

2017 MANAGEMENT FEE EVALUATION APPROVAL OF ADVISORY AGREEMENTS DURING THE PERIOD

JANUS INVESTMENT FUND

Approval of Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements with Janus and Janus Affiliates during the Period

On September 15, 2016, Janus Capital Group Inc. (“Janus”) advised the Trustees of Janus Investment Fund (the “Trust”), each of whom serves as an “independent” Trustee (the “Board” or the “Trustees”), of its intent to seek a strategic combination of its advisory business with Henderson Group plc (“Henderson”). The Board met with the Chief Executive Officer of Janus, who outlined the proposed combination and the potential benefits to Janus Capital Management LLC (“Janus Capital”) and each Fund of the Trust (each, a “Fund” and collectively, the “Funds”). Subsequent to the September 15, 2016 meeting, the Trustees identified a list of basic principles, which they believed should serve as the foundation for their review of the organizational, operational and strategic issues involved with any potential change in control of Janus Capital, the investment adviser to the Funds. These basic principles were communicated to Janus Capital on September 27, 2016, and were intended to be shared with Henderson. On October 3, 2016, Janus announced that it had entered into a definitive Agreement and Plan of Merger with Henderson pursuant to which Janus and Henderson agreed to effect an all-stock merger of equals strategic combination of their respective businesses, with Janus Capital surviving the merger as a direct wholly-owned subsidiary of Henderson (the “Transaction”). The Board was advised that, subject to certain conditions, the Transaction is currently expected to close during the second quarter of 2017.

As part of its due diligence, the Board developed an initial list of questions related to the proposed transaction, which was provided to Janus Capital on October 6, 2016. At a special Board meeting held on October 19, 2016, the Board considered Janus Capital’s response to the initial information request and met with the management of Janus to discuss the impact of the Transaction on the nature, extent and quality of services Janus Capital is expected to provide to the Janus Funds following the Transaction, addressing, among other matters, the personnel expected to provide such services, and the resources available to do so. After its October 19, 2016 meeting, the Board developed a supplemental request for additional information, which was provided to Janus Capital on October 26, 2016. At another special Board meeting held on November 7-8, 2016, the Board considered Janus Capital’s response to the supplemental information request and again met with the management of Janus and Henderson to discuss the impact of the Transaction on the nature, extent and quality of services Janus Capital is expected to provide to the Janus Funds following the Transaction, and also met with various officers of the Funds and of Janus Capital, including various Fund portfolio managers. After its November 7-8, 2016 meeting, the Board developed a second supplemental request for additional information, which was provided to Janus Capital on November 21, 2016. On December 7-8, 2016, the Board met to consider Janus Capital’s response to the second supplemental information request and to also consider the proposed new investment advisory agreements between the Trust, on behalf of each Fund, and Janus Capital (each, a “New Advisory Agreement” and collectively, the “New Advisory Agreements”) and the new sub-advisory agreements between Janus Capital and each of the Funds that utilize INTECH Investment Management LLC (“INTECH”), Perkins Investment Management LLC (“Perkins”), or Janus Singapore Pte. Limited (“Janus Singapore,” and together with INTECH and Perkins, the “Sub-Advisers” and each, a “Sub-Adviser”) as sub-advisers (each, a “New Sub-Advisory Agreement” and collectively, the “New Sub-Advisory Agreements”) to take effect immediately after the Transaction or shareholder approval, whichever is later. During each of these meetings, the Board sought additional and clarifying information as it deemed necessary or appropriate. In addition, the Board engaged its independent fee consultant to help evaluate certain of the proposals that the Board was being asked to consider. Throughout the process, the Board had the assistance of its independent legal counsel, who advised them on, among other things, its duties and obligations.

In connection with the Board’s review, Janus Capital provided, and the Board obtained, substantial information regarding the following matters: the management, financial position and business of Henderson; the history of Henderson’s business and operations; the investment performance of the investment companies advised by Henderson; the proposed structure, operations and investment processes of the combined investment management organization after the Transaction and the strategy for operating and growing the business following the Transaction; the future plans of Janus and Henderson with respect to the Funds and any proposed changes to the operations or structure of the Funds; and the future plans of Janus and Henderson with respect to the provision of services to the Funds, and the entities providing such services, including those affiliated with Janus. The Board also received information regarding the terms of the Transaction, anticipated management of the combined organization, the resources that each of Janus and Henderson bring to the combined organization and the process being followed by

Janus and Henderson to integrate their organizations. The Board also received information regarding the impact of the Transaction on each of INTECH, Perkins and Janus Singapore.

In connection with the Board's approval of New Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements at its December 8, 2016 meeting, the Board also continued its on-going annual process to determine whether to continue the existing investment advisory agreements between Janus Capital and the Trust on behalf of each Fund (each, a "Current Advisory Agreement" and collectively, the "Current Advisory Agreements") and the existing sub-advisory agreements between Janus Capital and each of the Funds that utilize INTECH, Perkins, or Janus Singapore as sub-advisers (each, a "Current Sub-Advisory Agreement" and collectively, the "Current Sub-Advisory Agreements"). In this regard, the Board received and reviewed information provided by Janus and the respective Sub-Advisers in response to requests of the Board and its independent legal counsel. The Board also received and reviewed information and analysis provided by, and in response to requests of, its independent fee consultant. The Board noted that as part of this annual process, the Board had considered and was in the process of considering, numerous factors, including the nature and quality of services provided by Janus Capital and each Sub-Adviser, as applicable; investment performance, on an absolute basis and relative to appropriate peer groups and one or a combination of market indices; investment management fees, expense ratios and asset sizes of the Funds and peer groups; investment management fees charged to comparable investment companies, separate accounts and non-fund clients; Janus Capital's profitability from managing the Funds; fall-out benefits to Janus Capital from its relationship to the Funds, including revenues derived from services provided to the Funds by affiliates of Janus Capital; and the potential benefits to Janus Capital, the Funds of receiving research services from broker/dealer firms in connection with the allocation of portfolio transactions to such firms.

In determining whether to approve the New Advisory Agreement for each Fund and the New Sub-Advisory Agreement for Funds managed by INTECH, Perkins or Janus Singapore in connection with the Transaction, and whether to recommend approval to Fund shareholders, the Board received information and made inquiries into all matters as it deemed appropriate. The Board reviewed and analyzed various factors it deemed relevant, including the following factors, among others, none of which by itself was considered dispositive:

- The terms of the New Advisory Agreements are substantially similar to the corresponding Current Advisory Agreements, and the contractual fee rate will not change. In this regard, see the discussion of the Board's considerations with respect to its most recent approval of the Current Advisory Agreements prior to December 8, 2016, as disclosed in each Fund's most recent prior annual or semi-annual shareholder report, as applicable.
- The terms of the New Sub-Advisory Agreements are substantially similar to the corresponding Current Sub-Advisory Agreements, and the contractual fee rate will not change. In this regard, see the discussion of the Board's considerations with respect to its most recent approval of the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements prior to December 8, 2016, as disclosed in each Fund's most recent prior annual or semi-annual shareholder report, as applicable.
- Janus Capital's plans for the operation of the Funds, including its plans for the continued provision of all services currently provided to the Funds by Janus Capital and its affiliates, including, among others, investment advisory services, portfolio trading services, and Fund administrative and accounting services, and the personnel and resources proposed to support the provision of such services.
- The estimated profitability to Janus Capital from managing the Funds after the Transaction, including potential economies of scale and fall-out benefits to Janus Capital from its relationship to the Funds, including revenues derived from services provided to the Funds by affiliates of Janus Capital, and the potential benefits to Janus Capital, and the Funds of receiving research services from broker/dealer firms in connection with the allocation of portfolio transactions to such firms.

In connection with its deliberations, the Board received assurances from Janus, on behalf of itself and its affiliates (collectively, "Janus") including the following:

- Janus has provided to the Board such information as it believes is reasonably necessary to evaluate the New Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements.
- Janus is committed to the continuance, without interruption, of services to the Funds of at least the type and quality currently provided by Janus Capital and its affiliates, or superior thereto.

- The Transaction is not expected to affect negatively the nature, extent or quality of the investment advisory services provided by Janus Capital to the Funds following the Transaction, and the investment advisory services are expected to be at least comparable to the services being provided under the Current Advisory Agreements and Current Sub-Advisory Agreements. In this regard, the Board noted specific representations that Janus does not intend for the nature, extent or quality of investment advisory and other services to be provided to the Funds following the Transaction to change, and the extent of such services were expected to increase based on the combined resources of the combined investment management organization after the Transaction, and should the nature, extent or quality of such services decline, Janus would commit the resources needed to return such services to pre-Transaction levels.
- The Funds' current operations were expected to remain largely unchanged, except for certain fund reorganizations which will be separately considered by the Board, and such other changes as were or will be presented to the Board.
- Janus does not intend to make changes to the portfolio managers providing services to the Funds, other than proposed changes in the management of certain Funds as discussed with the Board, including those related to proposals to merge certain Funds with Funds managed by Henderson Global Investors (North America) Inc., an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of Henderson, and subject to such changes as may arise at any time as a result of the ongoing process of portfolio manager evaluation.
- After the Transaction, the extent of distribution and marketing services provided to the Janus Funds were expected to increase based on the combined resources of Janus and Henderson. In this regard, Janus Capital advised the Board that after the Transaction, the extent of distribution and marketing services provided to the Janus Funds are expected to increase based on the combined resources of Janus and Henderson. This is due primarily to the anticipated increase of sales related resources and expanded global presence of the combined Janus Henderson organization, which is expected to enhance visibility and brand recognition of the Janus Henderson Funds.
- The intent of Janus Capital to take the necessary and appropriate steps to retain and attract its key investment advisory personnel.
- The intent of Janus to take the necessary and appropriate steps to retain and attract its key compliance, financial, fund accounting and administrative personnel supporting the management and oversight of the Funds.
- Janus is not aware of any express or implied term, condition, arrangement or understanding that would impose in its best judgement an "unfair burden" on any Fund as a result of the Transaction, as defined in Section 15(f) of the 1940 Act, and that Janus will take no action that would have the effect of imposing such an "unfair burden" on any Fund in connection with the Transaction.

Janus assured the Board that it intended to comply with Section 15(f) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act"). Section 15(f) provides a non-exclusive safe harbor for an investment adviser to an investment company or any of its affiliated persons to receive any amount or benefit in connection with a change in control of the investment adviser so long as two conditions are met. First, for a period of three years after the transaction, at least 75% of the board members of the investment company must not be interested persons of such investment adviser (as defined under the 1940 Act). The composition of the Board is in compliance with this provision of Section 15(f). In addition, after careful review and consideration, the Board determined that it would be in the best interests of the Funds to add to the Board an individual who currently acts as a non-interested board member of the Henderson Trust. The Board believes that this change in the Board composition will provide perspective and insight relating to experience working with the Henderson organization. The Board's Nominating and Governance Committee considered a number of candidates and recommended that the Board nominate one proposed new trustee from those candidates who currently act as non-interested board members of the Henderson Trust. The Board approved that trustee nominee to serve on the Board, subject to election by the shareholders of the Funds and contingent on the closing of the Transaction. If the new trustee is elected and serves on the Board, the Board composition would continue to satisfy the provisions of Section 15(f).

To meet the second condition of Section 15(f), an "unfair burden" must not be imposed upon the investment company as a result of such transaction or any express or implied terms, conditions or understandings applicable thereto. The term "unfair burden" is defined in Section 15(f) to include any arrangement during the two-year period after the transaction, whereby the investment adviser, or any interested person of such adviser, receives or is entitled to receive any compensation, directly or indirectly, from the investment company or its shareholders (other than fees for bona fide investment advisory or other services) or from any person in connection with the purchase or sale of

securities or other property to, from or on behalf of the investment company (other than bona fide ordinary compensation as principal underwriter for such investment company).

Janus represented that it does not believe that an “unfair burden” will be placed on the Funds as a result of the Transaction. In furtherance thereof, Janus has undertaken to pay the costs of preparing and distributing proxy materials to, and of holding the meetings of, the Funds’ shareholders (the “Meetings”), as well as other fees and expenses in connection with the Transaction, including the reasonable fees and expenses of legal counsel and consultants to the Funds and the Trustees. In addition, Janus has agreed, for a period of two years following the closing of the Transaction, (i) not to request any increases to advisory fees for the Funds, other than those proposed to and approved by the Board prior to the close of the Transaction, and (ii) to continue to use the current process by which expense caps are set annually for the Funds.

As a result of its review and consideration of the New Investment Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements in connection with the Transaction, at a meeting on December 8, 2016, the Board voted unanimously to approve a New Investment Advisory Agreement for each Fund and a New Sub-Advisory Agreement for each Fund managed by INTECH, Perkins or Janus Singapore, and to recommend such agreements to the Funds’ shareholders for their approval.

Approval of Interim Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements with Janus and Janus Affiliates during the Period

In the event shareholders of a Fund do not approve such Fund’s New Advisory Agreement and/or New Sub-Advisory Agreement at the Meetings prior to the closing of the Transaction, Janus Capital proposed that an interim investment advisory agreement between Janus Capital and such Fund (each, an “Interim Advisory Agreement” and collectively, the “Interim Advisory Agreements”) and an interim sub-advisory agreement between Janus Capital and the applicable Sub-Adviser (each, an “Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement” and collectively, the “Interim Sub-Advisory Agreements”) take effect upon the closing of the Transaction. At the December 8, 2016 meeting, the Board, all of whom are Independent Trustees, unanimously approved an Interim Advisory Agreement for each Fund and an Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement for each applicable Fund in order to assure continuity of investment advisory services to the Funds and sub-advisory services to the sub-advised Funds after the Transaction. The terms of each Interim Advisory Agreement are substantially identical to those of the applicable Current Advisory Agreement and New Advisory Agreement, except for the term and escrow provisions described below. Similarly, the terms of each Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement are substantially identical to those of the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements, except for the term and escrow provisions described below. The Interim Advisory Agreement and Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement will continue in effect for a term ending on the earlier of 150 days from the closing of the Transaction (the “150-day period”) or when shareholders of the Fund approve the New Advisory Agreement and/or New Sub-Advisory Agreement. Pursuant to Rule 15a-4 under the 1940 Act, compensation earned by Janus Capital under an Interim Advisory Agreement and compensation earned by a Sub-Adviser under an Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement will be held in an interest-bearing escrow account. If shareholders of a Fund approve the New Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the amount held in the escrow account under the Interim Advisory Agreement will be paid to Janus Capital. If shareholders of a Fund approve the New Advisory Agreement and New Sub-Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the amount held in the escrow account under the Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement will be paid to the Sub-Adviser. If shareholders of a Fund do not approve the New Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the Board will take such action as it deems to be in the best interests of the Fund, and Janus Capital will be paid the lesser of its costs incurred in performing its services under the Interim Advisory Agreement or the total amount in the escrow account, plus interest earned. If shareholders of a Fund do not approve the New Advisory Agreement and/or New Sub-Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the Board will take such action as it deems to be in the best interests of the Fund, and the Sub-Adviser will be paid the lesser of its costs incurred in performing its services under the Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement or the total amount in the escrow account, plus interest earned.

Approval of Sub-Advisory Agreements with Henderson Investment Management Limited during the Period

Janus Capital met with the Trustees on November 7-8, 2016, and December 7-8, 2016, to discuss the approval of a new sub-advisory agreement between Janus Capital and Henderson Investment Management Limited (“HIML”) (each, a “HIML Sub-Advisory Agreement” and collectively, the “HIML Sub-Advisory Agreements”) on behalf of each of Janus Asia Equity Fund, Janus Emerging Markets Fund, and Janus Global Real Estate Fund (each, an

“HIML Fund” and together, the “HIML Funds”) to take effect immediately after the closing of the Transaction or shareholder approval, whichever is later. At the meetings, the Trustees also discussed the HIML Sub-Advisory Agreements with their independent counsel in executive session. During the course of these meetings, the Trustees requested and considered such information as they deemed relevant to their deliberations. In addition, at prior meetings and during the course of these meetings the Board also undertook a comprehensive process to evaluate the impact of the Transaction on the nature, quality and extent of services expected to be provided by Janus Capital and HIML to each HIML Fund, including after the completion of the Transaction. For a fuller discussion of the Board’s consideration of the approval of a new investment advisory agreement for the HIML Funds in connection with the Transaction, see “Approval of Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements with Janus and its Affiliates During the Period” above.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees held on December 8, 2016, the Trustees considered the HIML Sub-Advisory Agreements. In determining whether to approve the HIML Sub-Advisory Agreements, and whether to recommend approval to the shareholders of each HIML Fund, the Board received information and made inquiries into all matters as it deemed appropriate. The Board reviewed and analyzed various factors it deemed relevant, including the following factors, among others, none of which by itself was considered dispositive:

- the terms of each HIML Sub-Advisory Agreement;
- the nature, quality and extent of services expected to be provided under the HIML Sub-Advisory Agreements, including the reputation, qualifications and background of HIML and its operational and compliance infrastructures;
- the investment approach, the experience and skills of senior management and investment personnel of HIML, including the portfolio managers who would be responsible for managing all or part of the portfolio of each HIML Fund, noting the resources made available to such personnel;
- the ability of HIML to attract and retain high-quality personnel and the organizational depth of HIML;
- the sub-advisory fee rate under each HIML Sub-Advisory Agreement, as well as the overall management fee structure of each HIML Fund, noting that the sub-advisory fee rate is consistent with the approach utilized in the Janus Funds complex for other sub-advisory relationships, taking into account the allocation of managed assets between Janus Capital and HIML for the Global Real Estate Fund;
- under each HIML Sub-Advisory Agreement, Janus Capital would be responsible for paying HIML out of its fees;
- the fall out benefits to HIML and its affiliates from its relationship with each HIML Fund, including the potential benefits to HIML and its affiliates and each HIML Fund of receiving research services from broker/dealer firms in connection with the allocation of portfolio transactions to such firms;
- the potential for economies of scale with respect to the overall fee structure of each HIML Fund and whether either Fund will benefit from any economies of scale; and
- the costs of seeking approval of the HIML Sub-Advisory Agreements will not be borne by the HIML Funds.

As a result of its review and consideration of each HIML Sub-Advisory Agreement and related matters, on December 8, 2016, the Board voted unanimously to approve each HIML Sub-Advisory Agreement and to recommend such agreement to each HIML Fund’s shareholders for their approval.

Renewal of Investment Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements for INTECH U.S. Core Fund

As noted above, at its December 8, 2016 meeting, the Board continued its on-going annual process to determine whether to continue the Current Advisory Agreements and the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements. In this regard, the Board received and reviewed information provided by Janus and the respective Sub-Advisers in response to requests of the Board and its independent legal counsel. The Board also received and reviewed information and analysis provided by, and in response to requests of, its independent fee consultant. The Board noted that the Current Advisory Agreement between the Trust, on behalf of INTECH U.S. Core Fund, and Janus Capital and the Current Sub-Advisory Agreement between Janus Capital and INTECH, on behalf of the Fund, would expire on January 1, 2017, if not renewed. The Board noted that the date of termination for the Current Advisory Agreements and the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements for the other Funds was February 1, 2017, if not renewed. Accordingly, the Board voted unanimously to renew the Current Advisory Agreement and the Current Sub-Advisory Agreement for INTECH U.S. Core Fund through January 31, 2017 in order to (i) align the termination date of such Agreements with the termination date of the Current Advisory Agreements and the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements for the

other Funds and (ii) allow for a more complete consideration of such Agreements, as well as the Current Advisory Agreements and the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements for the other Funds.

JANUS ASPEN SERIES

Approval of Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements with Janus Capital and Janus Capital Affiliates during the Period

On September 15, 2016, Janus Capital Group Inc. (“Janus”) advised the Trustees of Janus Investment Fund (the “Trust”), each of whom serves as an “independent” Trustee (the “Board” or the “Trustees”) of its intent to seek a strategic combination of its advisory business with Henderson Group plc (“Henderson”). The Board met with the Chief Executive Officer of Janus, who outlined the proposed combination and the potential benefits to Janus Capital Management LLC (“Janus Capital”) and each Fund of the Trust (each, a “Fund” and collectively, the “Funds”). Subsequent to the September 15, 2016 meeting, the Trustees identified a list of basic principles, which they believed should serve as the foundation for their review of the organizational, operational and strategic issues involved with any potential change in control of Janus Capital, the investment adviser to the Funds. These basic principles were communicated to Janus Capital on September 27, 2016, and were intended to be shared with Henderson. On October 3, 2016, Janus announced that it had entered into a definitive Agreement and Plan of Merger with Henderson pursuant to which Janus and Henderson agreed to effect an all-stock merger of equals strategic combination of their respective businesses, with Janus Capital surviving the merger as a direct wholly-owned subsidiary of Henderson (the “Transaction”). The Board was advised that, subject to certain conditions, the Transaction is currently expected to close during the second quarter of 2017.

As part of its due diligence, the Board developed an initial list of questions related to the proposed transaction, which was provided to Janus Capital on October 6, 2016. At a special Board meeting held on October 19, 2016, the Board considered Janus Capital’s response to the initial information request and met with the management of Janus to discuss the impact of the Transaction on the nature, extent and quality of services Janus Capital is expected to provide to the Janus Funds following the Transaction, addressing, among other matters, the personnel expected to provide such services, and the resources available to do so. After its October 19, 2016 meeting, the Board developed a supplemental request for additional information, which was provided to Janus Capital on October 26, 2016. At another special Board meeting held on November 7-8, 2016, the Board considered Janus Capital’s response to the supplemental information request and again met with the management of Janus and Henderson to discuss the impact of the Transaction on the nature, extent and quality of services Janus Capital is expected to provide to the Janus Funds following the Transaction, and also met with various officers of the Funds and of Janus Capital including various Fund portfolio managers. After its November 7-8, 2016 meeting, the Board developed a second supplemental request for additional information, which was provided to Janus Capital on November 21, 2016. On December 7-8, 2016, the Board met to consider Janus Capital’s response to the second supplemental information request and to also consider the proposed new investment advisory agreements between the Trust, on behalf of each Fund, and Janus Capital (each, a “New Advisory Agreement” and collectively, the “New Advisory Agreements”) and the new sub-advisory agreements between Janus Capital and each of the Funds that utilize INTECH Investment Management LLC (“INTECH”) or Perkins Investment Management LLC (“Perkins”) as sub-advisers (each, a “New Sub-Advisory Agreement” and collectively, the “New Sub-Advisory Agreements”) to take effect immediately after the Transaction or shareholder approval, whichever is later. During each of these meetings, the Board sought additional and clarifying information as it deemed necessary or appropriate. Throughout the process, the Board had the assistance of its independent legal counsel, who advised them on, among other things, its duties and obligations.

In connection with the Board’s review, Janus Capital provided, and the Board obtained, substantial information regarding the following matters: the management, financial position and business of Henderson; the history of Henderson’s business and operations; the investment performance of the investment companies advised by Henderson; the proposed structure, operations and investment processes of the combined investment management organization after the Transaction and the strategy for operating and growing the business following the Transaction; the future plans of Janus and Henderson with respect to the Funds and any proposed changes to the operations or structure of the Funds; and the future plans of Janus and Henderson with respect to the provision of services to the Funds, and the entities providing such services, including those affiliated with Janus. The Board also received information regarding the terms of the Transaction, anticipated management of the combined organization, the resources that each of Janus and Henderson bring to the combined organization and the process being followed by Janus and Henderson to integrate their organizations. The Board also received information regarding the impact of the Transaction on each of INTECH and Perkins.

In connection with the Board's approval of New Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements at its December 8, 2016 meeting, the Board also continued its on-going annual process to determine whether to continue the existing investment advisory agreements between Janus Capital and the Trust on behalf of each Fund (each, a "Current Advisory Agreement" and collectively, the "Current Advisory Agreements") and the existing sub-advisory agreements between Janus Capital and each of the Funds that utilize INTECH or Perkins as sub-advisers (each, a "Current Sub-Advisory Agreement" and collectively, the "Current Sub-Advisory Agreements"). In this regard, the Board received and reviewed information provided by Janus and the respective Sub-Advisers in response to requests of the Board and its independent legal counsel. The Board also received and reviewed information and analysis provided by, and in response to requests of, its independent fee consultant. The Board noted that as part of this annual process, the Board had considered and was in the process of considering, numerous factors, including the nature and quality of services provided by Janus Capital and each Sub-Adviser, as applicable; investment performance, on an absolute basis and relative to appropriate peer groups and one or a combination of market indices; investment management fees, expense ratios and asset sizes of the Funds and peer groups; investment management fees charged to comparable investment companies, separate accounts and non-fund clients; Janus Capital's profitability from managing the Funds; fall-out benefits to Janus Capital from its relationship to the Funds, including revenues derived from services provided to the Funds by affiliates of Janus Capital; and the potential benefits to Janus Capital, the Funds of receiving research services from broker/dealer firms in connection with the allocation of portfolio transactions to such firms.

In determining whether to approve the New Advisory Agreement for each Fund and the New Sub-Advisory Agreement for Funds managed by INTECH or Perkins in connection with the Transaction, and whether to recommend approval to Fund shareholders, the Board received information and made inquiries into all matters as it deemed appropriate. The Board reviewed and analyzed various factors it deemed relevant, including the following factors, among others, none of which by itself was considered dispositive:

- The terms of the New Advisory Agreements are substantially similar to the corresponding Current Advisory Agreements, and the contractual fee rate will not change. In this regard, see the discussion of the Board's considerations with respect to its most recent approval of the Current Advisory Agreements prior to December 8, 2016, as disclosed in each Fund's most recent prior annual or semi-annual shareholder report, as applicable.
- The terms of the New Sub-Advisory Agreements are substantially similar to the corresponding Current Sub-Advisory Agreements, and the contractual fee rate will not change. In this regard, see the discussion of the Board's considerations with respect to its most recent approval of the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements prior to December 8, 2016, as disclosed in each Fund's most recent prior annual or semi-annual shareholder report, as applicable.
- Janus Capital's plans for the operation of the Funds, including its plans for the continued provision of all services currently provided to the Funds by Janus Capital and its affiliates, including, among others, investment advisory services, portfolio trading services, and Fund administrative and accounting services, and the personnel and resources proposed to support the provision of such services.
- The estimated profitability to Janus Capital from managing the Funds after the Transaction, including potential economies of scale and fall-out benefits to Janus Capital from its relationship to the Funds, including revenues derived from services provided to the Funds by affiliates of Janus Capital, and the potential benefits to Janus Capital, and the Funds of receiving research services from broker/dealer firms in connection with the allocation of portfolio transactions to such firms.

In connection with its deliberations, the Board received assurances from Janus, on behalf of itself and its affiliates (collectively, "Janus") including the following:

- Janus has provided to the Board such information as it believes is reasonably necessary to evaluate the New Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements.
- Janus is committed to the continuance, without interruption, of services to the Funds of at least the type and quality currently provided by Janus Capital and its affiliates, or superior thereto.
- The Transaction is not expected to affect negatively the nature, extent or quality of the investment advisory services provided by Janus Capital to the Funds following the Transaction, and the investment advisory services are expected to be at least comparable to the services being provided under the Current Advisory Agreements

and Current Sub-Advisory Agreements. In this regard, the Board noted specific representations that Janus does not intend for the nature, extent or quality of investment advisory and other services to be provided to the Funds following the Transaction to change, and the extent of such services were expected to increase based on the combined resources of the combined investment management organization after the Transaction, and should the nature, extent or quality of such services decline, Janus would commit the resources needed to return such services to pre-Transaction levels.

- The Funds' current operations were expected to remain largely unchanged, except for certain fund reorganizations which will be separately considered by the Board, and such other changes as were or will be presented to the Board.
- The Transaction is not expected to result in any changes to the portfolio managers providing services to the Funds.
- After the Transaction, the distribution and marketing services provided to the Janus Funds were expected to be improved or enhanced based on the combined resources of Janus and Henderson. In this regard, Janus Capital advised the Board that after the Transaction, the extent of distribution and marketing services provided to the Janus Funds are expected to increase based on the combined resources of Janus and Henderson. This is due primarily to the anticipated increase of sales related resources and expanded global presence of the combined Janus Henderson organization, which is expected to enhance visibility and brand recognition of the Janus Henderson Funds.
- The intent of Janus Capital to take the necessary and appropriate steps to retain and attract key investment advisory personnel.
- The intent of Janus to take the necessary and appropriate steps to retain and attract key compliance, financial, fund accounting and administrative personnel supporting the management and oversight of the Funds.
- Janus is not aware of any express or implied term, condition, arrangement or understanding that would impose in its best judgement an "unfair burden" on any Fund as a result of the Transaction, as defined in Section 15(f) of the 1940 Act, and that Janus will take no action that would have the effect of imposing such an "unfair burden" on any Fund in connection with the Transaction.

Janus assured the Board that it intended to comply with Section 15(f) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended. Section 15(f) provides a non-exclusive safe harbor for an investment adviser to an investment company or any of its affiliated persons to receive any amount or benefit in connection with a change in control of the investment adviser so long as two conditions are met. First, for a period of three years after the transaction, at least 75% of the board members of the investment company must not be interested persons of such investment adviser (as defined under the 1940 Act). The composition of the Board is in compliance with this provision of Section 15(f). In addition, after careful review and consideration, the Board determined that it would be in the best interests of the Funds to add to the Board an individual who currently acts as a non-interested board member of the Henderson Trust. The Board believes that this change in the Board composition will provide perspective and insight relating to experience working with the Henderson organization. The Board's Nominating and Governance Committee considered a number of candidates and recommended that the Board nominate one proposed new trustee from those candidates who currently act as non-interested board members of the Henderson Trust. The Board approved that trustee nominee to serve on the Board, subject to election by the shareholders of the Funds and contingent on the closing of the Transaction. If the new trustee is elected and serves on the Board, the Board composition would continue to satisfy the provisions of Section 15(f).

To meet the second condition of Section 15(f), an "unfair burden" must not be imposed upon the investment company as a result of such transaction or any express or implied terms, conditions or understandings applicable thereto. The term "unfair burden" is defined in Section 15(f) to include any arrangement during the two-year period after the transaction, whereby the investment adviser, or any interested person of such adviser, receives or is entitled to receive any compensation, directly or indirectly, from the investment company or its shareholders (other than fees for bona fide investment advisory or other services) or from any person in connection with the purchase or sale of securities or other property to, from or on behalf of the investment company (other than bona fide ordinary compensation as principal underwriter for such investment company).

Janus represented that it does not believe that an "unfair burden" will be placed on the Funds as a result of the Transaction. In furtherance thereof, Janus has undertaken to pay the costs of preparing and distributing proxy materials to, and of holding the meetings of, the Funds' shareholders (the "Meetings"), as well as other fees and

expenses in connection with the Transaction, including the reasonable fees and expenses of legal counsel and consultants to the Funds and the Trustees. In addition, Janus has agreed, for a period of two years following the closing of the Transaction, (i) not to request any increases to advisory fees for the Funds, other than those proposed to and approved by the Board prior to the close of the Transaction, and (ii) to continue to use the current process by which expense caps are set annually for the Funds.

As a result of its review and consideration of the New Investment Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements in connection with the Transaction, at a meeting on December 8, 2016, the Board voted unanimously to approve a New Investment Advisory Agreement for each Fund and a New Sub-Advisory Agreement for each Fund managed by INTECH or Perkins, and to recommend such agreements to the Funds' shareholders for their approval.

Approval of Interim Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements with Janus Capital and Janus Capital Affiliates during the Period

In the event shareholders of a Fund do not approve such Fund's New Advisory Agreement and/or New Sub-Advisory Agreement at the Meetings prior to the closing of the Transaction, Janus Capital proposed that an interim investment advisory agreement between Janus Capital and such Fund (each, an "Interim Advisory Agreement" and collectively, the "Interim Advisory Agreements") and an interim sub-advisory agreement between Janus Capital and the applicable Sub-Adviser (each, an "Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement" and collectively, the "Interim Sub-Advisory Agreements") take effect upon the closing of the Transaction. At the December 8, 2016 meeting, the Board, all of whom are Independent Trustees, unanimously approved an Interim Advisory Agreement for each Fund and an Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement for each applicable Fund in order to assure continuity of investment advisory services to the Funds and sub-advisory services to the sub-advised Funds after the Transaction. The terms of each Interim Advisory Agreement are substantially identical to those of the applicable Current Advisory Agreement and New Advisory Agreement, except for the term and escrow provisions described below. Similarly, the terms of each Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement are substantially identical to those of the Current Sub-Advisory Agreements and New Sub-Advisory Agreements, except for the term and escrow provisions described below. The Interim Advisory Agreement and Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement will continue in effect for a term ending on the earlier of 150 days from the closing of the Transaction (the "150-day period") or when shareholders of the Fund approve the New Advisory Agreement and/or New Sub-Advisory Agreement. Pursuant to Rule 15a-4 under the 1940 Act, compensation earned by Janus Capital under an Interim Advisory Agreement and compensation earned by a Sub-Adviser under an Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement will be held in an interest-bearing escrow account. If shareholders of a Fund approve the New Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the amount held in the escrow account under the Interim Advisory Agreement will be paid to Janus Capital. If shareholders of a Fund approve the New Advisory Agreement and New Sub-Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the amount held in the escrow account under the Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement will be paid to the Sub-Adviser. If shareholders of a Fund do not approve the New Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the Board will take such action as it deems to be in the best interests of the Fund, and Janus Capital will be paid the lesser of its costs incurred in performing its services under the Interim Advisory Agreement or the total amount in the escrow account, plus interest earned. If shareholders of a Fund do not approve the New Advisory Agreement and/or New Sub-Advisory Agreement prior to the end of the 150-day period, the Board will take such action as it deems to be in the best interests of the Fund, and the Sub-Adviser will be paid the lesser of its costs incurred in performing its services under the Interim Sub-Advisory Agreement or the total amount in the escrow account, plus interest earned.

Approval of an Amended and Restated Investment Advisory Agreement for Janus Portfolio

Janus Capital met with the Trustees on December 7-8, 2016, to discuss the approval of an amended and restated investment advisory agreement (the "Amended Advisory Agreement") between Janus Capital and the Trust on behalf of Janus Portfolio (for the purposes of this section, the "Fund" refers to Janus Portfolio) and other matters related to the proposed changes to the Fund's name, principal investment strategies, and portfolio management team (the "Realignment"). At the meeting, the Trustees also discussed the Amended Advisory Agreement and other matters related to the Realignment with their independent counsel in executive session. During the course of this meeting, the Trustees requested and considered such information as they deemed relevant to their deliberations. In addition, at prior meetings and during the course of this meeting the Board also considered the proposal to merge the Janus Fund, a series of Janus Investment Fund, into the Janus Research Fund, another series of Janus Investment Fund, and undertook a comprehensive process to evaluate the impact of the Transaction on the nature, quality and

extent of services expected to be provided by Janus Capital to the Fund, including after the completion of the Transaction. For a fuller discussion of the Board's consideration of the approval of a new investment advisory agreement for the Fund in connection with the Transaction, see "Approval of Advisory and Sub-Advisory Agreements with Janus and Janus Affiliates during the Period" above..

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees held on December 8, 2016, the Trustees approved the Amended Advisory Agreement and other matters related to the Realignment. In determining whether to approve the Amended Advisory Agreement, and whether to recommend approval to Fund shareholders, the Board received information and made inquiries into all matters as it deemed appropriate. The Board reviewed and analyzed various factors it deemed relevant, including the following factors, among others, none of which by itself was considered dispositive:

- the terms of the Amended Advisory Agreement are substantially the same as the Current Advisory Agreement, except for the change to the advisory fee rate based on the amount of such outperformance or underperformance (the "Full Performance Rate") and cumulative investment record of the Fund's benchmark index (the "Performance Fee Benchmark");
- the estimated impact of the change to the Full Performance Rate and Performance Fee Benchmark on the amount of advisory fees to be paid by the Fund, including consideration of comparative pro forma data showing the advisory fees payable if the Amended Advisory Agreement had been in place in prior years;
- the Fund's investment team will be able to more efficiently manage the Fund's portfolio, assuming the merger of the Janus Fund into Janus Research Fund is implemented, which may also provide benefits from opportunities to aggregate trading across funds that have similar investment strategies;
- Janus Capital's belief that the Fund shareholders may benefit from the Realignment, as a result of the research-driven investment process to be implemented, which includes lower historical transaction costs and potential performance gains from securities lending as compared to the Fund's current investment approach;
- the Realignment was being proposed as part of Janus Capital's efforts to streamline its product line;
- Janus Capital's belief that the Fund would benefit from Janus Capital's operational efficiencies resulting from the merger of the Janus Fund into the Janus Research Fund and the Realignment, including a potentially more efficient and effective investment management approach providing the potential for a growing fund and improved performance after the Realignment;
- the costs of seeking approval of the Amended Advisory Agreement will be borne by Janus Capital;
- the costs incurred to reposition the Fund's portfolio in connection with the Realignment;
- the potential tax consequences of any repositioning of the Fund's portfolio as a result of the Merger; and any potential benefits of Janus Capital and its affiliates as a result of the Realignment.

2015 MANAGEMENT FEE EVALUATION APPROVAL OF ADVISORY AGREEMENTS DURING THE PERIOD

The Trustees of Janus Investment Fund and Janus Aspen Series, each of whom serves as an “independent” Trustee (the “Trustees”), oversee the management of each Fund of Janus Investment Fund and each Portfolio of Janus Aspen Series (each, a “Fund” and collectively, the “Funds”), and as required by law, determine annually whether to continue the investment advisory agreement for each Fund and the subadvisory agreements for the 16 Funds that utilize subadvisers.

In connection with their most recent consideration of those agreements for each Fund, the Trustees received and reviewed information provided by Janus Capital and the respective subadvisers in response to requests of the Trustees and their independent legal counsel. They also received and reviewed information and analysis provided by, and in response to requests of, their independent fee consultant. Throughout their consideration of the agreements, the Trustees were advised by their independent legal counsel. The Trustees met with management to consider the agreements, and also met separately in executive session with their independent legal counsel and their independent fee consultant.

At a meeting held on December 9, 2015, based on the Trustees’ evaluation of the information provided by Janus Capital, the subadvisers, and the independent fee consultant, as well as other information, the Trustees determined that the overall arrangements between each Fund and Janus Capital and each subadviser, as applicable, were fair and reasonable in light of the nature, extent and quality of the services provided by Janus Capital, its affiliates and the subadvisers, the fees charged for those services, and other matters that the Trustees considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment. At that meeting, the Trustees unanimously approved the continuation of the investment advisory agreement for each Fund, and the subadvisory agreement for each subadvised Fund, for the period from either January 1 or February 1, 2016 through January 1 or February 1, 2017, respectively, subject to earlier termination as provided for in each agreement.

In considering the continuation of those agreements, the Trustees reviewed and analyzed various factors that they determined were relevant, including the factors described below, none of which by itself was considered dispositive. However, the material factors and conclusions that formed the basis for the Trustees’ determination to approve the continuation of the agreements are discussed separately below. Also included is a summary of the independent fee consultant’s conclusions and opinions that arose during, and were included as part of, the Trustees’ consideration of the agreements. “Management fees,” as used herein, reflect actual annual advisory fees and any administration fees (excluding out of pocket costs), net of any waivers.

Nature, Extent and Quality of Services

The Trustees reviewed the nature, extent and quality of the services provided by Janus Capital and the subadvisers to the Funds, taking into account the investment objective, strategies and policies of each Fund, and the knowledge the Trustees gained from their regular meetings with management on at least a quarterly basis and their ongoing review of information related to the Funds. In addition, the Trustees reviewed the resources and key personnel of Janus Capital and each subadviser, particularly noting those employees who provide investment and risk management services to the Funds. The Trustees also considered other services provided to the Funds by Janus Capital or the subadvisers, such as managing the execution of portfolio transactions and the selection of broker-dealers for those transactions. The Trustees considered Janus Capital’s role as administrator to the Funds, noting that Janus Capital does not receive a fee for its services but is reimbursed for its out-of-pocket costs. The Trustees considered the role of Janus Capital in monitoring adherence to the Funds’ investment restrictions, providing support services for the Trustees and Trustee committees, and overseeing communications with shareholders and the activities of other service providers, including monitoring compliance with various policies and procedures of the Funds and with applicable securities laws and regulations.

In this regard, the independent fee consultant noted that Janus Capital provides a number of different services for the Funds and Fund shareholders, ranging from investment management services to various other servicing functions, and that, in its opinion, Janus Capital is a capable provider of those services. The independent fee consultant also provided its belief that Janus Capital has developed a number of institutional competitive advantages that should enable it to provide superior investment and service performance over the long term.

The Trustees concluded that the nature, extent and quality of the services provided by Janus Capital or the subadviser to each Fund were appropriate and consistent with the terms of the respective advisory and subadvisory agreements, and that, taking into account steps taken to address those Funds whose performance lagged that of their peers for certain periods, the Funds were likely to benefit from the continued provision of those services. They also concluded that Janus Capital and each subadviser had sufficient personnel, with the appropriate education and experience, to serve the Funds effectively and had demonstrated its ability to attract well-qualified personnel.

Performance of the Funds

The Trustees considered the performance results of each Fund over various time periods. They noted that they considered Fund performance data throughout the year, including periodic meetings with each Fund's portfolio manager(s), and also reviewed information comparing each Fund's performance with the performance of comparable funds and peer groups identified by Broadridge Financial Solutions, Inc. ("Broadridge"), an independent data provider, and with the Fund's benchmark index. In this regard, the independent fee consultant found that the overall Funds' performance has been strong: for the 36 months ended September 30, 2015, approximately 70% of the Funds were in the top two Broadridge quartiles of performance, and for the 12 months ended September 30, 2015, approximately 61% of the Funds were in the top two Broadridge quartiles of performance.

The Trustees considered the performance of each Fund, noting that performance may vary by share class, and noted the following:

Fixed-Income Funds and Money Market Funds

- For Janus Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Global Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Global Unconstrained Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance, the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance, and its limited performance history.
- For Janus High-Yield Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Multi-Sector Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Real Return Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Short-Term Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Government Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance.
- For Janus Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance.

Asset Allocation Funds

- For Janus Global Allocation Fund – Conservative, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.

- For Janus Global Allocation Fund – Growth, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Global Allocation Fund – Moderate, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.

Alternative Fund

- For Janus Diversified Alternatives Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.

Value Funds

- For Perkins International Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Perkins Global Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps Janus Capital and Perkins had taken or were taking to improve performance.
- For Perkins Large Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps Janus Capital and Perkins had taken or were taking to improve performance.
- For Perkins Mid Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps Janus Capital and Perkins had taken or were taking to improve performance.
- For Perkins Select Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, the steps Janus Capital and Perkins had taken or were taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
- For Perkins Small Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, the steps Janus Capital and Perkins had taken or were taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
- For Perkins Value Plus Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.

Mathematical Funds

- For INTECH Emerging Markets Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that, due to limited performance for the Fund, performance history was not a material factor.
- For INTECH Global Income Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For INTECH International Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the

12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance and the steps Janus Capital and INTECH had taken or were taking to improve performance.

- For INTECH U.S. Core Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For INTECH U.S. Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.

Growth and Core Funds

- For Janus Balanced Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Contrarian Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Enterprise Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Forty Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Growth and Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and in the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Triton Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Twenty Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Venture Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.

Global and International Funds

- For Janus Asia Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
- For Janus Emerging Markets Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Global Life Sciences Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Global Real Estate Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.

- For Janus Global Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Global Select Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Global Technology Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus International Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Overseas Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.

Janus Aspen Series

- For Janus Aspen Balanced Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Enterprise Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Flexible Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Forty Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Global Allocation Portfolio – Moderate, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Global Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the second Broadridge quartile-for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Global Technology Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Global Unconstrained Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, due to limited performance for the Fund, performance history was not a material factor.
- For Janus Aspen INTECH U.S. Low Volatility Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Janus Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015.
- For Janus Aspen Overseas Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps Janus Capital had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Aspen Perkins Mid Cap Value Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2015 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the

12 months ended May 31, 2015. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund's underperformance, noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps Janus Capital and Perkins had taken or were taking to improve performance.

In consideration of each Fund's performance, the Trustees concluded that, taking into account the factors relevant to performance, as well as other considerations, including steps taken to improve performance, the Fund's performance warranted continuation of the Fund's investment advisory and subadvisory agreement(s).

Costs of Services Provided

The Trustees examined information regarding the fees and expenses of each Fund in comparison to similar information for other comparable funds as provided by Broadridge, an independent data provider. They also reviewed an analysis of that information provided by their independent fee consultant and noted that the rate of management (investment advisory and any administration, but excluding out-of-pocket costs) fees for many of the Funds, after applicable waivers, was below the mean management fee rate of the respective peer group of funds selected by an independent data provider. The Trustees also examined information regarding the subadvisory fees charged for subadvisory services, as applicable, noting that all such fees were paid by Janus Capital out of its management fees collected from such Fund.

The independent fee consultant provided its belief that the management fees charged by Janus Capital to each of the Funds under the current investment advisory and administration agreements are reasonable in relation to the services provided by Janus Capital. The independent fee consultant found: (1) the total expenses and management fees of the Funds to be reasonable relative to other mutual funds; (2) total expenses, on average, were 14% below the mean total expenses of their respective Broadridge Expense Group peers and 24% below the mean total expenses for their Broadridge Expense Universes; (3) management fees for the Funds, on average, were 15% below the mean management fees for their Expense Groups and 19% below the mean for their Expense Universes; and (4) Fund expenses at the functional level for each asset and share class category were reasonable. The Trustees also considered the total expenses for each share class of each Fund compared to the mean total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Group peers and to mean total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Universe.

The independent fee consultant concluded that, based on its strategic review of expenses at the complex, category and individual fund level, Fund expenses were found to be reasonable relative to both Expense Group and Expense Universe benchmarks. Further, for certain Funds, the independent fee consultant also performed a systematic "focus list" analysis of expenses in the context of the performance or service delivered to each set of investors in each share class in each selected Fund. Based on this analysis, the independent fee consultant found that the combination of service quality/performance and expenses on these individual Funds and share classes were reasonable in light of performance trends, performance histories, and existence of performance fees, breakpoints, and expense waivers on such Funds.

The Trustees considered the methodology used by Janus Capital and each subadviser in determining compensation payable to portfolio managers, the competitive environment for investment management talent, and the competitive market for mutual funds in different distribution channels.

The Trustees also reviewed management fees charged by Janus Capital and each subadviser to comparable separate account clients and to comparable non-affiliated funds subadvised by Janus Capital or by a subadviser (for which Janus Capital or the subadviser provides only or primarily portfolio management services). Although in most instances subadvisory and separate account fee rates for various investment strategies were lower than management fee rates for Funds having a similar strategy, the Trustees considered that Janus Capital noted that, under the terms of the management agreements with the Funds, Janus Capital performs significant additional services for the Funds that it does not provide to those other clients, including administration services, oversight of the Funds' other service providers, trustee support, regulatory compliance and numerous other services, and that, in serving the Funds, Janus Capital assumes many legal risks and other costs that it does not assume in servicing its other clients. Moreover, they noted that the independent fee consultant found that: (1) the management fees Janus Capital charges to the Funds are reasonable in relation to the management fees Janus Capital charges to its institutional and subadvised accounts; (2) these institutional and subadvised accounts have different service and infrastructure needs; (3) the average spread between management fees charged to the Funds and those charged to Janus Capital's institutional accounts is reasonable relative to the average spreads seen in the industry; and (4) by one estimation methodology,

the fee margins implied by Janus Capital's subadvised fees when compared to its mutual fund fees are reasonable relative to the estimated fee margins in the industry and relative to estimated fee margins of fund managers using Janus Capital as a subadviser.

The Trustees considered the fees for each Fund for its fiscal year ended in 2014, and noted the following with regard to each Fund's total expenses, net of applicable fee waivers (the Fund's "total expenses"):

Fixed-Income Funds and Money Market Funds

- For Janus Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Global Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Global Unconstrained Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus High-Yield Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Multi-Sector Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Real Return Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for all share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Short-Term Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for all share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Government Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for both share classes. The Trustees considered that management fees for this Fund are higher than the peer group mean due to the Fund's management fee including other costs, such as custody and transfer agent services, while many funds in the peer group pay these expenses separately from their management fee. In addition, the Trustees considered that Janus Capital voluntarily waives one-half of its advisory fee and other expenses in order to maintain a positive yield.
- For Janus Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes. In addition, the Trustees considered that Janus Capital voluntarily waives one-half of its advisory fee and other expenses in order to maintain a positive yield.

Asset Allocation Funds

- For Janus Global Allocation Fund – Conservative, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Global Allocation Fund – Growth, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Global Allocation Fund – Moderate, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.

Alternative Fund

- For Janus Diversified Alternatives Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.

Value Funds

- For Perkins International Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Perkins Global Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable.
- For Perkins Large Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Perkins Mid Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Perkins Select Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Perkins Small Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Perkins Value Plus Income Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital had contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.

Mathematical Funds

- For INTECH Emerging Markets Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For INTECH Global Income Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For INTECH International Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital had contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For INTECH U.S. Core Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For INTECH U.S. Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital had contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.

Growth and Core Funds

- For Janus Balanced Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Contrarian Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Enterprise Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Forty Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.

- For Janus Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Growth and Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Triton Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Twenty Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Venture Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.

Global and International Funds

- For Janus Asia Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Emerging Markets Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for certain share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Global Life Sciences Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Global Real Estate Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Global Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Global Select Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus Global Technology Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.
- For Janus International Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund's total expenses were already below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Overseas Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for all share classes.

Janus Aspen Series

- For Janus Aspen Balanced Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.
- For Janus Aspen Enterprise Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.
- For Janus Aspen Flexible Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for one share class, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital had contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Aspen Forty Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.

- For Janus Aspen Global Allocation Portfolio - Moderate, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for both share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital has contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Aspen Global Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.
- For Janus Aspen Global Technology Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.
- For Janus Aspen Global Unconstrained Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund's total expenses exceeded the peer group mean for both share classes, overall the Fund's total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that Janus Capital had contractually agreed to limit the Fund's expenses.
- For Janus Aspen INTECH U.S. Low Volatility Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for its sole share class.
- For Janus Aspen Janus Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.
- For Janus Aspen Overseas Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.
- For Janus Aspen Perkins Mid Cap Value Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund's total expenses were below the peer group mean for both share classes.

The Trustees reviewed information on the profitability to Janus Capital and its affiliates of their relationships with each Fund, as well as an explanation of the methodology utilized by Janus Capital when allocating various expenses of Janus Capital and its affiliates with respect to contractual relationships with the Funds and other clients. The Trustees also reviewed the financial statements and corporate structure of Janus Capital's parent company. In their review, the Trustees considered whether Janus Capital and each subadviser receive adequate incentives and resources to manage the Funds effectively. The Trustees recognized that profitability comparisons among fund managers are difficult because very little comparative information is publicly available, and the profitability of any fund manager is affected by numerous factors, including the organizational structure of the particular fund manager, the types of funds and other accounts it manages, possible other lines of business, the methodology for allocating expenses, and the fund manager's capital structure and cost of capital. However, taking into account those factors and the analysis provided by the Trustees' independent fee consultant, and based on the information available, the Trustees concluded that Janus Capital's profitability with respect to each Fund in relation to the services rendered was reasonable.

The independent fee consultant found that, while assessing the reasonableness of expenses in light of Janus Capital's profits is dependent on comparisons with other publicly-traded mutual fund advisers, and that these comparisons are limited in accuracy by differences in complex size, business mix, institutional account orientation, and other factors, after accepting these limitations, the level of profit earned by Janus Capital from managing the Funds is reasonable.

The Trustees concluded that the management fees payable by each Fund to Janus Capital and its affiliates, as well as the fees paid by Janus Capital to the subadvisers of subadvised Funds, were reasonable in relation to the nature, extent, and quality of the services provided, taking into account the fees charged by other advisers for managing comparable mutual funds with similar strategies, the fees Janus Capital and the subadvisers charge to other clients, and, as applicable, the impact of fund performance on management fees payable by the Funds. The Trustees also concluded that each Fund's total expenses were reasonable, taking into account the size of the Fund, the quality of services provided by Janus Capital and any subadviser, the investment performance of the Fund, and any expense limitations agreed to or provided by Janus Capital.

Economies of Scale

The Trustees considered information about the potential for Janus Capital to realize economies of scale as the assets of the Funds increase. They noted that their independent fee consultant provided an analysis of economies of scale, which included discussion of analysis from prior years. They also noted that, although many Funds pay advisory fees at a base fixed rate as a percentage of net assets, without any breakpoints, their independent fee consultant concluded that 85% of these Funds have contractual management fees (gross of waivers) below their Broadridge expense group averages and, overall, 80% of the Funds are below their respective expense group averages for contractual management fees. They also noted that for those Funds whose expenses are being reduced by the

contractual expense limitations of Janus Capital, Janus Capital is subsidizing the Funds because they have not reached adequate scale. Moreover, as the assets of some of the Funds have declined in the past few years, certain Funds have benefited from having advisory fee rates that have remained constant rather than increasing as assets declined. In addition, performance fee structures have been implemented for various Funds that have caused the effective rate of advisory fees payable by such a Fund to vary depending on the investment performance of the Fund relative to its benchmark index over the measurement period; and a few Funds have fee schedules with breakpoints and reduced fee rates above certain asset levels. The Trustees also noted that the Funds share directly in economies of scale through the lower charges of third-party service providers that are based in part on the combined scale of all of the Funds. Based on all of the information they reviewed, including research and analysis conducted by the Trustees' independent fee consultant, the Trustees concluded that the current fee structure of each Fund was reasonable and that the current rates of fees do reflect a sharing between Janus Capital and the Fund of any economies of scale that may be present at the current asset level of the Fund.

The independent fee consultant concluded that, given the limitations of various analytical approaches to economies of scale considered in prior years, and their conflicting results, its analyses could not confirm or deny the existence of economies of scale in the Janus complex. Further, the independent fee consultant provided its belief that Fund investors are well-served by the fee levels and performance fee structures in place on the Funds in light of any economies of scale that may be present at Janus Capital.

Other Benefits to Janus Capital

The Trustees also considered benefits that accrue to Janus Capital and its affiliates and subadvisers to the Funds from their relationships with the Funds. They recognized that two affiliates of Janus Capital separately serve the Funds as transfer agent and distributor, respectively, and the transfer agent receives compensation directly from the non-money market funds for services provided. The Trustees also considered Janus Capital's past and proposed use of commissions paid by the Funds on portfolio brokerage transactions to obtain proprietary and third-party research products and services benefiting the Fund and/or other clients of Janus Capital and/or Janus Capital, and/or a subadviser to a Fund. The Trustees concluded that Janus Capital's and the subadvisers' use of these types of client commission arrangements to obtain proprietary and third-party research products and services was consistent with regulatory requirements and guidelines and was likely to benefit each Fund. The Trustees also concluded that, other than the services provided by Janus Capital and its affiliates and subadvisers pursuant to the agreements and the fees to be paid by each Fund therefor, the Funds and Janus Capital and the subadvisers may potentially benefit from their relationship with each other in other ways. They concluded that Janus Capital and/or the subadvisers benefits from the receipt of research products and services acquired through commissions paid on portfolio transactions of the Funds and that the Funds benefit from Janus Capital's and/or the subadvisers' receipt of those products and services as well as research products and services acquired through commissions paid by other clients of Janus Capital and/or other clients of the subadvisers. They further concluded that the success of any Fund could attract other business to Janus Capital, the subadvisers or other Janus funds, and that the success of Janus Capital and the subadvisers could enhance Janus Capital's and the subadvisers' ability to serve the Funds.