

# Evaluation and Approval of Advisory Contract – May 2020

## **FEDERATED MUNICIPAL BOND FUND, INC. (THE “FUND”)**

### **(EFFECTIVE CLOSE OF BUSINESS ON JUNE 26, 2020, THE FUND'S NAME CHANGED TO FEDERATED HERMES MUNICIPAL BOND FUND, INC.)**

At its meetings in May 2020 (the “May Meetings”), the Fund’s Board of Directors (the “Board”), including a majority of those Directors who are not “interested persons” of the Fund, as defined in the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the “Independent Directors”), reviewed and unanimously approved the continuation of the investment advisory contract between the Fund and Federated Investment Management Company (the “Adviser”) (the “Contract”) for an additional one-year term. The Board’s determination to approve the continuation of the Contract reflects the exercise of its business judgment after considering all of the information and factors believed to be relevant and appropriate on whether to continue the existing arrangements. The information, factors and conclusions that formed the basis for the Board’s approval are summarized below.

#### **Information Received and Review Process**

At the request of the Independent Directors, the Fund’s Chief Compliance Officer (the “CCO”) furnished to the Board in advance of its May Meetings an independent written evaluation presenting on the topics discussed below. The Board considered the CCO’s independent written evaluation (the “CCO Fee Evaluation Report”), along with other information, in evaluating the reasonableness of the Fund’s management fee and in determining to approve the continuation of the Contract. The CCO, in preparing the CCO Fee Evaluation Report, has the authority to retain consultants, experts or staff as reasonably necessary to assist in the performance of his duties, reports directly to the Board, and can be terminated only with the approval of a majority of the Independent Directors. At the request of the Independent Directors, the CCO Fee Evaluation Report followed the same general approach and covered the same topics as that of the report that had previously been delivered by the CCO in his capacity as “Senior Officer” prior to the elimination of the Senior Officer position in December 2017.

In addition to the extensive materials that comprise and accompany the CCO Fee Evaluation Report, in the months preceding the May Meetings, the Board requested and reviewed written responses and supporting materials prepared by the Adviser and its affiliates (collectively, “Federated Hermes”) in response to requests posed to Federated Hermes on behalf of the Independent Directors encompassing a wide variety of topics. The Board also considered such additional matters as the Independent Directors deemed reasonably necessary to evaluate the Contract, which included detailed information about the Fund and Federated Hermes furnished to the Board at its meetings throughout the year and in between regularly scheduled meetings on particular matters as the need arose, as well as information specifically prepared in connection with the approval of the continuation of the Contract that was presented at the May Meetings.

The Board’s consideration of the Contract included review of materials and information covering the following matters, among others: the Adviser’s and sub-adviser’s investment philosophy, revenue, profitability, personnel and processes; investment and operating strategies; the Fund’s short-term and long-term performance (in absolute terms, both on a gross basis and net of expenses, and relative to the Fund’s particular investment program and a group of its peer funds and/or its benchmark, as appropriate) and comments on the reasons for the Fund’s performance; the Fund’s investment objectives; the Fund’s expenses, including the advisory fee and the overall expense structure of the Fund (both in absolute terms and relative to a group of its peer funds), with due regard for contractual or voluntary expense limitations (if any); the use and allocation of brokerage commissions derived from trading the Fund’s portfolio securities (if any); and the nature, quality and extent of the advisory and other services provided to the Fund by the Adviser and its affiliates. The Board also considered the preferences and expectations of Fund shareholders; the entrepreneurial and other risks assumed by the Adviser in sponsoring and managing the Fund; the continuing state of competition in the mutual fund industry and market practices; the range of comparable fees for similar funds in the mutual fund industry; the Fund’s relationship to the other funds advised by Federated Hermes (each, a “Federated Hermes Fund”), which include a comprehensive array of funds with different investment objectives, policies and strategies which are generally available for exchange without the incurrence of additional sales charges; compliance and audit reports concerning the Federated Hermes Funds and the Federated Hermes’ affiliates that service them (including communications from regulatory agencies), as well as Federated Hermes’ responses to any issues raised therein; and relevant developments in the mutual fund industry and how the Federated Hermes Funds and/or Federated Hermes may be responding to them. In addition, the Board received and considered information furnished by Federated Hermes on the impacts of the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak on Federated Hermes generally and the Fund in particular, including, among other information, the current and anticipated impacts on the management, operations and performance of the Fund. The Board noted that its evaluation process is evolutionary and that the criteria considered and the emphasis placed on relevant criteria may change in recognition of changing circumstances in the mutual fund marketplace.

The Board also considered judicial decisions concerning allegedly excessive investment advisory fees in determining to approve the Contract. Using these judicial decisions as a guide, the Board observed that the following factors may be relevant to an adviser's fiduciary duty with respect to its receipt of compensation from a fund: (1) the nature and quality of the services provided by an adviser to a fund and its shareholders (including the performance of the fund, its benchmark, and comparable funds); (2) an adviser's cost of providing the services (including the profitability to an adviser of providing advisory services to a fund); (3) the extent to which an adviser may realize "economies of scale" as a fund grows larger and, if such economies of scale exist, whether they have been shared with a fund and its shareholders or the family of funds; (4) any "fall-out" financial benefits that accrue to an adviser because of its relationship with a fund (including research services received from brokers that execute fund trades and any fees paid to affiliates of an adviser for services rendered to a fund); (5) comparative fee and expense structures (including a comparison of fees paid to an adviser with those paid by similar funds both internally and externally as well as management fees charged to institutional and other advisory clients of the adviser for what might be viewed as like services); and (6) the extent of care, conscientiousness and independence with which the fund's board members perform their duties and their expertise (including whether they are fully informed about all facts the board deems relevant to its consideration of an adviser's services and fees). The Board noted that the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") disclosure requirements regarding the basis for a fund board's approval of the fund's investment advisory contracts generally align with the factors listed above. The Board was aware of these factors and was guided by them in its review of the Contract to the extent it considered them to be appropriate and relevant, as discussed further below.

The Board considered and weighed these factors in light of its substantial accumulated experience in governing the Fund and working with Federated Hermes on matters relating to the Federated Hermes Funds. While individual members of the Board may have weighed certain factors differently, the Board's determination to continue the Contract was based on a comprehensive consideration of all information provided to the Board throughout the year and specifically with respect to the continuation of the Contract. The Independent Directors were assisted throughout the evaluation process by independent legal counsel. In connection with their deliberations at the May Meetings, the Independent Directors met separately in executive session with their independent legal counsel and without management present to review the relevant materials and consider their responsibilities under applicable laws. In addition, senior management representatives of Federated Hermes also met with the Independent Directors and their independent legal counsel to discuss the materials and presentations furnished to the Board at the May Meetings. The Board considered the approval of the Contract for the Fund as part of its consideration of agreements for funds across the Federated Hermes Funds family, but its approvals were made on a fund-by-fund basis.

#### **Nature, Extent and Quality of Services**

The Board considered the nature, extent and quality of the services provided to the Fund by the Adviser and the resources of the Adviser and its affiliates dedicated to the Fund. In this regard, the Board evaluated, among other things, the Adviser's personnel, experience and track record, as well as the financial resources and overall reputation of Federated Hermes and its willingness to invest in personnel and infrastructure that benefit the Federated Hermes Funds. The Board noted the significant acquisition of Hermes Fund Managers Limited by Federated Hermes in 2018, which has deepened the organization's investment management expertise and capabilities and expanded the investment process for all of the Federated Hermes Funds to incorporate environmental, social and governance ("ESG") factors and issuer engagement on ESG matters.

In addition, the Board reviewed the qualifications, backgrounds and responsibilities of the portfolio management team primarily responsible for the day-to-day management of the Fund and the Adviser's ability and experience in attracting and retaining qualified personnel to service the Fund. The Board noted the compliance program of the Adviser and the compliance-related resources devoted by the Adviser and its affiliates in support of the Fund's obligations pursuant to Rule 38a-1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940, including the Adviser's commitment to respond to rulemaking and other regulatory initiatives of the SEC such as the liquidity risk management program rules. In addition, the Board considered the response by the Adviser to recent market conditions and considered the overall performance of the Adviser in this context. The Fund's ability to deliver competitive performance when compared to its Performance Peer Group (as defined below) was also deemed to be relevant by the Board as a useful indicator of how the Adviser is executing the Fund's investment program. The Adviser's ability to execute this program was one of the Board's considerations in reaching a conclusion that the nature, extent and quality of the Adviser's investment management and related services warrant the continuation of the Contract.

#### **Fund Investment Performance**

In evaluating the Fund's investment performance, the Board considered performance results in light of the Fund's investment objective, strategies and risks, as disclosed in the Fund's prospectus. The Board also considered the Fund's performance in light of the overall recent market conditions. The Board considered detailed investment reports on the Fund's performance over different time periods that were provided to the Board throughout the year and in connection

with the May Meetings and evaluated the Adviser's analysis of the Fund's performance for these time periods. The Board also reviewed comparative information regarding the performance of other mutual funds in the category of peer funds selected by Morningstar, Inc. (the "Morningstar"), an independent fund ranking organization (the "Performance Peer Group"), noting the CCO's view that comparisons to fund peer groups may be helpful, though not conclusive, in evaluating the performance of the Adviser in managing the Fund. The Board considered, in evaluating such comparisons, that in some cases there may be differences in the funds' objectives or investment management techniques, or the costs to implement the funds, even within the same Performance Peer Group.

For the periods ended December 31, 2019, the Fund's performance for the one-year period was above the median of the relevant Performance Peer Group, and the Fund's performance fell below the median of the relevant Performance Peer Group for the three-year and five-year periods. The Board discussed the Fund's performance with the Adviser and recognized the efforts being taken by the Adviser in the context of other factors considered relevant by the Board.

Following such evaluation, and full deliberations, the Board concluded that the performance of the Fund supported renewal of the Contract.

### **Fund Expenses**

While mindful that courts have cautioned against giving too much weight to comparative information concerning fees charged by other advisers for managing funds with comparable investment programs, the Board has found the use of such comparisons to be relevant to its deliberations. In this regard, the Board was presented with, and considered, information regarding the contractual advisory fee rates, net advisory fee rates, total expense ratios and each element of the Fund's total expense ratio (i.e., gross and net advisory fees, administrative fees, custody fees, portfolio accounting fees and transfer agency fees) relative to an appropriate group of peer funds compiled by Federated Hermes from the category of peer funds selected by Morningstar (the "Expense Peer Group"). The Board received a description of the methodology used to select the Expense Peer Group from the overall Morningstar category. The Board also reviewed comparative information regarding the fees and expenses of the broader group of funds in the overall Morningstar category. The Board focused on comparisons with other similar mutual funds more heavily than non-mutual fund products or services because such comparisons are believed to be more relevant. The Board considered that other mutual funds are the products most like the Fund, in that they are readily available to Fund shareholders as alternative investment vehicles, and they are the type of investment vehicle, in fact, chosen and maintained by the Fund's investors. The Board noted that the range of their fees and expenses, therefore, appears to be a relevant indicator of what consumers have found to be reasonable in the marketplace in which the Fund competes.

The Board reviewed the contractual advisory fee rate, net advisory fee rate and other expenses of the Fund and noted the position of the Fund's fee rates relative to its Expense Peer Group. In this regard, the Board noted that the contractual advisory fee rate was above the median of the relevant Expense Peer Group, but the Board noted the applicable waivers and reimbursements, and that the overall expense structure of the Fund remained competitive in the context of other factors considered by the Board.

For comparison, the Board received and considered information about the fees charged by Federated Hermes for providing advisory services to other types of clients with investment strategies similar to those of the Federated Hermes Funds, including non-mutual fund clients such as institutional separate accounts and third-party unaffiliated mutual funds for which the Adviser or its affiliates serve as sub-adviser. The Board noted the CCO's conclusion that non-mutual fund clients are inherently different products due to the following differences, among others: (i) different types of targeted investors; (ii) different applicable laws and regulations; (iii) different legal structures; (iv) different average account sizes and portfolio management techniques made necessary by different cash flows and different associated costs; (v) and the time spent by portfolio managers and their teams (among other personnel across various departments, including legal, compliance and risk management) in reviewing securities pricing, addressing different administrative responsibilities, and addressing different degrees of risk associated with management; and (vi) a variety of different costs. The Board also considered information regarding the differences in the nature of the services required for Federated Hermes to manage its proprietary mutual fund business versus managing a discrete pool of assets as a sub-adviser to another institution's mutual fund, noting that Federated Hermes generally performs significant additional services and assumes substantially greater risks in managing the Fund and other Federated Hermes Funds than in its role as sub-adviser to an unaffiliated third-party mutual fund. The Board noted that the CCO did not consider the fees for providing advisory services to other types of clients to be determinative in judging the appropriateness of the Federated Hermes Funds' advisory fees.

Following such evaluation, and full deliberations, the Board concluded that the fees and expenses of the Fund are reasonable and supported renewal of the Contract.

### **Profitability and Other Benefits**

The Board also received financial information about Federated Hermes, including information regarding the compensation and ancillary (or “fall-out”) benefits Federated Hermes derived from its relationships with the Federated Hermes Funds. This information covered not only the fees under the Federated Hermes Funds’ investment advisory contracts, but also fees received by Federated Hermes’ affiliates for providing other services to the Federated Hermes Funds under separate contracts (e.g., for serving as the Federated Hermes Funds’ administrator and distributor). In this regard, the Board considered that certain of Federated Hermes’ affiliates provide distribution and shareholder services to the Federated Hermes Funds, for which they may be compensated through distribution and servicing fees paid pursuant to Rule 12b-1 plans or otherwise. The Board also received and considered information detailing any indirect benefit Federated Hermes may derive from its receipt of research services from brokers who execute portfolio trades for the Federated Hermes Funds. In addition, the Board considered the fact that, in order for the Federated Hermes Funds to be competitive in the marketplace, the Adviser and its affiliates frequently waived fees and/or reimbursed expenses and have disclosed to Federated Hermes Fund shareholders and/or reported to the Board their intention to do so in the future. Moreover, the Board received and considered regular reports from Federated Hermes throughout the year as to the institution, adjustment or elimination of these voluntary waivers and/or reimbursements.

The Board received and considered information furnished by Federated Hermes, as requested by the CCO, that reported revenues on a fund-by-fund basis and made estimates of the allocation of expenses on a fund-by-fund basis, using allocation methodologies specified by the CCO and described to the Board. The Board considered the CCO’s view that, while these cost allocation reports apply consistent allocation processes, the inherent difficulties in allocating costs continues to cause the CCO to question the precision of the process and to conclude that such reports may be unreliable, because a single change in an allocation estimate may dramatically alter the resulting estimate of cost and/or profitability of a Federated Hermes Fund and may produce unintended consequences. The allocation information, including the CCO’s view that fund-by-fund estimations may be unreliable, was considered in the evaluation by the Board. In addition, the Board considered that, during the prior year, an independent consultant conducted a review of the allocation methodologies used by Federated Hermes in estimating profitability for purposes of reporting to the Board in connection with the continuation of the Contract. The Board noted the consultant’s view that, although there is no single best method to allocate expenses, the methodologies used by Federated Hermes are reasonable.

The Board also reviewed information compiled by Federated Hermes comparing its profitability information to other publicly held fund management companies, including information regarding profitability trends over time. The Board considered the CCO’s conclusion that, based on such profitability information, Federated Hermes’ profit margins did not appear to be excessive. The Board also considered the CCO’s view that Federated Hermes appeared financially sound, with the resources necessary to fulfill its obligations under its contracts with the Federated Hermes Funds.

### **Economies of Scale**

The Board received and considered information about the notion of possible realization of “economies of scale” as a fund grows larger, the difficulties of calculating economies of scale at an individual fund level, and the extent to which potential scale benefits are shared with shareholders. In this regard, the Board considered that the Adviser has made significant and long-term investments in areas that support all of the Federated Hermes Funds, such as personnel and processes for the portfolio management, trading operations, issuer engagement (including with respect to ESG matters), shareholder services, compliance, business continuity, internal audit and risk management functions, as well as systems technology (including technology relating to cybersecurity) and use of data. The Board noted that Federated Hermes’ investments in these areas are extensive and are designed to provide enhanced services to the Federated Hermes Funds and their shareholders. The Board considered that the benefits of these investments (as well as the benefits of any economies of scale, should they exist) are likely to be shared with the Federated Hermes Fund family as a whole. In addition, the Board considered that the Adviser and its affiliates have frequently waived fees and/or reimbursed expenses for the Federated Hermes Funds and that such waivers and reimbursements are another means for potential economies of scale to be shared with shareholders and can provide protection from an increase in expenses if a Federated Hermes Fund’s assets decline. Federated Hermes, as it does throughout the year, and specifically in connection with the Board’s review of the Contract, furnished information relative to adviser-paid fees (commonly referred to as revenue sharing). The Board considered the beliefs of Federated Hermes and the CCO that this information should be viewed to determine if there was an incentive to either not apply breakpoints, or to apply breakpoints at higher levels, and should not be viewed to determine the appropriateness of advisory fees. The Board also noted the absence of any applicable regulatory or industry guidelines on this subject, which is compounded by the lack of any common industry practice or general pattern with respect to structuring fund advisory fees with “breakpoints” that serve to reduce the fee as a fund attains a certain size.

## **Conclusions**

The Board considered the CCO's conclusion that his observations and the information accompanying the CCO Fee Evaluation Report show that the management fee for the Fund was reasonable and the CCO's recommendation that the Board approve the management fee. The Board noted that, under these circumstances, no changes were recommended to, and no objection was raised to the continuation of, the Contract by the CCO. The CCO also recognized that the Board's evaluation of the Federated Hermes Funds' advisory and subadvisory arrangements is a continuing and on-going process that is informed by the information that the Board requests and receives from management throughout the course of the year and, in this regard, the CCO noted certain items for future reporting to the Board or further consideration by management as the Board continues its on-going oversight of the Federated Hermes Funds.

In its determination to continue an existing investment advisory contract, the Board was mindful of the potential disruptions of the Fund's operations and various risks, uncertainties and other effects that could occur as a result of a decision to terminate or not renew an investment advisory contract. In particular, the Board recognized that many shareholders have invested in the Fund on the strength of the Adviser's industry standing and reputation and with the expectation that the Adviser will have a continuing role in providing advisory services to the Fund. Thus, the Board's approval of the Contract reflected the fact that it is the shareholders who have effectively selected the Adviser by virtue of having invested in the Fund. The Board concluded that, in light of the factors summarized above, including the nature, quality and scope of the services provided to the Fund by the Adviser and its affiliates, continuation of the Contract was appropriate.

The Board based its determination to approve the Contract on the totality of the circumstances and relevant factors and with a view to past and future long-term considerations. Not all of the factors and considerations identified above were necessarily deemed to be relevant to the Fund, nor did the Board consider any one of them to be determinative. With respect to the factors that were deemed to be relevant, the Board's determination to approve the continuation of the Contract reflects its view that Federated Hermes' performance and actions provided a satisfactory basis to support the determination to continue the existing arrangement.