2023 MANAGEMENT FEE EVALUATION
APPROVAL OF ADVISORY AGREEMENTS DURING THE PERIOD

JANUS INVESTMENT FUND

The Trustees of Janus Aspen Series, each of whom serves as an “independent” Trustee (the “Trustees”), oversee the management of each portfolio of Janus Aspen Series (each, a “VIT Portfolio,” and collectively, the “VIT Portfolios”), as well as each fund of Janus Investment Fund (each, a “Fund,” and collectively, the “Funds” and together with the VIT Portfolios, the “Janus Henderson Funds,” and each, a “Janus Henderson Fund”). As required by law, the Trustees determine annually whether to continue the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund.

In connection with their most recent consideration of those agreements for each Janus Henderson Fund, the Trustees received and reviewed information provided by Janus Henderson Investors US LLC (the “Adviser”) 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 meetings held on November 9-10, 2022 and December 13-14, 2022, the Trustees evaluated the information provided by the Adviser and the independent fee consultant, as well as other information provided by the Adviser and the independent fee consultant during the year. Following such evaluation, the Trustees determined that the overall arrangements between each Janus Henderson Fund and the Adviser were fair and reasonable in light of the nature, extent, and quality of the services provided by the Adviser and its affiliates, the fees charged for those services, and other matters that the Trustees considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment, and unanimously approved the continuation of the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund for the period from February 1, 2023 through February 1, 2024, 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, for the purpose of peer comparisons any administration fees (excluding out of pocket costs), net of any waivers, paid by a fund as a percentage of average net assets.

Nature, Extent and Quality of Services
The Trustees reviewed the nature, extent, and quality of the services provided by the Adviser to the Janus Henderson Funds, taking into account the investment objective, strategies, and policies of each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds. In addition, the Trustees reviewed the resources and key personnel of the Adviser, particularly noting those employees who provide investment and risk management services to the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered other services provided to the Janus Henderson Funds by the Adviser, such as managing the execution of portfolio transactions and the selection of broker-dealers for those transactions. The Trustees considered the Adviser’s role as administrator to the Janus Henderson Funds, noting that the Adviser generally does not receive a fee for its services as administrator, but is reimbursed for its out-of-pocket costs. The Trustees considered the role of the Adviser in monitoring adherence to the Janus Henderson Funds’ investment restrictions, providing support services for the Trustees and Trustee committees, and overseeing communications with Janus Henderson Fund shareholders and the activities of other service providers, including monitoring compliance with various policies and procedures of the Janus Henderson Funds and with applicable securities laws and regulations.

In this regard, the independent fee consultant noted that the Adviser provides a number of different services for the Janus Henderson Funds and their shareholders, ranging from investment management services to various other servicing functions, and that, in its view, the Adviser is a capable provider of those services. The independent fee
consultant also provided its belief that the Adviser 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 the Adviser to each Janus Henderson Fund were appropriate and consistent with the terms of the respective advisory agreements, and that, taking into account steps taken to address those Janus Henderson Funds whose performance lagged that of their peers for certain periods, the Janus Henderson Funds were likely to benefit from the continued provision of those services. They also concluded that the Adviser had sufficient personnel, with the appropriate education and experience, to serve the Janus Henderson Funds effectively and had demonstrated its ability to attract well-qualified personnel.

**Performance of the Funds**

The Trustees considered the performance results of each Janus Henderson Fund over various time periods. They noted that they considered Janus Henderson Fund performance data throughout the year, including periodic meetings with each Janus Henderson Fund’s portfolio manager(s), and also reviewed information comparing each Janus Henderson Fund’s performance with the performance of comparable fund peer groups identified by Broadridge Financial Solutions, Inc. (“Broadridge”), an independent data provider, and with the Janus Henderson Fund’s benchmark index. In this regard, the independent fee consultant found that the overall Janus Henderson Funds’ performance has been reasonable, noting that: (i) for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022, approximately 38% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of their Broadridge peer groups; (ii) for the 36 months ended September 30, 2022, approximately 45% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance as reported by Morningstar, and (iii) for the 12 months ended September 30, 2022, approximately 55% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance as reported by Morningstar.

The Trustees considered the performance of each Janus Henderson Fund, noting that performance may vary by share class, and noted the following with respect to the Funds:

**Asset Allocation Funds**

- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Conservative, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Growth, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Moderate, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

**Fixed-Income Funds**

- For Janus Henderson Absolute Return Income Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
- For Janus Developed World Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
- For Janus Henderson Global Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson High-Yield Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson Multi-Sector Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

- For Janus Henderson Short Duration Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

**Global and International Equity Funds**

- For Janus Henderson Asia Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson European Focus Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

- For Janus Henderson Global Equity Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

- For Janus Henderson Global Life Sciences Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

- For Janus Henderson Global Sustainable Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted that 36 month-end performance was not yet available.

- For Janus Henderson Global Real Estate Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

- For Janus Henderson Global Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

- For Janus Henderson Global Select Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

- For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

- For Janus Henderson International Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
For Janus Henderson Overseas Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

For Janus Henderson Responsible International Dividend Fund (formerly the Janus Henderson Dividend & Income Builder Fund), the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

Money Market Funds

For Janus Henderson 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, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

For Janus Henderson Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

Multi-Asset Funds

For Janus Henderson Adaptive Global Allocation Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

For Janus Henderson Balanced Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

U.S. Equity Funds

For Janus Henderson Adaptive Risk Managed U.S. Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or were taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

For Janus Henderson Contrarian Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

For Janus Henderson Enterprise Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

For Janus Henderson Forty Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

For Janus Henderson Growth and Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

For Janus Henderson 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, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
• For Janus Henderson Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

• For Janus Henderson 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, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

• For Janus Henderson Small-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, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend is improving.

• For Janus Henderson Triton Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

• For Janus Henderson Venture Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.

In consideration of each Janus Henderson 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, as applicable, the Janus Henderson Fund’s performance warranted continuation of such Janus Henderson Fund’s investment advisory agreement.

Costs of Services Provided
The Trustees examined information regarding the fees and expenses of each Janus Henderson 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. The independent fee consultant provided its belief that the management fees charged by the Adviser to each of the Janus Henderson Funds under the current investment advisory and administration agreements are reasonable in relation to the services provided by the Adviser. The independent fee consultant found: (1) the total expenses and management fees of the Janus Henderson Funds to be reasonable relative to other comparable mutual funds; (2) the total expenses, on average, were 6% under the average total expenses of the respective Broadridge peer group; and (3) the management fees for the Janus Henderson Funds, on average, were 5% under the average management fees for the respective Broadridge peer group. The Trustees also considered the total expenses for each share class of each Janus Henderson Fund compared to the average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Group and to average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Universe.

For Janus Henderson Funds with three or more years of performance history, the independent fee consultant also performed a systematic “focus list” analysis of expenses which assessed fund fees in the context of fund performance being delivered. Based on this analysis, the independent fee consultant found that the combination of service quality/performance and expenses on these individual Janus Henderson Funds was reasonable in light of performance trends, performance histories, changes in portfolio management, relative average net asset levels, and the existence of performance fees, breakpoints, and/or expense waivers on such Janus Henderson Funds.

The Trustees considered the methodology used by the Adviser 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 the Adviser to comparable separate account clients and to comparable non-affiliated funds subadvised by the Adviser (for which the Adviser 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 Janus Henderson Funds having a similar strategy, the Trustees considered that the Adviser noted that, under the terms of the management agreements with the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser performs significant additional services for the Janus Henderson Funds that it does not provide to those other clients, including administration services, oversight of the Janus Henderson Funds’ other service providers, Trustee support, regulatory compliance and numerous other services, and that, in serving the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser assumes many legal risks and other costs that it does not assume in servicing its other clients. Moreover, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found that: (1) the management fees the Adviser charges to the Janus Henderson Funds are reasonable in relation to the management fees the Adviser charges to funds subadvised by the Adviser and to the fees the Adviser charges to its institutional separate account clients; (2) these subadvised and institutional separate accounts have different service and infrastructure needs and operate in markets very different from the retail fund market; (3) Janus Henderson mutual fund investors enjoy reasonable fees relative to the fees charged in these other markets; and (4) as part of its 2022 review, 9 of 11 Janus Henderson Funds have lower management fees than similar funds subadvised by the Adviser. The Trustees noted that for the two Janus Henderson Funds that did not, management fees for each were under the average of its 15(c) peer group.

The Trustees considered the fees for each Janus Henderson Fund for its fiscal year ended in 2021 and noted the following with regard to each Janus Henderson Fund’s total expenses, net of applicable fee waivers (the Fund’s “total expenses”) as reflected in the comparative information provided by Broadridge:

**Asset Allocation Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Conservative, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Growth, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Moderate, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

**Fixed-Income Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Absolute Return Income Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Developed World Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.
- For Janus Henderson Global Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson High-Yield Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Multi-Sector Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
For Janus Henderson Short Duration Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

**Global and International Equity Funds**

For Janus Henderson Asia Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

For Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

For Janus Henderson European Focus Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

For Janus Henderson Global Equity Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

For Janus Henderson Global Life Sciences Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

For Janus Henderson Global Real Estate Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

For Janus Henderson Global Research Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

For Janus Henderson Global Select Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

For Janus Henderson Global Sustainable Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

For Janus Henderson International Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

For Janus Henderson Overseas Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

For Janus Henderson Responsible International Dividend Fund (formerly the Janus Henderson Dividend & Income Builder Fund), the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

**Money Market Funds**

For Janus Henderson Government Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

For Janus Henderson Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

**Multi-Asset Funds**
• For Janus Henderson Adaptive Global Allocation Fund, the Trustees noted that, that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

• For Janus Henderson Balanced Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

U.S. Equity Funds

• For Janus Henderson Adaptive Risk Managed U.S. Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

• For Janus Henderson Contrarian Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for all share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson Enterprise Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

• For Janus Henderson Forty Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

• For Janus Henderson Growth and Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

• For Janus Henderson Mid Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

• For Janus Henderson Research Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson Small Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

• For Janus Henderson Small-Mid Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

• For Janus Henderson Triton Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

• For Janus Henderson Venture Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses, although this limit did not apply because the Fund’s total expenses as shown were below the applicable fee limit.

The Trustees reviewed information on the overall profitability to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds, and considered profitability data of other publicly traded mutual fund advisers. The Trustees recognized that profitability comparisons among fund managers are difficult because of the variation in the type of comparative information that is publicly available, and the profitability of any fund manager is affected by numerous factors, including the organizational structure of the particular fund manager, differences in complex size, difference in product mix, difference in types of business (mutual fund, institutional and other), differences in 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.
Additionally, the Trustees considered the estimated profitability to the Adviser from the investment management services it provided to each Janus Henderson Fund. In their review, the Trustees considered whether the Adviser receive adequate incentives and resources to manage the Janus Henderson Funds effectively. In reviewing profitability, the Trustees noted that the estimated profitability for an individual Janus Henderson Fund is necessarily a product of the allocation methodology utilized by the Adviser to allocate its expenses as part of the estimated profitability calculation. In this regard, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found as part of its 2022 review that (1) the expense allocation methodology and rationales utilized by the Adviser were reasonable and (2) no clear correlation exists between expense allocations and operating margins. The Trustees also considered that the estimated profitability with respect to each Janus Henderson Fund was not unreasonable in relation to the services provided, and that the variation in the range of such estimated profitability among the Janus Henderson Funds was not a material factor in the Board’s approval of the reasonableness of any Janus Henderson Fund’s investment management fees.

The Trustees concluded that the management fees payable by each Janus Henderson Fund to the Adviser 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 the Adviser charges to other clients, and, as applicable, the impact of fund performance on management fees payable by the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also concluded that each Janus Henderson Fund’s total expenses were reasonable, taking into account the size of the Janus Henderson Fund, the quality of services provided by the Adviser, the investment performance of the Janus Henderson Fund, and any expense limitations agreed to or provided by the Adviser.

**Economies of Scale**

The Trustees considered information about the potential for the Adviser to realize economies of scale as the assets of the Janus Henderson Funds increase. They noted that their independent fee consultant published a report to the Trustees in June 2022 which provided its research and analysis into economies of scale. They also noted that, although many Janus Henderson Funds pay advisory fees at a fixed base rate as a percentage of net assets, without any breakpoints or performance fees, their independent fee consultant concluded that 75% of these Janus Henderson Funds’ have contractual management fees (gross of waivers) below their Broadridge Expense Group averages. The Trustees also noted the following from the independent fee consultant’s report: (1) that 31% of Janus Henderson Funds had management fee breakpoints in place whereby investors pay lower management fees as fund AUM increases; (2) that 29% of Janus Henderson Funds have low flat-rate fees and performance fees where the Adviser is incentivized to invest in resources which drive Janus Henderson Fund performance; and (3) that 39% of Janus Henderson Funds have low flat-rate fees versus peers where investors pay low fixed fees when the Janus Henderson Fund is small/midsized and higher fees when the Janus Henderson Fund grows in assets. The Trustees also noted that the Janus Henderson Funds share directly in economies of scale through the significant investments made by the Adviser and its affiliates related to services provided to the Funds and the lower charges of third-party service providers that are based in part on the combined scale of all of the Janus Henderson Funds.

The Trustees also considered the independent fee consultant’s conclusion that, given the limitations of various analytical approaches to economies of scale and their conflicting results, it is difficult to analytically confirm or deny the existence of economies of scale in the Janus Henderson complex. In this regard, the independent consultant concluded that (1) to the extent there were economies of scale at the Adviser, the Adviser’s general strategy of setting fixed management fees below peers appeared to share any such economies with investors even on smaller Janus Henderson Funds which have not yet achieved those economies and (2) by setting lower fixed fees from the start on these Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser appeared to be investing to increase the likelihood that these Janus Henderson Funds will grow to a level to achieve any economies of scale that may exist. Further, the independent fee consultant provided its belief that Janus Henderson Fund investors are well-served by the fee levels and performance fee structures in place on the Janus Henderson Funds in light of any economies of scale that may be present at the Adviser.

Based on all of the information reviewed, including the recent and past research and analysis conducted by the Trustees’ independent fee consultant, the Trustees concluded that the current fee structure of each Janus Henderson
Fund was reasonable and that the current rates of fees do reflect a sharing between the Adviser and the Janus Henderson Fund of any economies of scale that may be present at the current asset level of the Janus Henderson Fund.

Other Benefits to the Adviser

The Trustees also considered benefits that accrue to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds. They recognized that two affiliates of the Adviser separately serve the Janus Henderson Funds as transfer agent and distributor, respectively, and the transfer agent receives compensation directly from the non-money market Janus Henderson Funds for services provided, and that such compensation contributes to the overall profitability of the Adviser and its affiliates that results from their relationship with the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered the Adviser’s past and proposed use of commissions paid by the Janus Henderson Funds on portfolio brokerage transactions to obtain proprietary and third-party research products and services benefiting the Janus Henderson Fund and/or other clients of the Adviser and/or the Adviser. The Trustees concluded that the Adviser’s 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 Janus Henderson Fund. The Trustees also concluded that, other than the services provided by the Adviser and its affiliates pursuant to the agreements and the fees to be paid by each Janus Henderson Fund therefor, the Janus Henderson Funds and the Adviser may potentially benefit from their relationship with each other in other ways. They concluded that the Adviser and its affiliates 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 the Janus Henderson Funds and other clients serviced by the Adviser and its affiliates. They also concluded that the Adviser benefits from the receipt of research products and services acquired through commissions paid on portfolio transactions of the Janus Henderson Funds and that the Janus Henderson Funds benefit from the Adviser’s receipt of those products and services as well as research products and services acquired through commissions paid by other clients of the Adviser. They further concluded that the success of any Janus Henderson Fund could attract other business to the Adviser or other Janus Henderson Funds, and that the success of the Adviser could enhance the Adviser’s ability to serve the Janus Henderson Funds.
The Trustees of Janus Aspen Series, each of whom serves as an “independent” Trustee (the “Trustees”), oversee the management of each portfolio of Janus Aspen Series (each, a “VIT Portfolio,” and collectively, the “VIT Portfolios”), as well as each fund of Janus Investment Fund (each, a “Fund,” and collectively, the “Funds”) and together with the VIT Portfolios, the “Janus Henderson Funds,” and each, a “Janus Henderson Fund”). As required by law, the Trustees determine annually whether to continue the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund.

In connection with their most recent consideration of those agreements for each Janus Henderson Fund, the Trustees received and reviewed information provided by Janus Henderson Investors US LLC (the “Adviser”) 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 meetings held on November 9-10, 2022 and December 13-14, 2022, the Trustees evaluated the information provided by the Adviser and the independent fee consultant, as well as other information provided by the Adviser and the independent fee consultant during the year. Following such evaluation, the Trustees determined that the overall arrangements between each Janus Henderson Fund and the Adviser were fair and reasonable in light of the nature, extent, and quality of the services provided by the Adviser and its affiliates, the fees charged for those services, and other matters that the Trustees considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment, and unanimously approved the continuation of the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund for the period from February 1, 2023 through February 1, 2024, subject to earlier termination as provided for in each agreement.

At meetings held on November 9-10, 2022 and December 13-14, 2022, the Trustees evaluated the information provided by the Adviser and the independent fee consultant, as well as other information provided by the Adviser and the independent fee consultant during the year. Following such evaluation, the Trustees determined that the overall arrangements between each Janus Henderson Fund and the Adviser were fair and reasonable in light of the nature, extent, and quality of the services provided by the Adviser and its affiliates, the fees charged for those services, and other matters that the Trustees considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment, and unanimously approved the continuation of the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund for the period from February 1, 2023 through February 1, 2024, 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, for the purpose of peer comparisons any administration fees (excluding out of pocket costs), net of any waivers, paid by a fund as a percentage of average net assets.

Nature, Extent and Quality of Services
The Trustees reviewed the nature, extent, and quality of the services provided by the Adviser to the Janus Henderson Funds, taking into account the investment objective, strategies, and policies of each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds. In addition, the Trustees reviewed the resources and key personnel of the Adviser, particularly noting those employees who provide investment and risk management services to the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered other services provided to the Janus Henderson Funds by the Adviser, such as managing the execution of portfolio transactions and the selection of broker-dealers for those transactions. The Trustees considered the Adviser’s role as administrator to the Janus Henderson Funds, noting that the Adviser generally does not receive a fee for its services as administrator, but is reimbursed for its out-of-pocket costs. The Trustees considered the role of the Adviser in monitoring adherence to the Janus Henderson Funds’ investment restrictions, providing support services for the Trustees and Trustee committees, and overseeing communications with Janus Henderson Fund shareholders and the activities of other service providers, including monitoring compliance with various policies and procedures of the Janus Henderson Funds and with applicable securities laws and regulations.

In this regard, the independent fee consultant noted that the Adviser provides a number of different services for the Janus Henderson Funds and their shareholders, ranging from investment management services to various other servicing functions, and that, in its view, the Adviser is a capable provider of those services. The independent fee consultant also provided its belief that the Adviser 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 the Adviser to each Janus Henderson Fund were appropriate and consistent with the terms of the respective advisory agreements, and that, taking into account steps taken to address those Janus Henderson Funds whose performance lagged that of their peers for certain periods, the Janus Henderson Funds were likely to benefit from the continued provision of those services. They also concluded that the Adviser had sufficient personnel, with the appropriate education and experience, to serve the Janus Henderson Funds effectively and had demonstrated its ability to attract well-qualified personnel.

Performance of the Funds
The Trustees considered the performance results of each Janus Henderson Fund over various time periods. They noted that they considered Janus Henderson Fund performance data throughout the year, including periodic meetings with each Janus Henderson Fund’s portfolio manager(s), and also reviewed information comparing each Janus Henderson Fund’s performance with the performance of comparable fund peer groups identified by Broadridge Financial Solutions, Inc. (“Broadridge”), an independent data provider, and with the Janus Henderson Fund’s benchmark index. In this regard, the independent fee consultant found that the overall Janus Henderson Funds’ performance has been reasonable, noting that: (i) for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022, approximately 38% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of their Broadridge peer groups; (ii) for the 36 months ended September 30, 2022, approximately 45% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance as reported by Morningstar, and (iii) for the 12 months ended September 30, 2022, approximately 55% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance as reported by Morningstar.

The Trustees considered the performance of each Janus Henderson Fund, noting that performance may vary by share class, and noted the following with respect to the VIT Portfolios:

- For Janus Henderson Adaptive Risk Managed U.S. Equity Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the VIT Portfolio’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
- For Janus Henderson Balanced Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
- For Janus Henderson Enterprise Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the VIT Portfolio’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
- For Janus Henderson Forty Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
- For Janus Henderson Global Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
- For Janus Henderson Global Sustainable Equity Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the evaluated performance period ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted that 36 month-end performance was not yet available.
- For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
- For Janus Henderson Mid Cap Value Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022. The Trustees noted the reasons for the VIT Portfolio’s underperformance, while also noting that the VIT Portfolio has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the
performance trend was improving.

- For Janus Henderson Overseas Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.
- For Janus Henderson Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2022 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2022.

In consideration of each Janus Henderson 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, as applicable, the Janus Henderson Fund’s performance warranted continuation of such Janus Henderson Fund’s investment advisory agreement.

Costs of Services Provided
The Trustees examined information regarding the fees and expenses of each Janus Henderson 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. The independent fee consultant provided its belief that the management fees charged by the Adviser to each of the Janus Henderson Funds under the current investment advisory and administration agreements are reasonable in relation to the services provided by the Adviser. The independent fee consultant found: (1) the total expenses and management fees of the Janus Henderson Funds to be reasonable relative to other comparable mutual funds; (2) the total expenses, on average, were 6% under the average total expenses of the respective Broadridge peer group; and (3) the management fees for the Janus Henderson Funds, on average, were 5% under the average management fees for the respective Broadridge peer group. The Trustees also considered the total expenses for each share class of each Janus Henderson Fund compared to the average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Group and to average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Universe.

For Janus Henderson Funds with three or more years of performance history, the independent fee consultant also performed a systematic “focus list” analysis of expenses which assessed fund fees in the context of fund performance being delivered. Based on this analysis, the independent fee consultant found that the combination of service quality/performance and expenses on these individual Janus Henderson Funds was reasonable in light of performance trends, performance histories, changes in portfolio management, relative average net asset levels, and the existence of performance fees, breakpoints, and/or expense waivers on such Janus Henderson Funds.

The Trustees considered the methodology used by the Adviser 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 the Adviser to comparable separate account clients and to comparable non-affiliated funds subadvised by the Adviser (for which the Adviser 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 Janus Henderson Funds having a similar strategy, the Trustees considered that the Adviser noted that, under the terms of the management agreements with the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser performs significant additional services for the Janus Henderson Funds that it does not provide to those other clients, including administration services, oversight of the Janus Henderson Funds’ other service providers, Trustee support, regulatory compliance and numerous other services, and that, in serving the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser assumes many legal risks and other costs that it does not assume in servicing its other clients. Moreover, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found that: (1) the management fees the Adviser charges to the Janus Henderson Funds are reasonable in relation to the management fees the Adviser charges to funds subadvised by the Adviser and to the fees the Adviser charges to its institutional separate account clients; (2) these subadvised and institutional separate accounts have different service and infrastructure needs and operate in markets very different from the retail fund market; (3) Janus Henderson mutual fund investors enjoy reasonable fees relative to the fees charged in these other markets; and (4) as part of its 2022 review, 9 of 11 Janus Henderson Funds have lower management fees than similar funds subadvised by the Adviser. The Trustees noted that for the two Janus Henderson Funds that did not, management fees for each were under the average of its 15(c) peer group.
The Trustees considered the fees for each Janus Henderson Fund for its fiscal year ended in 2021 (except for Janus Henderson Global Sustainable Equity Portfolio for which the period end was March 31, 2022) and noted the following with regard to each Janus Henderson Fund’s total expenses, net of applicable fee waivers (the VIT Portfolio’s “total expenses”) as reflected in the comparative information provided by Broadridge:

- For Janus Henderson Adaptive Risk Management U.S. Equity Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were below the peer group average for its sole share class.
- For Janus Henderson Balanced Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Enterprise Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for one share class, overall the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the VIT Portfolio’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Forty Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Global Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Global Sustainable Equity Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were below the peer group average for both share classes.
- For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were below the peer group average for both share classes.
- For Janus Henderson Mid Cap Value Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were below the peer group average for both share classes.
- For Janus Henderson Overseas Portfolio, the Trustees noted that although the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the VIT Portfolio’s total expenses were below the peer group average for both share classes.

The Trustees reviewed information on the overall profitability to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds, and considered profitability data of other publicly traded mutual fund advisers. The Trustees recognized that profitability comparisons among fund managers are difficult because of the variation in the type of comparative information that is publicly available, and the profitability of any fund manager is affected by numerous factors, including the organizational structure of the particular fund manager, differences in complex size, difference in product mix, difference in types of business (mutual fund, institutional and other), differences in 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.

Additionally, the Trustees considered the estimated profitability to the Adviser from the investment management services it provided to each Janus Henderson Fund. In their review, the Trustees considered whether the Adviser receive adequate incentives and resources to manage the Janus Henderson Funds effectively. In reviewing profitability, the Trustees noted that the estimated profitability for an individual Janus Henderson Fund is necessarily a product of the allocation methodology utilized by the Adviser to allocate its expenses as part of the estimated profitability calculation. In this regard, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found as part of its 2022 review that (1) the expense allocation methodology and rationales utilized by the Adviser were reasonable and (2) no clear correlation exists between expense allocations and operating margins. The Trustees also considered that the estimated profitability for an individual Janus Henderson Fund was influenced by a number of factors, including not only the allocation methodology selected, but also the presence of fee waivers and expense caps, and whether the Janus Henderson Fund’s investment management agreement contained breakpoints or a performance fee component. The Trustees determined, after taking into account these factors, among others, that the Adviser’s estimated profitability with respect to each Janus Henderson Fund was not unreasonable in relation to the services provided, and that the variation in the range of such estimated profitability among the Janus Henderson Funds was not a material factor in the Board’s approval of the reasonableness of any Janus Henderson Fund’s investment management fees.
The Trustees concluded that the management fees payable by each Janus Henderson Fund to the Adviser 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 the Adviser charges to other clients, and, as applicable, the impact of fund performance on management fees payable by the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also concluded that each Janus Henderson Fund’s total expenses were reasonable, taking into account the size of the Janus Henderson Fund, the quality of services provided by the Adviser, the investment performance of the Janus Henderson Fund, and any expense limitations agreed to or provided by the Adviser.

**Economies of Scale**

The Trustees considered information about the potential for the Adviser to realize economies of scale as the assets of the Janus Henderson Funds increase. They noted that their independent fee consultant published a report to the Trustees in June 2022 which provided its research and analysis into economies of scale. They also noted that, although many Janus Henderson Funds pay advisory fees at a fixed base rate as a percentage of net assets, without any breakpoints or performance fees, their independent fee consultant concluded that 75% of these Janus Henderson Funds’ have contractual management fees (gross of waivers) below their Broadridge Expense Group averages. The Trustees also noted the following from the independent fee consultant’s report: (1) that 31% of Janus Henderson Funds had management fee breakpoints in place whereby investors pay lower management fees as fund AUM increases; (2) that 29% of Janus Henderson Funds have low flat-rate fees and performance fees where the Adviser is incentivized to invest in resources which drive Janus Henderson Fund performance; and (3) that 39% of Janus Henderson Funds have low flat-rate fees versus peers where investors pay low fixed fees when the Janus Henderson Fund is small/midsized and higher fees when the Janus Henderson Fund grows in assets. The Trustees also noted that the Janus Henderson Funds share directly in economies of scale through the significant investments made by the Adviser and its affiliates related to services provided to the Funds and the lower charges of third-party service providers that are based in part on the combined scale of all of the Janus Henderson Funds.

The Trustees also considered the independent fee consultant’s conclusion that, given the limitations of various analytical approaches to economies of scale and their conflicting results, it is difficult to analytically confirm or deny the existence of economies of scale in the Janus Henderson complex. In this regard, the independent consultant concluded that (1) to the extent there were economies of scale at the Adviser, the Adviser’s general strategy of setting fixed management fees below peers appeared to share any such economies with investors even on smaller Janus Henderson Funds which have not yet achieved those economies and (2) by setting lower fixed fees from the start on these Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser appeared to be investing to increase the likelihood that these Janus Henderson Funds will grow to a level to achieve any economies of scale that may exist. Further, the independent fee consultant provided its belief that Janus Henderson Fund investors are well-served by the fee levels and performance fee structures in place on the Janus Henderson Funds in light of any economies of scale that may be present at the Adviser.

Based on all of the information reviewed, including the recent and past research and analysis conducted by the Trustees’ independent fee consultant, the Trustees concluded that the current fee structure of each Janus Henderson Fund was reasonable and that the current rates of fees do reflect a sharing between the Adviser and the Janus Henderson Fund of any economies of scale that may be present at the current asset level of the Janus Henderson Fund.

**Other Benefits to the Adviser**

The Trustees also considered benefits that accrue to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds. They recognized that two affiliates of the Adviser separately serve the Janus Henderson Funds as transfer agent and distributor, respectively, and the transfer agent receives compensation directly from the non-money market Janus Henderson Funds for services provided, and that such compensation contributes to the overall profitability of the Adviser and its affiliates that results from their relationship with the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered the Adviser’s past and proposed use of commissions paid by the Janus Henderson Funds on portfolio brokerage transactions to obtain proprietary and third-party research products and services benefiting the Janus Henderson Fund and/or other clients of the Adviser and/or the Adviser. The Trustees concluded that the Adviser’s 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 Janus Henderson Fund. The Trustees also concluded that, other than the services provided by the Adviser and its affiliates pursuant to the agreements and the fees to be paid by each Janus Henderson Fund therefor, the Janus Henderson Funds and the Adviser may potentially benefit from their relationship with each other in other ways. They concluded that
the Adviser and its affiliates 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 the Janus Henderson Funds and other clients serviced by the Adviser and its affiliates. They also concluded that the Adviser benefits from the receipt of research products and services acquired through commissions paid on portfolio transactions of the Janus Henderson Funds and that the Janus Henderson Funds benefit from the Adviser’s receipt of those products and services as well as research products and services acquired through commissions paid by other clients of the Adviser. They further concluded that the success of any Janus Henderson Fund could attract other business to the Adviser or other Janus Henderson Funds, and that the success of the Adviser could enhance the Adviser’s ability to serve the Janus Henderson Funds.
The Trustees of Janus Aspen Series, each of whom serves as an “independent” Trustee (the “Trustees”), oversee the management of each portfolio of Janus Aspen Series (each, a “VIT Portfolio,” and collectively, the “VIT Portfolios”), as well as each fund of Janus Investment Fund (each, a “Fund,” and collectively, the “Funds” and together with the VIT Portfolios, the “Janus Henderson Funds,” and each, a “Janus Henderson Fund”). As required by law, the Trustees determine annually whether to continue the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund and the subadvisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund that utilizes a subadviser.

In connection with their most recent consideration of those agreements for each Janus Henderson Fund, the Trustees received and reviewed information provided by Janus Henderson Investors US LLC (formerly, Janus Capital Management LLC) (the “Adviser”) and the subadviser 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 meetings held on November 3-4, 2021 and December 7-8, 2021, the Trustees evaluated the information provided by the Adviser, the subadviser, and the independent fee consultant, as well as other information addressed during the year. Following such evaluation, the Trustees determined that the overall arrangements between each Janus Henderson Fund and the Adviser and each subadviser, as applicable, were fair and reasonable in light of the nature, extent and quality of the services provided by the Adviser, its affiliates and the subadviser, the fees charged for those services, and other matters that the Trustees considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment and unanimously approved the continuation of the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund and the subadvisory agreement for each subadvised Janus Henderson Fund, for the period from February 1, 2022 through February 1, 2023, 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, for the purpose of peer comparisons any administration fees (excluding out of pocket costs), net of any waivers, paid by a fund as a percentage of average net assets.

**Nature, Extent and Quality of Services**

The Trustees reviewed the nature, extent and quality of the services provided by the Adviser and the subadviser to the Janus Henderson Funds, taking into account the investment objective, strategies and policies of each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds. In addition, the Trustees reviewed the resources and key personnel of the Adviser and the subadviser, particularly noting those employees who provide investment and risk management services to the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered other services provided to the Janus Henderson Funds by the Adviser or the subadviser, such as managing the execution of portfolio transactions and the selection of broker-dealers for those transactions. The Trustees considered the Adviser’s role as administrator to the Janus Henderson Funds, noting that the Adviser generally does not receive a fee for its services as administrator, but is reimbursed for its out-of-pocket costs. The Trustees considered the role of the Adviser in monitoring adherence to the Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds and with applicable securities laws and regulations.

In this regard, the independent fee consultant noted that the Adviser provides a number of different services for the
Janus Henderson Funds and fund shareholders, ranging from investment management services to various other servicing functions, and that, in its view, the Adviser is a capable provider of those services. The independent fee consultant also provided its belief that the Adviser 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 the Adviser and the subadviser to each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds whose performance lagged that of their peers for certain periods, the Janus Henderson Funds were likely to benefit from the continued provision of those services. They also concluded that the Adviser and the subadviser had sufficient personnel, with the appropriate education and experience, to serve the Janus Henderson Funds effectively and each had demonstrated its ability to attract well-qualified personnel.

**Performance of the Funds**

The Trustees considered the performance results of each Janus Henderson Fund over various time periods. They noted that they considered Janus Henderson Fund performance data throughout the year, including periodic meetings with each Janus Henderson Fund’s portfolio manager(s), and also reviewed information comparing each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Fund’s benchmark index. In this regard, the independent fee consultant found that the overall Janus Henderson Funds’ performance has been reasonable: for the 36 months ended September 30, 2021, approximately 55% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance versus Broadridge peers, and for the 12 months ended September 30, 2021, approximately 45% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance versus Broadridge peers.

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

**Asset Allocation Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Conservative, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Growth, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance, and that the performance trend was improving.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Moderate, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance and that the performance trend was improving.

**Fixed-Income Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Absolute Return Income Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Developed World Bond Fund, the Trustees noted the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Global Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson High-Yield Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson Multi-Sector Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson Short Duration Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.

Global and International Equity Funds
• For Janus Henderson Asia Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson European Focus Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson Global Equity Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
• For Janus Henderson 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, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson 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, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson Global Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
• For Janus Henderson Global Select Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
• For Janus Henderson International Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
• For Janus Henderson Overseas Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.

Money Market Funds
• For Janus Henderson 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, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
• For Janus Henderson Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third
Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

**Multi-Asset Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Adaptive Global Allocation Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Dividend & Income Builder Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

**Multi-Asset U.S. Equity Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Balanced Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Contrarian Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Enterprise Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Forty Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Growth and Income Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Enterprise Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Triton Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Venture Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

**Quantitative Equity Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser and subadviser had taken or were taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Global Income Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson 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, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser and subadviser had taken or were taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson U.S. Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, the steps the Adviser and subadviser had taken or were taking to improve performance.

**U.S. Equity Funds**

- For Janus Henderson 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, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson 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, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson Small-Mid Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

In consideration of each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Fund’s performance warranted continuation of such Janus Henderson Fund’s investment advisory and subadvisory agreement(s).

**Costs of Services Provided**

The Trustees examined information regarding the fees and expenses of each Janus Henderson 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 fees (investment advisory fees and any administration fees but excluding out-of-pocket costs) for many of the Janus Henderson Funds, after applicable waivers, was below the average 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 the Adviser out of its management fees collected from such Janus Henderson Fund.

The independent fee consultant provided its belief that the management fees charged by the Adviser to each of the Janus Henderson Funds under the current investment advisory and administration agreements are reasonable in relation to the services provided by the Adviser. The independent fee consultant found: (1) the total expenses and management fees of the Janus Henderson Funds to be reasonable relative to other comparable mutual funds; (2) the total expenses, on average, were 8% under the average total expenses of the respective Broadridge Expense Group peers; and (3) and the management fees for the Janus Henderson Funds, on average, were 6% under the average management fees for the respective Broadridge Expense Group. The Trustees also considered the total expenses for each share class of each Janus Henderson Fund compared to the average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Group and to average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Universe.

For certain Janus Henderson Funds, the independent fee consultant also performed a systematic “focus list” analysis of expenses which assessed fund fees in the context of fund performance being delivered. Based on this analysis, the independent fee consultant found that the combination of service quality/performance and expenses on these individual Janus Henderson Funds was reasonable in light of performance trends, performance histories, and existence of performance fees, breakpoints, and/or expense waivers on such Janus Henderson Funds.
The Trustees considered the methodology used by the Adviser and 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 the Adviser and subadviser to comparable separate account clients and to comparable non-affiliated funds subadvised by the Adviser or subadviser (for which the Adviser 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 Janus Henderson Funds having a similar strategy, the Trustees considered that the Adviser noted that, under the terms of the management agreements with the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser performs significant additional services for the Janus Henderson Funds that it does not provide to those other clients, including administration services, oversight of the Janus Henderson Funds’ other service providers, trustee support, regulatory compliance and numerous other services, and that, in serving the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser assumes many legal risks and other costs that it does not assume in servicing its other clients. Moreover, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found that: (1) the management fees the Adviser charges to the Janus Henderson Funds are reasonable in relation to the management fees the Adviser charges to funds subadvised by the Adviser; (2) these subadvised and institutional separate accounts have different service and infrastructure needs and operate in markets very distinct relative to retail funds; (3) Janus Henderson mutual fund investors enjoy reasonable fees relative to the fees charged to Janus Henderson subadvised fund and separate account investors; and (4) as part of its 2020 review, 9 of 10 Janus Henderson Funds have lower management fees than similar funds subadvised by the Adviser.

The Trustees considered the fees for each Janus Henderson Fund for its fiscal year ended in 2020, including the VIT Portfolios, and noted the following with regard to each VIT Portfolio’s total expenses, net of applicable fee waivers (the VIT Portfolio’s “total expenses”):

**Asset Allocation Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Conservative, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Growth, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Global Allocation Fund – Moderate, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

**Fixed-Income Funds**
- For Janus Henderson Absolute Return Income Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Developed World Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Global Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson High-Yield Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
• For Janus Henderson Multi-Sector Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson Short Duration Flexible Bond Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

Global and International Equity Funds

• For Janus Henderson Asia Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson European Focus Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson Global Equity Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Global Life Sciences Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for all share classes.

• For Janus Henderson Global Real Estate Fund, the Trustees noted, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Global Research Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for all share classes.

• For Janus Henderson Global Select Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson Global Sustainable Equity Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for all share classes.

• For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for all share classes.

• For Janus Henderson International Opportunities Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

• For Janus Henderson Overseas Fund, the Trustees noted that although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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.

Money Market Funds

• For Janus Henderson Government Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for both share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has voluntarily agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses to assist the Fund in attempting to maintain a yield of at least 0.00%.

• For Janus Henderson Money Market Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for both share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses to assist the Fund in attempting to maintain a yield of at least 0.00%.

Multi-Asset Funds
• For Janus Henderson Adaptive Global Allocation Fund, the Trustees noted that, that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.
• For Janus Henderson Dividend & Income Builder Fund, the Trustees noted that, that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for all share classes.

*Multi-Asset U.S. Equity Funds*
• For Janus Henderson Balanced Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Contrarian Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
• For Janus Henderson Enterprise Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Forty Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Growth and Income Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Research Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Triton Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for all share classes.
• For Janus Henderson Venture Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for all share classes.

*Quantitative Equity Funds*
• For Janus Henderson Emerging Markets Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
• For Janus Henderson Global Income Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for all share classes.
• For Janus Henderson International Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
• For Janus Henderson U.S. Managed Volatility Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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.

*U.S. Equity Funds*
• For Janus Henderson Mid Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Small Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees
also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Small-Mid Cap Value Fund, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for certain share classes, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.

The Trustees reviewed information on the overall profitability to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds, and considered profitability data of other publicly traded mutual fund advisers. The Trustees recognized that profitability comparisons among fund managers are difficult because of the variation in the type of comparative information that is publicly available, and the profitability of any fund manager is affected by numerous factors, including the organizational structure of the particular fund manager, differences in complex size, difference in product mix, difference in types of business (mutual fund, institutional and other), differences in 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.

Additionally, the Trustees considered the estimated profitability to the Adviser from the investment management services it provided to each Janus Henderson Fund. In their review, the Trustees considered whether the Adviser and subadviser receive adequate incentives and resources to manage the Janus Henderson Funds effectively. In reviewing profitability, the Trustees noted that the estimated profitability for an individual Janus Henderson Fund is necessarily a product of the allocation methodology utilized by the Adviser to allocate its expenses as part of the estimated profitability calculation. In this regard, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found that (1) the expense allocation methodology and rationales utilized by the Adviser were reasonable and (2) no clear correlation exists between expense allocations and operating margins. The Trustees also considered that the estimated profitability for an individual Janus Henderson Fund was influenced by a number of factors, including not only the allocation methodology selected, but also the presence of fee waivers and expense caps, and whether the Janus Henderson Fund’s investment management agreement contained breakpoints or a performance fee component. The Trustees determined, after taking into account these factors, among others, that the Adviser’s estimated profitability with respect to each Janus Henderson Fund was not unreasonable in relation to the services provided, and that the variation in the range of such estimated profitability among the Janus Henderson Funds was not a material factor in the Board’s approval of the reasonableness of any Janus Henderson Fund’s investment management fees.

The Trustees concluded that the management fees payable by each Janus Henderson Fund to the Adviser and its affiliates, as well as the fees paid by the Adviser to the subadviser of subadvised Janus Henderson 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 the Adviser and the subadviser charge to other clients, and, as applicable, the impact of fund performance on management fees payable by the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also concluded that each Janus Henderson Fund’s total expenses were reasonable, taking into account the size of the Janus Henderson Fund, the quality of services provided by the Adviser and subadviser, the investment performance of the Janus Henderson Fund, and any expense limitations agreed to or provided by the Adviser.

Economies of Scale
The Trustees considered information about the potential for the Adviser to realize economies of scale as the assets of the Janus Henderson Funds increase. They noted that their independent fee consultant published a report to the Trustees in November 2019 which provided its research and analysis into economies of scale. They also noted that, although many Janus Henderson Funds pay advisory fees at a fixed base rate as a percentage of net assets, without any breakpoints or performance fees, their independent fee consultant concluded that 75% of these Janus Henderson Funds’ have contractual management fees (gross of waivers) below their Broadridge Expense Group averages. The Trustees also noted the following: (1) that for those Janus Henderson Funds whose expenses are being reduced by the contractual expense limitations of the Adviser, the Adviser is subsidizing certain of these Janus Henderson Funds because they have not reached adequate scale; (2) performance fee structures have been implemented for various Janus Henderson Funds that have caused the effective rate of advisory fees payable by such Janus Henderson Fund to vary depending on the investment performance of the Janus Henderson Fund relative to its benchmark index over the measurement period; and (3) a few Janus Henderson Funds have fee schedules with breakpoints and reduced fee rates above certain asset levels. The Trustees also noted that the Janus Henderson Funds share directly in economies of scale through the significant investments made by the Adviser and its affiliates related to services provided to the
Funds and the lower charges of third-party service providers that are based in part on the combined scale of all of the Janus Henderson Funds.

The Trustees also considered the independent fee consultant’s conclusion that, given the limitations of various analytical approaches to economies of scale and their conflicting results, it is difficult to analytically confirm or deny the existence of economies of scale in the Janus Henderson complex. In this regard, the independent consultant concluded that (1) to the extent there were economies of scale at the Adviser, the Adviser’s general strategy of setting fixed management fees below peers appeared to share any such economies with investors even on smaller Janus Henderson Funds which have not yet achieved those economies and (2) by setting lower fixed fees from the start on these Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser appeared to be investing to increase the likelihood that these Janus Henderson Funds will grow to a level to achieve any economies of scale that may exist. Further, the independent fee consultant provided its belief that Janus Henderson Fund investors are well-served by the fee levels and performance fee structures in place on the Janus Henderson Funds in light of any economies of scale that may be present at the Adviser.

Based on all of the information reviewed, including the recent and past research and analysis conducted by the Trustees’ independent fee consultant, the Trustees concluded that the current fee structure of each Janus Henderson Fund was reasonable and that the current rates of fees do reflect a sharing between the Adviser and the Janus Henderson Fund of any economies of scale that may be present at the current asset level of the Janus Henderson Fund.

Other Benefits to the Adviser
The Trustees also considered benefits that accrue to the Adviser and its affiliates and subadviser to the Janus Henderson Funds from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds. They recognized that two affiliates of the Adviser separately serve the Janus Henderson Funds as transfer agent and distributor, respectively, and the transfer agent receives compensation directly from the non-money market funds for services provided, and that such compensation contributes to the overall profitability of the Adviser and its affiliates that results from their relationship with the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered the Adviser’s past and proposed use of commissions paid by the Janus Henderson Funds on portfolio brokerage transactions to obtain proprietary and third-party research products and services benefitting the Janus Henderson Fund and/or other clients of the Adviser and/or the Adviser, and/or subadviser to a Janus Henderson Fund. The Trustees concluded that the Adviser’s and the subadviser’s 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 Janus Henderson Fund. The Trustees also concluded that, other than the services provided by the Adviser and its affiliates and subadviser pursuant to the agreements and the fees to be paid by each Janus Henderson Fund therefor, the Janus Henderson Funds and the Adviser and the subadviser may potentially benefit from their relationship with each other in other ways. They concluded that the Adviser and its affiliates 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 the Janus Henderson Funds and other clients serviced by the Adviser and its affiliates. They also concluded that the Adviser and the subadviser benefit from the receipt of research products and services acquired through commissions paid on portfolio transactions of the Janus Henderson Funds and that the Janus Henderson Funds benefit from the Adviser’s and/or the subadviser’s receipt of those products and services as well as research products and services acquired through commissions paid by other clients of the Adviser and/or other clients of the subadviser. They further concluded that the success of any Janus Henderson Fund could attract other business to the Adviser, the subadviser or other Janus Henderson funds, and that the success of the Adviser and the subadviser could enhance the Adviser’s and the subadviser’s ability to serve the Janus Henderson Funds.
The Trustees of Janus Aspen Series, each of whom serves as an “independent” Trustee (the “Trustees”), oversee the management of each portfolio of Janus Aspen Series (each, a “VIT Portfolio,” and collectively, the “VIT Portfolios”), as well as each fund of Janus Investment Fund (each, a “Fund,” and collectively, the “Funds” and together with the VIT Portfolios, the “Janus Henderson Funds,” and each, a “Janus Henderson Fund”). As required by law, the Trustees determine annually whether to continue the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund and the subadvisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund that utilizes a subadviser.

In connection with their most recent consideration of those agreements for each Janus Henderson Fund, the Trustees received and reviewed information provided by Janus Henderson Investors US LLC (formerly, Janus Capital Management LLC) (the “Adviser”) and the subadviser 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 meetings held on November 3-4, 2021 and December 7-8, 2021, the Trustees evaluated the information provided by the Adviser, the subadviser, and the independent fee consultant, as well as other information addressed during the year. Following such evaluation, the Trustees determined that the overall arrangements between each Janus Henderson Fund and the Adviser and each subadviser, as applicable, were fair and reasonable in light of the nature, extent and quality of the services provided by the Adviser, its affiliates and the subadviser, the fees charged for those services, and other matters that the Trustees considered relevant in the exercise of their business judgment and unanimously approved the continuation of the investment advisory agreement for each Janus Henderson Fund and the subadvisory agreement for each subadvised Janus Henderson Fund, for the period from February 1, 2022 through February 1, 2023, 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, for the purpose of peer comparisons any administration fees (excluding out of pocket costs), net of any waivers, paid by a fund as a percentage of average net assets.

Nature, Extent and Quality of Services

The Trustees reviewed the nature, extent and quality of the services provided by the Adviser and the subadviser to the Janus Henderson Funds, taking into account the investment objective, strategies and policies of each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds. In addition, the Trustees reviewed the resources and key personnel of the Adviser and the subadviser, particularly noting those employees who provide investment and risk management services to the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered other services provided to the Janus Henderson Funds by the Adviser or the subadviser, such as managing the execution of portfolio transactions and the selection of broker-dealers for those transactions. The Trustees considered the Adviser’s role as administrator to the Janus Henderson Funds, noting that the Adviser generally does not receive a fee for its services as administrator, but is reimbursed for its out-of-pocket costs. The Trustees considered the role of the Adviser in monitoring adherence to the Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds and with applicable securities laws and regulations.

In this regard, the independent fee consultant noted that the Adviser provides a number of different services for the Janus Henderson Funds and fund shareholders, ranging from investment management services to various other servicing functions, and that, in its view, the Adviser is a capable provider of those services. The independent fee consultant also provided its belief that the Adviser 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 the Adviser and the subadviser to each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Funds whose performance lagged that of their peers for certain periods, the Janus Henderson Funds were likely to benefit from the continued provision of those services. They also concluded that the Adviser and the subadviser had sufficient personnel, with the appropriate education and experience, to serve the Janus Henderson Funds effectively and each had demonstrated its ability to attract well-qualified personnel.

Performance of the Funds
The Trustees considered the performance results of each Janus Henderson Fund over various time periods. They noted that they considered Janus Henderson Fund performance data throughout the year, including periodic meetings with each Janus Henderson Fund’s portfolio manager(s), and also reviewed information comparing each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Fund’s benchmark index. In this regard, the independent fee consultant found that the overall Janus Henderson Funds’ performance has been reasonable: for the 36 months ended September 30, 2021, approximately 55% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance versus Broadridge peers, and for the 12 months ended September 30, 2021, approximately 45% of the Janus Henderson Funds were in the top two quartiles of performance versus Broadridge peers.

The Trustees considered the performance of each Janus Henderson Fund, noting that performance may vary by share class, and noted the following with respect to the VIT Portfolios:

- For Janus Henderson Balanced Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Enterprise Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Forty Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the first Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Global Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the second Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson 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, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.
- For Janus Henderson Overseas Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the second Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the first Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021.
- For Janus Henderson Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the third
Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the third Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance, while also noting that the Fund has a performance fee structure that results in lower management fees during periods of underperformance, and the steps the Adviser had taken or was taking to improve performance.

- For Janus Henderson U.S. Low Volatility Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s performance was in the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 36 months ended May 31, 2021 and the bottom Broadridge quartile for the 12 months ended May 31, 2021. The Trustees noted the reasons for the Fund’s underperformance and the steps the Adviser and subadviser had taken or were taking to improve performance.

In consideration of each Janus Henderson 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 Janus Henderson Fund’s performance warranted continuation of such Janus Henderson Fund’s investment advisory and subadvisory agreement(s).

**Costs of Services Provided**

The Trustees examined information regarding the fees and expenses of each Janus Henderson 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 fees (investment advisory fees and any administration fees but excluding out-of-pocket costs) for many of the Janus Henderson Funds, after applicable waivers, was below the average 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 the Adviser out of its management fees collected from such Janus Henderson Fund.

The independent fee consultant provided its belief that the management fees charged by the Adviser to each of the Janus Henderson Funds under the current investment advisory and administration agreements are reasonable in relation to the services provided by the Adviser. The independent fee consultant found: (1) the total expenses and management fees of the Janus Henderson Funds to be reasonable relative to other comparable mutual funds; (2) the total expenses, on average, were 8% under the average total expenses of the respective Broadridge Expense Group peers; and (3) and the management fees for the Janus Henderson Funds, on average, were 6% under the average management fees for the respective Broadridge Expense Group. The Trustees also considered the total expenses for each share class of each Janus Henderson Fund compared to the average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Group and to average total expenses for its Broadridge Expense Universe.

For certain Janus Henderson Funds, the independent fee consultant also performed a systematic “focus list” analysis of expenses which assessed fund fees in the context of fund performance being delivered. Based on this analysis, the independent fee consultant found that the combination of service quality/performance and expenses on these individual Janus Henderson Funds was reasonable in light of performance trends, performance histories, and existence of performance fees, breakpoints, and/or expense waivers on such Janus Henderson Funds.

The Trustees considered the methodology used by the Adviser and 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 the Adviser and subadviser to comparable separate account clients and to comparable non-affiliated funds subadvised by the Adviser or subadviser (for which the Adviser 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 Janus Henderson Funds having a similar strategy, the Trustees considered that the Adviser noted that, under the terms of the management agreements with the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser performs significant additional services for the Janus Henderson Funds that it does not provide to those other clients, including administration services, oversight of the Janus Henderson Funds’ other service providers, trustee support, regulatory compliance and numerous other services, and that, in serving the Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser assumes many legal risks and other costs that it does not assume in servicing its other clients. Moreover, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found that: (1) the management fees the Adviser charges to the Janus Henderson Funds are reasonable in relation to the management fees the Adviser charges to funds subadvised by the Adviser and to the fees the Adviser charges to its
institutional separate account clients; (2) these subadvised and institutional separate accounts have different service and infrastructure needs and operate in markets very distinct relative to retail funds; (3) Janus Henderson mutual fund investors enjoy reasonable fees relative to the fees charged to Janus Henderson subadvised fund and separate account investors; and (4) as part of its 2020 review, 9 of 10 Janus Henderson Funds have lower management fees than similar funds subadvised by the Adviser.

The Trustees considered the fees for each Janus Henderson Fund for its fiscal year ended in 2020, including the VIT Portfolios, and noted the following with regard to each VIT Portfolio’s total expenses, net of applicable fee waivers (the VIT Portfolio’s “total expenses”):

- For Janus Henderson Balanced Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Enterprise Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Flexible Bond Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser has contractually agreed to limit the Fund’s expenses.
- For Janus Henderson Forty Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Global Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Global Technology and Innovation Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for both share classes.
- For Janus Henderson Mid Cap Value Portfolio, the Trustees noted that, although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable. The Trustees also noted that the Adviser 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 Henderson Overseas Portfolio, the Trustees noted that although the Fund’s total expenses exceeded the peer group average for one share class, overall the Fund’s total expenses were reasonable.
- For Janus Henderson Research Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group average for both share classes.
- For Janus Henderson U.S. Low Volatility Portfolio, the Trustees noted that the Fund’s total expenses were below the peer group for its sole share class.

The Trustees reviewed information on the overall profitability to the Adviser and its affiliates from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds, and considered profitability data of other publicly traded mutual fund advisers. The Trustees recognized that profitability comparisons among fund managers are difficult because of the variation in the type of comparative information that is publicly available, and the profitability of any fund manager is affected by numerous factors, including the organizational structure of the particular fund manager, differences in complex size, difference in product mix, difference in types of business (mutual fund, institutional and other), differences in 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.

Additionally, the Trustees considered the estimated profitability to the Adviser from the investment management services it provided to each Janus Henderson Fund. In their review, the Trustees considered whether the Adviser and subadviser receive adequate incentives and resources to manage the Janus Henderson Funds effectively. In reviewing profitability, the Trustees noted that the estimated profitability for an individual Janus Henderson Fund is necessarily a product of the allocation methodology utilized by the Adviser to allocate its expenses as part of the estimated profitability calculation. In this regard, the Trustees noted that the independent fee consultant found that (1) the expense allocation methodology and rationales utilized by the Adviser were reasonable and (2) no clear correlation exists between expense allocations and operating margins. The Trustees also considered that the estimated profitability for an individual Janus Henderson Fund was influenced by a number of factors, including not only the allocation methodology selected, but also the presence of fee waivers and expense caps, and whether the Janus Henderson Fund’s investment management agreement contained breakpoints or a performance fee component. The Trustees determined, after taking into account these factors, among others, that the Adviser’s estimated profitability
with respect to each Janus Henderson Fund was not unreasonable in relation to the services provided, and that the variation in the range of such estimated profitability among the Janus Henderson Funds was not a material factor in the Board’s approval of the reasonableness of any Janus Henderson Fund’s investment management fees.

The Trustees concluded that the management fees payable by each Janus Henderson Fund to the Adviser and its affiliates, as well as the fees paid by the Adviser to the subadviser of subadvised Janus Henderson 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 the Adviser and the subadviser charge to other clients, and, as applicable, the impact of fund performance on management fees payable by the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also concluded that each Janus Henderson Fund’s total expenses were reasonable, taking into account the size of the Janus Henderson Fund, the quality of services provided by the Adviser and subadviser, the investment performance of the Janus Henderson Fund, and any expense limitations agreed to or provided by the Adviser.

Economies of Scale
The Trustees considered information about the potential for the Adviser to realize economies of scale as the assets of the Janus Henderson Funds increase. They noted that their independent fee consultant published a report to the Trustees in November 2019 which provided its research and analysis into economies of scale. They also noted that, although many Janus Henderson Funds pay advisory fees at a fixed base rate as a percentage of net assets, without any breakpoints or performance fees, their independent fee consultant concluded that 75% of these Janus Henderson Funds’ have contractual management fees (gross of waivers) below their Broadridge Expense Group averages. The Trustees also noted the following: (1) that for those Janus Henderson Funds whose expenses are being reduced by the contractual expense limitations of the Adviser, the Adviser is subsidizing certain of these Janus Henderson Funds because they have not reached adequate scale; (2) performance fee structures have been implemented for various Janus Henderson Funds that have caused the effective rate of advisory fees payable by such Janus Henderson Fund to vary depending on the investment performance of the Janus Henderson Fund relative to its benchmark index over the measurement period; and (3) a few Janus Henderson Funds have fee schedules with breakpoints and reduced fee rates above certain asset levels. The Trustees also noted that the Janus Henderson Funds share directly in economies of scale through the significant investments made by the Adviser and its affiliates related to services provided to the Funds and the lower charges of third-party service providers that are based in part on the combined scale of all of the Janus Henderson Funds.

The Trustees also considered the independent fee consultant’s conclusion that, given the limitations of various analytical approaches to economies of scale and their conflicting results, it is difficult to analytically confirm or deny the existence of economies of scale in the Janus Henderson complex. In this regard, the independent consultant concluded that (1) to the extent there were economies of scale at the Adviser, the Adviser’s general strategy of setting fixed management fees below peers appeared to share any such economies with investors even on smaller Janus Henderson Funds which have not yet achieved those economies and (2) by setting lower fixed fees from the start on these Janus Henderson Funds, the Adviser appeared to be investing to increase the likelihood that these Janus Henderson Funds will grow to a level to achieve any economies of scale that may exist. Further, the independent fee consultant provided its belief that Janus Henderson Fund investors are well-served by the fee levels and performance fee structures in place on the Janus Henderson Funds in light of any economies of scale that may be present at the Adviser.

Based on all of the information reviewed, including the recent and past research and analysis conducted by the Trustees’ independent fee consultant, the Trustees concluded that the current fee structure of each Janus Henderson Fund was reasonable and that the current rates of fees do reflect a sharing between the Adviser and the Janus Henderson Fund of any economies of scale that may be present at the current asset level of the Janus Henderson Fund.

Other Benefits to the Adviser
The Trustees also considered benefits that accrue to the Adviser and its affiliates and subadviser to the Janus Henderson Funds from their relationships with the Janus Henderson Funds. They recognized that two affiliates of the Adviser separately serve the Janus Henderson Funds as transfer agent and distributor, respectively, and the transfer agent receives compensation directly from the non-money market funds for services provided, and that such compensation contributes to the overall profitability of the Adviser and its affiliates that results from their relationship with the Janus Henderson Funds. The Trustees also considered the Adviser’s past and proposed use of commissions
paid by the Janus Henderson Funds on portfolio brokerage transactions to obtain proprietary and third-party research products and services benefiting the Janus Henderson Fund and/or other clients of the Adviser and/or the Adviser, and/or subadviser to a Janus Henderson Fund. The Trustees concluded that the Adviser’s and the subadviser’s 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 Janus Henderson Fund. The Trustees also concluded that, other than the services provided by the Adviser and its affiliates and subadviser pursuant to the agreements and the fees to be paid by each Janus Henderson Fund therefor, the Janus Henderson Funds and the Adviser and the subadviser may potentially benefit from their relationship with each other in other ways. They concluded that the Adviser and its affiliates 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 the Janus Henderson Funds and other clients serviced by the Adviser and its affiliates. They also concluded that the Adviser and the subadviser benefit from the receipt of research products and services acquired through commissions paid on portfolio transactions of the Janus Henderson Funds and that the Janus Henderson Funds benefit from the Adviser’s and/or the subadviser’s receipt of those products and services as well as research products and services acquired through commissions paid by other clients of the Adviser and/or other clients of the subadviser. They further concluded that the success of any Janus Henderson Fund could attract other business to the Adviser, the subadviser or other Janus Henderson funds, and that the success of the Adviser and the subadviser could enhance the Adviser’s and the subadviser’s ability to serve the Janus Henderson Funds.