 25% of the value of its total assets is invested in the securities (other than U.S. government securities or securities of other RICs) of any one issuer or the securities (other than the securities of another RIC) of two or more issuers that the Fund controls and which are engaged in the same or similar trades or businesses or related trades or businesses, or the securities of one or more qualified publicly traded partnerships (the “Asset Test”). Although the Fund intends to distribute substantially all of its net investment income and may distribute its capital gains for any taxable year, the Fund will be subject to federal income taxation to the extent any such income or gains are not distributed.

In general, for purposes of the Qualifying Income Test described in (i) above, income derived from a partnership will be treated as qualifying income only to the extent such income is attributable to items of income of the partnership that would be qualifying income if realized directly by the Fund. However, 100% of the net income derived from an interest in a “qualified publicly traded partnership” (generally, a partnership (i) interests in which are traded on an established securities market or are readily tradable on a secondary market or the substantial equivalent thereof, (ii) that derives at least 90% of its income from the passive income sources specified in Code section 7704(d), and (iii) that derives less than 90% of its income from the qualifying income described in (i) of the prior paragraph) will be treated as qualifying income. In addition, although in general the passive loss rules of the Code do not apply to RICs, such rules do apply to a RIC with respect to items attributable to an interest in a qualified publicly traded partnership.

The Fund may invest in certain MLPs which may be treated as “qualified publicly traded partnerships.” As described above, income from “qualified publicly traded partnerships” is qualifying income for purposes of the Qualifying Income Test, but the Fund’s investment in one or more of such “qualified publicly traded partnerships” is limited under the Asset Test to no more than 25% of the value of the Fund’s assets. The Fund will monitor its investment in such “qualified publicly traded partnerships” in order to ensure compliance with the Qualifying Income Test.

The U.S. Treasury Department has authority to issue regulations that would exclude foreign currency gains from the Qualifying Income Test described above if such gains are not directly related to the Fund’s business of investing in stock or securities (or options and futures with respect to stock or securities). Accordingly, regulations may be issued in the future that could treat some or all of the Fund’s non-U.S. currency gains as non-qualifying income, thereby potentially jeopardizing the Fund’s status as a RIC for all years to which the regulations are applicable.

The Fund is currently permitted to purchase or sell financial and physical commodities, commodity contracts based on (or relating to) physical commodities or financial commodities and securities and derivative instruments whose values are derived (in whole or in part) from physical commodities or financial commodities. These commodity-based investments will likely generate non-qualifying income for the Fund under the Qualifying Income Test. The Fund intends to carefully monitor the income from such investments in order to satisfy the

Qualifying Income Test by maintaining the Fund's non-qualifying income below 10% of the Fund's gross income for a taxable year.

If the Fund fails to satisfy the Qualifying Income or Asset Tests in any taxable year, the Fund may be eligible for relief provisions if the failures are due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect and if a penalty tax is paid with respect to each failure to satisfy the applicable requirements. Additionally, relief is provided for certain *de minimis* failures of the diversification requirements where the Fund corrects the failure within a specified period. If the Fund fails to maintain qualification as a RIC for a tax year, and the relief provisions are not available, the Fund will be subject to federal income tax at regular corporate rates without any deduction for distributions to shareholders. In such case, its shareholders would be taxed as if they received ordinary dividends, although corporate shareholders could be eligible for the dividends received deduction (subject to certain limitations) and individuals may be able to benefit from the lower tax rates available to qualified dividend income. In addition, the Fund could be required to recognize unrealized gains, pay substantial taxes and interest, and make substantial distributions before requalifying as a RIC. The Board reserves the right not to maintain the qualification of the Fund as a RIC if it determines such course of action to be beneficial to shareholders.

The Fund may elect to treat part or all of any "qualified late year loss" as if it had been incurred in the succeeding taxable year in determining the Fund's taxable income, net capital gain, net short-term capital gain, and earnings and profits. The effect of this election is to treat any such "qualified late year loss" as if it had been incurred in the succeeding taxable year in characterizing Fund distributions for any calendar. A "qualified late year loss" generally includes net capital loss, net long-term capital loss, or net short-term capital loss incurred after October 31 of the current taxable year (commonly referred to as "post-October losses") and certain other late-year losses.

The treatment of capital loss carryovers for the Fund is similar to the rules that apply to capital loss carryovers of individuals, which provide that such losses are carried over indefinitely. If the Fund has a "net capital loss" (that is, capital losses in excess of capital gains), the excess of the Fund's net short-term capital losses over its net long-term capital gains is treated as a short-term capital loss arising on the first day of the Fund's next taxable year, and the excess (if any) of the Fund's net long-term capital losses over its net short-term capital gains is treated as a long-term capital loss arising on the first day of the Fund's next taxable year. The carryover of capital losses may be limited under the general loss limitation rules if the Fund experiences an ownership change as defined in the Code.

Federal Excise Tax. Notwithstanding the Distribution Requirement described above, which generally requires the Fund to distribute at least 90% of its annual investment company taxable income and the excess of its exempt interest income (but does not require any minimum distribution of net capital gain), the Fund will be subject to a nondeductible 4% federal excise tax to the extent it fails to distribute, by the end of the calendar year at least 98% of its ordinary income and 98.2% of its capital gain net income (the excess of short- and long-term capital gains over short- and long-term capital losses) for the one-year period ending on October 31 of such year (including any retained amount from the prior calendar year on which the Fund paid no federal income tax). The Fund intends to make sufficient distributions to avoid liability for federal excise tax, but can make no assurances that such tax will be completely eliminated. The Fund may in certain circumstances be required to liquidate Fund investments in order to make sufficient distributions to avoid federal excise tax liability at a time when the investment adviser might not otherwise have chosen to do so, and liquidation of investments in such circumstances may affect the ability of the Fund to satisfy the requirement for qualification as a RIC.

Distributions to Shareholders. The Fund receives income generally in the form of dividends and interest on investments. This income, plus net short-term capital gains, if any, less expenses incurred in the operation of the Fund, constitutes the Fund's net investment income from which dividends may be paid to you. Any distributions by the Fund from such income will be taxable to you as ordinary income or at the lower capital gains rates that apply to individuals receiving qualified dividend income, whether you take them in cash or in additional shares.

Distributions by the Fund will be eligible for the reduced maximum tax rate to individuals currently set at 20% (lower rates apply to individuals in lower tax brackets) to the extent that the Fund receives qualified dividend income on the securities it holds and the Fund reports the distributions as qualified dividend income. Qualified dividend income is, in general, dividend income from taxable domestic corporations and certain foreign corporations (e.g., foreign corporations incorporated in a possession of the United States or in certain countries with a comprehensive tax treaty with the United States, or the stock of which is readily tradable on an established securities market in the United States). A dividend will not be treated as qualified dividend income to the extent that: (i) the shareholder has not held the shares on which the dividend was paid for more than 60 days during the 121-day period that begins on the date that is 60 days before the date on which the shares become “ex-dividend” (which is the day on which declared distributions (dividends or capital gains) are deducted from the Fund’s assets before it calculates the NAV) with respect to such dividend, (ii) the Fund has not satisfied similar holding period requirements with respect to the securities it holds that paid the dividends distributed to the shareholder), (iii) the shareholder is under an obligation (whether pursuant to a short sale or otherwise) to make related payments with respect to substantially similar or related property, or (iv) the shareholder elects to treat such dividend as investment income under section 163(d)(4)(B) of the Code. Therefore, if you lend your shares in the Fund, such as pursuant to a securities lending arrangement, you may lose the ability to treat dividends (paid while the shares are held by the borrower) as qualified dividend income. Distributions that the Fund receives from an ETF or underlying fund taxable as a RIC or a REIT will be treated as qualified dividend income only to the extent so reported by such ETF, underlying fund or REIT.

Distributions by the Fund of its net short-term capital gains will be taxable as ordinary income. Capital gain distributions consisting of the Fund’s net capital gains will be taxable as long-term capital gains for individual shareholders currently set at a maximum rate of 20% regardless of how long you have held your shares in the Fund. The Fund will report annually to its shareholders the federal tax status of all distributions made by the Fund.

In the case of corporate shareholders, the Fund’s distributions (other than capital gain distributions) generally qualify for the dividends-received deduction to the extent such distributions are so reported and do not exceed the gross amount of qualifying dividends received by the Fund for the year. Generally, and subject to certain limitations (including certain holding period limitations), a dividend will be treated as a qualifying dividend if it has been received from a domestic corporation. All such qualifying dividends (including the deducted portion) must be included in your alternative minimum taxable income calculation.

To the extent that the Fund makes a distribution of income received by the Fund in lieu of dividends (a “substitute payment”) with respect to securities on loan pursuant to a securities lending transaction, such income will not constitute qualified dividend income to individual shareholders and will not be eligible for the dividends received deduction for corporate shareholders.

If the Fund’s distributions exceed its taxable income and capital gains realized during a taxable year, all or a portion of the distributions made in the same taxable year may be recharacterized as a return of capital to shareholders. A return of capital distribution will generally not be taxable, but will reduce each shareholder’s cost basis in the Fund and result in a higher reported capital gain or lower reported capital loss when those shares on which the distribution was received are sold.

A dividend or distribution received shortly after the purchase of shares reduces the NAV of the shares by the amount of the dividend or distribution and, although in effect a return of capital, will be taxable to the shareholder. If the NAV of shares were reduced below the shareholder’s cost by dividends or distributions representing gains realized on sales of securities, such dividends or distributions would be a return of investment though taxable to the shareholder in the same manner as other dividends or distributions.

The Fund (or its administrative agent) will inform you of the amount of your ordinary income dividends, qualified dividend income and capital gain distributions, if any, and will advise you of their tax status for federal income tax purposes shortly after the close of each calendar year. If you have not held your shares for a full year, the Fund may designate and distribute to you, as ordinary income, qualified dividend income or capital gain, a percentage of income that is not equal to the actual amount of such income earned during the period of your investment in the Fund.

Dividends declared to shareholders of record in October, November or December and actually paid in January of the following year will be treated as having been received by shareholders on December 31 of the calendar year in which declared. Under this rule, therefore, a shareholder may be taxed in one year on dividends or distributions actually received in January of the following year.

Sales, Exchanges or Redemptions. Any gain or loss recognized on a sale, exchange, or redemption of shares of the Fund by a shareholder who is not a dealer in securities will generally, for individual shareholders, be treated as a long-term capital gain or loss if the shares have been held for more than twelve months and otherwise will be treated as a short-term capital gain or loss. However, if shares on which a shareholder has received a net capital gain distribution are subsequently sold, exchanged, or redeemed and such shares have been held for six months or less, any loss recognized will be treated as a long-term capital loss to the extent of the net capital gain distribution. In addition, the loss realized on a sale or other disposition of shares will be disallowed to the extent a shareholder repurchases (or enters into a contract to or option to repurchase) shares within a period of 61 days (beginning 30 days before and ending 30 days after the disposition of the shares). This loss disallowance rule will apply to shares received through the reinvestment of dividends during the 61-day period.

U.S. individuals with income exceeding \$200,000 (\$250,000 if married and filing jointly) are subject to a 3.8% Medicare contribution tax on their “net investment income,” including interest, dividends, and capital gains (including any capital gains realized on the sale or exchange of shares of the Fund).

The Fund (or its administrative agent) must report to the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) and furnish to Fund shareholders the cost basis information for purchases of Fund shares. In addition to the requirement to report the gross proceeds from the sale of Fund shares, the Fund is also required to report the cost basis information for such shares and indicate whether these shares had a short-term or long-term holding period. For each sale of Fund shares, the Fund will permit Fund shareholders to elect from among several IRS-accepted cost basis methods, including the average basis method. In the absence of an election, the Fund will use the average basis method as its default cost basis method. The cost basis method elected by the Fund shareholder (or the cost basis method applied by default) for each sale of Fund shares may not be changed after the settlement date of each such sale of Fund shares. Fund shareholders should consult with their tax advisors to determine the best IRS-accepted cost basis method for their tax situation and to obtain more information about cost basis reporting. Shareholders also should carefully review any cost basis information provided to them and make any additional basis, holding period or other adjustments that are required when reporting these amounts on their federal income tax returns.

Tax Treatment of Complex Securities. The Fund may invest in complex securities and these investments may be subject to numerous special and complex tax rules. These rules could affect the Fund’s ability to qualify as a RIC, affect whether gains and losses recognized by the Fund are treated as ordinary income or capital gain, accelerate the recognition of income to the Fund and/or defer the Fund’s ability to recognize losses, and, in limited cases, subject the Fund to U.S. federal income tax on income from certain of its foreign securities. In turn, these rules may affect the amount, timing or character of the income distributed to you by the Fund.

The Fund is required for federal income tax purposes to mark-to-market and recognize as income for each taxable year its net unrealized gains and losses on certain futures contracts as of the end of the year as well as those

actually realized during the year. Gain or loss from futures and options contracts on broad-based indexes required to be marked to market will be 60% long-term and 40% short-term capital gain or loss. Application of this rule may alter the timing and character of distributions to shareholders. The Fund may be required to defer the recognition of losses on futures contracts, options contracts and swaps to the extent of any unrecognized gains on offsetting positions held by the Fund. These provisions may also require the Fund to mark-to-market certain types of positions in its portfolio (i.e., treat them as if they were closed out), which may cause the Fund to recognize income without receiving cash with which to make distributions in amounts necessary to satisfy the Distribution Requirement and for avoiding the excise tax discussed above. Accordingly, in order to avoid certain income and excise taxes, the Fund may be required to liquidate its investments at a time when the investment adviser might not otherwise have chosen to do so.

With respect to investments in STRIPS, treasury receipts, and other zero coupon securities which are sold at original issue discount and thus do not make periodic cash interest payments, the Fund will be required to include as part of its current income the imputed interest on such obligations even though the Fund has not received any interest payments on such obligations during that period. Because the Fund intends to distribute all of its net investment income to its shareholders, the Fund may have to sell Fund securities to distribute such imputed income which may occur at a time when the Adviser would not have chosen to sell such securities and which may result in taxable gain or loss.

Any market discount recognized on a bond is taxable as ordinary income. A market discount bond is a bond acquired in the secondary market at a price below redemption value or adjusted issue price if issued with original issue discount. Absent an election by the Fund to include the market discount in income as it accrues, gain on the Fund's disposition of such an obligation will be treated as ordinary income rather than capital gain to the extent of the accrued market discount.

As described above in the section describing the qualification requirements for a RIC, the Fund may invest in certain MLPs which may be treated as "qualified publicly traded partnerships." Income from qualified publicly traded partnerships is qualifying income for purposes of the Qualifying Income Test, but the Fund's investment in one or more of such qualified publicly traded partnerships is limited under the Asset Test to no more than 25% of the value of the Fund's assets. The Fund will monitor its investment in such qualified publicly traded partnerships in order to ensure compliance with the Qualifying Income and Asset Tests. MLPs and other partnerships that the Fund may invest in will deliver Form K-1s to the Fund to report its share of income, gains, losses, deductions and credits of the MLP or other partnership. These Form K-1s may be delayed and may not be received until after the time that the Fund issues its tax reporting statements. As a result, the Fund may at times find it necessary to reclassify the amount and character of its distributions to you after it issues your tax reporting statement.

The Fund may invest in REITs. Investments in REIT equity securities may require the Fund to accrue and distribute income not yet received. To generate sufficient cash to make the requisite distributions, the Fund may be required to sell securities in its portfolio (including when it is not advantageous to do so) that it otherwise would have continued to hold. The Fund's investments in REIT equity securities may at other times result in the Fund's receipt of cash in excess of the REIT's earnings; if the Fund distributes these amounts, these distributions could constitute a return of capital to the Fund's shareholders for federal income tax purposes. Dividends paid by a REIT, other than capital gain distributions, will be taxable as ordinary income up to the amount of the REIT's current and accumulated earnings and profits. Capital gain dividends paid by a REIT to the Fund will be treated as long-term capital gains by the Fund and, in turn, may be distributed by the Fund to its shareholders as a capital gain distribution. Dividends received by the Fund from a REIT generally will not constitute qualified dividend income or qualify for the dividends-received deduction. If a REIT is operated in a manner such that it fails to qualify as a REIT, an investment in the REIT would become subject to double taxation, meaning the taxable income of the REIT would be subject to federal income tax at regular corporate rates without any deduction for

dividends paid to shareholders and the dividends would be taxable to shareholders as ordinary income (or possibly as qualified dividend income) to the extent of the REIT's current and accumulated earnings and profits.

Certain Foreign Currency Tax Issues. The Fund's transactions in foreign currencies and forward foreign currency contracts will generally be subject to special provisions of the Code that, among other things, may affect the character of gains and losses realized by the Fund (i.e., may affect whether gains or losses are ordinary or capital), accelerate recognition of income to the Fund and defer losses. These rules could therefore affect the character, amount and timing of distributions to shareholders. These provisions also may require the Fund to mark-to-market certain types of positions in its portfolio (i.e., treat them as if they were closed out) which may cause the Fund to recognize income without receiving cash with which to make distributions in amounts necessary to satisfy the Distribution Requirements and for avoiding the excise tax described above. The Fund intends to monitor its transactions, intends to make the appropriate tax elections, and intends to make the appropriate entries in its books and records when it acquires any foreign currency or forward foreign currency contract in order to mitigate the effect of these rules so as to prevent disqualification of the Fund as a RIC and minimize the imposition of income and excise taxes.

If the Fund owns shares in certain foreign investment entities, referred to as "passive foreign investment companies" or "PFICs," the Fund will generally be subject to one of the following special tax regimes: (i) the Fund may be liable for U.S. federal income tax, and an additional interest charge, on a portion of any "excess distribution" from such foreign entity or any gain from the disposition of such shares, even if the entire distribution or gain is paid out by the Fund as a dividend to its shareholders; (ii) if the Fund were able and elected to treat a PFIC as a "qualified electing fund" or "QEF," the Fund would be required each year to include in income, and distribute to shareholders in accordance with the distribution requirements set forth above, the Fund's pro rata share of the ordinary earnings and net capital gains of the PFIC, whether or not such earnings or gains are distributed to the Fund, whether or not such earnings or gains are distributed to the Fund; or (iii) the Fund may be entitled to mark-to-market annually shares of the PFIC, and in such event would be required to distribute to shareholders any such mark-to-market gains in accordance with the distribution requirements set forth above. The Fund may have to distribute to its shareholders certain "phantom" income and gain the Fund accrues with respect to its investment in a PFIC in order to satisfy the Distribution Requirement and to avoid imposition of the 4% excise tax described above. The Fund intends to make the appropriate tax elections, if possible, and take any additional steps that are necessary to mitigate the effect of these rules.

Foreign Taxes. Dividends and interest received by the Fund may be subject to income, withholding or other taxes imposed by foreign countries and U.S. possessions that would reduce the yield on the Fund's stock or securities. Tax conventions between certain countries and the United States may reduce or eliminate these taxes. Foreign countries generally do not impose taxes on capital gains with respect to investments by foreign investors.

If more than 50% of the value of the Fund's total assets at the close of its taxable year consists of stocks or securities of foreign corporations, the Fund will be eligible to and intends to file an election with the IRS that may enable shareholders, in effect, to receive either the benefit of a foreign tax credit, or a deduction from such taxes, with respect to any foreign and U.S. possessions income taxes paid by the Fund, subject to certain limitations. Pursuant to the election, the Fund will treat those taxes as dividends paid to its shareholders. Each such shareholder will be required to include a proportionate share of those taxes in gross income as income received from a foreign source and must treat the amount so included as if the shareholder had paid the foreign tax directly. The shareholder may then either deduct the taxes deemed paid by him or her in computing his or her taxable income or, alternatively, use the foregoing information in calculating any foreign tax credit they may be entitled to use against the shareholders' federal income tax. If the Fund makes the election, the Fund (or its administrative agent) will report annually to its shareholders the respective amounts per share of the Fund's income from sources within, and taxes paid to, foreign countries and U.S. possessions.

Foreign tax credits, if any, received by the Fund as a result of an investment in another RIC (including an ETF which is taxable as a RIC) will not be passed through to you unless the Fund qualifies as a “qualified fund-of-funds” under the Code. If the Fund is a “qualified fund-of-funds” it will be eligible to file an election with the IRS that will enable the Fund to pass along these foreign tax credits to its shareholders. The Fund will be treated as a “qualified fund-of-funds” under the Code if at least 50% of the value of the Fund’s total assets (at the close of each quarter of the Fund’s taxable year) is represented by interests in other RICs. Foreign tax credits, if any, received by the Fund as a result of an investment in an ETF which is taxable as a RIC will generally not be passed through to you.

Tax-Exempt Shareholders. Certain tax-exempt shareholders, including qualified pension plans, individual retirement accounts, salary deferral arrangements, 401(k)s, and other tax-exempt entities, generally are exempt from federal income taxation except with respect to their unrelated business taxable income (“UBTI”). Under current law, the Fund generally serves to block UBTI from being realized by its tax-exempt shareholders. However, notwithstanding the foregoing, the tax-exempt shareholder could realize UBTI by virtue of an investment in the Fund where, for example: (i) the Fund invests in residual interests of Real Estate Mortgage Investment Conduits (“REMICs”), (ii) the Fund invests in a REIT that is a taxable mortgage pool (“TMP”) or that has a subsidiary that is a TMP or that invests in the residual interest of a REMIC, or (iii) shares in the Fund constitute debt-financed property in the hands of the tax-exempt shareholder within the meaning of section 514(b) of the Code. Charitable remainder trusts are subject to special rules and should consult their tax advisor. The IRS has issued guidance with respect to these issues and prospective shareholders, especially charitable remainder trusts, are strongly encouraged to consult their tax advisors regarding these issues.

Backup Withholding. The Fund will be required in certain cases to withhold at a 28% withholding rate and remit to the U.S. Treasury the amount withheld on amounts payable to any shareholder who: (i) has provided the Fund either an incorrect tax identification number or no number at all; (ii) is subject to backup withholding by the IRS for failure to properly report payments of interest or dividends; (iii) has failed to certify to the Fund that such shareholder is not subject to backup withholding; or (iv) has failed to certify to the Fund that the shareholder is a U.S. person (including a resident alien).

Non-U.S. Investors. Any non-U.S. investors in the Fund may be subject to U.S. withholding and estate tax and are encouraged to consult their tax advisors prior to investing in the Fund. Foreign shareholders (i.e., nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations, partnerships, trusts and estates) are generally subject to U.S. withholding tax at the rate of 30% (or a lower tax treaty rate) on distributions derived from taxable ordinary income. The Fund may, under certain circumstances, report all or a portion of a dividend as an “interest-related dividend” or a “short-term capital gain dividend,” which would generally be exempt from this 30% U.S. withholding tax, provided certain other requirements are met. Short-term capital gain dividends received by a nonresident alien individual who is present in the United States for a period or periods aggregating 183 days or more during the taxable year are not exempt from this 30% withholding tax. Gains realized by foreign shareholders from the sale or other disposition of shares of a Fund generally are not subject to U.S. taxation, unless the recipient is an individual who is physically present in the United States for 183 days or more per year. Foreign shareholders who fail to provide an applicable IRS form may be subject to backup withholding on certain payments from the Fund. Backup withholding will not be applied to payments that are subject to the 30% (or lower applicable treaty rate) withholding tax described in this paragraph. Different tax consequences may result if the foreign shareholder is engaged in a trade or business within the United States. In addition, the tax consequences to a foreign shareholder entitled to claim the benefits of a tax treaty may be different than those described above.

A U.S. withholding tax at a 30% rate will be imposed on dividends effective July 1, 2014 (and proceeds of sales in respect of Fund shares (including certain capital gain dividends) received by Fund shareholders beginning after December 31, 2018) for shareholders who own their shares through foreign accounts or foreign intermediaries if

certain disclosure requirements related to U.S. accounts or ownership are not satisfied. The Fund will not pay any additional amounts in respect to any amounts withheld.

Tax Shelter Reporting Regulations. Under U.S. Treasury regulations, generally, if a shareholder recognizes a loss of \$2 million or more for an individual shareholder or \$10 million or more for a corporate shareholder, the shareholder must file with the IRS a disclosure statement on Form 8886. Direct shareholders of portfolio securities are in many cases excepted from this reporting requirement, but under current guidance, shareholders of a RIC such as the Fund are not excepted. Future guidance may extend the current exception from this reporting requirement to shareholders of most or all RICs. The fact that a loss is reportable under these regulations does not affect the legal determination of whether the taxpayer's treatment of the loss is proper. Shareholders should consult their tax advisors to determine the applicability of these regulations in light of their individual circumstances.

State Taxes. Depending upon state and local law, distributions by the Fund to its shareholders and the ownership of such shares may be subject to state and local taxes. Rules of state and local taxation of dividend and capital gains distributions from RICs often differ from rules for federal income taxation described above. It is expected that the Fund will not be liable for any corporate excise, income or franchise tax in Massachusetts if it qualifies as a RIC for federal income tax purposes.

Many states grant tax-free status to dividends paid to you from interest earned on direct obligations of the U.S. government, subject in some states to minimum investment requirements that must be met by the Fund. Investment in Ginnie Mae or Fannie Mae securities, banker's acceptances, commercial paper, and repurchase agreements collateralized by U.S. government securities do not generally qualify for such tax-free treatment. The rules on exclusion of this income are different for corporate shareholders. Shareholders are urged to consult their tax advisors regarding state and local taxes applicable to an investment in the Fund.

The Fund's shares held in a tax-qualified retirement account will generally not be subject to federal taxation on income and capital gains distributions from the Fund until a shareholder begins receiving payments from its retirement account. Because each shareholder's tax situation is different, shareholders should consult their tax advisor about the tax implications of an investment in the Fund.

FUND TRANSACTIONS

Brokerage Transactions. Generally, equity securities, both listed and over-the-counter, are bought and sold through brokerage transactions for which commissions are payable. Purchases from underwriters will include the underwriting commission or concession, and purchases from dealers serving as market makers will include a dealer's mark-up or reflect a dealer's mark-down. Money market securities and other debt securities are usually bought and sold directly from the issuer or an underwriter or market maker for the securities. Generally, the Fund will not pay brokerage commissions for such purchases. When a debt security is bought from an underwriter, the purchase price will usually include an underwriting commission or concession. The purchase price for securities bought from dealers serving as market makers will similarly include the dealer's mark up or reflect a dealer's mark down. When the Fund executes transactions in the over-the-counter market, it will generally deal with primary market makers unless prices that are more favorable are otherwise obtainable.

In addition, an adviser may place a combined order for two or more accounts it manages, including the Fund, engaged in the purchase or sale of the same security if, in its judgment, joint execution is in the best interest of each participant and will result in best price and execution. Transactions involving commingled orders are allocated in a manner deemed equitable to each account or fund. Although it is recognized that, in some cases, the joint execution of orders could adversely affect the price or volume of the security that a particular account or the

Fund may obtain, it is the opinion of the advisers that the advantages of combined orders outweigh the possible disadvantages of separate transactions.

For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014 and 2015, the Fund paid the following aggregate brokerage commissions on portfolio transactions:

Aggregate Dollar Amount of Brokerage Commissions Paid	
<i>2014¹</i>	<i>2015</i>
\$47,686.10	\$106,745

1 Represents the period from July 25, 2014 (commencement of Fund operations) to October 31, 2014.

Brokerage Selection. The Trust does not expect to use one particular broker or dealer, and when one or more brokers is believed capable of providing the best combination of price and execution, an adviser may select a broker based upon brokerage or research services provided to the adviser. The advisers may pay a higher commission than otherwise obtainable from other brokers in return for such services only if a good faith determination is made that the commission is reasonable in relation to the services provided.

Section 28(e) of the 1934 Act permits an adviser, under certain circumstances, to cause the Fund to pay a broker or dealer a commission for effecting a transaction in excess of the amount of commission another broker or dealer would have charged for effecting the transaction in recognition of the value of brokerage and research services provided by the broker or dealer. In addition to agency transactions, an adviser may receive brokerage and research services in connection with certain riskless principal transactions, in accordance with applicable SEC guidance. Brokerage and research services include: (1) furnishing advice as to the value of securities, the advisability of investing in, purchasing or selling securities, and the availability of securities or purchasers or sellers of securities; (2) furnishing analyses and reports concerning issuers, industries, securities, economic factors and trends, portfolio strategy, and the performance of accounts; and (3) effecting securities transactions and performing functions incidental thereto (such as clearance, settlement, and custody). In the case of research services, the advisers believe that access to independent investment research is beneficial to their investment decision-making processes and, therefore, to the Fund.

To the extent research services may be a factor in selecting brokers, such services may be in written form or through direct contact with individuals and may include information as to particular companies and securities as well as market, economic, or institutional areas and information which assists in the valuation and pricing of investments. Examples of research-oriented services for which the advisers might utilize Fund commissions include research reports and other information on the economy, industries, sectors, groups of securities, individual companies, statistical information, political developments, technical market action, pricing and appraisal services, credit analysis, risk measurement analysis, performance and other analysis. An adviser may use research services furnished by brokers in servicing all client accounts and not all services may necessarily be used by the adviser in connection with the Fund or any other specific client account that paid commissions to the broker providing such services. Information so received by the adviser will be in addition to and not in lieu of the services required to be performed by the adviser under an Investment Advisory Agreement. Any advisory or other fees paid to the advisers are not reduced as a result of the receipt of research services.

In some cases an adviser may receive a service from a broker that has both a “research” and a “non-research” use. When this occurs, the adviser makes a good faith allocation, under all the circumstances, between the research and non-research uses of the service. The percentage of the service that is used for research purposes may be paid for

with client commissions, while the adviser will use its own funds to pay for the percentage of the service that is used for non-research purposes. In making this good faith allocation, the advisers face a potential conflict of interest, but the advisers believe that their allocation procedures are reasonably designed to ensure that they appropriately allocate the anticipated use of such services to their research and non-research uses.

From time to time, an adviser may purchase new issues of securities for clients, including the Fund, in a fixed price offering. In these situations, the seller may be a member of the selling group that will, in addition to selling securities, provide the advisers with research services. FINRA has adopted rules expressly permitting these types of arrangements under certain circumstances. Generally, the seller will provide research “credits” in these situations at a rate that is higher than that which is available for typical secondary market transactions. These arrangements may not fall within the safe harbor of Section 28(e).

For the fiscal year ended October 31, 2015, the Fund did not pay any commissions on brokerage transactions directed to brokers pursuant to an agreement or understanding whereby the broker provides research or other brokerage services to an adviser.

Brokerage with Fund Affiliates. The Fund may execute brokerage or other agency transactions through registered broker-dealer affiliates of either the Fund, the advisers or the Distributor for a commission in conformity with the 1940 Act, the 1934 Act and rules promulgated by the SEC. These rules require that commissions paid to the affiliate by the Fund for exchange transactions not exceed “usual and customary” brokerage commissions. The rules define “usual and customary” commissions to include amounts which are “reasonable and fair compared to the commission, fee or other remuneration received or to be received by other brokers in connection with comparable transactions involving similar securities being purchased or sold on a securities exchange during a comparable period of time.” The Trustees, including those who are not “interested persons” of the Fund, have adopted procedures for evaluating the reasonableness of commissions paid to affiliates and review these procedures periodically.

For the fiscal period from July 25, 2014 (commencement of Fund operations) to October 31, 2014 and the fiscal year ended October 31, 2015, the Fund did not pay brokerage commissions on portfolio transactions effected by affiliated brokers.

Securities of “Regular Broker-Dealers.” The Fund is required to identify any securities of its “regular brokers and dealers” (as such term is defined in the 1940 Act) that the Fund held during its most recent fiscal year. During the fiscal year ended October 31, 2015, the Fund did not hold any securities of its “regular brokers or dealers.”

Portfolio Turnover Rate. Portfolio turnover rate is defined under SEC rules as the greater of the value of the securities purchased or securities sold, excluding all securities whose maturities at the time of acquisition were one-year or less, divided by the average monthly value of such securities owned during the year. Based on this definition, instruments with remaining maturities of less than one-year are excluded from the calculation of the portfolio turnover rate. Instruments excluded from the calculation of portfolio turnover generally would include the futures contracts in which the Fund may invest since such contracts generally have remaining maturities of less than one-year. The Fund may at times hold investments in other short-term instruments, such as repurchase agreements, which are excluded for purposes of computing portfolio turnover. For the fiscal years ended October 31, 2014 and 2015, the Fund’s portfolio turnover rate was as follows:

Portfolio Turnover Rate	
2014	2015
140% ¹	603%

1 Represents the period from July 25, 2014 (commencement of Fund operations) to October 31, 2014.

PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS

The Board has approved policies and procedures that govern the timing and circumstances regarding the disclosure of Fund portfolio holdings information to shareholders and third parties. These policies and procedures are designed to ensure that disclosure of information regarding the Fund's portfolio securities is in the best interests of Fund shareholders, and include procedures to address conflicts between the interests of the Fund's shareholders, on the one hand, and those of the Adviser, Sub-Advisers, principal underwriter or any affiliated person of the Fund, the Adviser, Sub-Advisers or their principal underwriter, on the other. Pursuant to such procedures, the Board has authorized the Adviser's Chief Compliance Officer (the "Authorized Person") to authorize the release of the Fund's portfolio holdings, as necessary, in conformity with the foregoing principles. The Authorized Person reports at least quarterly to the Board regarding the implementation of such policies and procedures.

Pursuant to applicable law, the Fund is required to disclose its complete portfolio holdings quarterly, within 60 days of the end of each fiscal quarter (currently, each January 31, April 30, July 31 and October 31). The Fund discloses a complete schedule of investments in each Semi-Annual Report and Annual Report to Fund shareholders following the second and fourth fiscal quarters and in quarterly holdings reports filed with the SEC on Form N-Q following the first and third fiscal quarters. Semi-Annual and Annual Reports are distributed to Fund shareholders. Reports filed with the SEC on Form N-Q are not distributed to Fund shareholders, but are available, free of charge, on the EDGAR database on the SEC's website at www.sec.gov.

In addition to the quarterly portfolio holdings disclosure required by applicable law, ten calendar days after each month end, a complete list of the Fund's portfolio holdings as of the end of such month may be made available at www.rllfunds.com. The Adviser may exclude any portion of the portfolio holdings from publication when deemed in the best interest of the Fund. Beginning on the day after any portfolio holdings information is posted on the Fund's website, such information will be delivered directly to any person that requests it, through electronic or other means. The portfolio holdings information placed on the Fund's website generally will remain there until replaced by new postings as described above.

The Fund's policies and procedures provide that the Authorized Person may authorize disclosure of portfolio holdings information to third parties at differing times and/or with different lag times than the information posted to the internet; provided that the recipient is, either by contractual agreement or otherwise by law, (i) required to maintain the confidentiality of the information and (ii) prohibited from using the information to facilitate or assist in any securities transactions or investment program. The Fund will review a third party's request for portfolio holdings information to determine whether the third party has legitimate business objectives in requesting such information.

The Trust's policies and procedures prohibit any compensation or other consideration from being paid to or received by any party in connection with the disclosure of portfolio holdings information, including the Fund, Adviser, Sub-Advisers and their affiliates or recipients of the Fund's portfolio holdings information.

In addition, the Fund's service providers, such as the Custodian, Administrator and Transfer Agent, may receive portfolio holdings information as frequently as daily in connection with their services to the Fund. In addition to any contractual provisions relating to confidentiality of information that may be included in the service providers contract with the Trust, these arrangements impose obligations on the Fund's service providers that would prohibit them from disclosing or trading on the Fund's non-public information. Financial printers and pricing information vendors may receive portfolio holdings information, as necessary, in connection with their services to the Fund.

The Administrator may disclose portfolio holdings information to rating agencies and similar parties as part of its services to the Fund if such disclosure is made in the best interests of shareholders, as determined by the Trust's president and chief compliance officer. Portfolio holdings information may be disclosed no more frequently than monthly to such parties. Monthly disclosures will not be made sooner than three (3) days after the date of the information.

DESCRIPTION OF SHARES

The Declaration of Trust authorizes the issuance of an unlimited number of funds and shares of each fund, each of which represents an equal proportionate interest in that fund with each other share. Shares are entitled upon liquidation to a pro rata share in the net assets of the fund. Shareholders have no preemptive rights. The Declaration of Trust provides that the Trustees may create additional series or classes of shares. All consideration received by the Trust for shares of any additional funds and all assets in which such consideration is invested would belong to that fund and would be subject to the liabilities related thereto. Share certificates representing shares will not be issued. The Fund's shares, when issued, are fully paid and non-assessable.

LIMITATION OF TRUSTEES' LIABILITY

The Declaration of Trust provides that a Trustee shall be liable only for his or her own willful misfeasance, bad faith, gross negligence or reckless disregard of the duties involved in the conduct of the office of Trustee, and shall not be liable for errors of judgment or mistakes of fact or law. The Trustees shall not be responsible or liable in any event for any neglect or wrongdoing of any officer, agent, employee, investment adviser or principal underwriter of the Trust, nor shall any Trustee be responsible for the act or omission of any other Trustee. The Declaration of Trust also provides that the Trust shall indemnify each person who is, or has been, a Trustee, officer, employee or agent of the Trust, any person who is serving or has served at the Trust's request as a Trustee, officer, employee or agent of another organization in which the Trust has any interest as a shareholder, creditor or otherwise to the extent and in the manner provided in the By-Laws. However, nothing in the Declaration of Trust shall protect or indemnify a Trustee against any liability for his or her willful misfeasance, bad faith, gross negligence or reckless disregard of the duties involved in the conduct of the office of Trustee. Nothing contained in this section attempts to disclaim a Trustee's individual liability in any manner inconsistent with the federal securities laws.

PROXY VOTING

The Board has delegated responsibility for decisions regarding proxy voting for securities held by the Fund to the Adviser, who in turn has delegated the responsibility to the Sub-Advisers. To the extent that they invest in voting securities on behalf of the Fund, each Sub-Adviser will vote such proxies in accordance with its proxy policies and procedures. The proxy voting policies and procedures of the Adviser and Winton are included in Appendix B to the SAI. As of the date of this SAI, it is not contemplated that Karya or MAI will hold voting securities, and as a result there are no proxy voting policies and procedures attached for Karya or MAI.

Ellington will engage a third-party proxy voting service to vote proxies with respect to positions held by the Fund as a result of the advisory services provided by Ellington. Proxies will be voted by the service in accordance with its then-current guidelines. Though in the ordinary course proxies will be voted in accordance with the service's guidelines, the recommendation of the proxy service may be overridden on a case-by-case basis, provided that the relevant Ellington portfolio manager has made a determination that it is in the best interests of the Fund to vote contrary to the recommendation of the service and the override has been pre-approved by Ellington's Chief Compliance Officer or his designee. The proxy voting guidelines utilized by the third-party proxy voting service engaged by Ellington are included in Appendix B to the SAI.

The Trust is required to disclose annually the Fund’s complete proxy voting record during the most recent 12-month period ended June 30 on Form N-PX. This voting record is available: (i) without charge, upon request, by calling 1-844-RLL-FUND (1-844-755-3863); and (ii) on the SEC’s website at <http://www.sec.gov>.

CODES OF ETHICS

The Board on behalf of the Trust has adopted a Code of Ethics pursuant to Rule 17j-1 under the 1940 Act. In addition, the Adviser, the Sub-Advisers, the Administrator and the Distributor have adopted Codes of Ethics pursuant to Rule 17j-1. These Codes of Ethics apply to the personal investing activities of trustees, officers and certain employees (“Access Persons”). Rule 17j-1 and the Codes are designed to prevent unlawful practices in connection with the purchase or sale of securities by Access Persons. Under each Code of Ethics, Access Persons are permitted to engage in personal securities transactions, including securities that may be purchased or held by the Fund, but are required to report their personal securities transactions for monitoring purposes. In addition, certain Access Persons are required to obtain approval before investing in initial public offerings or private placements or are prohibited from making such investments. Copies of these Codes of Ethics are on file with the SEC, and are available to the public.

5% AND 25% SHAREHOLDERS

As of February 3, 2016, the following persons were the only persons who were record owners (or to the knowledge of the Trust, beneficial owners) of 5% and 25% or more of any class of the shares of the Fund. Persons owning of record or beneficially more than 25% of a Fund’s outstanding shares may be deemed to “control” the Fund within the meaning of the 1940 Act. Shareholders controlling the Fund may have a significant impact on any shareholder vote of the Fund.

Rothschild Larch Lane Alternatives Fund – Investor Class shares		
Name and Address	Number of Shares	% of Class
MID ATLANTIC TRUST COMPANY FBO WILTON RE US HOLDINGS, INC. & AFFIL 1251 WATERFRONT PL STE 525 PITTSBURGH PA 15222-4228	62,533.7910	68.58%
CHARLES SCHWAB & CO INC SPECIAL CUSTODY A/C FBO CUSTOMERS ATTN MUTUAL FUNDS 211 MAIN ST SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-1905	14,590.3670	16.00%
MID ATLANTIC TRUST COMPANY FBO GENERAL ATLANTIC SERVICE COMPANY, L 1251 WATERFRONT PL STE 525 PITTSBURGH PA 15222-4228	8,887.5510	9.75%

Rothschild Larch Lane Alternatives Fund – Institutional Class shares		
Name and Address	Number of Shares	% of Class
MAI BRIDGE FUND II 190 ELGIN AVENUE GEORGE TOWN GRAND CAYMAN KY1-9005	5,295,794.3930	86.45%
RBC CAPITAL MARKETS LLC MUTUAL FUND OMNIBUS PROCESSING OMNIBUS ATTN MUTUAL FUND OPS MANAGER	461,519.5010	7.53%

60 S 6TH ST P08 MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-4413		
--	--	--

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF RATINGS

Description of Ratings

The following descriptions of securities ratings have been published by Moody's Investors Services, Inc. ("Moody's"), Standard & Poor's ("S&P"), and Fitch Ratings ("Fitch"), respectively.

DESCRIPTION OF MOODY'S GLOBAL RATINGS

Ratings assigned on Moody's global long-term and short-term rating scales are forward-looking opinions of the relative credit risks of financial obligations issued by non-financial corporates, financial institutions, structured finance vehicles, project finance vehicles, and public sector entities. Long-term ratings are assigned to issuers or obligations with an original maturity of one year or more and reflect both on the likelihood of a default on contractually promised payments and the expected financial loss suffered in the event of default. Short-term ratings are assigned to obligations with an original maturity of thirteen months or less and reflect the likelihood of a default on contractually promised payments.

Description of Moody's Global Long-Term Ratings

Aaa Obligations rated Aaa are judged to be of the highest quality, subject to the lowest level of credit risk.

Aa Obligations rated Aa are judged to be of high quality and are subject to very low credit risk.

A Obligations rated A are considered upper-medium grade and are subject to low credit risk.

Baa Obligations rated Baa are judged to be medium-grade and subject to moderate credit risk and as such may possess certain speculative characteristics.

Ba Obligations rated Ba are judged to be speculative and are subject to substantial credit risk.

B Obligations rated B are considered speculative and are subject to high credit risk.

Caa Obligations rated Caa are judged to be speculative of poor standing and are subject to very high credit risk.

Ca Obligations rated Ca are highly speculative and are likely in, or very near, default, with some prospect of recovery of principal and interest.

C Obligations rated C are the lowest rated and are typically in default, with little prospect for recovery of principal or interest.

Note: Moody's appends numerical modifiers 1, 2, and 3 to each generic rating classification from Aa through Caa. The modifier 1 indicates that the obligation ranks in the higher end of its generic rating category; the modifier 2 indicates a mid-range ranking; and the modifier 3 indicates a ranking in the lower end of that generic rating category.

Hybrid Indicator (hyb)

The hybrid indicator (hyb) is appended to all ratings of hybrid securities issued by banks, insurers, finance companies, and securities firms. By their terms, hybrid securities allow for the omission of scheduled dividends, interest, or principal payments, which can potentially result in impairment if such an omission occurs. Hybrid securities may also be subject to contractually allowable write-downs of principal that could result in impairment. Together with the hybrid indicator, the long-term obligation rating assigned to a hybrid security is an expression of the relative credit risk associated with that security.

Description of Moody's Global Short-Term Ratings

P-1 Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Prime-1 have a superior ability to repay short-term debt obligations.

P-2 Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Prime-2 have a strong ability to repay short-term debt obligations.

P-3 Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Prime-3 have an acceptable ability to repay short-term obligations.

NP Issuers (or supporting institutions) rated Not Prime do not fall within any of the Prime rating categories.

Description of Moody's U.S. Municipal Short-Term Obligation Ratings

The Municipal Investment Grade ("MIG") scale is used to rate U.S. municipal bond anticipation notes of up to three years maturity. Municipal notes rated on the MIG scale may be secured by either pledged revenues or proceeds of a take-out financing received prior to note maturity. MIG ratings expire at the maturity of the obligation, and the issuer's long-term rating is only one consideration in assigning the MIG rating. MIG ratings are divided into three levels—MIG 1 through MIG 3—while speculative grade short-term obligations are designated SG.

Moody's U.S. municipal short-term obligation ratings are as follows:

MIG 1 This designation denotes superior credit quality. Excellent protection is afforded by established cash flows, highly reliable liquidity support, or demonstrated broad-based access to the market for refinancing.

MIG 2 This designation denotes strong credit quality. Margins of protection are ample, although not as large as in the preceding group.

MIG 3 This designation denotes acceptable credit quality. Liquidity and cash-flow protection may be narrow, and market access for refinancing is likely to be less well-established.

SG This designation denotes speculative-grade credit quality. Debt instruments in this category may lack sufficient margins of protection.

Description of Moody's Demand Obligation Ratings

In the case of variable rate demand obligations (“VRDOs”), a two-component rating is assigned: a long or short-term debt rating and a demand obligation rating. The first element represents Moody's evaluation of risk associated with scheduled principal and interest payments. The second element represents Moody's evaluation of risk associated with the ability to receive purchase price upon demand (“demand feature”). The second element uses a rating from a variation of the MIG scale called the Variable Municipal Investment Grade (“VMIG”) scale.

Moody's demand obligation ratings are as follows:

VMIG 1 This designation denotes superior credit quality. Excellent protection is afforded by the superior short-term credit strength of the liquidity provider and structural and legal protections that ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

VMIG 2 This designation denotes strong credit quality. Good protection is afforded by the strong short-term credit strength of the liquidity provider and structural and legal protections that ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

VMIG 3 This designation denotes acceptable credit quality. Adequate protection is afforded by the satisfactory short-term credit strength of the liquidity provider and structural and legal protections that ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

SG This designation denotes speculative-grade credit quality. Demand features rated in this category may be supported by a liquidity provider that does not have an investment grade short-term rating or may lack the structural and/or legal protections necessary to ensure the timely payment of purchase price upon demand.

DESCRIPTION OF S&P'S ISSUE CREDIT RATINGS

An S&P's issue credit rating is a forward-looking opinion about the creditworthiness of an obligor with respect to a specific financial obligation, a specific class of financial obligations, or a specific financial program (including ratings on medium-term note programs and commercial paper programs). It takes into consideration the creditworthiness of guarantors, insurers, or other forms of credit enhancement on the obligation and takes into account the currency in which the obligation is denominated. The opinion reflects S&P's view of the obligor's capacity and willingness to meet its financial commitments as they come due, and may assess terms, such as collateral security and subordination, which could affect ultimate payment in the event of default.

Issue credit ratings can be either long-term or short-term. Short-term ratings are generally assigned to those obligations considered short-term in the relevant market. In the U.S., for example, that means obligations with an original maturity of no more than 365 days—including commercial paper. Short-term ratings are also used to indicate the creditworthiness of an obligor with respect to put features on long-term obligations. Medium-term notes are assigned long-term ratings.

Issue credit ratings are based, in varying degrees, on S&P's analysis of the following considerations:

- Likelihood of payment—capacity and willingness of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on an obligation in accordance with the terms of the obligation;
- Nature of and provisions of the obligation; and the promise S&P imputes;
- Protection afforded by, and relative position of, the obligation in the event of bankruptcy, reorganization, or other arrangement under the laws of bankruptcy and other laws affecting creditors' rights.

Issue ratings are an assessment of default risk, but may incorporate an assessment of relative seniority or ultimate recovery in the event of default. Junior obligations are typically rated lower than senior obligations, to reflect the lower priority in bankruptcy. (Such differentiation may apply when an entity has both senior and subordinated obligations, secured and unsecured obligations, or operating company and holding company obligations.)

Description of S&P's Long-Term Issue Credit Ratings*

AAA An obligation rated 'AAA' has the highest rating assigned by S&P. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is extremely strong.

AA An obligation rated 'AA' differs from the highest-rated obligations only to a small degree. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is very strong.

A An obligation rated 'A' is somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligations in higher-rated categories. However, the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is still strong.

BBB An obligation rated 'BBB' exhibits adequate protection parameters. However, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

BB; B; CCC; CC; and C Obligations rated 'BB', 'B', 'CCC', 'CC', and 'C' are regarded as having significant speculative characteristics. 'BB' indicates the least degree of speculation and 'C' the highest. While such obligations will likely have some quality and protective characteristics, these may be outweighed by large uncertainties or major exposures to adverse conditions.

BB An obligation rated 'BB' is less vulnerable to nonpayment than other speculative issues. However, it faces major ongoing uncertainties or exposure to adverse business, financial, or economic conditions which could lead to the obligor's inadequate capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

B An obligation rated 'B' is more vulnerable to nonpayment than obligations rated 'BB', but the obligor currently has the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation. Adverse business, financial, or economic conditions will likely impair the obligor's capacity or willingness to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

CCC An obligation rated 'CCC' is currently vulnerable to nonpayment, and is dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions for the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation. In the event of adverse business, financial, or economic

conditions, the obligor is not likely to have the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

CC An obligation rated 'CC' is currently highly vulnerable to nonpayment. The 'CC' rating is used when a default has not yet occurred, but S&P expects default to be a virtual certainty, regardless of the anticipated time to default.

C An obligation rated 'C' is currently highly vulnerable to nonpayment, and the obligation is expected to have lower relative seniority or lower ultimate recovery compared to obligations that are rated higher.

D An obligation rated 'D' is in default or in breach of an imputed promise. For non-hybrid capital instruments, the 'D' rating category is used when payments on an obligation are not made on the date due, unless S&P believes that such payments will be made within five business days in the absence of a stated grace period or within the earlier of the stated grace period or 30 calendar days. The 'D' rating also will be used upon the filing of a bankruptcy petition or the taking of similar action and where default on an obligation is a virtual certainty, for example due to automatic stay provisions. An obligation's rating is lowered to 'D' if it is subject to a distressed exchange offer.

NR This indicates that no rating has been requested, that there is insufficient information on which to base a rating, or that S&P does not rate a particular obligation as a matter of policy.

*The ratings from 'AA' to 'CCC' may be modified by the addition of a plus (+) or minus (-) sign to show relative standing within the major rating categories.

Description of S&P's Short-Term Issue Credit Ratings

A-1 A short-term obligation rated 'A-1' is rated in the highest category by S&P. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is strong. Within this category, certain obligations are designated with a plus sign (+). This indicates that the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on these obligations is extremely strong.

A-2 A short-term obligation rated 'A-2' is somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligations in higher rating categories. However, the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is satisfactory.

A-3 A short-term obligation rated 'A-3' exhibits adequate protection parameters. However, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

B A short-term obligation rated 'B' is regarded as vulnerable and has significant speculative characteristics. The obligor currently has the capacity to meet its financial commitments; however, it faces major ongoing uncertainties which could lead to the obligor's inadequate capacity to meet its financial commitments.

C A short-term obligation rated 'C' is currently vulnerable to nonpayment and is dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions for the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

D A short-term obligation rated ‘D’ is in default or in breach of an imputed promise. For non-hybrid capital instruments, the ‘D’ rating category is used when payments on an obligation are not made on the date due, unless S&P believes that such payments will be made within any stated grace period. However, any stated grace period longer than five business days will be treated as five business days. The ‘D’ rating also will be used upon the filing of a bankruptcy petition or the taking of a similar action and where default on an obligation is a virtual certainty, for example due to automatic stay provisions. An obligation’s rating is lowered to ‘D’ if it is subject to a distressed exchange offer.

Description of S&P’s Municipal Short-Term Note Ratings

An S&P’s U.S. municipal note rating reflects S&P’s opinion about the liquidity factors and market access risks unique to the notes. Notes due in three years or less will likely receive a note rating. Notes with an original maturity of more than three years will most likely receive a long-term debt rating. In determining which type of rating, if any, to assign, S&P’s analysis will review the following considerations:

- Amortization schedule—the larger the final maturity relative to other maturities, the more likely it will be treated as a note; and
- Source of payment—the more dependent the issue is on the market for its refinancing, the more likely it will be treated as a note.

S&P’s municipal short-term note ratings are as follows:

SP-1 Strong capacity to pay principal and interest. An issue determined to possess a very strong capacity to pay debt service is given a plus (+) designation.

SP-2 Satisfactory capacity to pay principal and interest, with some vulnerability to adverse financial and economic changes over the term of the notes.

SP-3 Speculative capacity to pay principal and interest.

DESCRIPTION OF FITCH’S CREDIT RATINGS

Fitch’s credit ratings provide an opinion on the relative ability of an entity to meet financial commitments, such as interest, preferred dividends, repayment of principal, insurance claims or counterparty obligations. Credit ratings are used by investors as indications of the likelihood of receiving the money owed to them in accordance with the terms on which they invested.

The terms “investment grade” and “speculative grade” have established themselves over time as shorthand to describe the categories ‘AAA’ to ‘BBB’ (investment grade) and ‘BB’ to ‘D’ (speculative grade). The terms “investment grade” and “speculative grade” are market conventions, and do not imply any recommendation or endorsement of a specific security for investment purposes. “Investment grade” categories indicate relatively low to moderate credit risk, while ratings in the “speculative” categories either signal a higher level of credit risk or that a default has already occurred.

Fitch's credit ratings do not directly address any risk other than credit risk. In particular, ratings do not deal with the risk of a market value loss on a rated security due to changes in interest rates, liquidity and other market considerations. However, in terms of payment obligation on the rated liability, market risk may be considered to the extent that it influences the *ability* of an issuer to pay upon a commitment. Ratings nonetheless do not reflect market risk to the extent that they influence the size or other conditionality of the *obligation* to pay upon a commitment (for example, in the case of index-linked bonds).

In the default components of ratings assigned to individual obligations or instruments, the agency typically rates to the likelihood of non-payment or default in accordance with the terms of that instrument's documentation. In limited cases, Fitch may include additional considerations (i.e. rate to a higher or lower standard than that implied in the obligation's documentation). In such cases, the agency will make clear the assumptions underlying the agency's opinion in the accompanying rating commentary.

Description of Fitch's Long-Term Corporate Finance Obligations Ratings

AAA Highest credit quality. 'AAA' ratings denote the lowest expectation of credit risk. They are assigned only in cases of exceptionally strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is highly unlikely to be adversely affected by foreseeable events.

AA Very high credit quality. 'AA' ratings denote expectations of very low credit risk. They indicate very strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable events.

A High credit quality. 'A' ratings denote expectations of low credit risk. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered strong. This capacity may, nevertheless, be more vulnerable to adverse business or economic conditions than is the case for higher ratings.

BBB Good credit quality. 'BBB' ratings indicate that expectations of credit risk are currently low. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered adequate but adverse business or economic conditions are more likely to impair this capacity.

BB Speculative. 'BB' ratings indicate an elevated vulnerability to credit risk, particularly in the event of adverse changes in business or economic conditions over time; however, business or financial alternatives may be available to allow financial commitments to be met.

B Highly speculative. 'B' ratings indicate that material credit risk is present.

CCC Substantial credit risk. 'CCC' ratings indicate that substantial credit risk is present.

CC Very high levels of credit risk. 'CC' ratings indicate very high levels of credit risk.

C Exceptionally high levels of credit risk. 'C' ratings indicate exceptionally high levels of credit risk.

NR This designation is used to denote securities not rated by Fitch where Fitch has rated some, but not all, securities comprising an issuance capital structure.

WD This designation indicates that the rating has been withdrawn and the issue or issuer is no

longer rated by Fitch.

Note: The modifiers “+” or “-” may be appended to a rating to denote relative status within major rating categories. Such suffixes are not added to the ‘AAA’ obligation rating category, or to corporate finance obligation ratings in the categories below ‘CCC’.

Description of Fitch’s Short-Term Ratings

A short-term issuer or obligation rating is based in all cases on the short-term vulnerability to default of the rated entity or security stream and relates to the capacity to meet financial obligations in accordance with the documentation governing the relevant obligation. Short-Term Ratings are assigned to obligations whose initial maturity is viewed as “short term” based on market convention. Typically, this means up to 13 months for corporate, sovereign, and structured obligations, and up to 36 months for obligations in U.S. public finance markets.

Fitch’s short-term ratings are as follows:

F1 Highest short-term credit quality. Indicates the strongest intrinsic capacity for timely payment of financial commitments; may have an added “+” to denote any exceptionally strong credit feature.

F2 Good short-term credit quality. Good intrinsic capacity for timely payment of financial commitments.

F3 Fair short-term credit quality. The intrinsic capacity for timely payment of financial commitments is adequate.

B Speculative short-term credit quality. Minimal capacity for timely payment of financial commitments, plus heightened vulnerability to near term adverse changes in financial and economic conditions.

C High short-term default risk. Default is a real possibility.

RD Restricted default. Indicates an entity that has defaulted on one or more of its financial commitments, although it continues to meet other financial obligations. Applicable to entity ratings only.

D Default. Indicates a broad-based default event for an entity, or the default of a short-term obligation.

NR This designation is used to denote securities not rated by Fitch where Fitch has rated some, but not all, securities comprising an issuance capital structure.

WD This designation indicates that the rating has been withdrawn and the issue or issuer is no longer rated by Fitch.

APPENDIX B

PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AND/OR PROXY VOTING GUIDELINES USED BY THE ADVISER AND CERTAIN SUB-ADVISERS

Exhibit	Investment Adviser or Sub-Adviser	Document
A	Rothschild Larch Lane Management Company LLC	Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures
B	Ellington Management Group, L.L.C.	Proxy Voting Guidelines
C	Winton Capital Management Limited	Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures and Proxy Voting Guidelines

EXHIBIT A

Rothschild Larch Lane Management Company LLC

PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

July 2014

The Firm provides investment advisory services to funds registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”) as investment companies under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, whose portfolios the Firm advises or sub-advises (each a “Fund” and collectively, the “Funds”). The Firm generally delegates its investment authority over Fund assets to one or more sub-advisers, in which case each sub-adviser will be responsible for voting the proxies of the securities comprising its allocated portion of Fund assets. In the event that a sub-adviser has not accepted such delegation or has failed to exercise its delegated responsibility, or where the Firm has made direct investments of Fund assets requiring the exercise of proxy voting authority, the Firm will endeavor to vote proxies in accordance with these policies and procedures.

The SEC has adopted Rule 206(4)-6 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended. Under this rule, registered investment advisers that exercise voting authority over securities held in client portfolios are required to implement proxy voting policies and describe those policies to their clients.

The Investment Committee (which may delegate a Proxy Committee for this purpose) is responsible for making all proxy voting decisions in accordance with these proxy voting policies and procedures (the “Policies”). The investment team is responsible for the actual voting of all proxies in a timely manner, while the CCO is responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the Policies. (See Section IV, “Procedures for Proxies”.)

The Policies attempt to generalize a complex subject. The Firm may, from time to time, determine that it is in the best interests of its clients to depart from specific policies described herein. The rationale for any such departure will be memorialized in writing by the CCO.

I. General Policy

The general policy is to vote proxy proposals, amendments, consents or resolutions relating to Fund securities (collectively, “proxies”) in a manner that reasonably furthers the best interests of such Fund and is consistent with the investment philosophy as set forth in the relevant Fund documents, taking into account relevant factors, including, but not limited to:

- the impact on the value of the securities;
- the anticipated costs and benefits associated with the proposal;
- the effect on liquidity; and

- customary industry and business practices.

II. Specific Policies

A. Routine Matters

Routine matters are typically proposed by Management (as defined below) of a company and meet the following criteria: (i) they do not measurably change the structure, management, control or operation of the company; (ii) they do not measurably change the terms of, or fees or expenses associated with, an investment in the company; and (iii) they are consistent with customary industry standards and practices, as well as the laws of the state of incorporation applicable to the company.

For routine matters, the Firm will vote in accordance with the recommendation of the company's management, directors, general partners, managing members or trustees (collectively, the "*Management*"), as applicable, unless, in the Firm's opinion, such recommendation is not in the best interests of the Funds.

1. General Matters

The Firm will generally vote for proposals:

- to set time and location of annual meeting;
- to change the fiscal year of the company; and
- to change the name of a company.

2. Board Members

a. Election or Re-Election. The Firm will generally vote for Management proposals to elect or re-elect board members.

b. Fees to Board Members. The Firm will generally vote for proposals to increase fees paid to board members, unless it determines that the compensation exceeds market standards.

3. Capital Structure

The Firm will generally vote for proposals to change capitalization, including to increase authorized common shares or to increase authorized preferred shares, as long as the proposal does not either: (i) establish a class or classes of shares or interests with terms that may disadvantage the class held by the Funds or (ii) result in disproportionate voting rights for preferred shares or other classes of shares or interests.

4. Appointment of Auditors

The Firm will generally vote for the approval of auditors and proposals authorizing a company's board to fix auditor fees, unless:

- the Firm has serious concerns about the accountants presented, including their independence, or the audit procedures used; or
- the auditors are being changed without explanation.

B. Non-Routine Matters

Non-routine matters involve a variety of issues and may be proposed by a company's Management or beneficial owners (*i.e.*, shareholders, members, partners, etc. (collectively, the "Owners")). These proxies may involve one or more of the following: (i) a measurable change in the structure, management, control or operation of the company; (ii) a measurable change in the terms of, or fees or expenses associated with, an investment in the company; or (iii) a change that is inconsistent with industry standards and/or the laws of the state of incorporation applicable to the company.

1. Board Members

a. Term Limits. The Firm will generally vote for proposals to require a reasonable retirement age (*e.g.*, 72) for board members, and will vote on a case-by-case basis on proposals to attempt to limit tenure.

b. Replacement. The Firm will generally vote against proposals that make it more difficult to replace board members, including proposals:

- to stagger the board;
- to overweight Management representation on the board;
- to introduce cumulative voting (cumulative voting allows the Owners to "stack" votes behind one or a few individuals for a position on the board, thereby giving minority Owners a greater chance of electing the board member(s));
- to introduce unequal voting rights;
- to create supermajority voting; or
- to establish pre-emptive rights.

c. Liability and Indemnification. In order to promote accountability, the Firm will generally vote against proposals to limit the personal liability of board members for any breach of fiduciary duty or failure to act in good faith.

d. Ownership Issues. The Firm will generally vote for proposals that require Management to own a minimum interest in the company. The purpose of this policy is to encourage the alignment of Management's interests with the interests of the company's Owners. However, the Firm will generally vote against proposals for stock options or other compensation that grant an ownership interest for Management if such proposals offer greater than 15% of the outstanding securities of a company because such options may dilute the voting rights of other Owners of the company.

2. Compensation, Fees and Expenses

In general, the Firm will vote against proposals to increase compensation, fees or expenses to be paid to the company's Owners, unless the Firm determines that the benefits resulting to the company and its Owners justifies the increased compensation, fees or expenses.

3. Voting Rights

The Firm will generally vote against proposals:

- to introduce unequal voting or dividend rights among the classes;
- to change the amendment provisions of a company's charter documents by removing Owner approval requirements;
- to require supermajority ($\frac{2}{3}$) approval for votes rather than a simple majority ($\frac{1}{2}$);
- to restrict the Owners' right to act by written consent; or
- to restrict the Owners' right to call meetings, propose amendments to the articles of incorporation or other governing documents of the company or nominate board members.

The Firm will generally vote for proposals that eliminate any of the foregoing rights or requirements.

4. Takeover Defenses and Related Actions

The Firm will generally vote against any proposal to create any plan or procedure designed primarily to discourage a takeover or other similar action, including "poison pills". Examples of "poison pills" include:

- large increases in the amount of stock authorized but not issued;
- blank check preferred stock (stock with a fixed dividend and a preferential claim on company assets relative to common shares, the terms of which are set by the board at a future date without further

action by the Owners);

- compensation that would act to reward Management as a result of a takeover attempt, whether successful or not, such as revaluing purchase price of stock options, or “golden parachutes”;
- fixed price amendments that require a certain price to be offered to all Owners based on a fixed formula; and
- greenmail provisions that allow a company to make payments to a bidder in order to persuade the bidder to abandon its takeover plans.

The Firm will generally vote for proposals that eliminate any of the foregoing rights or requirements, as well as proposals to:

- require that golden parachutes or golden handcuffs be submitted for ratification by the Owners; and
- to opt out of state anti-takeover laws deemed by the Firm to be detrimental.

The Firm will generally vote on a case-by-case basis regarding other proposals that may be used to prevent takeovers, such as the establishment of employee stock purchase or ownership plans.

5. Reincorporation

The Firm will generally vote for a change in the state of incorporation if the change is for valid business reasons (such as reincorporating in the same state as the headquarters of any controlling company).

6. Debt Issuance and Pledging of Assets for Debt

The Firm will generally vote proxies relating to the issuance of debt, the pledging of assets for debt, and an increase in borrowing powers on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration relevant factors, including, for example:

- the potential increase in the company’s outstanding interests or shares, if any (*e.g.*, convertible bonds); and
- the potential increase in the company’s capital, if any, over the current outstanding capital.

7. Mergers or Acquisitions

The Firm will vote proxies relating to mergers or acquisitions on a case-by-case basis, but will generally vote for any proposals that the Firm believes will offer fair value to its clients.

8. Termination or Liquidation of the Company

The Firm will vote proxies relating to the termination or liquidation of a company on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration one or more of the following factors:

- terms of liquidation;
- past performance of the company; and
- strategies employed to save the company.

9. Social & Environmental Issues and Corporate Responsibility

The Firm will vote proxies relating to social and environmental issues on a case-by-case basis, but will generally vote for any proposals that will reduce discrimination, improve protections to minorities and disadvantaged classes, and increase conservation of resources and wildlife.

The Firm will generally vote against any proposals that place arbitrary restrictions on the company's ability to invest, market, enter into contractual arrangements or conduct other activities. The Firm will also generally vote against proposals:

- to bar or restrict charitable contributions; or
- to limit corporate political activities.

10. All Other Matters

All other decisions regarding proxies will be determined on a case-by-case basis taking into account the general policy, as set forth above.

C. Abstaining from Voting or Affirmatively Not Voting

The Firm will abstain from voting (which generally requires submission of a proxy voting card) or affirmatively decide not to vote if the Firm determines that abstaining or not voting is in the best interests of the Fund. In making such a determination, the Firm will consider various factors, including, but not limited to: (i) the costs associated with exercising the proxy (*e.g.*, translation or travel costs); and (ii) any legal restrictions on trading resulting from the exercise of a proxy. The Firm will not abstain from voting or affirmatively decide not to vote a proxy if the Fund is a plan asset fund subject to the requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended. Furthermore, the Firm will not abstain from voting or affirmatively decide not to vote merely to avoid a conflict of interest.

III. Conflicts of Interest

At times, conflicts may arise between the interests of the Funds, on the one hand, and

the interests of the Firm or its affiliates, on the other hand. If the Firm determines that it has, or may be perceived to have, a conflict of interest when voting a proxy, the Firm will address matters involving such conflicts of interest as follows:

A. If a proposal is addressed by the specific policies herein, the Firm will vote in accordance with such policies;

B. If the Firm believes it is in the best interest of the Funds to depart from the specific policies provided for herein, the Firm will be subject to the requirements of C or D below, as applicable;

C. If the proxy proposal is (1) not addressed by the specific policies or (2) requires a case-by-case determination by the Firm, the Firm may vote such proxy as it determines to be in the best interest of the Funds, without taking any action described in D below, provided that such vote would be against the Firm's own interest in the matter (*i.e.*, against the perceived or actual conflict). The Firm will memorialize the rationale of such vote in writing; and

D. If the proxy proposal is (1) not addressed by the specific policies or (2) requires a case-by-case determination by the Firm, and the Firm believes it should vote in a way that may also benefit, or be perceived to benefit, its own interest, then the Firm must take one of the following actions in voting such proxy: (a) delegate the voting decision for such proxy proposal to an independent third party; (b) delegate the voting decision to an independent committee of trustees, members, directors or other representatives of the Funds, as applicable; (c) inform the investors in the Funds of the conflict of interest and obtain consent to (majority consent in the case of a Fund) vote the proxy as recommended by the Firm; or (d) obtain approval of the decision from the Firm's CCO.

IV. Procedures for Proxies

The Investment Committee will be responsible for determining whether each proxy is for a "routine" matter or not, as described above. All proxies identified as "routine" will be voted in accordance with the Policies.

Any proxies that are not clearly "routine" will be submitted to the Investment Committee, who/which will determine how to vote each such proxy by applying the Policies. Upon making a decision, the proxy will be executed and submitted to the company and the Firm will update the respective Fund's proxy voting record. The CCO or his designee is responsible for the actual voting of all proxies in a timely manner. The CCO is responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the Policies.

In the event the Firm determines that the Funds should rely on the advice of an independent third party or a committee regarding the voting of a proxy, the Firm will submit the proxy to such third party or committee for a decision. The CCO or his designee will execute the proxy in accordance with such third party's or committee's decision.

V. Record of Proxy Voting

The CCO also will maintain, or have available, written or electronic copies of each proxy statement received by the Firm and of each proxy executed by the Firm.

The CCO will also maintain records relating to each proxy received and voted by the Firm, including (i) the determination as to whether the proxy was routine or not, (ii) the voting decision with regard to each proxy; and (iii) any documents created by the Investment Committee, or others, that were material to making the voting decision.

The Firm will maintain a record of each written request from an investor in a Fund for proxy voting information and the Firm's written response to any request (oral or written) from an investor in a Fund for proxy voting information.

The CCO will maintain such records in its offices for two years from the end of the fiscal year during which the record was created, and for an additional three years in an easily accessible place.

EXHIBIT B

**Proxy Voting Guidelines Utilized by Third Party Proxy Voting Service Engaged by
Ellington**

PROXY PAPER™

GUIDELINES

2016 PROXY SEASON

AN OVERVIEW OF THE GLASS LEWIS
APPROACH TO PROXY ADVICE

UNITED STATES



Table of Contents

GUIDELINES INTRODUCTION	1
Summary of Changes for the 2016 United States Policy Guidelines	1
I. A BOARD OF DIRECTORS THAT SERVES SHAREHOLDER INTEREST.....	3
Election of Directors	3
Independence	3
Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Board Independence	5
Committee Independence.....	5
Independent Chairman	5
Performance.....	6
Voting Recommendations on the Basis of Performance	6
Board Responsiveness.....	7
The Role of a Committee Chairman	8
Audit Committees and Performance	8
Standards for Assessing the Audit Committee	9
Compensation Committee Performance.....	11
Nominating and Governance Committee Performance	13
Board-Level Risk Management Oversight	15
Environmental and Social Risk Oversight	15
Other Considerations	15
Controlled Companies.....	17
Significant Shareholders.....	18
Exceptions for Recent IPOs	18
Dual-Listed Companies.....	18
Mutual Fund Boards.....	19
Declassified Boards.....	20
Mandatory Director Term and Age limits	20
Proxy Access	21
Majority Vote for the Election of Directors	21
The Plurality Vote Standard.....	22
Advantages of a Majority Vote Standard.....	22
Conflicting Proposals	22
II. TRANSPARENCY AND INTEGRITY IN FINANCIAL REPORTING.....	24
Auditor Ratification	24
Voting Recommendations on Auditor Ratification	24
Pension Accounting Issues	25
III. THE LINK BETWEEN COMPENSATION AND PERFORMANCE	26
Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation (“Say-on-Pay”).....	26
Say-on-Pay Voting Recommendations.....	27
Company Responsiveness	28
Pay for Performance.....	28
Short-Term Incentives	28
Long-Term Incentives	29
Transitional and One-Off Awards	29
Recoupment Provisions (“Clawbacks”)	30

Hedging of Stock	30
Pledging of Stock.....	30
Compensation Consultant Independence.....	31
Frequency of Say-on-Pay	32
Vote on Golden Parachute Arrangements.....	32
Equity-Based Compensation Plan Proposals	32
Option Exchanges.....	33
Option Backdating, Spring-Loading and Bullet-Dodging	34
Director Compensation Plans	34
Employee Stock Purchase Plans	35
Executive Compensation Tax Deductibility (IRS 162(m) Compliance)	35
IV. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND THE SHAREHOLDER FRANCHISE	36
Anti-Takeover Measures.....	36
Poison Pills (Shareholder Rights Plans)	36
NOL Poison Pills.....	36
Fair Price Provisions	37
Reincorporation.....	37
Exclusive Forum and Fee-Shifting Bylaw Provisions	38
Authorized Shares	39
Advance Notice Requirements	39
Voting Structure	40
Cumulative Voting.....	40
Supermajority Vote Requirements.....	40
Transaction of Other Business.....	40
Anti-Greenmail Proposals.....	41
Mutual Funds: Investment Policies and Advisory Agreements	41
Real Estate Investment Trusts.....	41
Preferred Stock Issuances at REITs	41
Business Development Companies	42
Authorization to Sell Shares at a Price below Net Asset Value.....	42
V. COMPENSATION, ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE SHAREHOLDER INITIATIVES OVERVIEW	43

Guidelines Introduction

Glass Lewis evaluates these guidelines on an ongoing basis and formally updates them on an annual basis. This year we've made noteworthy revisions in the following areas, which are summarized below but discussed in greater detail in the relevant section of this document:

SUMMARY OF CHANGES FOR THE 2016 UNITED STATES POLICY GUIDELINES

CONFLICTING MANAGEMENT AND SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS

We have outlined our approach to analyzing and determining whether to support conflicting management and shareholder proposals. Specifically, we will consider the following:

- The nature of the underlying issue;
- The benefit to shareholders from implementation of the proposal;
- The materiality of the differences between the terms of the shareholder proposal and management proposal;
- The appropriateness of the provisions in the context of a company's shareholder base, corporate structure and other relevant circumstances; and
- A company's overall governance profile and, specifically, its responsiveness to shareholders as evidenced by a company's response to previous shareholder proposals and its adoption of progressive shareholder rights provisions (see p. 22).

EXCLUSIVE FORUM PROVISIONS

We have refined our approach to companies that include exclusive forum provisions in their governing documents in connection with an initial public offering. Specifically, we will no longer recommend that shareholders vote against the chairman of the nominating and governance committee in such situations. Instead, we will weigh the presence of an exclusive forum provision in a newly-public company's bylaws in conjunction with other provisions that we believe will unduly limit shareholder rights such as supermajority vote requirements, a classified board or a fee-shifting bylaw. However, our policy to recommend voting against the chairman of the nominating and governance committee when a company adopts an exclusive forum provision without shareholder approval outside of a spin-off, merger or IPO will not change.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISK OVERSIGHT

We have codified our policy regarding our view of the responsibilities of directors for oversight of environmental and social issues. The codification provides more clarity about instances when we may consider recommending shareholders vote against directors for lapses in environmental and social risk management at companies (see p. 15).

NOMINATING COMMITTEE PERFORMANCE

We have revised the guidelines to clarify that we may consider recommending shareholders vote against the chair of the nominating committee where the board's failure to ensure the board has directors with relevant experience, either through periodic director assessment or board refreshment, has contributed to a company's poor performance (see p. 14).

DIRECTOR OVERBOARDING POLICY

Glass Lewis recognizes that the time directors are devoting to their board obligations has increased in recent years. That, coupled with increased investor scrutiny of directors' commitments, has resulted in directors serving on fewer boards. Therefore, in 2016 Glass Lewis will closely review director board commitments and may note as a concern instances of directors serving on more than five total boards, for directors who are not also executives, and more than two total boards for a director who serves as an executive of a public company. Our voting recommendations in 2016, however, will be continue to be based on our existing thresholds of three total boards for a director who serves as an executive of a public company and six total boards for directors who are not public company executives (see p. 16). Beginning in 2017, Glass Lewis will generally recommend voting against a director who serves as an executive officer of any public company while serving on a total of more than two public company boards and any other director who serves on a total of more than five public company boards.

COMPENSATION UPDATES

We have added additional information to our discussion of one-time and transitional awards to highlight some of the specific factors we evaluate in considering these awards as well as our expectations regarding the relevant disclosure. We have also added minor clarifications regarding the quantitative and qualitative factors we use to analyze equity compensation plans.

I. A Board of Directors that Serves Shareholder Interest

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

The purpose of Glass Lewis' proxy research and advice is to facilitate shareholder voting in favor of governance structures that will drive performance, create shareholder value and maintain a proper tone at the top. Glass Lewis looks for talented boards with a record of protecting shareholders and delivering value over the medium- and long-term. We believe that a board can best protect and enhance the interests of shareholders if it is sufficiently independent, has a record of positive performance, and consists of individuals with diverse backgrounds and a breadth and depth of relevant experience.

INDEPENDENCE

The independence of directors, or lack thereof, is ultimately demonstrated through the decisions they make. In assessing the independence of directors, we will take into consideration, when appropriate, whether a director has a track record indicative of making objective decisions. Likewise, when assessing the independence of directors we will also examine when a director's track record on multiple boards indicates a lack of objective decision-making. Ultimately, we believe the determination of whether a director is independent or not must take into consideration both compliance with the applicable independence listing requirements as well as judgments made by the director.

We look at each director nominee to examine the director's relationships with the company, the company's executives, and other directors. We do this to evaluate whether personal, familial, or financial relationships (not including director compensation) may impact the director's decisions. We believe that such relationships make it difficult for a director to put shareholders' interests above the director's or the related party's interests. We also believe that a director who owns more than 20% of a company can exert disproportionate influence on the board, and therefore believe such a director's independence may be hampered, in particular when serving on the audit committee.

Thus, we put directors into three categories based on an examination of the type of relationship they have with the company:

Independent Director – An independent director has no material financial, familial or other current relationships with the company, its executives, or other board members, except for board service and standard fees paid for that service. Relationships that existed within three to five years¹ before the inquiry are usually considered "current" for purposes of this test.

Affiliated Director – An affiliated director has, (or within the past three years, had) a material financial, familial or other relationship with the company or its executives, but is not an employee of the company.² This includes directors whose employers have a material financial relationship with the company.³ In addition, we view a director who either owns or controls 20% or more of the company's voting stock, or is an employee or affiliate of an entity that controls such amount, as an affiliate.⁴

1 NASDAQ originally proposed a five-year look-back period but both it and the NYSE ultimately settled on a three-year look-back prior to finalizing their rules. A five-year standard is more appropriate, in our view, because we believe that the unwinding of conflicting relationships between former management and board members is more likely to be complete and final after five years. However, Glass Lewis does not apply the five-year look-back period to directors who have previously served as executives of the company on an interim basis for less than one year.

2 If a company does not consider a non-employee director to be independent, Glass Lewis will classify that director as an affiliate.

3 We allow a five-year grace period for former executives of the company or merged companies who have consulting agreements with the surviving company. (We do not automatically recommend voting against directors in such cases for the first five years.) If the consulting agreement persists after this five-year grace period, we apply the materiality thresholds outlined in the definition of "material."

4 This includes a director who serves on a board as a representative (as part of his or her basic responsibilities) of an investment firm with greater than 20% ownership. However, while we will generally consider him/her to be affiliated, we will not recommend voting against unless (i) the investment firm has disproportionate board representation or (ii) the director serves on the audit committee.

We view 20% shareholders as affiliates because they typically have access to and involvement with the management of a company that is fundamentally different from that of ordinary shareholders. More importantly, 20% holders may have interests that diverge from those of ordinary holders, for reasons such as the liquidity (or lack thereof) of their holdings, personal tax issues, etc.

Glass Lewis applies a three-year look back period to all directors who have an affiliation with the company other than former employment, for which we apply a five-year look back.

Definition of **“Material”**: A material relationship is one in which the dollar value exceeds:

- \$50,000 (or where no amount is disclosed) for directors who are paid for a service they have agreed to perform for the company, outside of their service as a director, including professional or other services; or
- \$120,000 (or where no amount is disclosed) for those directors employed by a professional services firm such as a law firm, investment bank, or consulting firm and the company pays the firm, not the individual, for services.⁵ This dollar limit would also apply to charitable contributions to schools where a board member is a professor; or charities where a director serves on the board or is an executive;⁶ and any aircraft and real estate dealings between the company and the director’s firm; or
- 1% of either company’s consolidated gross revenue for other business relationships (e.g., where the director is an executive officer of a company that provides services or products to or receives services or products from the company).⁷

Definition of **“Familial”**: Familial relationships include a person’s spouse, parents, children, siblings, grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, nieces, nephews, in-laws, and anyone (other than domestic employees) who shares such person’s home. A director is an affiliate if: i) he or she has a family member who is employed by the company and receives more than \$120,000 in annual compensation; or, ii) he or she has a family member who is employed by the company and the company does not disclose this individual’s compensation.

Definition of **“Company”**: A company includes any parent or subsidiary in a group with the company or any entity that merged with, was acquired by, or acquired the company.

Inside Director – An inside director simultaneously serves as a director and as an employee of the company. This category may include a chairman of the board who acts as an employee of the company or is paid as an employee of the company. In our view, an inside director who derives a greater amount of income as a result of affiliated transactions with the company rather than through compensation paid by the company (i.e., salary, bonus, etc. as a company employee) faces a conflict between making decisions that are in the best interests of the company versus those in the director’s own best interests. Therefore, we will recommend voting against such a director.

Additionally, we believe a director who is currently serving in an interim management position should be considered an insider, while a director who previously served in an interim management position for less than one year and is no longer serving in such capacity is considered independent. Moreover, a director who previously served in an interim management position for over one year and is no longer serving in such capacity is considered an affiliate for five years following the date of his/her resignation or departure from the interim management position.

⁵ We may deem such a transaction to be immaterial where the amount represents less than 1% of the firm’s annual revenues and the board provides a compelling rationale as to why the director’s independence is not affected by the relationship.

⁶ We will generally take into consideration the size and nature of such charitable entities in relation to the company’s size and industry along with any other relevant factors such as the director’s role at the charity. However, unlike for other types of related party transactions, Glass Lewis generally does not apply a look-back period to affiliated relationships involving charitable contributions; if the relationship between the director and the school or charity ceases, or if the company discontinues its donations to the entity, we will consider the director to be independent.

⁷ This includes cases where a director is employed by, or closely affiliated with, a private equity firm that profits from an acquisition made by the company. Unless disclosure suggests otherwise, we presume the director is affiliated.

VOTING RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE BASIS OF BOARD INDEPENDENCE

Glass Lewis believes a board will be most effective in protecting shareholders' interests if it is at least two-thirds independent. We note that each of the Business Roundtable, the Conference Board, and the Council of Institutional Investors advocates that two-thirds of the board be independent. Where more than one-third of the members are affiliated or inside directors, we typically⁸ recommend voting against some of the inside and/or affiliated directors in order to satisfy the two-thirds threshold.

In the case of a less than two-thirds independent board, Glass Lewis strongly supports the existence of a presiding or lead director with authority to set the meeting agendas and to lead sessions outside the insider chairman's presence.

In addition, we scrutinize avowedly "independent" chairmen and lead directors. We believe that they should be unquestionably independent or the company should not tout them as such.

COMMITTEE INDEPENDENCE

We believe that only independent directors should serve on a company's audit, compensation, nominating, and governance committees.⁹ We typically recommend that shareholders vote against any affiliated or inside director seeking appointment to an audit, compensation, nominating, or governance committee, or who has served in that capacity in the past year.

Pursuant to Section 952 of the Dodd-Frank Act, as of January 11, 2013, the SEC approved new listing requirements for both the NYSE and NASDAQ which require that boards apply enhanced standards of independence when making an affirmative determination of the independence of compensation committee members. Specifically, when making this determination, in addition to the factors considered when assessing general director independence, the board's considerations must include: (i) the source of compensation of the director, including any consulting, advisory or other compensatory fee paid by the listed company to the director (the "Fees Factor"); and (ii) whether the director is affiliated with the listing company, its subsidiaries, or affiliates of its subsidiaries (the "Affiliation Factor").

Glass Lewis believes it is important for boards to consider these enhanced independence factors when assessing compensation committee members. However, as discussed above in the section titled Independence, we apply our own standards when assessing the independence of directors, and these standards also take into account consulting and advisory fees paid to the director, as well as the director's affiliations with the company and its subsidiaries and affiliates. We may recommend voting against compensation committee members who are not independent based on our standards.

INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN

Glass Lewis believes that separating the roles of CEO (or, more rarely, another executive position) and chairman creates a better governance structure than a combined CEO/chairman position. An executive manages the business according to a course the board charts. Executives should report to the board regarding their performance in achieving goals set by the board. This is needlessly complicated when a CEO chairs the board, since a CEO/chairman presumably will have a significant influence over the board.

While many companies have an independent lead or presiding director who performs many of the same functions of an independent chairman (e.g., setting the board meeting agenda), we do not believe this alternate form of independent board leadership provides as robust protection for shareholders as an independent chairman.

⁸ With a staggered board, if the affiliates or insiders that we believe should not be on the board are not up for election, we will express our concern regarding those directors, but we will not recommend voting against the other affiliates or insiders who are up for election just to achieve two-thirds independence. However, we will consider recommending voting against the directors subject to our concern at their next election if the issue giving rise to the concern is not resolved.

⁹ We will recommend voting against an audit committee member who owns 20% or more of the company's stock, and we believe that there should be a maximum of one director (or no directors if the committee is comprised of less than three directors) who owns 20% or more of the company's stock on the compensation, nominating, and governance committees.

It can become difficult for a board to fulfill its role of overseer and policy setter when a CEO/chairman controls the agenda and the boardroom discussion. Such control can allow a CEO to have an entrenched position, leading to longer-than-optimal terms, fewer checks on management, less scrutiny of the business operation, and limitations on independent, shareholder-focused goal-setting by the board.

A CEO should set the strategic course for the company, with the board's approval, and the board should enable the CEO to carry out the CEO's vision for accomplishing the board's objectives. Failure to achieve the board's objectives should lead the board to replace that CEO with someone in whom the board has confidence.

Likewise, an independent chairman can better oversee executives and set a pro-shareholder agenda without the management conflicts that a CEO and other executive insiders often face. Such oversight and concern for shareholders allows for a more proactive and effective board of directors that is better able to look out for the interests of shareholders.

Further, it is the board's responsibility to select a chief executive who can best serve a company and its shareholders and to replace this person when his or her duties have not been appropriately fulfilled. Such a replacement becomes more difficult and happens less frequently when the chief executive is also in the position of overseeing the board.

Glass Lewis believes that the installation of an independent chairman is almost always a positive step from a corporate governance perspective and promotes the best interests of shareholders. Further, the presence of an independent chairman fosters the creation of a thoughtful and dynamic board, not dominated by the views of senior management. Encouragingly, many companies appear to be moving in this direction—one study indicates that only 10 percent of incoming CEOs in 2014 were awarded the chairman title, versus 48 percent in 2002.¹⁰ Another study finds that 47 percent of S&P 500 boards now separate the CEO and chairman roles, up from 37 percent in 2009, although the same study found that only 28 percent of S&P 500 boards have truly independent chairs.¹¹

We do not recommend that shareholders vote against CEOs who chair the board. However, we typically recommend that our clients support separating the roles of chairman and CEO whenever that question is posed in a proxy (typically in the form of a shareholder proposal), as we believe that it is in the long-term best interests of the company and its shareholders.

Further, where the company has neither an independent chairman nor independent lead director, we will recommend voting against the chair of the governance committee.

PERFORMANCE

The most crucial test of a board's commitment to the company and its shareholders lies in the actions of the board and its members. We look at the performance of these individuals as directors and executives of the company and of other companies where they have served.

We find that a director's past conduct is often indicative of future conduct and performance. We often find directors with a history of overpaying executives or of serving on boards where avoidable disasters have occurred serving on the boards of companies with similar problems. Glass Lewis has a proprietary database of directors serving at over 8,000 of the most widely held U.S. companies. We use this database to track the performance of directors across companies.

VOTING RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE BASIS OF PERFORMANCE

We typically recommend that shareholders vote against directors who have served on boards or as executives of companies with records of poor performance, inadequate risk oversight, excessive compensation, audit- or accounting-related issues, and/or other indicators of mismanagement or actions against the interests of shareholders. We will reevaluate such directors based on, among other factors, the length of time passed since the incident giving rise to the concern, shareholder support for the director, the severity of the issue, the

¹⁰ Ken Favaro, Per-Ola Karlsson and Gary L. Nelson. "The \$112 Billion CEO Succession Problem." (*Strategy+Business*, Issue 79, Summer 2015).

¹¹ Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2014, p. 23.

director's role (e.g., committee membership), director tenure at the subject company, whether ethical lapses accompanied the oversight lapse, and evidence of strong oversight at other companies.

Likewise, we examine the backgrounds of those who serve on key board committees to ensure that they have the required skills and diverse backgrounds to make informed judgments about the subject matter for which the committee is responsible.

We believe shareholders should avoid electing directors who have a record of not fulfilling their responsibilities to shareholders at any company where they have held a board or executive position. We typically recommend voting against:

1. A director who fails to attend a minimum of 75% of board and applicable committee meetings, calculated in the aggregate.¹²
2. A director who belatedly filed a significant form(s) 4 or 5, or who has a pattern of late filings if the late filing was the director's fault (we look at these late filing situations on a case-by-case basis).
3. A director who is also the CEO of a company where a serious and material restatement has occurred after the CEO had previously certified the pre-restatement financial statements.
4. A director who has received two against recommendations from Glass Lewis for identical reasons within the prior year at different companies (the same situation must also apply at the company being analyzed).
5. All directors who served on the board if, for the last three years, the company's performance has been in the bottom quartile of the sector and the directors have not taken reasonable steps to address the poor performance.

BOARD RESPONSIVENESS

Glass Lewis believes that any time 25% or more of shareholders vote contrary to the recommendation of management, the board should, depending on the issue, demonstrate some level of responsiveness to address the concerns of shareholders. These include instances when 25% or more of shareholders (excluding abstentions and broker non-votes): WITHHOLD votes from (or vote AGAINST) a director nominee, vote AGAINST a management-sponsored proposal, or vote FOR a shareholder proposal. In our view, a 25% threshold is significant enough to warrant a close examination of the underlying issues and an evaluation of whether or not a board response was warranted and, if so, whether the board responded appropriately following the vote. While the 25% threshold alone will not automatically generate a negative vote recommendation from Glass Lewis on a future proposal (e.g., to recommend against a director nominee, against a say-on-pay proposal, etc.), it may be a contributing factor to our recommendation to vote against management's recommendation in the event we determine that the board did not respond appropriately.

As a general framework, our evaluation of board responsiveness involves a review of publicly available disclosures (e.g., the proxy statement, annual report, 8-Ks, company website, etc.) released following the date of the company's last annual meeting up through the publication date of our most current Proxy Paper. Depending on the specific issue, our focus typically includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- At the board level, any changes in directorships, committee memberships, disclosure of related party transactions, meeting attendance, or other responsibilities;
- Any revisions made to the company's articles of incorporation, bylaws or other governance documents;
- Any press or news releases indicating changes in, or the adoption of, new company policies, business practices or special reports; and

¹² However, where a director has served for less than one full year, we will typically not recommend voting against for failure to attend 75% of meetings. Rather, we will note the poor attendance with a recommendation to track this issue going forward. We will also refrain from recommending to vote against directors when the proxy discloses that the director missed the meetings due to serious illness or other extenuating circumstances.

- Any modifications made to the design and structure of the company’s compensation program, as well as an assessment of the company’s engagement with shareholders on compensation issues as discussed in the CD&A, particularly following a material vote against a company’s say-on-pay.

Our Proxy Paper analysis will include a case-by-case assessment of the specific elements of board responsiveness that we examined along with an explanation of how that assessment impacts our current voting recommendations.

THE ROLE OF A COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Glass Lewis believes that a designated committee chairman maintains primary responsibility for the actions of his or her respective committee. As such, many of our committee-specific voting recommendations are against the applicable committee chair rather than the entire committee (depending on the seriousness of the issue). However, in cases where we would ordinarily recommend voting against a committee chairman but the chair is not specified, we apply the following general rules, which apply throughout our guidelines:

- If there is no committee chair, we recommend voting against the longest-serving committee member or, if the longest-serving committee member cannot be determined, the longest-serving board member serving on the committee (i.e., in either case, the “senior director”); and
- If there is no committee chair, but multiple senior directors serving on the committee, we recommend voting against both (or all) such senior directors.

In our view, companies should provide clear disclosure of which director is charged with overseeing each committee. In cases where that simple framework is ignored and a reasonable analysis cannot determine which committee member is the designated leader, we believe shareholder action against the longest serving committee member(s) is warranted. Again, this only applies if we would ordinarily recommend voting against the committee chair but there is either no such position or no designated director in such role.

On the contrary, in cases where there is a designated committee chair and the recommendation is to vote against the committee chair, but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will note the concern with regard to the committee chair.

AUDIT COMMITTEES AND PERFORMANCE

Audit committees play an integral role in overseeing the financial reporting process because “[v]ibrant and stable capital markets depend on, among other things, reliable, transparent, and objective financial information to support an efficient and effective capital market process. The vital oversight role audit committees play in the process of producing financial information has never been more important.”¹³

When assessing an audit committee’s performance, we are aware that an audit committee does not prepare financial statements, is not responsible for making the key judgments and assumptions that affect the financial statements, and does not audit the numbers or the disclosures provided to investors. Rather, an audit committee member monitors and oversees the process and procedures that management and auditors perform. The 1999 Report and Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Improving the Effectiveness of Corporate Audit Committees stated it best:

A proper and well-functioning system exists, therefore, when the three main groups responsible for financial reporting – the full board including the audit committee, financial management including the internal auditors, and the outside auditors – form a ‘three legged stool’ that supports responsible financial disclosure and active participatory oversight. However, in the view of the Committee, the audit committee must be ‘first among equals’ in this process, since the audit committee is an extension of the full board and hence the ultimate monitor of the process.

¹³ Audit Committee Effectiveness – What Works Best.” PricewaterhouseCoopers. The Institute of Internal Auditors Research Foundation. 2005.

STANDARDS FOR ASSESSING THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

For an audit committee to function effectively on investors' behalf, it must include members with sufficient knowledge to diligently carry out their responsibilities. In its audit and accounting recommendations, the Conference Board Commission on Public Trust and Private Enterprise said "members of the audit committee must be independent and have both knowledge and experience in auditing financial matters."¹⁴

We are skeptical of audit committees where there are members that lack expertise as a Certified Public Accountant (CPA), Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or corporate controller, or similar experience. While we will not necessarily recommend voting against members of an audit committee when such expertise is lacking, we are more likely to recommend voting against committee members when a problem such as a restatement occurs and such expertise is lacking.

Glass Lewis generally assesses audit committees against the decisions they make with respect to their oversight and monitoring role. The quality and integrity of the financial statements and earnings reports, the completeness of disclosures necessary for investors to make informed decisions, and the effectiveness of the internal controls should provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements are materially free from errors. The independence of the external auditors and the results of their work all provide useful information by which to assess the audit committee.

When assessing the decisions and actions of the audit committee, we typically defer to its judgment and generally recommend voting in favor of its members. However, we will consider recommending that shareholders vote against the following:¹⁵

1. All members of the audit committee when options were backdated, there is a lack of adequate controls in place, there was a resulting restatement, and disclosures indicate there was a lack of documentation with respect to the option grants.
2. The audit committee chair, if the audit committee does not have a financial expert or the committee's financial expert does not have a demonstrable financial background sufficient to understand the financial issues unique to public companies.
3. The audit committee chair, if the audit committee did not meet at least four times during the year.
4. The audit committee chair, if the committee has less than three members.
5. Any audit committee member who sits on more than three public company audit committees, unless the audit committee member is a retired CPA, CFO, controller or has similar experience, in which case the limit shall be four committees, taking time and availability into consideration including a review of the audit committee member's attendance at all board and committee meetings.¹⁶
6. All members of an audit committee who are up for election and who served on the committee at the time of the audit, if audit and audit-related fees total one-third or less of the total fees billed by the auditor.
7. The audit committee chair when tax and/or other fees are greater than audit and audit-related fees paid to the auditor for more than one year in a row (in which case we also recommend against ratification of the auditor).
8. All members of an audit committee where non-audit fees include fees for tax services (including, but not limited to, such things as tax avoidance or shelter schemes) for senior executives of the company. Such services are prohibited by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB").

¹⁴ Commission on Public Trust and Private Enterprise. The Conference Board. 2003.

¹⁵ As discussed under the section labeled "Committee Chairman," where the recommendation is to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against the members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will note the concern with regard to the committee chair.

¹⁶ Glass Lewis may exempt certain audit committee members from the above threshold if, upon further analysis of relevant factors such as the director's experience, the size, industry-mix and location of the companies involved and the director's attendance at all the companies, we can reasonably determine that the audit committee member is likely not hindered by multiple audit committee commitments.

9. All members of an audit committee that reappointed an auditor that we no longer consider to be independent for reasons unrelated to fee proportions.
10. All members of an audit committee when audit fees are excessively low, especially when compared with other companies in the same industry.
11. The audit committee chair¹⁷ if the committee failed to put auditor ratification on the ballot for shareholder approval. However, if the non-audit fees or tax fees exceed audit plus audit-related fees in either the current or the prior year, then Glass Lewis will recommend voting against the entire audit committee.
12. All members of an audit committee where the auditor has resigned and reported that a section 10A¹⁸ letter has been issued.
13. All members of an audit committee at a time when material accounting fraud occurred at the company.¹⁹
14. All members of an audit committee at a time when annual and/or multiple quarterly financial statements had to be restated, and any of the following factors apply:
 - The restatement involves fraud or manipulation by insiders;
 - The restatement is accompanied by an SEC inquiry or investigation;
 - The restatement involves revenue recognition;
 - The restatement results in a greater than 5% adjustment to costs of goods sold, operating expense, or operating cash flows; or
 - The restatement results in a greater than 5% adjustment to net income, 10% adjustment to assets or shareholders equity, or cash flows from financing or investing activities.
15. All members of an audit committee if the company repeatedly fails to file its financial reports in a timely fashion. For example, the company has filed two or more quarterly or annual financial statements late within the last 5 quarters.
16. All members of an audit committee when it has been disclosed that a law enforcement agency has charged the company and/or its employees with a violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA).
17. All members of an audit committee when the company has aggressive accounting policies and/or poor disclosure or lack of sufficient transparency in its financial statements.
18. All members of the audit committee when there is a disagreement with the auditor and the auditor resigns or is dismissed (e.g., the company receives an adverse opinion on its financial statements from the auditor).
19. All members of the audit committee if the contract with the auditor specifically limits the auditor's liability to the company for damages.²⁰
20. All members of the audit committee who served since the date of the company's last annual meeting, and when, since the last annual meeting, the company has reported a material weakness that has not yet been corrected, or, when the company has an ongoing material weakness from a prior year that has not yet been corrected.

¹⁷ As discussed under the section labeled "Committee Chairman," in all cases, if the chair of the committee is not specified, we recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest.

¹⁸ Auditors are required to report all potential illegal acts to management and the audit committee unless they are clearly inconsequential in nature.

If the audit committee or the board fails to take appropriate action on an act that has been determined to be a violation of the law, the independent auditor is required to send a section 10A letter to the SEC. Such letters are rare and therefore we believe should be taken seriously.

¹⁹ Research indicates that revenue fraud now accounts for over 60% of SEC fraud cases, and that companies that engage in fraud experience significant negative abnormal stock price declines—facing bankruptcy, delisting, and material asset sales at much higher rates than do non-fraud firms (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. "Fraudulent Financial Reporting: 1998-2007." May 2010).

²⁰ The Council of Institutional Investors. "Corporate Governance Policies," p. 4, April 5, 2006; and "Letter from Council of Institutional Investors to the AICPA," November 8, 2006.

We also take a dim view of audit committee reports that are boilerplate, and which provide little or no information or transparency to investors. When a problem such as a material weakness, restatement or late filings occurs, we take into consideration, in forming our judgment with respect to the audit committee, the transparency of the audit committee report.

COMPENSATION COMMITTEE PERFORMANCE

Compensation committees have a critical role in determining the compensation of executives. This includes deciding the basis on which compensation is determined, as well as the amounts and types of compensation to be paid. This process begins with the hiring and initial establishment of employment agreements, including the terms for such items as pay, pensions and severance arrangements. It is important in establishing compensation arrangements that compensation be consistent with, and based on the long-term economic performance of, the business's long-term shareholders returns.

Compensation committees are also responsible for the oversight of the transparency of compensation. This oversight includes disclosure of compensation arrangements, the matrix used in assessing pay for performance, and the use of compensation consultants. In order to ensure the independence of the board's compensation consultant, we believe the compensation committee should only engage a compensation consultant that is not also providing any services to the company or management apart from their contract with the compensation committee. It is important to investors that they have clear and complete disclosure of all the significant terms of compensation arrangements in order to make informed decisions with respect to the oversight and decisions of the compensation committee.

Finally, compensation committees are responsible for oversight of internal controls over the executive compensation process. This includes controls over gathering information used to determine compensation, establishment of equity award plans, and granting of equity awards. For example, the use of a compensation consultant who maintains a business relationship with company management may cause the committee to make decisions based on information that is compromised by the consultant's conflict of interests. Lax controls can also contribute to improper awards of compensation such as through granting of backdated or spring-loaded options, or granting of bonuses when triggers for bonus payments have not been met.

Central to understanding the actions of a compensation committee is a careful review of the Compensation Discussion and Analysis ("CD&A") report included in each company's proxy. We review the CD&A in our evaluation of the overall compensation practices of a company, as overseen by the compensation committee. The CD&A is also integral to the evaluation of compensation proposals at companies, such as advisory votes on executive compensation, which allow shareholders to vote on the compensation paid to a company's top executives.

When assessing the performance of compensation committees, we will consider recommending that shareholders vote against the following:²¹

1. All members of a compensation committee during whose tenure the committee failed to address shareholder concerns following majority shareholder rejection of the say-on-pay proposal in the previous year. Where the proposal was approved but there was a significant shareholder vote (i.e., greater than 25% of votes cast) against the say-on-pay proposal in the prior year, if the board did not respond sufficiently to the vote including actively engaging shareholders on this issue, we will also consider recommending voting against the chairman of the compensation committee or all members of the compensation committee, depending on the severity and history of the compensation problems and the level of shareholder opposition.
2. All members of the compensation committee who are up for election and served when the company failed to align pay with performance (e.g., a company receives an F grade in our pay-for-performance

²¹ As discussed under the section labeled "Committee Chairman," where the recommendation is to vote against the committee chair and the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will note the concern with regard to the committee chair.

analysis) if shareholders are not provided with an advisory vote on executive compensation at the annual meeting.²²

3. Any member of the compensation committee who has served on the compensation committee of at least two other public companies that have consistently failed to align pay with performance and whose oversight of compensation at the company in question is suspect.
4. The compensation committee chair if the company consistently has received deficient grades in our pay-for-performance analysis, and if during the past year the company performed the same as or worse than its peers.²³
5. All members of the compensation committee (during the relevant time period) if the company entered into excessive employment agreements and/or severance agreements.
6. All members of the compensation committee when performance goals were changed (i.e., lowered) when employees failed or were unlikely to meet original goals, or performance-based compensation was paid despite goals not being attained.
7. All members of the compensation committee if excessive employee perquisites and benefits were allowed.
8. The compensation committee chair if the compensation committee did not meet during the year.
9. All members of the compensation committee when the company repriced options or completed a “self tender offer” without shareholder approval within the past two years.
10. All members of the compensation committee when vesting of in-the-money options is accelerated.
11. All members of the compensation committee when option exercise prices were backdated. Glass Lewis will recommend voting against an executive director who played a role in and participated in option backdating.
12. All members of the compensation committee when option exercise prices were spring-loaded or otherwise timed around the release of material information.
13. All members of the compensation committee when a new employment contract is given to an executive that does not include a clawback provision and the company had a material restatement, especially if the restatement was due to fraud.
14. The chair of the compensation committee where the CD&A provides insufficient or unclear information about performance metrics and goals, where the CD&A indicates that pay is not tied to performance, or where the compensation committee or management has excessive discretion to alter performance terms or increase amounts of awards in contravention of previously defined targets.
15. All members of the compensation committee during whose tenure the committee failed to implement a shareholder proposal regarding a compensation-related issue, where the proposal received the affirmative vote of a majority of the voting shares at a shareholder meeting, and when a reasonable analysis suggests that the compensation committee (rather than the governance committee) should have taken steps to implement the request.²⁴

22 Where there are multiple CEOs in one year, we will consider not recommending against the compensation committee but will defer judgment on compensation policies and practices until the next year or a full year after arrival of the new CEO. In addition, if a company provides shareholders with a say-on-pay proposal, we will initially only recommend voting against the company's say-on-pay proposal and will not recommend voting against the members of the compensation committee unless there is a pattern of failing to align pay and performance and/or the company exhibits egregious compensation practices. However, if the company repeatedly fails to align pay and performance, we will then recommend against the members of the compensation committee in addition to recommending voting against the say-on-pay proposal.

23 In cases where a company has received two consecutive D grades, or if its grade improved from an F to a D in the most recent period, and during the most recent year the company performed better than its peers (based on our analysis), we refrain from recommending to vote against the compensation committee chair. In addition, if a company provides shareholders with a say-on-pay proposal in this instance, we will consider voting against the advisory vote rather than the compensation committee chair unless the company exhibits unquestionably egregious practices.

24 In all other instances (i.e., a non-compensation-related shareholder proposal should have been implemented) we recommend that shareholders vote against the members of the governance committee.

NOMINATING AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE PERFORMANCE

The nominating and governance committee, as an agent for the shareholders, is responsible for the governance by the board of the company and its executives. In performing this role, the committee is responsible and accountable for selection of objective and competent board members. It is also responsible for providing leadership on governance policies adopted by the company, such as decisions to implement shareholder proposals that have received a majority vote. (At most companies, a single committee is charged with these oversight functions; at others, the governance and nominating responsibilities are apportioned among two separate committees.)

Consistent with Glass Lewis' philosophy that boards should have diverse backgrounds and members with a breadth and depth of relevant experience, we believe that nominating and governance committees should consider diversity when making director nominations within the context of each specific company and its industry. In our view, shareholders are best served when boards make an effort to ensure a constituency that is not only reasonably diverse on the basis of age, race, gender and ethnicity, but also on the basis of geographic knowledge, industry experience, board tenure and culture.

Regarding the committee responsible for governance, we will consider recommending that shareholders vote against the following:²⁵

1. All members of the governance committee²⁶ during whose tenure a shareholder proposal relating to important shareholder rights received support from a majority of the votes cast (excluding abstentions and broker non-votes) and the board has not begun to implement or enact the proposal's subject matter.²⁷ Examples of such shareholder proposals include those seeking a declassified board structure, a majority vote standard for director elections, or a right to call a special meeting. In determining whether a board has sufficiently implemented such a proposal, we will examine the quality of the right enacted or proffered by the board for any conditions that may unreasonably interfere with the shareholders' ability to exercise the right (e.g., overly restrictive procedural requirements for calling a special meeting).
2. The governance committee chair,²⁸ when the chairman is not independent and an independent lead or presiding director has not been appointed.²⁹
3. In the absence of a nominating committee, the governance committee chair when there are less than five or the whole nominating committee when there are more than 20 members on the board.
4. The governance committee chair, when the committee fails to meet at all during the year.
5. The governance committee chair, when for two consecutive years the company provides what we consider to be "inadequate" related party transaction disclosure (i.e., the nature of such transactions and/or the monetary amounts involved are unclear or excessively vague, thereby preventing a shareholder from being able to reasonably interpret the independence status of multiple directors above and beyond what the company maintains is compliant with SEC or applicable stock exchange listing requirements).

25 As discussed in the guidelines section labeled "Committee Chairman," where we would recommend to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will note the concern with regard to the committee chair.

26 If the board does not have a committee responsible for governance oversight and the board did not implement a shareholder proposal that received the requisite support, we will recommend voting against the entire board. If the shareholder proposal at issue requested that the board adopt a declassified structure, we will recommend voting against all director nominees up for election.

27 Where a compensation-related shareholder proposal should have been implemented, and when a reasonable analysis suggests that the members of the compensation committee (rather than the governance committee) bear the responsibility for failing to implement the request, we recommend that shareholders only vote against members of the compensation committee.

28 As discussed in the guidelines section labeled "Committee Chairman," if the committee chair is not specified, we recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest. If the longest-serving committee member cannot be determined, we will recommend voting against the longest-serving board member serving on the committee.

29 We believe that one independent individual should be appointed to serve as the lead or presiding director. When such a position is rotated among directors from meeting to meeting, we will recommend voting against the governance committee chair as we believe the lack of fixed lead or presiding director means that, effectively, the board does not have an independent board leader.

6. The governance committee chair, when during the past year the board adopted a forum selection clause (i.e., an exclusive forum provision)³⁰ without shareholder approval, or, if the board is currently seeking shareholder approval of a forum selection clause pursuant to a bundled bylaw amendment rather than as a separate proposal.
7. All members of the governance committee during whose tenure the board adopted, without shareholder approval, provisions in its charter or bylaws that, through rules on director compensation, may inhibit the ability of shareholders to nominate directors.

In addition, we may recommend that shareholders vote against the chairman of the governance committee, or the entire committee, where the board has amended the company's governing documents to reduce or remove important shareholder rights, or to otherwise impede the ability of shareholders to exercise such right, and has done so without seeking shareholder approval. Examples of board actions that may cause such a recommendation include: the elimination of the ability of shareholders to call a special meeting or to act by written consent; an increase to the ownership threshold required for shareholders to call a special meeting; an increase to vote requirements for charter or bylaw amendments; the adoption of provisions that limit the ability of shareholders to pursue full legal recourse—such as bylaws that require arbitration of shareholder claims or that require shareholder plaintiffs to pay the company's legal expenses in the absence of a court victory (i.e., “fee-shifting” or “loser pays” bylaws); the adoption of a classified board structure; and the elimination of the ability of shareholders to remove a director without cause.

Regarding the nominating committee, we will consider recommending that shareholders vote against the following:³¹

1. All members of the nominating committee, when the committee nominated or renominated an individual who had a significant conflict of interest or whose past actions demonstrated a lack of integrity or inability to represent shareholder interests.
2. The nominating committee chair, if the nominating committee did not meet during the year.
3. In the absence of a governance committee, the nominating committee chair³² when the chairman is not independent, and an independent lead or presiding director has not been appointed.³³
4. The nominating committee chair, when there are less than five or the whole nominating committee when there are more than 20 members on the board.³⁴
5. The nominating committee chair, when a director received a greater than 50% against vote the prior year and not only was the director not removed, but the issues that raised shareholder concern were not corrected.³⁵

In addition, we may consider recommending shareholders vote against the chair of the nominating committee where the board's failure to ensure the board has directors with relevant experience, either through periodic director assessment or board refreshment, has contributed to a company's poor performance.

30 A forum selection clause is a bylaw provision stipulating that a certain state, typically where the company is incorporated, which is most often Delaware, shall be the exclusive forum for all intra-corporate disputes (e.g., shareholder derivative actions, assertions of claims of a breach of fiduciary duty, etc.). Such a clause effectively limits a shareholder's legal remedy regarding appropriate choice of venue and related relief offered under that state's laws and rulings.

31 As discussed in the guidelines section labeled “Committee Chairman,” where we would recommend to vote against the committee chair but the chair is not up for election because the board is staggered, we do not recommend voting against any members of the committee who are up for election; rather, we will note the concern with regard to the committee chair.

32 As discussed under the section labeled “Committee Chairman,” if the committee chair is not specified, we will recommend voting against the director who has been on the committee the longest. If the longest-serving committee member cannot be determined, we will recommend voting against the longest-serving board member on the committee.

33 In the absence of both a governance and a nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the chairman of the board on this basis, unless if the chairman also serves as the CEO, in which case we will recommend voting against the longest-serving director.

34 In the absence of both a governance and a nominating committee, we will recommend voting against the chairman of the board on this basis, unless if the chairman also serves as the CEO, in which case we will recommend voting against the the longest-serving director.

35 Considering that shareholder discontent clearly relates to the director who received a greater than 50% against vote rather than the nominating chair, we review the severity of the issue(s) that initially raised shareholder concern as well as company responsiveness to such matters, and will only recommend voting against the nominating chair if a reasonable analysis suggests that it would be most appropriate. In rare cases, we will consider recommending against the nominating chair when a director receives a substantial (i.e., 25% or more) vote against based on the same analysis.

BOARD-LEVEL RISK MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT

Glass Lewis evaluates the risk management function of a public company board on a strictly case-by-case basis. Sound risk management, while necessary at all companies, is particularly important at financial firms which inherently maintain significant exposure to financial risk. We believe such financial firms should have a chief risk officer reporting directly to the board and a dedicated risk committee or a committee of the board charged with risk oversight. Moreover, many non-financial firms maintain strategies which involve a high level of exposure to financial risk. Similarly, since many non-financial firms have complex hedging or trading strategies, those firms should also have a chief risk officer and a risk committee.

Our views on risk oversight are consistent with those expressed by various regulatory bodies. In its December 2009 Final Rule release on Proxy Disclosure Enhancements, the SEC noted that risk oversight is a key competence of the board and that additional disclosures would improve investor and shareholder understanding of the role of the board in the organization's risk management practices. The final rules, which became effective on February 28, 2010, now explicitly require companies and mutual funds to describe (while allowing for some degree of flexibility) the board's role in the oversight of risk.

When analyzing the risk management practices of public companies, we take note of any significant losses or writedowns on financial assets and/or structured transactions. In cases where a company has disclosed a sizable loss or writedown, and where we find that the company's board-level risk committee's poor oversight contributed to the loss, we will recommend that shareholders vote against such committee members on that basis. In addition, in cases where a company maintains a significant level of financial risk exposure but fails to disclose any explicit form of board-level risk oversight (committee or otherwise)³⁶, we will consider recommending to vote against the chairman of the board on that basis. However, we generally would not recommend voting against a combined chairman/CEO, except in egregious cases.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISK OVERSIGHT

Companies face significant financial, legal and reputational risks resulting from poor environmental and social practices, or negligent oversight thereof. Therefore, Glass Lewis views the identification, mitigation and management of environmental and social risks as integral components when evaluating a company's overall risk exposure. We believe boards should ensure that management conducts a complete risk analysis of company operations, including those that have environmental and social implications. Directors should monitor management's performance in managing and mitigating these environmental and social risks in order to eliminate or minimize the risks to the company and its shareholders. In cases where the board or management has failed to sufficiently identify and manage a material environmental or social risk that did or could negatively impact shareholder value, we will recommend shareholders vote against directors responsible for risk oversight in consideration of the nature of the risk and the potential effect on shareholder value.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In addition to the three key characteristics – independence, performance, experience – that we use to evaluate board members, we consider conflict-of-interest issues as well as the size of the board of directors when making voting recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest

We believe board members should be wholly free of identifiable and substantial conflicts of interest, regardless of the overall level of independent directors on the board. Accordingly, we recommend that shareholders vote against the following types of directors:

1. A CFO who is on the board: In our view, the CFO holds a unique position relative to financial reporting and disclosure to shareholders. Due to the critical importance of financial disclosure and reporting, we believe the CFO should report to the board and not be a member of it.

³⁶ A committee responsible for risk management could be a dedicated risk committee, the audit committee, or the finance committee, depending on a given company's board structure and method of disclosure. At some companies, the entire board is charged with risk management.

2. A director who is on an excessive number of boards: We will typically recommend voting against a director who serves as an executive officer of any public company while serving on a total of more than three public company boards (i.e., their own company’s board and two others), and any other director who serves on a total of more than six public company boards.³⁷ Academic literature suggests that one board takes up approximately 248 hours per year of each member’s time.³⁸ We believe this limits the number of boards on which directors can effectively serve, especially executives at other companies. Further, we note a recent study has shown that the average number of outside board seats held by CEOs of S&P 500 companies is 0.6, down from 0.9 in 2004.³⁹
3. A director who provides — or a director who has an immediate family member who provides — material consulting or other material professional services to the company. These services may include legal, consulting, or financial services. We question the need for the company to have consulting relationships with its directors. We view such relationships as creating conflicts for directors, since they may be forced to weigh their own interests against shareholder interests when making board decisions. In addition, a company’s decisions regarding where to turn for the best professional services may be compromised when doing business with the professional services firm of one of the company’s directors.
4. A director, or a director who has an immediate family member, engaging in airplane, real estate, or similar deals, including perquisite-type grants from the company, amounting to more than \$50,000. Directors who receive these sorts of payments from the company will have to make unnecessarily complicated decisions that may pit their interests against shareholder interests.
5. Interlocking directorships: CEOs or other top executives who serve on each other’s boards create an interlock that poses conflicts that should be avoided to ensure the promotion of shareholder interests above all else.⁴⁰
6. All board members who served at a time when a poison pill with a term of longer than one year was adopted without shareholder approval within the prior twelve months.⁴¹ In the event a board is classified and shareholders are therefore unable to vote against all directors, we will recommend voting against the remaining directors the next year they are up for a shareholder vote. If a poison pill with a term of one year or less was adopted without shareholder approval, and without adequate justification, we will consider recommending that shareholders vote against all members of the governance committee. If the board has, without seeking shareholder approval, and without adequate justification, extended the term of a poison pill by one year or less in two consecutive years, we will consider recommending that shareholders vote against the entire board.

Size of the Board of Directors

While we do not believe there is a universally applicable optimum board size, we do believe boards should have at least five directors to ensure sufficient diversity in decision-making and to enable the formation of key board committees with independent directors. Conversely, we believe that boards with more than 20 members will typically suffer under the weight of “too many cooks in the kitchen” and have difficulty reaching consensus and making timely decisions. Sometimes the presence of too many voices can make it difficult to draw on the wisdom and experience in the room by virtue of the need to limit the discussion so that each voice may be heard.

³⁷ For meetings held in 2016, Glass Lewis will note as a concern instances of a director who serves as an executive of a public company while serving on more than two boards and any other director who serves on more than five boards. Beginning in 2017, our voting recommendations will be based on these lowered thresholds. Glass Lewis will not recommend voting against the director at the company where he or she serves as an executive officer, only at the other public companies where he or she serves on the board.

³⁸ NACD Public Company Governance Survey 2015-2016. p. 22.

³⁹ Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2014, p. 22.

⁴⁰ We do not apply a look-back period for this situation. The interlock policy applies to both public and private companies. We will also evaluate multiple board interlocks among non-insiders (i.e., multiple directors serving on the same boards at other companies), for evidence of a pattern of poor oversight.

⁴¹ Refer to Section V. Governance Structure and the Shareholder Franchise for further discussion of our policies regarding anti-takeover measures, including poison pills.

To that end, we typically recommend voting against the chairman of the nominating committee (or the governance committee, in the absence of a nominating committee) at a board with fewer than five directors or more than 20 directors.⁴²

CONTROLLED COMPANIES

We believe controlled companies warrant certain exceptions to our independence standards. The board's function is to protect shareholder interests; however, when an individual, entity (or group of shareholders party to a formal agreement) owns more than 50% of the voting shares, the interests of the majority of shareholders are the interests of that entity or individual. Consequently, Glass Lewis does not apply our usual two-thirds board independence rule and therefore we will not recommend voting against boards whose composition reflects the makeup of the shareholder population.

Independence Exceptions

The independence exceptions that we make for controlled companies are as follows:

1. We do not require that controlled companies have boards that are at least two-thirds independent. So long as the insiders and/or affiliates are connected with the controlling entity, we accept the presence of non-independent board members.
2. The compensation committee and nominating and governance committees do not need to consist solely of independent directors.
 - We believe that standing nominating and corporate governance committees at controlled companies are unnecessary. Although having a committee charged with the duties of searching for, selecting, and nominating independent directors can be beneficial, the unique composition of a controlled company's shareholder base makes such committees weak and irrelevant.
 - Likewise, we believe that independent compensation committees at controlled companies are unnecessary. Although independent directors are the best choice for approving and monitoring senior executives' pay, controlled companies serve a unique shareholder population whose voting power ensures the protection of its interests. As such, we believe that having affiliated directors on a controlled company's compensation committee is acceptable. However, given that a controlled company has certain obligations to minority shareholders we feel that an insider should not serve on the compensation committee. Therefore, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against any insider (the CEO or otherwise) serving on the compensation committee.
3. Controlled companies do not need an independent chairman or an independent lead or presiding director. Although an independent director in a position of authority on the board – such as chairman or presiding director – can best carry out the board's duties, controlled companies serve a unique shareholder population whose voting power ensures the protection of its interests.

Size of the Board of Directors

We have no board size requirements for controlled companies.

Audit Committee Independence

Despite a controlled company's status, unlike for the other key committees, we nevertheless believe that audit committees should consist solely of independent directors. Regardless of a company's controlled status, the interests of all shareholders must be protected by ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the company's financial statements. Allowing affiliated directors to oversee the preparation of financial reports could create an insurmountable conflict of interest.

⁴² The Conference Board, at p. 23 in its May 2003 report "Corporate Governance Best Practices, Id.," quotes one of its roundtable participants as stating, "[w]hen you've got a 20 or 30 person corporate board, it's one way of assuring that nothing is ever going to happen that the CEO doesn't want to happen."

SIGNIFICANT SHAREHOLDERS

Where an individual or entity holds between 20-50% of a company's voting power, we believe it is reasonable to allow proportional representation on the board and committees (excluding the audit committee) based on the individual or entity's percentage of ownership.

EXCEPTIONS FOR RECENT IPOs

We believe companies that have recently completed an initial public offering ("IPO") should be allowed adequate time to fully comply with marketplace listing requirements as well as to meet basic corporate governance standards. We believe a one-year grace period immediately following the date of a company's IPO is sufficient time for most companies to comply with all relevant regulatory requirements and to meet such corporate governance standards. Except in egregious cases, Glass Lewis refrains from issuing voting recommendations on the basis of corporate governance best practices (e.g., board independence, committee membership and structure, meeting attendance, etc.) during the one-year period following an IPO.

However, two specific cases warrant strong shareholder action against the board of a company that completed an IPO within the past year:

1. **Adoption of an anti-takeover provision such as a poison pill or classified board:** In cases where a board adopts an anti-takeover provision preceding an IPO, we will consider recommending to vote against the members of the board who served when it was adopted if the board: (i) did not also commit to submit the anti-takeover provision to a shareholder vote within 12 months of the IPO; or (ii) did not provide a sound rationale for adopting the anti-takeover provision (such as a sunset for the pill of three years or less). In our view, adopting such an anti-takeover device unfairly penalizes future shareholders who (except for electing to buy or sell the stock) are unable to weigh in on a matter that could potentially negatively impact their ownership interest. This notion is strengthened when a board adopts a classified board with an infinite duration or a poison pill with a five to ten year term immediately prior to having a public shareholder base so as to insulate management for a substantial amount of time while postponing and/or avoiding allowing public shareholders the ability to vote on the anti-takeover provision adoption. Such instances are indicative of boards that may subvert shareholders' best interests following their IPO.
2. **Adoption of a fee-shifting bylaw:** Adoption of a fee-shifting bylaw: Consistent with our general approach to boards that adopt fee-shifting bylaws without shareholder approval (refer to our discussion of nominating and governance committee performance in Section I of the guidelines), we believe shareholders should hold members of the governance committee responsible. Given the strong impediment on shareholder legal recourse of a fee-shifting bylaw, in cases where a board adopts such a bylaw before the company's IPO, we will recommend voting against the entire governance committee, or, in the absence of such a committee, the chairman of the board, who served during the period of time when the provision was adopted.

In addition, shareholders should also be wary of companies that adopt supermajority voting requirements before their IPO. Absent explicit provisions in the articles or bylaws stipulating that certain policies will be phased out over a certain period of time (e.g., a predetermined declassification of the board, a planned separation of the chairman and CEO, etc.) long-term shareholders could find themselves in the predicament of having to attain a supermajority vote to approve future proposals seeking to eliminate such policies.

DUAL-LISTED COMPANIES

For those companies whose shares trade on exchanges in multiple countries, and which may seek shareholder approval of proposals in accordance with varying exchange- and country-specific rules, we will apply the governance standards most relevant in each situation. We will consider a number of factors in determining which Glass Lewis country-specific policy to apply, including but not limited to: (i) the corporate governance structure and features of the company including whether the board structure is unique to a particular market; (ii) the nature of the proposals; (iii) the location of the company's primary listing, if one can be determined;

(iv) the regulatory/governance regime that the board is reporting against; and (v) the availability and completeness of the company's SEC filings.

MUTUAL FUND BOARDS

Mutual funds, or investment companies, are structured differently from regular public companies (i.e., operating companies). Typically, members of a fund's adviser are on the board and management takes on a different role from that of regular public companies. Thus, we focus on a short list of requirements, although many of our guidelines remain the same.

The following mutual fund policies are similar to the policies for regular public companies:

1. **Size of the board of directors:** The board should be made up of between five and twenty directors.
2. **The CFO on the board:** Neither the CFO of the fund nor the CFO of the fund's registered investment adviser should serve on the board.
3. **Independence of the audit committee:** The audit committee should consist solely of independent directors.
4. **Audit committee financial expert:** At least one member of the audit committee should be designated as the audit committee financial expert.

The following differences from regular public companies apply at mutual funds:

1. **Independence of the board:** We believe that three-fourths of an investment company's board should be made up of independent directors. This is consistent with a proposed SEC rule on investment company boards. The Investment Company Act requires 40% of the board to be independent, but in 2001, the SEC amended the Exemptive Rules to require that a majority of a mutual fund board be independent. In 2005, the SEC proposed increasing the independence threshold to 75%. In 2006, a federal appeals court ordered that this rule amendment be put back out for public comment, putting it back into "proposed rule" status. Since mutual fund boards play a vital role in overseeing the relationship between the fund and its investment manager, there is greater need for independent oversight than there is for an operating company board.
2. **When the auditor is not up for ratification:** We do not recommend voting against the audit committee if the auditor is not up for ratification. Due to the different legal structure of an investment company compared to an operating company, the auditor for the investment company (i.e., mutual fund) does not conduct the same level of financial review for each investment company as for an operating company.
3. **Non-independent chairman:** The SEC has proposed that the chairman of the fund board be independent. We agree that the roles of a mutual fund's chairman and CEO should be separate. Although we believe this would be best at all companies, we recommend voting against the chairman of an investment company's nominating committee as well as the chairman of the board if the chairman and CEO of a mutual fund are the same person and the fund does not have an independent lead or presiding director. Seven former SEC commissioners support the appointment of an independent chairman and we agree with them that "an independent board chairman would be better able to create conditions favoring the long-term interests of fund shareholders than would a chairman who is an executive of the adviser." (See the comment letter sent to the SEC in support of the proposed rule at <http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/indchair.pdf>)
4. **Multiple funds overseen by the same director:** Unlike service on a public company board, mutual fund boards require much less of a time commitment. Mutual fund directors typically serve on dozens of other mutual fund boards, often within the same fund complex. The Investment Company Institute's ("ICI") Overview of Fund Governance Practices, 1994-2012, indicates that the average number of funds served by an independent director in 2012 was 53. Absent evidence that a specific director is hindered from being an effective board member at a fund due to service on other funds' boards, we refrain from maintaining a cap on the number of outside mutual fund boards that we believe a director can serve on.

DECLASSIFIED BOARDS

Glass Lewis favors the repeal of staggered boards and the annual election of directors. We believe staggered boards are less accountable to shareholders than boards that are elected annually. Furthermore, we feel the annual election of directors encourages board members to focus on shareholder interests.

Empirical studies have shown: (i) staggered boards are associated with a reduction in a firm's valuation; and (ii) in the context of hostile takeovers, staggered boards operate as a takeover defense, which entrenches management, discourages potential acquirers, and delivers a lower return to target shareholders.

In our view, there is no evidence to demonstrate that staggered boards improve shareholder returns in a takeover context. Some research has indicated that shareholders are worse off when a staggered board blocks a transaction; further, when a staggered board negotiates a friendly transaction, no statistically significant difference in premium occurs.⁴³ Additional research found that charter-based staggered boards “reduce the market value of a firm by 4% to 6% of its market capitalization” and that “staggered boards bring about and not merely reflect this reduction in market value.”⁴⁴ A subsequent study reaffirmed that classified boards reduce shareholder value, finding “that the ongoing process of dismantling staggered boards, encouraged by institutional investors, could well contribute to increasing shareholder wealth.”⁴⁵

Shareholders have increasingly come to agree with this view. In 2013, 91% of S&P 500 companies had declassified boards, up from approximately 40% a decade ago.⁴⁶ Management proposals to declassify boards are approved with near unanimity and shareholder proposals on the topic also receive strong shareholder support; in 2014, shareholder proposals requesting that companies declassify their boards received average support of 84% (excluding abstentions and broker non-votes), whereas in 1987, only 16.4% of votes cast favored board declassification.⁴⁷ Further, a growing number of companies, nearly half of all those targeted by shareholder proposals requesting that all directors stand for election annually, either recommended shareholder support the proposal or made no recommendation, a departure from the more traditional management recommendation to vote against shareholder proposals.

Given our belief that declassified boards promote director accountability, the empirical evidence suggesting staggered boards reduce a company's value and the established shareholder opposition to such a structure, Glass Lewis supports the declassification of boards and the annual election of directors.

MANDATORY DIRECTOR TERM AND AGE LIMITS

Glass Lewis believes that director age and term limits typically are not in shareholders' best interests. Too often age and term limits are used by boards as a crutch to remove board members who have served for an extended period of time. When used in that fashion, they are indicative of a board that has a difficult time making “tough decisions.”

Academic literature suggests that there is no evidence of a correlation between either length of tenure or age and director performance. On occasion, term limits can be used as a means to remove a director for boards that are unwilling to police their membership and to enforce turnover. Some shareholders support term limits as a way to force change when boards are unwilling to do so.

While we understand that age limits can be a way to force change where boards are unwilling to make changes on their own, the long-term impact of age limits restricts experienced and potentially valuable board members from service through an arbitrary means. Further, age limits unfairly imply that older (or, in rare cases, younger) directors cannot contribute to company oversight.

43 Lucian Bebchuk, John Coates IV, Guhan Subramanian, “The Powerful Antitakeover Force of Staggered Boards: Further Findings and a Reply to Symposium Participants,” 55 *Stanford Law Review* 885-917 (2002).

44 Lucian Bebchuk, Alma Cohen, “The Costs of Entrenched Boards” (2004).

45 Lucian Bebchuk, Alma Cohen and Charles C.Y. Wang, “Staggered Boards and the Wealth of Shareholders: Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1706806> (2010), p. 26.

46 Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2013, p. 4

47 Lucian Bebchuk, John Coates IV and Guhan Subramanian, “The Powerful Antitakeover Force of Staggered Boards: Theory, Evidence, and Policy”.

In our view, a director's experience can be a valuable asset to shareholders because of the complex, critical issues that boards face. However, we support routine director evaluation, preferably performed independently by an external firm, and periodic board refreshment to foster the sharing of new perspectives in the boardroom and the generation of new ideas and business strategies. Further, we believe the board should evaluate the need for changes to board composition based on an analysis of skills and experience necessary for the company, as well as the results of an independent board evaluation, instead of relying on arbitrary age or tenure limits. When necessary, shareholders can address concerns regarding proper board composition through director elections.

We believe that shareholders are better off monitoring the board's approach to corporate governance and the board's stewardship of company performance rather than imposing inflexible rules that don't necessarily correlate with returns or benefits for shareholders.

However, if a board adopts term/age limits, it should follow through and not waive such limits. If the board waives its term/age limits, Glass Lewis will consider recommending shareholders vote against the nominating and/or governance committees, unless the rule was waived with sufficient explanation, such as consummation of a corporate transaction like a merger.

PROXY ACCESS

In lieu of running their own contested election, proxy access would not only allow certain shareholders to nominate directors to company boards but the shareholder nominees would be included on the company's ballot, significantly enhancing the ability of shareholders to play a meaningful role in selecting their representatives. Glass Lewis generally supports affording shareholders the right to nominate director candidates to management's proxy as a means to ensure that significant, long-term shareholders have an ability to nominate candidates to the board.

Companies generally seek shareholder approval to amend company bylaws to adopt proxy access in response to shareholder engagement or pressure, usually in the form of a shareholder proposal requesting proxy access, although some companies may adopt some elements of proxy access without prompting. Glass Lewis considers several factors when evaluating whether to support proposals for companies to adopt proxy access including the specified minimum ownership and holding requirement for shareholders to nominate one or more directors, as well as company size, performance and responsiveness to shareholders.

For a discussion of recent regulatory events in this area, along with a detailed overview of the Glass Lewis approach to Shareholder Proposals regarding Proxy Access, refer to Glass Lewis' *Proxy Paper Guidelines for Shareholder Initiatives*, available at www.glasslewis.com.

MAJORITY VOTE FOR THE ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

Majority voting for the election of directors is fast becoming the de facto standard in corporate board elections. In our view, the majority voting proposals are an effort to make the case for shareholder impact on director elections on a company-specific basis.

While this proposal would not give shareholders the opportunity to nominate directors or lead to elections where shareholders have a choice among director candidates, if implemented, the proposal would allow shareholders to have a voice in determining whether the nominees proposed by the board should actually serve as the overseer-representatives of shareholders in the boardroom. We believe this would be a favorable outcome for shareholders.

During the first half of 2014, Glass Lewis tracked approximately 28 shareholder proposals seeking to require a majority vote to elect directors at annual meetings in the U.S. While this is roughly on par with what we have reviewed in each of the past several years, it is a sharp contrast to the 147 proposals tracked during all of 2006. This large drop in the number of proposals being submitted in recent years compared to 2006 is a result of many companies having already adopted some form of majority voting, including approximately 84% of companies in the S&P 500 Index, up from 56% in 2008.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Spencer Stuart Board Index, 2013, p. 13

Investors are also increasingly supporting this measure. During the 2014 proxy season, shareholder proposals requesting that companies adopt a majority voting standard for director elections received, on average, 59% shareholder support (excluding abstentions and broker non-votes). Further, nearly half of these resolutions received majority shareholder support and a number of companies either recommended shareholders vote in favor of or did not make a recommendation for how shareholders should vote on these proposals.

THE PLURALITY VOTE STANDARD

Today, most US companies still elect directors by a plurality vote standard. Under that standard, if one shareholder holding only one share votes in favor of a nominee (including that director, if the director is a shareholder), that nominee “wins” the election and assumes a seat on the board. The common concern among companies with a plurality voting standard is the possibility that one or more directors would not receive a majority of votes, resulting in “failed elections.”

ADVANTAGES OF A MAJORITY VOTE STANDARD

If a majority vote standard were implemented, a nominee would have to receive the support of a majority of the shares voted in order to be elected. Thus, shareholders could collectively vote to reject a director they believe will not pursue their best interests. Given that so few directors (less than 100 a year) do not receive majority support from shareholders, we think that a majority vote standard is reasonable since it will neither result in many failed director elections nor reduce the willingness of qualified, shareholder-focused directors to serve in the future. Further, most directors who fail to receive a majority shareholder vote in favor of their election do not step down, underscoring the need for true majority voting.

We believe that a majority vote standard will likely lead to more attentive directors. Although shareholders only rarely fail to support directors, the occasional majority vote against a director’s election will likely deter the election of directors with a record of ignoring shareholder interests. Glass Lewis will therefore generally support proposals calling for the election of directors by a majority vote, excepting contested director elections.

In response to the high level of support majority voting has garnered, many companies have voluntarily taken steps to implement majority voting or modified approaches to majority voting. These steps range from a modified approach requiring directors that receive a majority of withheld votes to resign (i.e., a resignation policy) to actually requiring a majority vote of outstanding shares to elect directors.

We feel that the modified approach does not go far enough because requiring a director to resign is not the same as requiring a majority vote to elect a director and does not allow shareholders a definitive voice in the election process. Further, under the modified approach, the corporate governance committee could reject a resignation and, even if it accepts the resignation, the corporate governance committee decides on the director’s replacement. And since the modified approach is usually adopted as a policy by the board or a board committee, it could be altered by the same board or committee at any time.

CONFLICTING PROPOSALS

On January 16, 2015, the SEC announced that for the 2015 proxy season it would not opine on the application of Rule 14a-8(i)(9) that allows companies to exclude shareholder proposals, including those seeking proxy access, that conflict with a management proposal on the same issue. While the announcement did not render the rule ineffective, a number of companies opted not to exclude a shareholder proposal but rather to allow shareholders a vote on both management and shareholder proposals on the same issue, generally proxy access. The management proposals typically imposed more restrictive terms than the shareholder proposal in order to exercise the particular shareholder right at issue, e.g., a higher proxy access ownership threshold. On October 22, 2015, the SEC issued Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14H (“SLB 14H”) clarifying its rule concerning the exclusion of certain shareholder proposals when similar items are also on the ballot. SLB 14H increases the burden on companies to prove to SEC staff that a conflict exists; therefore, some companies may still choose to place management proposals alongside similar shareholder proposals in the coming year.

When Glass Lewis reviews conflicting management and shareholder proposals, we will consider the following:

- The nature of the underlying issue;
- The benefit to shareholders from implementation of the proposal;
- The materiality of the differences between the terms of the shareholder proposal and management proposal;
- The appropriateness of the provisions in the context of a company's shareholder base, corporate structure and other relevant circumstances; and
- A company's overall governance profile and, specifically, its responsiveness to shareholders as evidenced by a company's response to previous shareholder proposals and its adoption of progressive shareholder rights provisions.

II. Transparency and Integrity in Financial Reporting

AUDITOR RATIFICATION

The auditor's role as gatekeeper is crucial in ensuring the integrity and transparency of the financial information necessary for protecting shareholder value. Shareholders rely on the auditor to ask tough questions and to do a thorough analysis of a company's books to ensure that the information provided to shareholders is complete, accurate, fair, and that it is a reasonable representation of a company's financial position. The only way shareholders can make rational investment decisions is if the market is equipped with accurate information about a company's fiscal health. As stated in the October 6, 2008 Final Report of the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession to the U.S. Department of the Treasury:

"The auditor is expected to offer critical and objective judgment on the financial matters under consideration, and actual and perceived absence of conflicts is critical to that expectation. The Committee believes that auditors, investors, public companies, and other market participants must understand the independence requirements and their objectives, and that auditors must adopt a mindset of skepticism when facing situations that may compromise their independence."

As such, shareholders should demand an objective, competent and diligent auditor who performs at or above professional standards at every company in which the investors hold an interest. Like directors, auditors should be free from conflicts of interest and should avoid situations requiring a choice between the auditor's interests and the public's interests. Almost without exception, shareholders should be able to annually review an auditor's performance and to annually ratify a board's auditor selection. Moreover, in October 2008, the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession went even further, and recommended that "to further enhance audit committee oversight and auditor accountability ... disclosure in the company proxy statement regarding shareholder ratification [should] include the name(s) of the senior auditing partner(s) staffed on the engagement."⁴⁹

On August 16, 2011, the PCAOB issued a Concept Release seeking public comment on ways that auditor independence, objectivity and professional skepticism could be enhanced, with a specific emphasis on mandatory audit firm rotation. The PCAOB convened several public roundtable meetings during 2012 to further discuss such matters. Glass Lewis believes auditor rotation can ensure both the independence of the auditor and the integrity of the audit; we will typically recommend supporting proposals to require auditor rotation when the proposal uses a reasonable period of time (usually not less than 5-7 years), particularly at companies with a history of accounting problems.

VOTING RECOMMENDATIONS ON AUDITOR RATIFICATION

We generally support management's choice of auditor except when we believe the auditor's independence or audit integrity has been compromised. Where a board has not allowed shareholders to review and ratify an auditor, we typically recommend voting against the audit committee chairman. When there have been material restatements of annual financial statements or material weaknesses in internal controls, we usually recommend voting against the entire audit committee.

Reasons why we may not recommend ratification of an auditor include:

1. When audit fees plus audit-related fees total less than the tax fees and/or other non-audit fees.
2. Recent material restatements of annual financial statements, including those resulting in the reporting of material weaknesses in internal controls and including late filings by the company where the auditor bears some responsibility for the restatement or late filing.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ "Final Report of the Advisory Committee on the Auditing Profession to the U.S. Department of the Treasury." p. VIII:20, October 6, 2008.

⁵⁰ An auditor does not audit interim financial statements. Thus, we generally do not believe that an auditor should be opposed due to a restatement of interim financial statements unless the nature of the misstatement is clear from a reading of the incorrect financial statements.

3. When the auditor performs prohibited services such as tax-shelter work, tax services for the CEO or CFO, or contingent-fee work, such as a fee based on a percentage of economic benefit to the company.
4. When audit fees are excessively low, especially when compared with other companies in the same industry.
5. When the company has aggressive accounting policies.
6. When the company has poor disclosure or lack of transparency in its financial statements.
7. Where the auditor limited its liability through its contract with the company or the audit contract requires the corporation to use alternative dispute resolution procedures without adequate justification.
8. We also look for other relationships or concerns with the auditor that might suggest a conflict between the auditor's interests and shareholder interests.

PENSION ACCOUNTING ISSUES

A pension accounting question occasionally raised in proxy proposals is what effect, if any, projected returns on employee pension assets should have on a company's net income. This issue often arises in the executive-compensation context in a discussion of the extent to which pension accounting should be reflected in business performance for purposes of calculating payments to executives.

Glass Lewis believes that pension credits should not be included in measuring income that is used to award performance-based compensation. Because many of the assumptions used in accounting for retirement plans are subject to the company's discretion, management would have an obvious conflict of interest if pay were tied to pension income. In our view, projected income from pensions does not truly reflect a company's performance.

III. The Link Between Compensation and Performance

Glass Lewis carefully reviews the compensation awarded to senior executives, as we believe that this is an important area in which the board's priorities are revealed. Glass Lewis strongly believes executive compensation should be linked directly with the performance of the business the executive is charged with managing. We believe the most effective compensation arrangements provide for an appropriate mix of performance-based short- and long-term incentives in addition to fixed pay elements while promoting a prudent and sustainable level of risk-taking.

Glass Lewis believes that comprehensive, timely and transparent disclosure of executive pay is critical to allowing shareholders to evaluate the extent to which pay is aligned with company performance. When reviewing proxy materials, Glass Lewis examines whether the company discloses the performance metrics used to determine executive compensation. We recognize performance metrics must necessarily vary depending on the company and industry, among other factors, and may include a wide variety of financial measures as well as industry-specific performance indicators. However, we believe companies should disclose why the specific performance metrics were selected and how the actions they are designed to incentivize will lead to better corporate performance.

Moreover, it is rarely in shareholders' interests to disclose competitive data about individual salaries below the senior executive level. Such disclosure could create internal personnel discord that would be counterproductive for the company and its shareholders. While we favor full disclosure for senior executives and we view pay disclosure at the aggregate level (e.g., the number of employees being paid over a certain amount or in certain categories) as potentially useful, we do not believe shareholders need or will benefit from detailed reports about individual management employees other than the most senior executives.

ADVISORY VOTE ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ("SAY-ON-PAY")

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act") required companies to hold an advisory vote on executive compensation at the first shareholder meeting that occurs six months after enactment of the bill (January 21, 2011).

This practice of allowing shareholders a non-binding vote on a company's compensation report is standard practice in many non-US countries, and has been a requirement for most companies in the United Kingdom since 2003 and in Australia since 2005. Although say-on-pay proposals are non-binding, a high level of "against" or "abstain" votes indicates substantial shareholder concern about a company's compensation policies and procedures.

Given the complexity of most companies' compensation programs, Glass Lewis applies a highly nuanced approach when analyzing advisory votes on executive compensation. We review each company's compensation on a case-by-case basis, recognizing that each company must be examined in the context of industry, size, maturity, performance, financial condition, its historic pay for performance practices, and any other relevant internal or external factors.

We believe that each company should design and apply specific compensation policies and practices that are appropriate to the circumstances of the company and, in particular, will attract and retain competent executives and other staff, while motivating them to grow the company's long-term shareholder value.

Where we find those specific policies and practices serve to reasonably align compensation with performance, and such practices are adequately disclosed, Glass Lewis will recommend supporting the company's approach. If, however, those specific policies and practices fail to demonstrably link compensation with performance, Glass Lewis will generally recommend voting against the say-on-pay proposal.

Glass Lewis reviews say-on-pay proposals on both a qualitative basis and a quantitative basis, with a focus on several main areas:

- The overall design and structure of the company’s executive compensation programs including selection and challenging nature of performance metrics;
- The implementation and effectiveness of the company’s executive compensation programs including pay mix and use of performance metrics in determining pay levels;
- The quality and content of the company’s disclosure;
- The quantum paid to executives; and
- The link between compensation and performance as indicated by the company’s current and past pay-for-performance grades.

We also review any significant changes or modifications, and the rationale for such changes, made to the company’s compensation structure or award amounts, including base salaries.

SAY-ON-PAY VOTING RECOMMENDATIONS

In cases where we find deficiencies in a company’s compensation program’s design, implementation or management, we will recommend that shareholders vote against the say-on-pay proposal. Generally such instances include evidence of a pattern of poor pay-for-performance practices (i.e., deficient or failing pay for performance grades), unclear or questionable disclosure regarding the overall compensation structure (e.g., limited information regarding benchmarking processes, limited rationale for bonus performance metrics and targets, etc.), questionable adjustments to certain aspects of the overall compensation structure (e.g., limited rationale for significant changes to performance targets or metrics, the payout of guaranteed bonuses or sizable retention grants, etc.), and/or other egregious compensation practices.

Although not an exhaustive list, the following issues when weighed together may cause Glass Lewis to recommend voting against a say-on-pay vote:

- Inappropriate peer group and/or benchmarking issues;
- Inadequate or no rationale for changes to peer groups;
- Egregious or excessive bonuses, equity awards or severance payments, including golden handshakes and golden parachutes;
- Problematic contractual payments, such as guaranteed bonuses;
- Targeting overall levels of compensation at higher than median without adequate justification;
- Performance targets not sufficiently challenging, and/or providing for high potential payouts;
- Performance targets lowered without justification;
- Discretionary bonuses paid when short- or long-term incentive plan targets were not met;
- Executive pay high relative to peers not justified by outstanding company performance; and
- The terms of the long-term incentive plans are inappropriate (please see “Long-Term Incentives” on page 29).

In instances where a company has simply failed to provide sufficient disclosure of its policies, we may recommend shareholders vote against this proposal solely on this basis, regardless of the appropriateness of compensation levels.

Where we identify egregious compensation practices, we may also recommend voting against the compensation committee based on the practices or actions of its members during the year. Such practices may include: approving large one-off payments, the inappropriate, unjustified use of discretion, or sustained poor pay for performance practices.

COMPANY RESPONSIVENESS

At companies that received a significant level of shareholder opposition (25% or greater) to their say-on-pay proposal at the previous annual meeting, we believe the board should demonstrate some level of engagement and responsiveness to the shareholder concerns behind the discontent, particularly in response to shareholder engagement. While we recognize that sweeping changes cannot be made to a compensation program without due consideration and that a majority of shareholders voted in favor of the proposal, given that the average approval rate for say-on-pay proposals is about 90% we believe the compensation committee should provide some level of response to a significant vote against, including engaging with large shareholders to identify their concerns. In the absence of any evidence that the board is actively engaging shareholders on these issues and responding accordingly, we may recommend holding compensation committee members accountable for failing to adequately respond to shareholder opposition, giving careful consideration to the level of shareholder protest and the severity and history of compensation problems.

PAY FOR PERFORMANCE

Glass Lewis believes an integral part of a well-structured compensation package is a successful link between pay and performance. Our proprietary pay-for-performance model was developed to better evaluate the link between pay and performance of the top five executives at US companies. Our model benchmarks these executives' pay and company performance against peers selected using Equilar's market-based peer groups and across five performance metrics. By measuring the magnitude of the gap between two weighted-average percentile rankings (executive compensation and performance), we grade companies based on a school letter system: "A", "B", "F", etc. The grades guide our evaluation of compensation committee effectiveness and we generally recommend voting against compensation committee of companies with a pattern of failing our pay-for-performance analysis.

We also use this analysis to inform our voting decisions on say-on-pay proposals. As such, if a company receives a failing grade from our proprietary model, we are more likely to recommend that shareholders vote against the say-on-pay proposal. However, other qualitative factors such as an effective overall incentive structure, the relevance of selected performance metrics, significant forthcoming enhancements or reasonable long-term payout levels may give us cause to recommend in favor of a proposal even when we have identified a disconnect between pay and performance.

SHORT-TERM INCENTIVES

A short-term bonus or incentive ("STI") should be demonstrably tied to performance. Whenever possible, we believe a mix of corporate and individual performance measures is appropriate. We would normally expect performance measures for STIs to be based on company-wide or divisional financial measures as well as non-financial factors such as those related to safety, environmental issues, and customer satisfaction. While we recognize that companies operating in different sectors or markets may seek to utilize a wide range of metrics, we expect such measures to be appropriately tied to a company's business drivers.

Further, the target and potential maximum awards that can be achieved under STI awards should be disclosed. Shareholders should expect stretching performance targets for the maximum award to be achieved. Any increase in the potential target and maximum award should be clearly justified to shareholders.

Glass Lewis recognizes that disclosure of some measures may include commercially confidential information. Therefore, we believe it may be reasonable to exclude such information in some cases as long as the company provides sufficient justification for non-disclosure. However, where a short-term bonus has been paid, companies should disclose the extent to which performance has been achieved against relevant targets, including disclosure of the actual target achieved.

Where management has received significant STIs but short-term performance over the previous year *prima facie* appears to be poor or negative, we believe the company should provide a clear explanation of why these significant short-term payments were made.

LONG-TERM INCENTIVES

Glass Lewis recognizes the value of equity-based incentive programs, which are often the primary long-term incentive for executives. When used appropriately, they can provide a vehicle for linking an executive's pay to company performance, thereby aligning their interests with those of shareholders. In addition, equity-based compensation can be an effective way to attract, retain and motivate key employees.

There are certain elements that Glass Lewis believes are common to most well-structured long-term incentive ("LTI") plans. These include:

- No re-testing or lowering of performance conditions;
- Performance metrics that cannot be easily manipulated by management;
- Two or more performance metrics;
- At least one relative performance metric that compares the company's performance to a relevant peer group or index;
- Performance periods of at least three years;
- Stretching metrics that incentivize executives to strive for outstanding performance while not encouraging excessive risk-taking; and
- Individual limits expressed as a percentage of base salary.

Performance measures should be carefully selected and should relate to the specific business/industry in which the company operates and, especially, the key value drivers of the company's business.

While cognizant of the inherent complexity of certain performance metrics, Glass Lewis generally believes that measuring a company's performance with multiple metrics serves to provide a more complete picture of the company's performance than a single metric; further, reliance on just one metric may focus too much management attention on a single target and is therefore more susceptible to manipulation. When utilized for relative measurements, external benchmarks such as a sector index or peer group should be disclosed and transparent. The rationale behind the selection of a specific index or peer group should also be disclosed. Internal benchmarks should also be disclosed and transparent, unless a cogent case for confidentiality is made and fully explained. Similarly, actual performance and vesting levels for previous grants earned during the fiscal year should be disclosed.

We also believe shareholders should evaluate the relative success of a company's compensation programs, particularly with regard to existing equity-based incentive plans, in linking pay and performance when evaluating new LTI plans to determine the impact of additional stock awards. We will therefore review the company's pay-for-performance grade (see below for more information) and specifically the proportion of total compensation that is stock-based.

TRANSITIONAL AND ONE-OFF AWARDS

Glass Lewis believes shareholders should generally be wary of awards granted outside of the standard incentive schemes outlined above, as such awards have the potential to undermine the integrity of a company's regular incentive plans, the link between pay and performance or both. We generally believe that if the existing incentive programs fail to provide adequate incentives to executives, companies should redesign their compensation programs rather than make additional grants.

However, we recognize that in certain circumstances, additional incentives may be appropriate. In these cases, companies should provide a thorough description of the awards, including a cogent and convincing explanation of their necessity and why existing awards do not provide sufficient motivation. Further, such awards should be tied to future service and performance whenever possible.

Similarly, we acknowledge that there may be certain costs associated with transitions at the executive level. We believe that sign-on arrangements should be clearly disclosed and accompanied by a meaningful explanation of the payments and the process by which the amounts are reached. Furthermore, the details of and basis for

any “make-whole” payments (which are paid as compensation for forfeited awards from a previous employer) should be provided.

While in limited circumstances such deviations may not be inappropriate, we believe shareholders should be provided with a meaningful explanation of any additional benefits agreed upon outside of the regular arrangements. For severance or sign-on arrangements, we may consider the executive’s regular target compensation levels or the sums paid to other executives (including the recipient’s predecessor, where applicable) in evaluating the appropriateness of such an arrangement.

Additionally, we believe companies making supplemental or one-time awards should also describe if and how the regular compensation arrangements will be affected by these additional grants. In reviewing a company’s use of supplemental awards, Glass Lewis will evaluate the terms and size of the grants in the context of the company’s overall incentive strategy and granting practices, as well as the current operating environment.

RECOUPMENT PROVISIONS (“CLAWBACKS”)

We believe it is prudent for boards to adopt detailed and stringent bonus recoupment policies to prevent executives from retaining performance-based awards that were not truly earned. We believe such “clawback” policies should be triggered in the event of a restatement of financial results or similar revision of performance indicators upon which bonuses were based. Such policies would allow the board to review all performance-related bonuses and awards made to senior executives during the period covered by a restatement and would, to the extent feasible, allow the company to recoup such bonuses in the event that performance goals were not actually achieved. We further believe clawback policies should be subject to only limited discretion to ensure the integrity of such policies.

Section 954 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the SEC to create a rule requiring listed companies to adopt policies for recouping certain compensation during a three-year look-back period. The rule applies to incentive-based compensation paid to current or former executives if the company is required to prepare an accounting restatement due to erroneous data resulting from material non-compliance with any financial reporting requirements under the securities laws. However, the SEC has yet to finalize the relevant rules.

These recoupment provisions are more stringent than under Section 304 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in three respects: (i) the provisions extend to current or former executive officers rather than only to the CEO and CFO; (ii) it has a three-year look-back period (rather than a twelve-month look-back period); and (iii) it allows for recovery of compensation based upon a financial restatement due to erroneous data, and therefore does not require misconduct on the part of the executive or other employees.

HEDGING OF STOCK

Glass Lewis believes that the hedging of shares by executives in the shares of the companies where they are employed severs the alignment of interests of the executive with shareholders. We believe companies should adopt strict policies to prohibit executives from hedging the economic risk associated with their shareownership in the company.

PLEDGING OF STOCK

Glass Lewis believes that shareholders should examine the facts and circumstances of each company rather than apply a one-size-fits-all policy regarding employee stock pledging. Glass Lewis believes that shareholders benefit when employees, particularly senior executives have “skin-in-the-game” and therefore recognizes the benefits of measures designed to encourage employees to both buy shares out of their own pocket and to retain shares they have been granted; blanket policies prohibiting stock pledging may discourage executives and employees from doing either.

However, we also recognize that the pledging of shares can present a risk that, depending on a host of factors, an executive with significant pledged shares and limited other assets may have an incentive to take steps to avoid a forced sale of shares in the face of a rapid stock price decline. Therefore, to avoid substantial losses from a forced sale to meet the terms of the loan, the executive may have an incentive to boost the stock price in the

short term in a manner that is unsustainable, thus hurting shareholders in the long-term. We also recognize concerns regarding pledging may not apply to less senior employees, given the latter group's significantly more limited influence over a company's stock price. Therefore, we believe that the issue of pledging shares should be reviewed in that context, as should policies that distinguish between the two groups.

Glass Lewis believes that the benefits of stock ownership by executives and employees may outweigh the risks of stock pledging, depending on many factors. As such, Glass Lewis reviews all relevant factors in evaluating proposed policies, limitations and prohibitions on pledging stock, including:

- The number of shares pledged;
- The percentage executives' pledged shares are of outstanding shares;
- The percentage executives' pledged shares are of each executive's shares and total assets;
- Whether the pledged shares were purchased by the employee or granted by the company;
- Whether there are different policies for purchased and granted shares;
- Whether the granted shares were time-based or performance-based;
- The overall governance profile of the company;
- The volatility of the company's stock (in order to determine the likelihood of a sudden stock price drop);
- The nature and cyclical, if applicable, of the company's industry;
- The participation and eligibility of executives and employees in pledging;
- The company's current policies regarding pledging and any waiver from these policies for employees and executives; and
- Disclosure of the extent of any pledging, particularly among senior executives.

COMPENSATION CONSULTANT INDEPENDENCE

As mandated by Section 952 of the Dodd-Frank Act, as of January 11, 2013, the SEC approved new listing requirements for both the NYSE and NASDAQ which require compensation committees to consider six factors in assessing compensation advisor independence. These factors include: (1) provision of other services to the company; (2) fees paid by the company as a percentage of the advisor's total annual revenue; (3) policies and procedures of the advisor to mitigate conflicts of interests; (4) any business or personal relationships of the consultant with any member of the compensation committee; (5) any company stock held by the consultant; and (6) any business or personal relationships of the consultant with any executive officer of the company. According to the SEC, "no one factor should be viewed as a determinative factor." Glass Lewis believes this six-factor assessment is an important process for every compensation committee to undertake but believes companies employing a consultant for board compensation, consulting and other corporate services should provide clear disclosure beyond just a reference to examining the six points to allow shareholders to review the specific aspects of the various consultant relationships.

We believe compensation consultants are engaged to provide objective, disinterested, expert advice to the compensation committee. When the consultant or its affiliates receive substantial income from providing other services to the company, we believe the potential for a conflict of interest arises and the independence of the consultant may be jeopardized. Therefore, Glass Lewis will, when relevant, note the potential for a conflict of interest when the fees paid to the advisor or its affiliates for other services exceeds those paid for compensation consulting.

FREQUENCY OF SAY-ON-PAY

The Dodd-Frank Act also requires companies to allow shareholders a non-binding vote on the frequency of say-on-pay votes, i.e. every one, two or three years. Additionally, Dodd-Frank requires companies to hold such votes on the frequency of say-on-pay votes at least once every six years.

We believe companies should submit say-on-pay votes to shareholders every year. We believe that the time and financial burdens to a company with regard to an annual vote are relatively small and incremental and are outweighed by the benefits to shareholders through more frequent accountability. Implementing biannual or triennial votes on executive compensation limits shareholders' ability to hold the board accountable for its compensation practices through means other than voting against the compensation committee. Unless a company provides a compelling rationale or unique circumstances for say-on-pay votes less frequent than annually, we will generally recommend that shareholders support annual votes on compensation.

VOTE ON GOLDEN PARACHUTE ARRANGEMENTS

The Dodd-Frank Act also requires companies to provide shareholders with a separate non-binding vote on approval of golden parachute compensation arrangements in connection with certain change-in-control transactions. However, if the golden parachute arrangements have previously been subject to a say-on-pay vote which shareholders approved, then this required vote is waived.

Glass Lewis believes the narrative and tabular disclosure of golden parachute arrangements benefits all shareholders. Glass Lewis analyzes each golden parachute arrangement on a case-by-case basis, taking into account, among other items: the nature of the change-in-control transaction, the ultimate value of the payments particularly compared to the value of the transaction, any excise tax gross-up obligations, the tenure and position of the executives in question before and after the transaction, any new or amended employment agreements entered into in connection with the transaction, and the type of triggers involved (i.e., single vs. double).

EQUITY-BASED COMPENSATION PLAN PROPOSALS

We believe that equity compensation awards, when not abused, are useful for retaining employees and providing an incentive for them to act in a way that will improve company performance. Glass Lewis recognizes that equity-based compensation plans are critical components of a company's overall compensation program and we analyze such plans accordingly based on both quantitative and qualitative factors.

Our quantitative analysis assesses the plan's cost and the company's pace of granting utilizing a number of different analyses, comparing the program with absolute limits we believe are key to equity value creation and with a carefully chosen peer group. In general, our model seeks to determine whether the proposed plan is either absolutely excessive or is more than one standard deviation away from the average plan for the peer group on a range of criteria, including dilution to shareholders and the projected annual cost relative to the company's financial performance. Each of the analyses (and their constituent parts) is weighted and the plan is scored in accordance with that weight.

We compare the program's expected annual expense with the business's operating metrics to help determine whether the plan is excessive in light of company performance. We also compare the plan's expected annual cost to the enterprise value of the firm rather than to market capitalization because the employees, managers and directors of the firm contribute to the creation of enterprise value but not necessarily market capitalization (the biggest difference is seen where cash represents the vast majority of market capitalization). Finally, we do not rely exclusively on relative comparisons with averages because, in addition to creeping averages serving to inflate compensation, we believe that some absolute limits are warranted.

We then consider qualitative aspects of the plan such as plan administration, the method and terms of exercise, repricing history, express or implied rights to reprice, and the presence of evergreen provisions. We also closely review the choice and use of, and difficulty in meeting, the awards' performance metrics and targets, if any. We believe significant changes to the terms of a plan should be explained for shareholders and clearly indicated. Other factors such as a company's size and operating environment may also be relevant in assessing the severity

of concerns or the benefits of certain changes. Finally, we may consider a company's executive compensation practices in certain situations, as applicable.

We evaluate equity plans based on certain overarching principles:

- Companies should seek more shares only when needed;
- Requested share amounts should be small enough that companies seek shareholder approval every three to four years (or more frequently);
- If a plan is relatively expensive, it should not grant options solely to senior executives and board members;
- Annual net share count and voting power dilution should be limited;
- Annual cost of the plan (especially if not shown on the income statement) should be reasonable as a percentage of financial results and should be in line with the peer group;
- The expected annual cost of the plan should be proportional to the business's value;
- The intrinsic value that option grantees received in the past should be reasonable compared with the business's financial results;
- Plans should deliver value on a per-employee basis when compared with programs at peer companies;
- Plans should not permit re-pricing of stock options;
- Plans should not contain excessively liberal administrative or payment terms;
- Plans should not count shares in ways that understate the potential dilution, or cost, to common shareholders. This refers to "inverse" full-value award multipliers;
- Selected performance metrics should be challenging and appropriate, and should be subject to relative performance measurements; and
- Stock grants should be subject to minimum vesting and/or holding periods sufficient to ensure sustainable performance and promote retention.

OPTION EXCHANGES

Glass Lewis views option repricing plans and option exchange programs with great skepticism. Shareholders have substantial risk in owning stock and we believe that the employees, officers, and directors who receive stock options should be similarly situated to align their interests with shareholder interests.

We are concerned that option grantees who believe they will be "rescued" from underwater options will be more inclined to take unjustifiable risks. Moreover, a predictable pattern of repricing or exchanges substantially alters a stock option's value because options that will practically never expire deeply out of the money are worth far more than options that carry a risk of expiration.

In short, repricings and option exchange programs change the bargain between shareholders and employees after the bargain has been struck.

There is one circumstance in which a repricing or option exchange program may be acceptable: if macroeconomic or industry trends, rather than specific company issues, cause a stock's value to decline dramatically and the repricing is necessary to motivate and retain employees. In this circumstance, we think it fair to conclude that option grantees may be suffering from a risk that was not foreseeable when the original "bargain" was struck. In such a circumstance, we will recommend supporting a repricing if the following conditions are true:

- Officers and board members cannot participate in the program;
- The stock decline mirrors the market or industry price decline in terms of timing and approximates the decline in magnitude;
- The exchange is value-neutral or value-creative to shareholders using very conservative assumptions and with a recognition of the adverse selection problems inherent in voluntary programs; and

- Management and the board make a cogent case for needing to motivate and retain existing employees, such as being in a competitive employment market.

OPTION BACKDATING, SPRING-LOADING AND BULLET-DODGING

Glass Lewis views option backdating, and the related practices of spring-loading and bullet-dodging, as egregious actions that warrant holding the appropriate management and board members responsible. These practices are similar to re-pricing options and eliminate much of the downside risk inherent in an option grant that is designed to induce recipients to maximize shareholder return.

Backdating an option is the act of changing an option's grant date from the actual grant date to an earlier date when the market price of the underlying stock was lower, resulting in a lower exercise price for the option. Since 2006, Glass Lewis has identified over 270 companies that have disclosed internal or government investigations into their past stock-option grants.

Spring-loading is granting stock options while in possession of material, positive information that has not been disclosed publicly. Bullet-dodging is delaying the grants of stock options until after the release of material, negative information. This can allow option grants to be made at a lower price either before the release of positive news or following the release of negative news, assuming the stock's price will move up or down in response to the information. This raises a concern similar to that of insider trading, or the trading on material non-public information.

The exercise price for an option is determined on the day of grant, providing the recipient with the same market risk as an investor who bought shares on that date. However, where options were backdated, the executive or the board (or the compensation committee) changed the grant date retroactively. The new date may be at or near the lowest price for the year or period. This would be like allowing an investor to look back and select the lowest price of the year at which to buy shares.

A 2006 study of option grants made between 1996 and 2005 at 8,000 companies found that option backdating can be an indication of poor internal controls. The study found that option backdating was more likely to occur at companies without a majority independent board and with a long-serving CEO; both factors, the study concluded, were associated with greater CEO influence on the company's compensation and governance practices.⁵¹

Where a company granted backdated options to an executive who is also a director, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against that executive/director, regardless of who decided to make the award. In addition, Glass Lewis will recommend voting against those directors who either approved or allowed the backdating. Glass Lewis feels that executives and directors who either benefited from backdated options or authorized the practice have breached their fiduciary responsibility to shareholders.

Given the severe tax and legal liabilities to the company from backdating, Glass Lewis will consider recommending voting against members of the audit committee who served when options were backdated, a restatement occurs, material weaknesses in internal controls exist and disclosures indicate there was a lack of documentation. These committee members failed in their responsibility to ensure the integrity of the company's financial reports.

When a company has engaged in spring-loading or bullet-dodging, Glass Lewis will consider recommending voting against the compensation committee members where there has been a pattern of granting options at or near historic lows. Glass Lewis will also recommend voting against executives serving on the board who benefited from the spring-loading or bullet-dodging.

DIRECTOR COMPENSATION PLANS

Glass Lewis believes that non-employee directors should receive reasonable and appropriate compensation for the time and effort they spend serving on the board and its committees. However, a balance is required. Fees should be competitive in order to retain and attract qualified individuals, but excessive fees represent a financial cost to the company and potentially compromise the objectivity and independence of non-employee directors. We will consider recommending supporting compensation plans that include option grants or other

⁵¹ Lucian Bebchuk, Yaniv Grinstein and Urs Peyer. "LUCKY CEOs." November, 2006.

equity-based awards that help to align the interests of outside directors with those of shareholders. However, equity grants to directors should not be performance-based to ensure directors are not incentivized in the same manner as executives but rather serve as a check on imprudent risk-taking in executive compensation plan design.

Glass Lewis uses a proprietary model and analyst review to evaluate the costs of equity plans compared to the plans of peer companies with similar market capitalizations. We use the results of this model to guide our voting recommendations on stock-based director compensation plans.

EMPLOYEE STOCK PURCHASE PLANS

Glass Lewis believes that employee stock purchase plans (“ESPPs”) can provide employees with a sense of ownership in their company and help strengthen the alignment between the interests of employees and shareholders. We use a quantitative model to estimate the cost of the plan by measuring the expected discount, purchase period, expected purchase activity (if previous activity has been disclosed) and whether the plan has a “lookback” feature, and then compare this cost to ESPPs at similar companies. Except for the most extreme cases, Glass Lewis will generally support these plans given the regulatory purchase limit of \$25,000 per employee per year, which we believe is reasonable. We also look at the number of shares requested to see if a ESPP will significantly contribute to overall shareholder dilution or if shareholders will not have a chance to approve the program for an excessive period of time. As such, we will generally recommend against ESPPs that contain “evergreen” provisions that automatically increase the number of shares available under the ESPP each year.

EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION TAX DEDUCTIBILITY (IRS 162(m) COMPLIANCE)

Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code allows companies to deduct compensation in excess of \$1 million for the CEO and the next three most highly compensated executive officers, excluding the CFO, if the compensation is performance-based and is paid under shareholder-approved plans. Companies therefore submit incentive plans for shareholder approval to take advantage of the tax deductibility afforded under 162(m) for certain types of compensation.

We believe the best practice for companies is to provide robust disclosure to shareholders so that they can make fully-informed judgments about the reasonableness of the proposed compensation plan. To allow for meaningful shareholder review, we prefer that disclosure should include specific performance metrics, a maximum award pool, and a maximum award amount per employee. We also believe it is important to analyze the estimated grants to see if they are reasonable and in line with the company’s peers.

We typically recommend voting against a 162(m) proposal where: (i) a company fails to provide at least a list of performance targets; (ii) a company fails to provide one of either a total maximum or an individual maximum; or (iii) the proposed plan or individual maximum award limit is excessive when compared with the plans of the company’s peers.

The company’s record of aligning pay with performance (as evaluated using our proprietary pay-for-performance model) also plays a role in our recommendation. Where a company has a record of setting reasonable pay relative to business performance, we generally recommend voting in favor of a plan even if the plan caps seem large relative to peers because we recognize the value in special pay arrangements for continued exceptional performance.

As with all other issues we review, our goal is to provide consistent but contextual advice given the specifics of the company and ongoing performance. Overall, we recognize that it is generally not in shareholders’ best interests to vote against such a plan and forgo the potential tax benefit since shareholder rejection of such plans will not curtail the awards; it will only prevent the tax deduction associated with them.

IV. Governance Structure and the Shareholder Franchise

ANTI-TAKEOVER MEASURES

POISON PILLS (SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS PLANS)

Glass Lewis believes that poison pill plans are not generally in shareholders' best interests. They can reduce management accountability by substantially limiting opportunities for corporate takeovers. Rights plans can thus prevent shareholders from receiving a buy-out premium for their stock. Typically we recommend that shareholders vote against these plans to protect their financial interests and ensure that they have an opportunity to consider any offer for their shares, especially those at a premium.

We believe boards should be given wide latitude in directing company activities and in charting the company's course. However, on an issue such as this, where the link between the shareholders' financial interests and their right to consider and accept buyout offers is substantial, we believe that shareholders should be allowed to vote on whether they support such a plan's implementation. This issue is different from other matters that are typically left to board discretion. Its potential impact on and relation to shareholders is direct and substantial. It is also an issue in which management interests may be different from those of shareholders; thus, ensuring that shareholders have a voice is the only way to safeguard their interests.

In certain circumstances, we will support a poison pill that is limited in scope to accomplish a particular objective, such as the closing of an important merger, or a pill that contains what we believe to be a reasonable qualifying offer clause. We will consider supporting a poison pill plan if the qualifying offer clause includes each of the following attributes:

- The form of offer is not required to be an all-cash transaction;
- The offer is not required to remain open for more than 90 business days;
- The offeror is permitted to amend the offer, reduce the offer, or otherwise change the terms;
- There is no fairness opinion requirement; and
- There is a low to no premium requirement.

Where these requirements are met, we typically feel comfortable that shareholders will have the opportunity to voice their opinion on any legitimate offer.

NOL POISON PILLS

Similarly, Glass Lewis may consider supporting a limited poison pill in the event that a company seeks shareholder approval of a rights plan for the express purpose of preserving Net Operating Losses (NOLs). While companies with NOLs can generally carry these losses forward to offset future taxable income, Section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code limits companies' ability to use NOLs in the event of a "change of ownership."⁵² In this case, a company may adopt or amend a poison pill ("NOL pill") in order to prevent an inadvertent change of ownership by multiple investors purchasing small chunks of stock at the same time, and thereby preserve the ability to carry the NOLs forward. Often such NOL pills have trigger thresholds much lower than the common 15% or 20% thresholds, with some NOL pill triggers as low as 5%.

Glass Lewis evaluates NOL pills on a strictly case-by-case basis taking into consideration, among other factors, the value of the NOLs to the company, the likelihood of a change of ownership based on the size of the holding and the nature of the larger shareholders, the trigger threshold and whether the term of the plan is limited in

⁵² Section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code refers to a "change of ownership" of more than 50 percentage points by one or more 5% shareholders within a three-year period. The statute is intended to deter the "trafficking" of net operating losses.

duration (i.e., whether it contains a reasonable “sunset” provision) or is subject to periodic board review and/or shareholder ratification. However, we will recommend that shareholders vote against a proposal to adopt or amend a pill to include NOL protective provisions if the company has adopted a more narrowly tailored means of preventing a change in control to preserve its NOLs. For example, a company may limit share transfers in its charter to prevent a change of ownership from occurring.

Furthermore, we believe that shareholders should be offered the opportunity to vote on any adoption or renewal of a NOL pill regardless of any potential tax benefit that it offers a company. As such, we will consider recommending voting against those members of the board who served at the time when an NOL pill was adopted without shareholder approval within the prior twelve months and where the NOL pill is not subject to shareholder ratification.

FAIR PRICE PROVISIONS

Fair price provisions, which are rare, require that certain minimum price and procedural requirements be observed by any party that acquires more than a specified percentage of a corporation’s common stock. The provision is intended to protect minority shareholder value when an acquirer seeks to accomplish a merger or other transaction which would eliminate or change the interests of the minority stockholders. The provision is generally applied against the acquirer unless the takeover is approved by a majority of “continuing directors” and holders of a majority, in some cases a supermajority as high as 80%, of the combined voting power of all stock entitled to vote to alter, amend, or repeal the above provisions.

The effect of a fair price provision is to require approval of any merger or business combination with an “interested stockholder” by 51% of the voting stock of the company, excluding the shares held by the interested stockholder. An interested stockholder is generally considered to be a holder of 10% or more of the company’s outstanding stock, but the trigger can vary.

Generally, provisions are put in place for the ostensible purpose of preventing a back-end merger where the interested stockholder would be able to pay a lower price for the remaining shares of the company than he or she paid to gain control. The effect of a fair price provision on shareholders, however, is to limit their ability to gain a premium for their shares through a partial tender offer or open market acquisition which typically raise the share price, often significantly. A fair price provision discourages such transactions because of the potential costs of seeking shareholder approval and because of the restrictions on purchase price for completing a merger or other transaction at a later time.

Glass Lewis believes that fair price provisions, while sometimes protecting shareholders from abuse in a takeover situation, more often act as an impediment to takeovers, potentially limiting gains to shareholders from a variety of transactions that could significantly increase share price. In some cases, even the independent directors of the board cannot make exceptions when such exceptions may be in the best interests of shareholders. Given the existence of state law protections for minority shareholders such as Section 203 of the Delaware Corporations Code, we believe it is in the best interests of shareholders to remove fair price provisions.

REINCORPORATION

In general, Glass Lewis believes that the board is in the best position to determine the appropriate jurisdiction of incorporation for the company. When examining a management proposal to reincorporate to a different state or country, we review the relevant financial benefits, generally related to improved corporate tax treatment, as well as changes in corporate governance provisions, especially those relating to shareholder rights, resulting from the change in domicile. Where the financial benefits are de minimis and there is a decrease in shareholder rights, we will recommend voting against the transaction.

However, costly, shareholder-initiated reincorporations are typically not the best route to achieve the furtherance of shareholder rights. We believe shareholders are generally better served by proposing specific shareholder resolutions addressing pertinent issues which may be implemented at a lower cost, and perhaps even with board approval. However, when shareholders propose a shift into a jurisdiction with enhanced shareholder rights, Glass Lewis examines the significant ways would the company benefit from shifting jurisdictions including the following:

- Is the board sufficiently independent?
- Does the company have anti-takeover protections such as a poison pill or classified board in place?
- Has the board been previously unresponsive to shareholders (such as failing to implement a shareholder proposal that received majority shareholder support)?
- Do shareholders have the right to call special meetings of shareholders?
- Are there other material governance issues of concern at the company?
- Has the company's performance matched or exceeded its peers in the past one and three years?
- How has the company ranked in Glass Lewis' pay-for-performance analysis during the last three years?
- Does the company have an independent chairman?

We note, however, that we will only support shareholder proposals to change a company's place of incorporation in exceptional circumstances.

EXCLUSIVE FORUM AND FEE-SHIFTING BYLAW PROVISIONS

Glass Lewis recognizes that companies may be subject to frivolous and opportunistic lawsuits, particularly in conjunction with a merger or acquisition, that are expensive and distracting. In response, companies have sought ways to prevent or limit the risk of such suits by adopting bylaws regarding where the suits must be brought or shifting the burden of the legal expenses to the plaintiff, if unsuccessful at trial.

Glass Lewis believes that charter or bylaw provisions limiting a shareholder's choice of legal venue are not in the best interests of shareholders. Such clauses may effectively discourage the use of shareholder claims by increasing their associated costs and making them more difficult to pursue. As such, shareholders should be wary about approving any limitation on their legal recourse including limiting themselves to a single jurisdiction (e.g., Delaware) without compelling evidence that it will benefit shareholders.

For this reason, we recommend that shareholders vote against any bylaw or charter amendment seeking to adopt an exclusive forum provision unless the company: (i) provides a compelling argument on why the provision would directly benefit shareholders; (ii) provides evidence of abuse of legal process in other, non-favored jurisdictions; (iii) narrowly tailors such provision to the risks involved; and (iv) maintains a strong record of good corporate governance practices.

Moreover, in the event a board seeks shareholder approval of a forum selection clause pursuant to a bundled bylaw amendment rather than as a separate proposal, we will weigh the importance of the other bundled provisions when determining the vote recommendation on the proposal. We will nonetheless recommend voting against the chairman of the governance committee for bundling disparate proposals into a single proposal (refer to our discussion of nominating and governance committee performance in Section I of the guidelines).

Similarly, some companies have adopted bylaws requiring plaintiffs who sue the company and fail to receive a judgment in their favor pay the legal expenses of the company. These bylaws, also known as "fee-shifting" or "loser pays" bylaws, will likely have a chilling effect on even meritorious shareholder lawsuits as shareholders would face an strong financial disincentive not to sue a company. Glass Lewis therefore strongly opposes the adoption of such fee-shifting bylaws and, if adopted without shareholder approval, will recommend voting against the governance committee. While we note that in June of 2015 the State of Delaware banned the adoption of fee-shifting bylaws, such provisions could still be adopted by companies incorporated in other states.

AUTHORIZED SHARES

Glass Lewis believes that adequate capital stock is important to a company's operation. When analyzing a request for additional shares, we typically review four common reasons why a company might need additional capital stock:

1. **Stock Split** – We typically consider three metrics when evaluating whether we think a stock split is likely or necessary: The historical stock pre-split price, if any; the current price relative to the company's most common trading price over the past 52 weeks; and some absolute limits on stock price that, in our view, either always make a stock split appropriate if desired by management or would almost never be a reasonable price at which to split a stock.
2. **Shareholder Defenses** – Additional authorized shares could be used to bolster takeover defenses such as a poison pill. Proxy filings often discuss the usefulness of additional shares in defending against or discouraging a hostile takeover as a reason for a requested increase. Glass Lewis is typically against such defenses and will oppose actions intended to bolster such defenses.
3. **Financing for Acquisitions** – We look at whether the company has a history of using stock for acquisitions and attempt to determine what levels of stock have typically been required to accomplish such transactions. Likewise, we look to see whether this is discussed as a reason for additional shares in the proxy.
4. **Financing for Operations** – We review the company's cash position and its ability to secure financing through borrowing or other means. We look at the company's history of capitalization and whether the company has had to use stock in the recent past as a means of raising capital.

Issuing additional shares can dilute existing holders in limited circumstances. Further, the availability of additional shares, where the board has discretion to implement a poison pill, can often serve as a deterrent to interested suitors. Accordingly, where we find that the company has not detailed a plan for use of the proposed shares, or where the number of shares far exceeds those needed to accomplish a detailed plan, we typically recommend against the authorization of additional shares. Similar concerns may also lead us to recommend against a proposal to conduct a reverse stock split if the board does not state that it will reduce the number of authorized common shares in a ratio proportionate to the split.

While we think that having adequate shares to allow management to make quick decisions and effectively operate the business is critical, we prefer that, for significant transactions, management come to shareholders to justify their use of additional shares rather than providing a blank check in the form of a large pool of unallocated shares available for any purpose.

ADVANCE NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

We typically recommend that shareholders vote against proposals that would require advance notice of shareholder proposals or of director nominees.

These proposals typically attempt to require a certain amount of notice before shareholders are allowed to place proposals on the ballot. Notice requirements typically range between three to six months prior to the annual meeting. Advance notice requirements typically make it impossible for a shareholder who misses the deadline to present a shareholder proposal or a director nominee that might be in the best interests of the company and its shareholders.

We believe shareholders should be able to review and vote on all proposals and director nominees. Shareholders can always vote against proposals that appear with little prior notice. Shareholders, as owners of a business, are capable of identifying issues on which they have sufficient information and ignoring issues on which they have insufficient information. Setting arbitrary notice restrictions limits the opportunity for shareholders to raise issues that may come up after the window closes.

VOTING STRUCTURE

CUMULATIVE VOTING

Cumulative voting increases the ability of minority shareholders to elect a director by allowing shareholders to cast as many shares of the stock they own multiplied by the number of directors to be elected. As companies generally have multiple nominees up for election, cumulative voting allows shareholders to cast all of their votes for a single nominee, or a smaller number of nominees than up for election, thereby raising the likelihood of electing one or more of their preferred nominees to the board. It can be important when a board is controlled by insiders or affiliates and where the company's ownership structure includes one or more shareholders who control a majority-voting block of company stock.

Glass Lewis believes that cumulative voting generally acts as a safeguard for shareholders by ensuring that those who hold a significant minority of shares can elect a candidate of their choosing to the board. This allows the creation of boards that are responsive to the interests of all shareholders rather than just a small group of large holders.

We review cumulative voting proposals on a case-by-case basis, factoring in the independence of the board and the status of the company's governance structure. But we typically find these proposals on ballots at companies where independence is lacking and where the appropriate checks and balances favoring shareholders are not in place. In those instances we typically recommend in favor of cumulative voting.

Where a company has adopted a true majority vote standard (i.e., where a director must receive a majority of votes cast to be elected, as opposed to a modified policy indicated by a resignation policy only), Glass Lewis will recommend voting against cumulative voting proposals due to the incompatibility of the two election methods. For companies that have not adopted a true majority voting standard but have adopted some form of majority voting, Glass Lewis will also generally recommend voting against cumulative voting proposals if the company has not adopted antitakeover protections and has been responsive to shareholders.

Where a company has not adopted a majority voting standard and is facing both a shareholder proposal to adopt majority voting and a shareholder proposal to adopt cumulative voting, Glass Lewis will support only the majority voting proposal. When a company has both majority voting and cumulative voting in place, there is a higher likelihood of one or more directors not being elected as a result of not receiving a majority vote. This is because shareholders exercising the right to cumulate their votes could unintentionally cause the failed election of one or more directors for whom shareholders do not cumulate votes.

SUPERMAJORITY VOTE REQUIREMENTS

Glass Lewis believes that supermajority vote requirements impede shareholder action on ballot items critical to shareholder interests. An example is in the takeover context, where supermajority vote requirements can strongly limit the voice of shareholders in making decisions on such crucial matters as selling the business. This in turn degrades share value and can limit the possibility of buyout premiums to shareholders. Moreover, we believe that a supermajority vote requirement can enable a small group of shareholders to overrule the will of the majority shareholders. We believe that a simple majority is appropriate to approve all matters presented to shareholders.

TRANSACTION OF OTHER BUSINESS

We typically recommend that shareholders not give their proxy to management to vote on any other business items that may properly come before an annual or special meeting. In our opinion, granting unfettered discretion is unwise.

ANTI-GREENMAIL PROPOSALS

Glass Lewis will support proposals to adopt a provision preventing the payment of greenmail, which would serve to prevent companies from buying back company stock at significant premiums from a certain shareholder. Since a large or majority shareholder could attempt to compel a board into purchasing its shares at a large premium, the anti-greenmail provision would generally require that a majority of shareholders other than the majority shareholder approve the buyback.

MUTUAL FUNDS: INVESTMENT POLICIES AND ADVISORY AGREEMENTS

Glass Lewis believes that decisions about a fund's structure and/or a fund's relationship with its investment advisor or sub-advisors are generally best left to management and the members of the board, absent a showing of egregious or illegal conduct that might threaten shareholder value. As such, we focus our analyses of such proposals on the following main areas:

- The terms of any amended advisory or sub-advisory agreement;
- Any changes in the fee structure paid to the investment advisor; and
- Any material changes to the fund's investment objective or strategy.

We generally support amendments to a fund's investment advisory agreement absent a material change that is not in the best interests of shareholders. A significant increase in the fees paid to an investment advisor would be reason for us to consider recommending voting against a proposed amendment to an investment advisory agreement. However, in certain cases, we are more inclined to support an increase in advisory fees if such increases result from being performance-based rather than asset-based. Furthermore, we generally support sub-advisory agreements between a fund's advisor and sub-advisor, primarily because the fees received by the sub-advisor are paid by the advisor, and not by the fund.

In matters pertaining to a fund's investment objective or strategy, we believe shareholders are best served when a fund's objective or strategy closely resembles the investment discipline shareholders understood and selected when they initially bought into the fund. As such, we generally recommend voting against amendments to a fund's investment objective or strategy when the proposed changes would leave shareholders with stakes in a fund that is noticeably different than when originally purchased, and which could therefore potentially negatively impact some investors' diversification strategies.

REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS

The complex organizational, operational, tax and compliance requirements of Real Estate Investment Trusts ("REITs") provide for a unique shareholder evaluation. In simple terms, a REIT must have a minimum of 100 shareholders (the "100 Shareholder Test") and no more than 50% of the value of its shares can be held by five or fewer individuals (the "5/50 Test"). At least 75% of a REITs' assets must be in real estate, it must derive 75% of its gross income from rents or mortgage interest, and it must pay out 90% of its taxable earnings as dividends. In addition, as a publicly traded security listed on a stock exchange, a REIT must comply with the same general listing requirements as a publicly traded equity.

In order to comply with such requirements, REITs typically include percentage ownership limitations in their organizational documents, usually in the range of 5% to 10% of the REITs outstanding shares. Given the complexities of REITs as an asset class, Glass Lewis applies a highly nuanced approach in our evaluation of REIT proposals, especially regarding changes in authorized share capital, including preferred stock.

PREFERRED STOCK ISSUANCES AT REITS

Glass Lewis is generally against the authorization of preferred shares that allows the board to determine the preferences, limitations and rights of the preferred shares (known as "blank-check preferred stock"). We believe that granting such broad discretion should be of concern to common shareholders, since blank-check preferred stock could be used as an antitakeover device or in some other fashion that adversely affects the voting power or financial interests of common shareholders. However, given the requirement that a REIT must distribute 90%

of its net income annually, it is inhibited from retaining capital to make investments in its business. As such, we recognize that equity financing likely plays a key role in a REIT's growth and creation of shareholder value. Moreover, shareholder concern regarding the use of preferred stock as an anti-takeover mechanism may be allayed by the fact that most REITs maintain ownership limitations in their certificates of incorporation. For these reasons, along with the fact that REITs typically do not engage in private placements of preferred stock (which result in the rights of common shareholders being adversely impacted), we may support requests to authorize shares of blank-check preferred stock at REITs.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

Business Development Companies ("BDCs") were created by the U.S. Congress in 1980; they are regulated under the Investment Company Act of 1940 and are taxed as regulated investment companies ("RICs") under the Internal Revenue Code. BDCs typically operate as publicly traded private equity firms that invest in early stage to mature private companies as well as small public companies. BDCs realize operating income when their investments are sold off, and therefore maintain complex organizational, operational, tax and compliance requirements that are similar to those of REITs—the most evident of which is that BDCs must distribute at least 90% of their taxable earnings as dividends.

AUTHORIZATION TO SELL SHARES AT A PRICE BELOW NET ASSET VALUE

Considering that BDCs are required to distribute nearly all their earnings to shareholders, they sometimes need to offer additional shares of common stock in the public markets to finance operations and acquisitions. However, shareholder approval is required in order for a BDC to sell shares of common stock at a price below Net Asset Value ("NAV"). Glass Lewis evaluates these proposals using a case-by-case approach, but will recommend supporting such requests if the following conditions are met:

- The authorization to allow share issuances below NAV has an expiration date of one year or less from the date that shareholders approve the underlying proposal (i.e. the meeting date);
- The proposed discount below NAV is minimal (ideally no greater than 20%);
- The board specifies that the issuance will have a minimal or modest dilutive effect (ideally no greater than 25% of the company's then-outstanding common stock prior to the issuance); and
- A majority of the company's independent directors who do not have a financial interest in the issuance approve the sale.

In short, we believe BDCs should demonstrate a responsible approach to issuing shares below NAV, by proactively addressing shareholder concerns regarding the potential dilution of the requested share issuance, and explaining if and how the company's past below-NAV share issuances have benefitted the company.

V Compensation, Environmental, Social and Governance Shareholder Initiatives

Glass Lewis generally believes decisions regarding day-to-day management and policy decisions, including those related to social, environmental or political issues, are best left to management and the board as they in almost all cases have more and better information about company strategy and risk. However, when there is a clear link between the subject of a shareholder proposal and value enhancement or risk mitigation, Glass Lewis will recommend in favor of a reasonable, well-crafted shareholder proposal where the company has failed to or inadequately addressed the issue.

We believe that shareholders should not attempt to micromanage a company, its businesses or its executives through the shareholder initiative process. Rather, we believe shareholders should use their influence to push for governance structures that protect shareholders and promote director accountability. Shareholders should then put in place a board they can trust to make informed decisions that are in the best interests of the business and its owners, and hold directors accountable for management and policy decisions through board elections. However, we recognize that support of appropriately crafted shareholder initiatives may at times serve to promote or protect shareholder value.

To this end, Glass Lewis evaluates shareholder proposals on a case-by-case basis. We generally recommend supporting shareholder proposals calling for the elimination of, as well as to require shareholder approval of, antitakeover devices such as poison pills and classified boards. We generally recommend supporting proposals likely to increase and/or protect shareholder value and also those that promote the furtherance of shareholder rights. In addition, we also generally recommend supporting proposals that promote director accountability and those that seek to improve compensation practices, especially those promoting a closer link between compensation and performance, as well as those that promote more and better disclosure of relevant risk factors where such disclosure is lacking or inadequate.

For a detailed review of our policies concerning compensation, environmental, social and governance shareholder initiatives, please refer to our comprehensive *Proxy Paper Guidelines for Shareholder Initiatives*, available at www.glasslewis.com.

DISCLAIMER

This document is intended to provide an overview of Glass Lewis' proxy voting policies and guidelines. It is not intended to be exhaustive and does not address all potential voting issues. Additionally, none of the information contained herein should be relied upon as investment advice. The content of this document has been developed based on Glass Lewis' experience with proxy voting and corporate governance issues, engagement with clients and issuers and review of relevant studies and surveys, and has not been tailored to any specific person.

No representations or warranties express or implied, are made as to the accuracy or completeness of any information included herein. In addition, Glass Lewis shall not be liable for any losses or damages arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use, reliance on or inability to use any such information. Glass Lewis expects its subscribers possess sufficient experience and knowledge to make their own decisions entirely independent of any information contained in this document.

All information contained in this report is protected by law, including but not limited to, copyright law, and none of such information may be copied or otherwise reproduced, repackaged, further transmitted, transferred, disseminated, redistributed or resold, or stored for subsequent use for any such purpose, in whole or in part, in any form or manner or by any means whatsoever, by any person without Glass Lewis' prior written consent.

© 2016 Glass, Lewis & Co., Glass Lewis Europe, Ltd., and CGI Glass Lewis Pty Ltd. (collectively, "Glass Lewis"). All Rights Reserved.

•••••

SAN FRANCISCO

Headquarters
Glass, Lewis & Co., LLC
One Sansome Street
Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel: +1 415-678-4110
Tel: +1 888-800-7001
Fax: +1 415-357-0200

•••••

NEW YORK

Glass, Lewis & Co., LLC
44 Wall Street
Suite 2001
New York, NY 10005
Tel: +1 212-797-3777
Fax: +1 212-980-4716

•••••

AUSTRALIA

CGI Glass Lewis Pty Limited
Suite 8.01, Level 8
261 George St
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia
Tel: +61 2 9299 9266
Fax: +61 2 9299 1866

•••••

IRELAND

Glass Lewis Europe, Ltd.
15 Henry Street
Limerick, Ireland
Phone: +353 61 292 800
Fax: +353 61 292 899

•••••

GERMANY

IVOX Glass Lewis GmbH
Maximilianstr. 6
76133 Karlsruhe
Germany
Phone: +49 721-35 49 622
Fax: +49 721-35 49 621

EXHIBIT C—Updated Proxy Voting Policy for Winton Capital Management Limited

PROXY VOTING POLICY

October 2014



Grove House
27 Hammersmith Grove
London W6 0NE
Tel: +44 (0)20 8576 5800
Fax: +44 (0)20 7610 5301

Winton Capital Group Limited and/or its affiliates (“Winton”) has authority to vote proxies on behalf of its clients, including Winton-sponsored funds and third party funds and managed accounts, which have delegated voting authority to Winton.

Winton has engaged Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”) to provide proxy voting guidelines and to vote proxies for Winton. ISS is an unaffiliated service provider that assists institutional investors in meeting their fiduciary requirements for proxy voting. To that end, the stated goal of ISS is to design its proxy voting guidelines to enhance shareholders' long-term economic interests.

Although Winton will generally rely on the recommendations of ISS, Winton reserves the right to exercise its discretion in voting proxies and may vote proxies in a manner other than that specifically set out by ISS.

Winton does not anticipate any conflicts in its proxy voting practices. In the event that Winton does direct a vote, its Compliance Department will evaluate the recommendation for any potential conflict of interest with Firm clients and maintain documentation related to the voting decision.

In addition, there may be situations where Winton does not vote proxies. For example, Winton may not vote proxies where:

- The cost of voting a proxy outweighs the benefit of voting the proxy;
- There are legal encumbrances to voting, including blocking restrictions that preclude the ability to dispose of a security if Winton votes a proxy, laws requiring the appointment of a local power of attorney to facilitate voting instructions, laws requiring Winton to obtain additional consents from clients or beneficial owners to vote a proxy, or other cases where Winton is prohibited from voting by applicable legal or market requirements;
- Winton has not been provided sufficient time to process the voting of a proxy;
- Winton has outstanding sell orders on a company's shares, or otherwise intends to sell a company's shares, prior to the company's meeting date; or
- Winton holds shares on a company's record date, but sells those shares prior to the company's meeting date.

Investors may contact Winton to request information about ISS' policy formulation process and a quarterly record of all proxy votes cast on behalf of clients.

www.WintonCapital.com

Winton Capital Management Limited. Authorised and Regulated by The Financial Conduct Authority
Registered Office: 16 Old Bailey, London EC4M 7EG. Registered in England & Wales No: 3311531