

business days after the end of each calendar month, each Money Market Fund will file a schedule of detailed information regarding its portfolio holdings as of the last day of that month with the SEC. These filings will be publicly available on the J.P. Morgan Funds' website at www.jpmorganfunds.com and the SEC's website. Each business day, each money market will make available upon request an uncertified complete schedule of its portfolio holdings as of the prior business day. In addition, each money market fund may post portfolio holdings on the J.P. Morgan Funds' website or on other external websites. In addition, on each business day, all money market funds will post their level of weekly liquid assets, net flows and market-based NAV per shares as of the prior business day, with a rolling six month history, and the money market funds (other than tax free and municipal money market funds) will post their level of daily liquid assets, with a rolling six month history, as of the prior business day on the J.P. Morgan Funds' website at www.jpmorganfunds.com. In addition to information on portfolio holdings, no sooner than 10 days after month end, the Funds may post a portfolio characteristics summary to the J.P. Morgan Funds' website at www.jpmorganfunds.com. In addition, other fund statistical information may be found on the J.P. Morgan Funds' website from time to time.

PROXY VOTING PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

The Board of Trustees has delegated to the Adviser and its affiliated advisers, proxy voting authority with respect to the Funds' portfolio securities. To ensure that the proxies of portfolio companies are voted in the best interests of the Funds, the Funds' Board of Trustees has adopted the Adviser's detailed proxy voting procedures (the "Procedures") that incorporate guidelines ("Guidelines") for voting proxies on specific types of issues for Funds other than the Behavioral Value Fund. Proxy voting for the Behavioral Value Fund has been delegated to Fuller & Thaler, the Fund's sub-adviser. Fuller & Thaler votes proxies for the Fund in accordance with the proxy voting policies and procedures as described at the end of this section under Fuller & Thaler.

The Adviser and its affiliated advisers are part of a global asset management organization with the capability to invest in securities of issuers located around the globe. Because the regulatory framework and the business cultures and practices vary from region to region, the Guidelines are customized for each region to take into account such variations. The Adviser has adopted a separate set of Guidelines that covers the regions of each of: (1) North America, (2) Europe, Middle East, Africa, Central America and South America ("EMEA"), (3) Asia (ex-Japan) and (4) Japan (each, a "Region"; collectively, the "Regions"). In addition, for each Region, the Adviser has adopted Sustainable Strategy Proxy Voting Guidelines ("Sustainable Proxy Guidelines") for certain sustainable strategies, which may apply to certain Funds as approved by the Board of Trustees. The Sustainable Proxy Guidelines for those sustainable strategies replace certain sections of the Guidelines for each of the Regions. Proposals for securities held in the sustainable strategies that are not covered by the Sustainable Proxy Guidelines will continue to be voted in accordance with the other provisions of the applicable Guidelines for each of the Regions. The Board of Trustees has adopted the Sustainable Proxy Guidelines for the JPMorgan U.S. Sustainable Leaders Fund.

Notwithstanding the variations among the Guidelines, all of the Guidelines have been designed with the uniform objective of encouraging corporate action that enhances shareholder value consistent with each Fund's objectives and strategies. As a general rule, in voting proxies of a particular security, the Adviser and its affiliated advisers will apply the Guidelines of the Region in which the issuer of such security is organized. Except as noted below, proxy voting decisions will be made in accordance with the Guidelines covering a multitude of both routine and non-routine matters that the Adviser and its affiliated advisers have encountered globally, based on many years of collective investment management experience.

To oversee the proxy voting process on an ongoing basis, the Adviser has established a proxy committee ("Proxy Committee") for each global location where proxy voting decisions are made. Each Proxy Committee is composed of members and invitees including a proxy administrator ("Proxy Administrator") and senior officers from among the investment, legal, compliance, and risk management departments. The primary functions of each Proxy Committee include: (1) reviewing and approving the Guidelines annually; (2) providing advice and recommendations on general proxy voting matters, including potential or material conflicts of interest escalated to it from time to time as well as on specific voting issues to be implemented by the Adviser; and (3) determining the independence of any third-party vendor to which it has delegated proxy voting responsibilities (such as, for example, delegation when the Adviser has identified a material conflict of interest) and to conclude that there are no conflicts of interest that would prevent such vendor from providing such proxy voting services prior to delegating proxy responsibilities.

The Guidelines are proprietary to the Adviser and reflect the Adviser's views on proxy voting matters as informed by its investment experience and research over many years of proxy voting. Certain guidelines are prescriptive ("Prescribed Guidelines") meaning they specify how the Adviser will vote a particular proxy proposal except where the Adviser, pursuant to its procedures, determines to vote in a manner contrary to its Prescribed Guidelines also known as an "Override". Other guidelines contemplate voting on a case-by-case basis. In addition, there will undoubtedly be proxy matters that are not contemplated by the Guidelines. Individual company facts and circumstances vary. In some cases, the Adviser may determine that, in the best interest of its clients, a particular proxy item should be voted in a manner that is not consistent with the Prescribed Guidelines. Where the Adviser chooses to vote in a manner contrary to its Prescribed Guideline or where the Proxy Administrator determines that such vote requires further escalation to certain portfolio management teams ("escalated votes"), the procedures include a review and, for certain votes, an attestation process. These processes are designed to identify actual or potential material conflicts of interest (between a Fund on the one hand, and the Fund's Adviser, principal underwriter or an affiliate of any of the foregoing, on the other hand), ensure that relevant personnel were not in possession of material non-public information ("MNPI"), and ensure that the proxy vote is cast in the best interests of the Fund.

In order to maintain the integrity and independence of the Adviser's investment processes and decisions, including proxy voting decisions, and to protect the Adviser's decisions from influences that could lead to a vote other than in the Funds' best interests, JPMC (including the Adviser) has adopted policies and procedures that (i) address the handling of conflicts, (ii) establish information barriers, and (iii) restrict the use of MNPI. Material conflicts of interest are further avoided by voting in accordance with the Adviser's Prescribed Guidelines. A material conflict is deemed to exist when the proxy is for JPMorgan Chase & Co. stock or for a J.P. Morgan Fund, or when the Proxy Administrator has actual knowledge indicating that a JPMorgan affiliate is an investment banker or has rendered a fairness opinion with respect to the matter that is the subject of the proxy vote. When such conflicts are identified, the proxy will be voted by an independent third party using its own guidelines; provided, however, that the Adviser's investment professional(s) may request an exception to this process to vote against a proposal rather than referring it to an independent third party ("Exception Request") where the Proxy Administrator has actual knowledge indicating that a JPMorgan Chase affiliate is an investment banker or has rendered a fairness opinion with respect to the matter that is the subject of the proxy vote. The applicable proxy committee shall review the Exception Request and shall determine whether the Adviser should vote against the proposal or whether such proxy should still be referred to an independent third party due to the potential for additional conflicts or otherwise.

Depending on the nature of the conflict, the Adviser may elect to take one or more of the following measures, or other appropriate action: removing certain Adviser personnel from the proxy voting process; "walling off" personnel with knowledge of the conflict to ensure that such personnel do not influence the relevant proxy vote; voting in accordance with the applicable Prescribed Guidelines, if any, if the application of the Prescribed Guidelines would objectively result in the casting of a proxy vote in a predetermined manner; or delegating the vote to an independent third party, in which case the proxy will be voted by the independent third party in accordance with its own determination. In the event that a J.P. Morgan Fund, in the aggregate, holds more than 25% of the outstanding voting securities of an open-end registered investment company or registered unit investment trust that is not managed by JPMIM (a "Non-J.P. Morgan Fund"), the J.P. Morgan Fund will vote its respective securities in a Non-J.P. Morgan Fund in the same proportion as the vote of all other holders of such securities.

For securities held in Funds that seek to follow the investment returns of an underlying index, the Adviser may abstain from voting if it determines that casting a vote would not have a material effect on the value of the Fund's investments based on the size of the Fund's holdings, its ownership in the issuer, and/or its consideration of the importance of the proxy vote.

The following summarizes some of the more noteworthy types of proxy voting policies of the North America Guidelines:

- The Adviser considers votes on director nominees on a case-by-case basis. Votes generally will be withheld from directors who: (a) attend less than 75% of board and committee meetings without a valid excuse; (b) adopt or renew a poison pill without shareholder approval; (c) are affiliated outside directors who serve on audit, compensation or nominating committees or are affiliated outside directors and the full board serves on such committees or the company does not have such committees; (d) ignore a shareholder proposal that is approved by a majority of either the shares outstanding or the votes cast based on a review over a consecutive two year time frame; (e) are insiders and affiliated outsiders on boards that are not at least majority independent except, in the

case of controlled companies, vote for non-independent directors who serve on committees other than the audit committee; or (f) are CEOs of publicly-traded companies who serve on more than two public boards (besides his or her own board) or for all other directors, who serve on more than four public company boards. In addition, votes are generally withheld for directors who serve on committees in certain cases. For example, the Adviser generally withholds votes from audit committee members in circumstances in which there is evidence that there exists material weaknesses in the company's internal controls. Votes generally are also withheld from directors when there is a demonstrated history of poor performance or inadequate risk oversight or when the board adopts changes to the company's governing documents without shareholder approval if the changes materially diminish shareholder rights. Votes generally will be withheld from board chair, lead independent directors, or governance committee chairs of publicly traded companies where employees have departed for significant violation of code of conduct without claw back of compensation. In addition, the Adviser generally votes against the chair of the nominating committee if one or more directors remain on the board after having received less than majority of votes cast in the prior election.

- The Adviser generally votes for board declassification proposals and votes against board classification proposals.
- The Adviser also considers management poison pill proposals on a case-by-case basis, looking for shareholder-friendly provisions before voting in favor.
- The Adviser votes against proposals for a super-majority vote to approve a merger.
- The Adviser considers proposals to increase common and/or preferred shares and to issue shares as part of a debt restructuring plan on a case-by-case basis, taking into account such factors as the extent of dilution and whether the transaction will result in a change in control.
- The Adviser considers vote proposals with respect to stock-based incentive plans on a case-by-case basis. The analysis of compensation plans focuses primarily on the transfer of shareholder wealth (the dollar cost of pay plans to shareholders) and includes an analysis of the structure of the plan and pay practices of other companies in the relevant industry and peer companies.
- The Adviser also considers on a case-by-case basis proposals to change an issuer's state of incorporation, mergers and acquisitions and other corporate restructuring proposals and certain social issue proposals.
- The Adviser generally votes for management proposals which seek shareholder approval to make the state of incorporation the exclusive forum for disputes if the company is a Delaware corporation; otherwise, the Adviser votes on a case by case basis.
- The Adviser supports board refreshment, independence, and a diverse skill set for directors as an important part of contributing to long-term shareholder value. The Adviser generally supports investee companies' consideration of equal employment opportunity and inclusiveness in their general recruitment policies as the Adviser believes such diversity contributes to the effectiveness of boards and further development of sound governance and risk oversight. The Adviser supports investee companies' disclosure of gender, racial and ethnic composition of the board so that the Adviser can include that information as one of the many data points used in its holistic assessment of the companies. As with all proxy votes, the Adviser seeks to vote in each Fund's best interests to enhance long-term shareholder value.
- The Adviser will generally vote against a plan and/or withhold its vote from members of the compensation committee when there is a disconnect between the chief executive officer's pay and performance (an increase in pay and a decrease in performance). The Adviser reviews Say on Pay proposals on a case-by-case basis with additional review of proposals where the issuer's previous year's proposal received a low level of support.

The following summarizes some of the more noteworthy types of proxy voting policies of **Section 12 Social and Environmental Issues** from the North America Guidelines:

- The Adviser generally encourages a level of reporting on environmental matters that is not unduly costly or burdensome and which does not place the company at a competitive disadvantage, but which provides meaningful information to enable shareholders to evaluate the impact of the company's environmental policies and practices on its financial performance. In general, the

Adviser supports management disclosure practices that are overall consistent with the goals and objective expressed above. Proposals with respect to companies that have been involved in controversies, fines or litigation are expected to be subject to heightened review and consideration.

- In evaluating how to vote environmental proposals, key considerations may include, but are not limited to, issuer considerations such as asset profile of the company, including whether it is exposed to potentially declining demand for the company's products or services due to environmental considerations; cash deployments; cost structure of the company, including its position on the cost curve, expected impact of future carbon tax and exposure to high fixed operating costs; corporate behavior of the company; demonstrated capabilities of the company, its strategic planning process, and past performance; current level of disclosure of the company and consistency of disclosure across its industry; and whether the company incorporates environmental or social issues in a risk assessment or risk reporting framework. The Adviser may also consider whether adoption of the proposal would inform and educate shareholders; have companies that adopted the proposal provided insightful and meaningful information that would allow shareholders to evaluate the long-term risks and performance of the company; does the proposal require disclosure that is already addressed by existing and proposed mandated regulatory requirements or formal guidance at the local, state, or national level or the company's existing disclosure practices; and does the proposal create the potential for unintended consequences such as a competitive disadvantage.
- The Adviser votes against the chair of the committee responsible for providing oversight of environmental matters and/or risk where the Adviser believes the company is lagging peers in terms of disclosure, business practices or targets. The Adviser also votes against committee members, lead independent director and/or board chair for companies that have lagged over several years.
- With regard to social issues, among other factors, the Adviser considers the company's labor practices, supply chain, how the company supports and monitors those issues, what types of disclosure the company and its peers currently provide, and whether the proposal would result in a competitive disadvantage for the company.
- The Adviser expects boards to provide oversight of human capital management which includes the company management of its workforce, use of full time versus part time employees, workforce cost, employee engagement and turnover, talent development, retention and training, compliance record and health and safety. As an engaged and diverse employee base is integral to a company's ability to innovate, respond to a diverse customer base and engage with diverse communities and deliver shareholder returns, the Adviser will generally support shareholder resolutions seeking the company to disclose data on workforce demographics, and release of EEO-1 or comparable data where such disclosure is deemed by the Adviser as inadequate.

Sustainable Proxy Guidelines. For the JPMorgan U.S. Sustainable Leaders Fund, the Sustainable Proxy Guidelines are used in lieu of certain sections of the Guidelines for each of the Regions. Each Region's Sustainable Proxy Guidelines are similar to the North America Sustainable Proxy Guidelines except for certain regional differences. The following summarizes some of the more noteworthy types of proxy voting policies of the Sustainable Proxy Guidelines and highlights some of the regional differences:

- In voting shares of securities under the Sustainable Proxy Guidelines, the Adviser considers good corporate governance, the ethical behavior of corporations and the social and environmental impact of such companies' actions consistent with the applicable Fund's objectives and strategies. The Adviser believes that disclosure and benchmarking of performance versus peers can enable an issuer to generate better long-term performance. The Adviser generally encourages reporting that is material, informative and does not place the company at a competitive disadvantage. Disclosure should provide meaningful information that enables shareholders to evaluate the impact of the company's environmental, social and governance ("ESG") policies and practices.
- In evaluating how to vote to social proposals, the Adviser considers among other items: (1) the company's business activities, workplace and product safety, labor practices, diversity and equality, and supply chain, (2) how the company supports and monitors these issues, and (3) what types of disclosure the company provides.

- In evaluating how to vote environmental proposals, the Adviser considers among other items: (1) the company's business activities, energy efficiency, impact on climate change, water use, toxic emissions, and operations in environmentally sensitive areas, (2) how the company supports and monitors these issues, and (3) what types of disclosure the company provides.
- In general, the Adviser supports management disclosure practices that are consistent with the goals and objectives of the applicable Fund. Proposals with respect to companies that have been involved in controversies, fines or litigation are expected to be subject to heightened review and consideration. For companies that have demonstrated leadership in disclosure, the Adviser may yet elect to support a shareholder proposal if the Adviser believes that improvement in disclosures will help sustain the leadership, unless there are material adverse consequences to such disclosure.
- The Sustainable Proxy Guidelines provide a framework for voting on social and environmental proposals. The Adviser notes that there may be cases in which the final vote varies from the guidelines due to the fact the Adviser reviews the merits of each proposal individually and considers relevant information in arriving at decisions. The Adviser considers among other items company-specific circumstances, whether or not the company has substantially achieved the stated objective, whether the proposal would be unduly burdensome, whether the proposal itself is well-framed and reasonable, as well as the most up-to-date research and information that is readily accessible to the Adviser as it pertains to the proposal.
- The North America Sustainable Proxy Guidelines provide that generally, the Adviser votes for shareholder proposals requesting disclosure of the gender, racial and ethnic composition of the board so that the Adviser can include that information as one of many data points considered in a holistic assessment of the company. The EMEA and Asia Ex-Japan Sustainable Proxy Guidelines provide that generally, the Adviser votes against /withholds from individual directors who serve as members of the nominating committee and the board lacks at least one woman, and the board is not at least 30 percent diverse (25% with respect to the Asia Ex-Japan Sustainable Proxy Guidelines), or does not adhere to the local market best practice. The Japan Sustainable Proxy Guidelines provide that generally, the Adviser votes against /withholds from individual directors who serve as members of the nominating committee and the board lacks at least one woman with the expectation that the board will be at least 30% diverse by 2030.
- Generally, the Adviser votes for proposals linking executive compensation to material environmental and social factors.
- Generally, the Adviser votes for proposals requiring reporting on environmental impacts and preparation of reports in accordance with certain external reporting standards.
- Generally, the Adviser votes against directors of companies, that, in the Adviser's opinion, face material climate related transition or asset risks, where climate disclosures are not available or where the Adviser believes such disclosures are not meaningful. See "**North America and Non-U.S. Guidelines**" below for a discussion of Climate Risk guidelines applicable to Funds that do not use the Sustainable Proxy Guidelines.
- Generally, the Adviser votes for proposals requiring the company to take specific actions to mitigate climate change, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions and developing and using renewable energy sources.
- Generally, the Adviser votes for proposals requiring disclosure on the company's land use, including its supply chain, deforestation and degradation.
- Generally, the Adviser votes for proposals requiring disclosure of political expenditures and lobbying.

Non-U.S. Guidelines. The following summarizes some of the more noteworthy types of proxy voting policies of the EMEA, Asia (Ex-Japan) and Japan Guidelines (collectively, "Non-U.S. Guidelines"):

- Corporate governance procedures differ among the countries. Because of time constraints and local customs, it is not always possible for the Adviser to receive and review all proxy materials in connection with each item submitted for a vote. Many proxy statements are in foreign languages. Proxy materials are generally mailed by the issuer to the sub-custodian which holds the securities for the client in the country where the portfolio company is organized, and there may not be sufficient time for such materials to be transmitted to the Adviser in time for a vote to be cast. In

some countries, proxy statements are not mailed at all, and in some locations, the deadline for voting is two to four days after the initial announcement that a vote is to be solicited and it may not always be possible to obtain sufficient information to make an informed decision in good time to vote.

- Certain markets require that shares being tendered for voting purposes are temporarily immobilized from trading until after the shareholder meeting has taken place. Elsewhere, notably emerging markets, it may not always be possible to obtain sufficient information to make an informed decision in good time to vote. Some markets require a local representative to be hired in order to attend the meeting and vote in person on our behalf, which can result in considerable cost. The Adviser also considers the cost of voting in light of the expected benefit of the vote. In certain instances, it may sometimes be in a Fund's best interests to intentionally refrain from voting in certain overseas markets from time to time.
- The Non-U.S. Guidelines reflect the applicable Region's corporate governance or stewardship codes with respect to corporate governance and proxy voting. For example, JPMAM is a signatory to the UK Stewardship Code 2020 and believes that its existing stewardship policies meet the standards required under the Code. Additionally, for example, the EMEA Guidelines for UK companies are based on the revised UK Corporate Governance Code. If a portfolio company chooses to deviate from the provisions of the UK Corporate Governance Code, the Adviser takes the company's explanation into account as appropriate, based on the Adviser's overall assessment of the standards of corporate governance evidenced at the company. For Continental European markets, the Adviser expects companies to comply with local Corporate Governance Codes, where they exist. In markets where a comparable standard does not exist, the Adviser uses the EMEA Guidelines as the primary basis for voting, while taking local market practice into consideration where applicable. The Japan Guidelines reflect the 2020 revisions to the Japanese Stewardship Code. Likewise, the Asia (Ex-Japan) Guidelines endorse the stewardship principles promoted by different regulators and industry bodies in the Region including the Singapore Stewardship Principles for Responsible Investors supported by Monetary Authority of Singapore and Singapore Exchange, the Principles for Responsible Ownership issued by the Securities and Futures Commission in Hong Kong, and the Principles of Internal Governance and Asset Stewardship issued by the Financial Services Council of Australia.
- Where proxy issues concern corporate governance, takeover defense measures, compensation plans, capital structure changes and so forth, the Adviser pays particular attention to management's arguments for promoting the prospective change.
- The Non-U.S. Guidelines encourage transparency and disclosure with respect to remuneration reporting as well as processes and policies designed to align compensation with the long-term performance of portfolio companies.
 - In particular, the EMEA Guidelines indicate that the remuneration policy as it relates to senior management should ideally be presented to shareholders for approval with such votes normally occurring every third year. In addition, the EMEA Guidelines describe information that the Adviser expects to be included in remuneration reports including disclosure on amounts paid to executives, alignment between company performance and pay out to executives, disclosure of, among other things, variable incentive targets, levels of achievement and performance awards, information on the ratio of CEO pay to median employee pay.
 - With respect to the Japan Guidelines, the voting decision will be made taking into account matters such as recent trends in the company's earnings and performance, with the expectation that companies will have a remuneration system comprised of a reasonable mix of fixed and variable (based on short term and medium to long term incentives) compensation. Such Guidelines also support the introduction of clawback clauses in order to prevent excessive risk taking which can negatively impact shareholder value and excessive pay.
 - Where shareholders are able to exercise a binding vote on remuneration policies, the Asia (Ex-Japan) Guidelines reflect the Adviser's belief that such policies should stand the test of time. The Asia (Ex-Japan) Guidelines further encourage companies to provide information on the ratio of CEO pay to median employee pay and to explain the reasons for changes to the ratio as it unfolds year by year. The Asia (Ex-Japan) Guidelines also highlight information that companies should have with regard to gender pay gaps and indicate how this issue is being addressed.

- The Adviser is in favor of a unitary board structure of the type found in the United Kingdom as opposed to tiered board structures. Thus, under the EMEA Guidelines, the Adviser will generally vote to encourage the gradual phasing out of tiered board structures, in favor of a unitary board structure. However, since tiered boards are still very prevalent in markets outside of the United Kingdom, the Non-U.S. Guidelines do not mandate a unitary board structure and local market practice will always be taken into account.
- The Adviser will use its voting powers to encourage appropriate levels of board independence and diversity as an important part of contributing to long-term shareholder value, taking into account local market practice.
 - The EMEA Guidelines indicate that the Adviser expects boards to have a strategy to improve female representation in particular. The EMEA Guidelines generally support the target of one-third of board positions being held by women, as recommended by the UK Government's Women on Boards Report, the Davies Review and the FTSE Women Leaders Review (formerly the Hampton-Alexander Review).
 - The Japan Guidelines include provisions on board diversity and indicate that the Adviser believes directors with diverse backgrounds should make up a majority of a board over time. The Japan Guidelines provide that the current policy is to vote against the election of the representative directors, such as the president of the company, if there is only one or no female directors (at least 30% gender diversity before 2030).
 - The Asia ex Japan Guidelines reflect, as a minimum standard for all Asia ex Japan markets, that JPMAM would expect no single-gender boards and that such boards would have 25% gender diverse representation, with 30% gender diverse representation or such higher amounts as reflected by local market practice before 2030.
- The Adviser will usually vote against discharging the board from responsibility in cases of pending litigation, or if there is evidence of wrongdoing for which the board must be held accountable.
- The Adviser will vote in favor of increases in capital which enhance a company's long-term prospects. The Adviser will also vote in favor of the partial suspension of preemptive rights if they are for purely technical reasons (e.g., rights offers which may not be legally offered to shareholders in certain jurisdictions). However, the Adviser will vote against increases in capital which would allow the company to adopt "poison pill" takeover defense tactics, or where the increase in authorized capital would dilute shareholder value in the long term.
- The Adviser will vote in favor of proposals which will enhance a company's long-term prospects. The Adviser will vote against an increase in bank borrowing powers which would result in the company reaching an unacceptable level of financial leverage, where such borrowing is expressly intended as part of a takeover defense, or where there is a material reduction in shareholder value.
- The Adviser will generally vote against anti-takeover devices.
- The Adviser considers social or environmental issues on a case-by-case basis under the Non-U.S. Guidelines, keeping in mind at all times the best economic interests of its clients. With respect to environmental proposals, the Non-U.S. Guidelines indicate that good corporate governance policies should consider the impact of company operations on the environment and the costs of compliance with laws and regulations relating to environmental matters, physical damage to the environment (including the costs of clean-ups and repairs), consumer preferences and capital investments related to climate change. The Non-U.S. Guidelines further encourage a level of environmental reporting that is not unduly costly or burdensome and which does not place the company at a competitive disadvantage, but which provides meaningful information to enable shareholders to evaluate the impact of the company's environmental policies and practices on its financial performance. With regard to social issues, among other factors, the Adviser considers the company's labor practices, supply chain, how the company supports and monitors those issues, what types of disclosure the company and its peers currently provide, and whether the proposal would result in a competitive disadvantage for the company.

North America and Non-U.S. Guidelines. The following describes certain elements that are common to the North America and Non-U.S. Guidelines:

- The North America and Non-U.S. Guidelines note that, in certain markets, by-law changes have taken place to allow a company to hold virtual or hybrid general shareholder meetings and reflect

that general shareholder meetings should be fair, constructive and foster dialogue between company management and shareholders. In principle, the Adviser is supportive of proposals allowing shareholder meetings to be convened by electronic means so long as the flexibility in the format of the meetings contributes to enhancing access to the meetings and where shareholder participation rights are protected, regardless of whether physical or virtual.

- The North America and Non-U.S. Guidelines include climate risk guidelines due to the Adviser's view that climate change has become a material risk to the strategy and financial performance of many companies. The Adviser may vote against directors of companies, that, in the Adviser's opinion, face material climate-related transition or asset risks, where such disclosures are not available or where the Adviser believes such disclosures are not meaningful. To provide shareholders with meaningful disclosures on how the company is addressing risks related to climate change, the Adviser encourages disclosure aligned with the reporting framework developed by the Task Force on Climate related Financial Disclosures ("TCFD"). In addition, for companies in industries where the Adviser believes climate change risks pose material financial risks, the Adviser encourages more comprehensive reporting including scenario analysis to help under the resilience of a company's strategy and disclosures of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gases ("GHG") emission targets, where decarbonization of a company's operations and purchased energy has been identified by the company as a key part of a company's strategy to manage climate change risks. In addition, for companies who have chosen to set long-term net zero targets, the Adviser encourages the company to make disclosures including scope of emissions included in such targets in order to allow the Adviser to evaluate the long-term credibility of transition plans. The Adviser may vote for shareholder resolutions requesting information where disclosure is unavailable or not meaningful.

Proxy Voting Record. The Funds file their proxy voting record with the SEC on Form N-PX no later than August 31 of each year (or on the next filing date following August 31 if August 31 falls on a weekend or a day the SEC is closed). Following such filing, each Fund's voting record for the most recent 12-month period ended June 30 is available, without charge, upon request, by calling 1-800-338-4345 or on the SEC's website at www.sec.gov. Such information can also be accessed from the J.P. Morgan Funds' website at www.jpmorganfunds.com a reasonable time after the Form N-PX is filed with the SEC.

Fuller & Thaler.

The policies and procedures used by Fuller & Thaler, the sub-adviser to the Behavioral Value Fund, to determine how to vote proxies relating to the portfolio securities of such Fund are summarized below:

GENERAL

It is the general policy of Fuller & Thaler to exercise its proxy voting authority in a manner that will maintain or enhance shareholder value of the companies in which we have invested client assets. Unless a client specifically reserves the right, in writing, to vote its own proxies, we will vote all proxies in accordance with this policy.

VOTING POLICY

We use the following guidelines in making voting decisions:

Approve (or follow management recommendations on) the following (unless good reason for voting otherwise):

- Routine corporate matters including:
 - Selection of directors
 - Appointment of auditors
- An increase in authorized shares where needed for clearly defined business purposes
- Follow management recommendations on "social" issues

Oppose (in some cases against management recommendations on) the following (unless good reason for voting otherwise):

- Indemnification of directors and/or officers where such indemnification includes "negligence and gross negligence" in the performance of their fiduciary duties
- Super-majority voting requirements

- Anti-takeover proposals which restrict shareholder authority
- An increase in authorized shares of more than 25% without a stated business purpose
- Changes in corporate charter that do not have a clearly stated business purpose
- Provisions for multi-tiered voting rights
- Authorizations of “blank check” preferred stock or other capital stock without a stated business purpose
- “Shareholder rights” provisions which tend to diminish rather than enhance shareholder power
- “Anti-greenmail” provisions which also restrict shareholder authority
- Staggered Boards of directors

Evaluate the following on a case-by-case basis:

- Corporate combinations and divestments
- Shareholder proposals
- Profit sharing and stock options plans
- Say-on pay items such as executive compensation and golden parachutes

VOTING PROCESS

Fuller & Thaler has hired an independent third-party vendor, Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (“ISS”), to assist it in fulfilling its proxy voting obligations. ISS is responsible for collecting proxy information from companies and voting proxies according to our instructions. ISS also provides Fuller & Thaler with proxy recommendations and corporate governance ratings on each ballot. While we may consider such research in determining how to vote on a proxy issue, we vote each proxy on its own merits. Thus, our proxy voting may or may not be consistent with the recommendations of ISS.

On a weekly basis, we:

- Send a list of the securities held in client accounts to ISS.
- Download proxy statements.

Each of our portfolio managers is responsible for voting the proxies for securities held in the portfolio manager’s strategy. Proxy voting reports received from ISS are provided to the portfolio managers for review prior to voting. Where Fuller & Thaler becomes aware that an issuer intends to file, or has filed, additional soliciting materials with the SEC after Fuller & Thaler has received ISS’s voting recommendation but before the submission deadline, Fuller & Thaler considers such additional information in its proxy voting. Any changes to the votes made by the portfolio manager are communicated to ISS electronically.

As part of the overall vote review process, each portfolio manager responsible for voting proxies must report any known, material conflict of interest to the Chief Compliance Officer, who will communicate the conflict of interest to the other portfolio managers.

Using information provided by our firm, ISS votes the proxies for each individual account.

On a quarterly basis, ISS provides us with voting summary reports for our client accounts. These reports, and copies of the Proxy Voting Policy, are available to clients upon request.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

All proxies are voted solely in the best interests of our clients. Shareholders and employees of Fuller & Thaler will not be unduly influenced by outside sources nor be affected by any conflict of interest regarding the vote of any proxy. Where a proxy proposal raises a material conflict between our interests and a client’s interests, Fuller & Thaler will rely on the recommendation of ISS to vote the proxy. ISS votes based on its pre-determined voting policy developed from internally conducted research on shareholder best practices.

LIMITATIONS

The following are examples of situations where Fuller & Thaler may abstain from voting or from review of proxies:

1. Terminated Account: Once a client account has been terminated with us in accordance with its investment advisory agreement, we will not vote any proxies received after the termination.
2. Limited Value: If we determine that the value of a client's economic interest or the value of the portfolio holding is indeterminable or insignificant, we may abstain from voting a proxy or alternatively, vote proxies in accordance with ISS recommendations with minimal review of the proxies. We also will not vote proxies received for securities no longer held by the client's account.
3. Unmanaged Assets. If a client account contains securities that we do not actively manage, but that are maintained in the account at the client's request (designated as "Unmanaged Assets"), we will abstain from voting on such securities unless the client directs us in writing to take action with respect to a particular matter.
4. Securities Lending Programs: When securities are out on loan, they are transferred into the borrower's name and are voted by the borrower, in its discretion. However, where we determine that a proxy vote (or other shareholder action) is materially important to the client's account, we may recall the security for purposes of voting.

ANNUAL FILING OF SAY-ON-PAY PROXY VOTING RECORD

Pursuant to the amended Securities Exchange Act Rule 14Ad-1, Fuller & Thaler will file an annual report of each say-on-pay related proxy voted with respect to portfolio securities for which it exercised voting power, during the twelve-month period ended June 30 on Form N-PX not later than August 31 of each year, beginning with August 31, 2024 for the twelve-month period ended June 30, 2024.

RECORDKEEPING

Fuller & Thaler will maintain the following proxy related books and records in an easily accessible place for a period of not less than five years from the end of the fiscal year during which the last entry was made on such record, the first two years in an appropriate office of Fuller & Thaler:

- i. Copies of proxy policies and procedures.
- ii. A copy of each proxy statement that Fuller & Thaler receives regarding client securities. Alternatively, Fuller & Thaler may rely on ISS to make and retain a copy of a proxy statement on Fuller & Thaler's behalf (provided that Fuller & Thaler has obtained an undertaking from ISS to provide a copy of the proxy statement promptly upon request) or may rely on obtaining a copy of a proxy statement from the Commission's Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval (EDGAR) system.
- iii. A record of each vote cast by Fuller & Thaler on behalf of a client. Alternatively, Fuller & Thaler may rely on a third party to make and retain a record of the vote cast on Fuller & Thaler's behalf (provided that Fuller & Thaler has obtained an undertaking from ISS to provide a copy of the record promptly upon request).
- iv. A copy of any document created by Fuller & Thaler that was material to making a decision on how to vote proxies on behalf of a client or that memorializes the basis for that decision.
- v. A copy of each written client request for information on how Fuller & Thaler voted proxies on behalf of the client, and a copy of any written response by Fuller & Thaler to any (written or oral) client request for information on how Fuller & Thaler voted proxies on behalf of the requesting client.

Please see Books and Records Policy contained in Section 13 of the Compliance Manual for further details.

RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

The Portfolio Managers are responsible for the following:

- adhering to this policy which includes voting proxies consistently with these guidelines;
- notifying the Chief Compliance Officer of any conflicts of interest;

- providing the Portfolio Administrator with a copy of any document that was material to making a voting decision or that memorializes the basis for a decision, if any was created;
- recommending any policy or procedure changes to the Head of Trading Operations and Chief Compliance Officer.

The Head of Trading Operations and Portfolio Administrator are responsible for adhering to the voting process and maintaining required books and records. They should also recommend any policy or procedure changes to the Portfolio Managers and Chief Compliance Officer.

The Chief Compliance Officer will review this policy and procedures with the Head of Trading Operations, Portfolio Administrator, and other applicable Fuller & Thaler personnel at least annually.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

A Trust is not required to hold a meeting of Shareholders for the purpose of electing Trustees except that (i) a Trust is required to hold a Shareholders' meeting for the election of Trustees at such time as less than a majority of the Trustees holding office have been elected by Shareholders and (ii) if, as a result of a vacancy on the Board of Trustees, less than two-thirds of the Trustees holding office have been elected by the Shareholders, that vacancy may only be filled by a vote of the Shareholders. In addition, Trustees may be removed from office by a written consent signed by the holders of Shares representing two-thirds of the outstanding Shares of a Trust at a meeting duly called for the purpose, which meeting shall be called and held in accordance with the bylaws of the applicable Trust. Except as set forth above, the Trustees may continue to hold office and may appoint successor Trustees.

As used in a Trust's Prospectuses and in this SAI, "assets belonging to a Fund" means the consideration received by a Trust upon the issuance or sale of Shares in that Fund, together with all income, earnings, profits, and proceeds derived from the investment thereof, including any proceeds from the sale, exchange, or liquidation of such investments, and any funds or payments derived from any reinvestment of such proceeds, and any general assets of a Trust not readily identified as belonging to a particular Fund that are allocated to that Fund by a Trust's Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees may allocate such general assets in any manner it deems fair and equitable. It is anticipated that the factor that will be used by the Board of Trustees in making allocations of general assets to particular Funds will be the relative NAVs of the respective Funds at the time of allocation. Assets belonging to a particular Fund are charged with the direct liabilities and expenses in respect of that Fund, and with a share of the general liabilities and expenses of a Trust not readily identified as belonging to a particular Fund that are allocated to that Fund in proportion to the relative NAVs of the respective Funds at the time of allocation. The timing of allocations of general assets and general liabilities and expenses of a Trust to particular Funds will be determined by the Board of Trustees of a Trust and will be in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Determinations by the Board of Trustees of a Trust as to the timing of the allocation of general liabilities and expenses and as to the timing and allocable portion of any general assets with respect to a particular Fund are conclusive.

As used in this SAI and the Prospectuses, the term "majority of the outstanding voting securities" of the Trust, a particular Fund or a particular class of a Fund means the following when the 1940 Act governs the required approval: the affirmative vote of the lesser of (a) more than 50% of the outstanding shares of the Trust, such Fund or such class of such Fund, or (b) 67% or more of the shares of the Trust, such Fund or such class of such Fund present at a meeting at which the holders of more than 50% of the outstanding shares of the Trust, such Fund or such class of such Fund are represented in person or by proxy. Otherwise, the declaration of trust, articles of incorporation or by-laws usually govern the needed approval and generally require that if a quorum is present at a meeting, the vote of a majority of the shares of the Trust, such Fund or such class of such Fund, as applicable, shall decide the question.

Telephone calls to the Funds, the Funds' service providers or a Financial Intermediary as Financial Intermediary may be recorded. With respect to the securities offered hereby, this SAI and the Prospectuses do not contain all the information included in the Registration Statements of the Trusts filed with the SEC under the 1933 Act and the 1940 Act. Pursuant to the rules and regulations of the SEC, certain portions have been omitted. The Registration Statement including the exhibits filed therewith may be examined at the office of the SEC in Washington, D.C.

Statements contained in this SAI and the Prospectuses concerning the contents of any contract or other document are not necessarily complete, and in each instance, reference is made to the copy of such contract or other document filed as an exhibit to the Registration Statements of the Trusts. Each such statement is qualified in all respects by such reference.

No dealer, salesman or any other person has been authorized to give any information or to make any representations, other than those contained in the Prospectuses and this SAI, in connection with the offer contained therein and, if given or made, such other information or representations must not be relied upon as having been authorized by any of the Trusts, the Funds or JPMDS. The Prospectuses and this SAI do not constitute an offer by any Fund or by JPMDS to sell or solicit any offer to buy any of the securities offered hereby in any jurisdiction to any person to whom it is unlawful for the Funds or JPMDS to make such offer in such jurisdictions.