

Evaluation and Approval of Advisory Contract – November 2018

FEDERATED HERMES GLOBAL EQUITY FUND (THE “FUND”)

At its meetings in November 2018, the Fund’s Board of Trustees (the “Board”), including a majority of those Trustees who are not “interested persons” of the Fund, as defined in the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “1940 Act”) (the “Independent Trustees”), reviewed and unanimously approved for an initial two-year term a proposed investment advisory contract for the Fund with Federated Global Investment Management Corp. (“FGIM”) and a separate proposed subadvisory contract with Hermes Investment Management Limited (the “Sub-Adviser” and together with FGIM, the “Advisers”) on behalf of the Fund. The Board’s decision to approve these contracts reflects the exercise of its business judgment on whether to authorize the creation and offering of this new investment vehicle, as proposed by Federated Investors, Inc. (together with its wholly owned subsidiaries, “Federated”), and based on information requested by the Board and provided by Federated, as well as Federated’s recommendation to go forward with development of the Fund.

The Board had previously appointed a Senior Officer, whose duties included specified responsibilities relating to the process by which advisory fees are to be charged to a fund advised by Federated (each, a “Federated fund”). The Senior Officer’s responsibilities included preparing and furnishing to the Board an annual independent written evaluation that covered topics discussed below. In December 2017, the Senior Officer position was eliminated. Notwithstanding the elimination of the Senior Officer position, at the request of the Independent Trustees, the Fund’s Chief Compliance Officer (the CCO) furnished to the Board in advance of its November 2018 meetings an independent written evaluation covering substantially the same topics that had been covered in the Senior Officer’s written evaluation in prior years. The Board considered the CCO’s independent written evaluation (the “CCO Fee Evaluation Report”), along with other information, including additional materials relating to the proposed Fund presented to the Board by Federated, at its November 2018 meetings, in evaluating the reasonableness of the Fund’s proposed management fee and in deciding to approve the proposed investment advisory and subadvisory contracts. The Board also considered the materials and presentations received by the Board at its May and August 2018 meetings, including materials provided by Federated and the CCO’s independent written evaluation, in connection with its annual approval of the continuation of the advisory and subadvisory contracts for the other Federated funds and its initial approval of the advisory and subadvisory contracts for a different Federated fund sub-advised by the Sub-Adviser, respectively. Consistent with the former Senior Officer position, 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 Trustees.

The Board also considered judicial decisions concerning allegedly excessive investment advisory fees in making its decision. 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 Advisers and their affiliates 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 the Board’s approval of the Fund’s investment advisory and subadvisory 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 Fund’s proposed investment advisory and subadvisory contracts 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, and working with Federated on matters relating to, the Federated funds. The Independent Trustees were assisted in their deliberations by independent legal counsel. At the November meetings, in addition to separate sessions of the Independent Trustees without management present, senior management of FGIM also met with the Independent Trustees and their counsel to discuss the materials presented and such additional matters as the Independent Trustees deemed reasonably necessary to evaluate the proposed advisory and subadvisory contracts.

The Board's consideration of the proposed investment advisory and subadvisory contracts included review of the CCO's Fee Evaluation Report, accompanying data and additional information covering the following matters, among others: each Adviser's investment philosophy, revenue, profitability, personnel and processes; investment and operating strategies; the Fund's proposed investment objectives; the Fund's anticipated fees and expenses (including the proposed advisory and subadvisory fees and the overall estimated expense structure of the Fund, both in absolute terms and relative to similar and/or competing funds, with due regard for contractual or voluntary fee waivers and expense limitations); the use and allocation of brokerage commissions to be derived from trading the Fund's portfolio securities (if any); and the nature, quality and extent of the advisory and other services to be provided to the Fund by each Adviser and its affiliates. The Board also considered the likely preferences and expectations of anticipated Fund shareholders; the entrepreneurial and other risks assumed by FGIM in sponsoring 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 Federated funds, which include a comprehensive array of funds with different investment objectives, policies and strategies that are generally available for exchange without the incurrence of additional sales charges; compliance and audit reports concerning the Federated funds and the Federated companies that service them (including communications from regulatory agencies), as well as Federated's responses to any issues raised therein; and relevant developments in the mutual fund industry and how the Federated funds and/or Federated are responding to them. The Board's evaluation process is evolutionary. The criteria considered and the emphasis placed on relevant criteria change in recognition of changing circumstances in the mutual fund marketplace.

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 proposed contractual advisory and subadvisory fee rates, proposed net advisory fee rates, anticipated total expense ratios and each element of the Fund's anticipated total expense ratio (i.e., gross and net advisory fees, custody fees, portfolio accounting fees and transfer agency fees) relative to an appropriate group of peer funds compiled by Federated using data supplied by independent fund ranking organizations (the "Peer Group"). The Board received a description of the composition and methodology used to select the Peer Group. The Board focused on comparisons with other similar mutual funds more heavily than non-mutual fund products or services because it is believed that they are more relevant. For example, other mutual funds are the products most like the Fund, in that they are readily available to Fund shareholders as alternative investment vehicles. Also, they are the type of investment vehicle, in fact, chosen and maintained by the Fund's anticipated investors. 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 will compete.

The Board reviewed the proposed contractual advisory and subadvisory fee rates, proposed net advisory fee rate and proposed other expenses of the Fund and noted the position of the Fund's proposed fee rates relative to its Peer Group. In this regard, the Board noted that the proposed contractual advisory fee rate of the Fund was below the median of the Peer Group. The Board also considered absolute and relative information regarding the proposed contractual subadvisory fee rate (expressed as a percentage of the contractual advisory fee rate).

For comparison, the CCO reviewed the fees charged by Federated for providing advisory services to products other than the Federated funds (e.g., institutional and separate accounts and third-party unaffiliated mutual funds for which Federated serves as sub-adviser) (referenced to as "Other Funds/Accounts"). The CCO provided information to the Board regarding the Other Funds/Accounts other than third-party mutual funds, and the CCO concluded that they are inherently different products in light of, among other differences, different types of targeted investors, different applicable laws and regulations, different legal structures, and different average account sizes and portfolio management techniques made necessary by different cash flows and different associated costs. The CCO noted that Federated did not currently manage any Other Funds/Accounts with comparable investment strategies to the Fund's proposed investment strategy.

The CCO also reviewed the fees charged by the Sub-Adviser for serving as the sole investment adviser to a foreign fund that employs an investment strategy substantially similar to that proposed for the Fund (the "Comparable Fund"). The Board considered that, unlike the Fund's proposed management fee structure, the Comparable Fund pays an advisory fee to the Sub-Adviser under an all-in "unitary" fee structure. The Board considered the inherent limitations of comparing the Fund's proposed management fee to the Comparable Fund's advisory fee because such advisory fee is subsumed within its unitary fee. The Board considered that the unitary fee was in range of the anticipated total expense ratio for the share class offered by the Fund that is similar to the Comparable Fund. In connection with these considerations, the Board considered FGIM's representation to the Board that any differences between the total expense ratios of the Fund and the Comparable Fund will be primarily attributable to certain differences between U.S. registered mutual funds and funds domiciled in a foreign (non-U.S.) country, including differences in the types of restrictions and investment limitations that are in place under the regulatory regimes for each investment product. The Board also noted that the anticipated total expense ratio for the share class offered by the Fund that is similar to the Comparable Fund was below the average of the Peer Group.

The CCO Fee Evaluation Report indicated that the proposed management fee, after projected waivers, was reasonable. The Board reviewed the proposed fees and other expenses of the Fund and was satisfied that the proposed overall expense structure of the Fund appeared to be appropriate.

The Board considered the nature, extent and quality of the services to be provided to the Fund by each Adviser and the resources of each Adviser and its affiliates dedicated to the Fund. In this regard, the Board evaluated, among other things, each Adviser's organizational structure, personnel, experience, track record, financial resources, overall reputation and willingness to invest in personnel and infrastructure that will benefit the Fund. The Board considered the personnel and other resources dedicated to the Sub-Adviser's operational, compliance and legal functions. The Board also considered that Federated recently acquired a majority ownership stake in the Sub-Adviser's parent company. In addition, the Board reviewed the qualifications, backgrounds and responsibilities of the portfolio managers who will be primarily responsible for the day-to-day management of the Fund and each Adviser's ability and experience in attracting and retaining qualified personnel to service the Fund.

The Board considered the range of investment advisory services to be provided by the Sub-Adviser under the oversight of FGIM, including the daily investment of the assets of the Fund. In evaluating these investment advisory services, the Board considered, among other things, the Sub-Adviser's investment philosophy and process, investment research capabilities and resources, performance record, trade execution capabilities and experience, including with respect to the Sub-Adviser's use of a disciplined environmental, social and governance ("ESG") characteristics analysis as part of the Fund's investment process.

The Board received and considered information regarding the application of fiduciary principles to the different ways in which ESG investing may be integrated into a fund's investment process. The Board considered that the Sub-Adviser analyzes ESG-related risk and return factors to seek to enhance the Fund's long-term risk-adjusted returns and does not consider the advancement of noninvestment goals for the benefit of parties other than the Fund's shareholders. The Board considered the Adviser's belief that such ESG investing is consistent with the Adviser's and the Sub-Adviser's fiduciary duties to the Fund.

The Board considered that FGIM would retain overall responsibility for the management and investment of the assets of the Fund and that, in this capacity, FGIM would play an active role in overseeing, monitoring and reviewing the Sub-Adviser in the performance of its duties. The Board evaluated information about the nature and extent of responsibilities retained and risks assumed by FGIM and not delegated to or assumed by the Sub-Adviser. In this regard, the Board considered that FGIM would monitor and evaluate the performance of the Sub-Adviser, monitor the Sub-Adviser for adherence to the stated investment objectives, strategies, policies and restrictions of the Fund, and supervise the Sub-Adviser with respect to the services that the Sub-Adviser would provide under the subadvisory contract. The Board also considered the process used by FGIM to recommend to the Board that the Sub-Adviser be appointed as the sub-adviser to the Fund.

The Board noted the compliance program of each Adviser and the compliance-related resources to be provided to the Fund by each Adviser, including each Adviser's commitment to respond to rulemaking initiatives of the SEC. The Fund's anticipated ability to deliver competitive performance when compared to its Peer Group was also deemed to be relevant by the Board as a useful indicator of how the Advisers are anticipated to execute the Fund's investment program. The Advisers' ability to execute this program was one of the Board's considerations in reaching a conclusion that the nature, extent and quality of the Advisers' investment management services to be provided to the Fund warrant the approval of the proposed advisory and subadvisory contracts.

The CCO reviewed the investment performance of the Sub-Adviser, including, for purposes of considering the investment skill and experience of the Fund's portfolio managers, performance data showing the portfolio managers' capabilities in managing a composite of other accounts, including the Comparable Fund, that has a substantially similar investment strategy to that proposed for the Fund (the "Composite"), noting that the Sub-Adviser did not currently manage an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 that uses an investment strategy substantially similar to that proposed for the Fund. The Board also considered information comparing the Composite to the Fund's proposed benchmark and the Comparable Fund's benchmark. The Board considered the CCO's view that comparisons to the Composite may be helpful, though not conclusive, in evaluating the anticipated performance of the Sub-Adviser in managing the Fund. The CCO also provided additional information about the broad range of the portfolio managers' investment experience and the Sub-Adviser's investment philosophy and process. The Board also considered how the integration of the ESG analysis into the Fund's investment process may influence the Fund's performance relative to its benchmark or peers. Based on these considerations, the Board concluded that it was satisfied that FGIM and the Sub-Adviser have the capability of providing satisfactory investment performance for the Fund.

In connection with the Board's governance of other Federated funds, the Board noted that it regularly receives financial information about Federated, including information regarding the compensation and ancillary (or "fall-out") benefits Federated derives from its relationships with the other Federated funds. This information covers not only the fees under the investment advisory contracts, but also fees received by Federated's subsidiaries for providing other services to the Federated funds under separate contracts (e.g., for serving as the Federated funds' administrator and distributor). In this regard, the

Board considered that certain Federated subsidiaries provide distribution and shareholder services to the Federated funds, for which they may be compensated through distribution and servicing fees paid pursuant to Rule 12b-1 plans or otherwise. The information also details any indirect benefit Federated may derive from its receipt of research services from brokers who execute Federated fund trades. In addition, the Board considered the fact that, in order for a Federated fund to be competitive in the marketplace, Federated frequently waives fees and/or reimburses expenses and has disclosed to fund investors and/or indicated to the Board its intention to do so in the future. Moreover, the Board receives regular reporting as to the institution, adjustment or elimination of these voluntary waivers.

Because the Board was considering the advisory and subadvisory contracts in the context of Federated's proposal to create a new Federated fund, the factors mentioned above relating to such matters as performance and any indirect benefits that may accrue to the Advisers and their affiliates as a result of the Advisers' relationships with the Fund are essentially impossible to apply before the Fund has experienced any meaningful operating history.

Federated furnished information, requested by the CCO, that reported projected revenues for the Fund, as detailed cost allocation reports had not yet been projected for this Fund. The CCO noted 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, since a single change in an allocation estimate may dramatically alter the resulting estimate of cost and/or profitability of a Federated fund and may produce unintended consequences. The CCO noted that the Fund was new to Federated and any projected cost allocation and/or profit margin does not represent the full or actual cost of operating a Federated fund and makes only rough estimates of the cost to launch a Federated fund. The CCO also noted that, while the Fund is expected to grow in size, the creation and maintenance of the Fund requires a substantial initial investment. The allocation information, including the CCO's view that the estimations regarding the Fund may be unreliable, was considered in the evaluation by the Board.

The Board and the CCO also reviewed information compiled by Federated comparing its profitability information to other publicly held fund management companies. The CCO noted that Federated regularly undertakes to establish new Federated funds and maintains a number of other smaller Federated funds that, while expected to grow to a greater size, nevertheless require substantial investment and waiver or assumption of fees and other expenses in order to deliver them to the marketplace. Based on this and other relevant information, the CCO concluded that Federated's projected profit margins did not appear to be excessive. The CCO also noted that Federated appeared financially sound, with the resources necessary to fulfill its obligations under its contracts with the Fund.

The CCO Fee Evaluation Report also discussed the notion of possible realization of "economies of scale" as a fund grows larger. In this regard, the Board considered that Federated has made significant and long-term investments in areas that support all of the Federated funds, such as personnel and processes for the portfolio management, shareholder services, compliance, internal audit, and risk management functions, as well as systems technology (including technology relating to cybersecurity), and that the benefits of these efforts (as well as any economies of scale, should they exist) were likely to be shared with the Federated fund family as a whole. The Board noted that Federated's investments in these areas are extensive. In addition, the Board considered that Federated has frequently waived fees and/or reimbursed expenses and that this has allowed fund shareholders to share potential economies of scale with shareholders. The Board also considered that such waivers and reimbursements can provide protection from an increase in expenses if a Federated fund's assets decline. Federated, as it does throughout the year, and specifically in connection with the Board's review of the advisory and subadvisory contracts, furnished information relative to revenue sharing or adviser-paid fees. Federated and the CCO noted 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, because it would represent marketing and distribution expenses. 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. The CCO did not recommend institution of breakpoints in pricing Federated's proposed advisory services to the Fund at this time, noting that it would review future asset growth and the appropriateness of any potential future breakpoints as part of its future annual review of the advisory and subadvisory contracts.

The CCO stated that his observations and the information accompanying the CCO Fee Evaluation Report supported a finding by the Board that the management fee for the Fund was reasonable.

The Board based its decision to approve the proposed investment advisory and subadvisory contracts 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 relevant to the Fund, nor did the Board consider any one of them to be determinative. With respect to the factors that were relevant, the Board's decision to approve the proposed investment advisory and subadvisory contracts reflects its view that, based upon the information requested and supplied, Federated's proposal to establish and manage the Fund, and its past performance and actions in providing services to other Federated funds (which the Board has found to be satisfactory with respect to such other Federated funds), provide a satisfactory basis to support the decision to approve the proposed arrangements.