

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees (the “Board”) of Ivy Funds (the “Trust”) held on August 15 and 16, 2017, the Board, including all of the trustees who are not “interested persons” (the “Independent Trustees”), as defined in Section 2(a)(19) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “1940 Act”), unanimously approved the continuance of the Investment Management Agreement (the “Management Agreement”) between Ivy Investment Management Company (“IICO”) and the Trust, and the continuance of the Investment Subadvisory Agreements between IICO and:

- Advantus Capital Management, Inc. (with respect to Ivy Advantus Bond Fund and Ivy Advantus Real Estate Securities Fund);
- Mackenzie Financial Corporation (with respect to Ivy Cundill Global Value Fund);
- LaSalle Investment Management Securities, LLC and LaSalle Investment Management Securities B.V. (with respect to Ivy LaSalle Global Real Estate Fund and Ivy LaSalle Global Risk-Managed Real Estate Fund and Ivy Apollo Multi-Asset Income Fund); and
- Pictet Asset Management Limited and Pictet Asset Management (Singapore) Pte Ltd. (with respect to the Ivy Emerging Markets Local Currency Debt Fund)
- Pictet Asset Management Limited and Pictet Asset Management SA (Ivy Targeted Return Bond Fund)
- Apollo Credit Management, LLC (Ivy Apollo Multi-Asset Income Fund and Ivy Apollo Strategic Income Fund)

Each such subadviser referred to herein as a “Subadviser.”

The Board’s Independent Trustees were assisted in their review by independent legal counsel, and met with such counsel separately from representatives of IICO and the Subadvisers. Independent legal counsel explained the factors that the Board should consider as part of its review of the various agreements, all as outlined in a memorandum it had provided to the Board prior to the meeting, including, among other things, the nature and the quality of the services provided by IICO and the Subadvisers, profitability (including any fall-out benefits) from the relationships with each series of the Trust (each a “Fund” and together, the “Funds”), economies of scale, the role played by the Independent Trustees, and information on comparative fees and expenses. The Independent Trustees also considered the written responses and materials produced by IICO and each Subadviser in response to a 15(c) due diligence request list submitted by the Independent Trustees’ legal counsel prior to the meeting, as well as materials produced in response to a follow-up request list sent to IICO by independent legal counsel on behalf of the Independent Trustees. Included in those responses, which had been provided to the Board prior to the meeting, was a Fund-by-Fund profitability analysis prepared by IICO, as well as an explanation of the methodology by which the profitability analysis was calculated. The Board also received extensive materials on performance, expenses and comparable fund information from Broadridge, Inc. (“Broadridge”), an independent mutual fund rating service. Finally, the Independent Trustees received and reviewed a considerable amount of information that their independent fee consultant had provided to them. The Independent Trustees previously had reviewed and discussed these materials during a telephonic meeting in July 2017. They further reviewed these materials among themselves, with their independent legal counsel and the independent fee consultant, and with the other Board members at executive sessions of the Independent Trustees at the August 15th and 16th Board meeting, during which the Board considered various factors described below, none of which by itself was considered dispositive. However, the material factors and conclusions that formed the basis for the Board’s determination to approve the agreements are discussed separately below.

Nature, Extent and Quality of Services

The Board considered the nature, extent and quality of services provided to the Funds by IICO and each Subadviser, taking into account the large amount of materials produced by IICO and each Subadviser in response to the 15(c) due diligence requests submitted by independent legal counsel to the Independent Trustees.

The Board also took into account the report from its Investment Oversight Committee (the “IOC”), in light of that committee’s duties to assist the Board in the 15(c) process. The IOC had reported to the Board on its review of the overall performance of the Funds, IICO’s investment risk management function, and the proposed and on-going changes IICO has been considering for itself, the Trust and the overall fund complex. As such, the Board examined all of IICO’s activities (both taken and proposed) in light of the Funds’ performance and expense structure, as well as the proposed overall rationalization of the fund complex, which is designed to provide economies of scale to the Funds’ shareholders, reduce the Funds’ expenses and enhance the performance of the Funds, particularly in the context of substantial industry change and regulatory developments.

The Board likewise considered the knowledge it had received from its regular meetings, including from the materials provided in connection with those meetings, such as the resources and key personnel of IICO and each Subadviser, as well as the other services provided to the Funds by IICO and each Subadviser (such as managing the quality of execution of portfolio transactions and the selection of broker-dealers for those transactions, monitoring adherence to each Fund’s investment restrictions, producing reports, providing support services for the Board and Board committees,

communicating with shareholders and overseeing the activities of other service providers, including monitoring compliance with various Fund policies and procedures and with applicable laws and regulations). The Board also took into account the compliance environment at IICO and each Subadviser, noting the resources that each entity has dedicated towards compliance. The Board concluded that the nature and extent of the services provided by IICO and each Subadviser were appropriate, that the quality of those services had been consistent with quality norms in the industry and that the Funds were likely to benefit from the continued provision of those services.

Benefits from the Relationship with Funds

The Board next discussed whether IICO or any Subadviser derives any other direct or indirect benefit from serving the Funds. In that regard, the Board discussed the transfer agency/shareholder servicing fees that Waddell & Reed Services Company, an affiliate of IICO, provides the Funds. The Board also considered the benefits that accrue to each service provider organization from its respective relationship with the Funds, including the fact that a variety of services are provided by affiliates of IICO, including distribution, administrative and fund accounting services, and, as discussed above, shareholder servicing. After full consideration of these and other factors, the Board concluded that none of IICO, any Subadviser nor any of their affiliates receives any additional direct or indirect benefits that would preclude the Board from approving the continuation of the Management Agreement with IICO or any Investment Subadvisory Agreement with a Subadviser.

Economies of Scale

The Board discussed whether economies of scale are being realized by the Funds and whether fee levels reflect those economies of scale for the benefit of the Funds' shareholders. The Board considered the significant number of initiatives that IICO is undertaking to seek to rationalize the fund complex, reduce expenses and enhance performance.

Performance of the Funds and Costs of Services Provided

The Board considered the performance of each Fund and the costs of the services provided, focusing on a number of Funds that the independent fee consultant had identified. Specifically, the Board examined the investment performance of each Fund, including the percentile ranking of each Fund over various periods of time. The Board also examined the performance of each Fund against its respective Lipper index for the same periods. After extensively reviewing all of the performance information provided, the Board concluded that the Funds' performance in each asset class was acceptable. Although the performance of some of the focus Funds identified by the independent fee consultant lagged that of their peers or respective Lipper index, the Board recognized that IICO, or the applicable Subadviser, had taken, or was taking, steps to address that underperformance, and determined to continue to monitor closely the performance of those Funds.

The Board also considered the expenses and expense ratio of each Fund, and the expense limitation arrangements entered into by IICO in light of the services provided by IICO and each Subadviser. The Board also compared each Fund's expenses, including advisory, distribution and shareholder servicing fees, with the expenses and advisory fees of other investment advisers managing similarly situated funds, as well as the advisory fees that IICO (or an affiliate) charges for providing advisory services to other accounts in the same asset class for certain Funds. In that regard, the Board noted that IICO performs significant additional services for the Funds as compared to those other accounts. The Board also took into account the information on IICO's profitability in managing the Funds, including the methodology used to calculate profitability. The Board finally considered the amount of assets in each Fund, each Fund's average account size and how those factors affect the Funds' expense ratios, noting that, as the Funds' assets have increased or decreased over time, the expense ratios of the Funds generally have fallen or risen, respectively. After completing this examination, the Board concluded that each Fund's expenses are appropriate at the current time.

Independent Fee Consultant Review

Independent legal counsel, on behalf of the Independent Trustees, engaged an independent fee consultant to assist them in evaluating the reasonableness of the management fees charged by IICO to the Funds. The independent fee consultant's review addressed the following fee-related factors:

1. The nature, extent and quality of IICO's services to the Funds;
2. Management fees and expenses in the context of performance;
3. Product category expenses, including peers;
4. Profit margins of IICO's parent from supplying such services;
5. Subadviser and institutional fee analyses; and
6. Possible economies of scale as a Fund grows larger.

The following summarizes the findings of the independent fee consultant retained by the Independent Trustees.

Summary Findings

The report stated that IICO delivered reasonable levels of performance in the longer-term periods and reasonable levels of service to the Funds in relation to its management fees as compared to the investment advisers of comparable funds. For the 36 months ended March 31, 2017, approximately 9% of the funds within the Waddell & Reed Fund Complex (including the Funds) were in the top quartile of performance and 33% of such funds were in the top two quartiles of performance, and that short-term performance of such funds were showing signs of improvement. Specifically, the report noted that 42% of the funds were in the top two quartiles in the one-year period, and that 32% of all such funds had improving performance in their one-year period. The independent fee consultant noted that the funds' performance appeared to be grounded in a number of institutional competitive advantages at IICO, including economic analysis, investment management depth, ability to attract top talent, strategic vision, performance-focused culture, and an effective trading infrastructure.

The report further indicated that total expenses of the Funds, on average, were 2% over the average total expenses of their respective Broadridge Expense Group peers and 3% below the average total expenses for their Broadridge Expense Universes. The management fees for the funds were 1% over the average management fees of their respective Broadridge Expense Group peers and 3% over the average management fees for their Broadridge Expense Universes.

The report also stated that the management fees IICO charges to the funds are reasonable in relation to the management fees it charges to its institutional account clients. The report noted that these institutional account clients have different service and infrastructure needs and in addition, the average spread between management fees IICO charged to the funds and those it charges to institutional account clients is reasonable relative to the average fee spreads computed from industry surveys.

The report stated that while it was difficult to confirm overall economies of scale, it was clear that the funds' shareholders generally are benefitting from lower expenses as the funds' assets grow through management fee breakpoints, decline in transfer agency expenses, decline in custody contract rates and declines in other non-management expenses.

The report also noted that the overall profitability of IICO's parent is near the median of most similarly-sized, publicly-traded peers, but appears adequate to enable IICO to continue to provide quality support to the funds and their shareholders. Finally, the report noted that IICO has continued to invest time in board mergers and fund mergers, which could help drive down expenses for shareholders.

Finally, the report also examined the fees that IICO retains on Funds that are subadvised by unaffiliated subadvisers, and indicated that those fees are reasonable relative to the industry. The report also stated that the subadvisory fees that IICO earns for serving as a subadviser to an unaffiliated fund when compared to fees of similar Funds are generally similar.

Conclusions

The independent fee consultant's report concluded that it believes that the services provided by IICO and its affiliates and expenses incurred by the Funds in the previous 12 months are reasonable and provide adequate justification for renewal of the Funds' existing Management Agreement.