NUVEEN GEORGIA DIVIDEND ADVANTAGE MUNICIPAL FUND 2
Form N-CSR
August 05, 2011

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM N-CSR

CERTIFIED SHAREHOLDER REPORT OF
REGISTERED MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Investment Company Act file number 811-21152

Nuveen Georgia Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 2
(Exact name of registrant as specified in charter)

Nuveen Investments
333 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(Address of principal executive offices) (Zip code)

Kevin J. McCarthy
Nuveen Investments
333 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(Name and address of agent for service)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: (312) 917-7700

Date of fiscal year end: May 31

Date of reporting period: May 31, 2011

Form N-CSR is to be used by management investment companies to file reports with the Commission not later than 10 days after the transmission to stockholders of any report that is required to be transmitted to stockholders under Rule 30e-1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (17 CFR 270.30e-1). The Commission may use the information provided on Form N-CSR in its regulatory, disclosure review, inspection, and policymaking roles.

A registrant is required to disclose the information specified by Form N-CSR, and the Commission will make this information public. A registrant is not required to respond to the collection of information contained in Form N-CSR unless the Form displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") control number. Please direct comments concerning the accuracy of the information collection burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing the burden to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549-0609. The OMB has reviewed this collection of information under the clearance requirements of 44 U.S.C. ss. 3507.

ITEM 1. REPORTS TO STOCKHOLDERS.

INVESTMENT ADVISER NAME CHANGE

Effective January 1, 2011, Nuveen Asset Management, the Funds' investment adviser, changed its name to Nuveen Fund Advisors, Inc. ("Nuveen Fund Advisors"). Concurrently, Nuveen Fund Advisors formed a wholly-owned subsidiary, Nuveen Asset Management, LLC, to house its portfolio management capabilities.

NUVEEN INVESTMENTS COMPLETES STRATEGIC COMBINATION WITH FAF ADVISORS

On December 31, 2010, Nuveen Investments completed the strategic combination between Nuveen Asset Management, the largest investment affiliate of Nuveen Investments, and FAF Advisors. As part of this transaction, U.S. Bancorp – the parent of FAF Advisors – received cash consideration and a 9.5% stake in Nuveen Investments in exchange for the long-term investment business of FAF Advisors, including investment management responsibilities for the non-money market mutual funds of the First American Funds family.

The approximately $27 billion of mutual fund and institutional assets managed by FAF Advisors, along with the investment professionals managing these assets and other key personnel, have become part of Nuveen Asset Management, LLC. With these additions to Nuveen Asset Management, LLC, this affiliate now manages more than $100 billion of assets across a broad range of strategies from municipal and taxable fixed income to traditional and specialized equity investments.

This combination does not affect the investment objectives or strategies of the Funds in this report. Over time, Nuveen Investments expects that the combination will provide even more ways to meet the needs of investors who work with financial advisors and consultants by enhancing the multi-boutique model of Nuveen Investments, which also includes highly respected investment teams at HydePark, NWQ Investment Management, Santa Barbara Asset Management, Symphony Asset Management, Tradewinds Global Investors and Winslow Capital. Nuveen Investments managed approximately $206 billion of assets as of March 31, 2011.

Table of Contents

Chairman's
Letter to Shareholders

Dear Shareholders,

In 2010, the global economy recorded another year of recovery from the financial and economic crises of 2008, but many of the factors that caused the downturn still weigh on the prospects for continued improvement. In the U.S., ongoing weakness in housing values has put pressure on homeowners and mortgage lenders. Similarly, the strong earnings recovery for corporations and banks is only slowly being translated into increased hiring or more active lending. Globally, deleveraging by private and public borrowers has inhibited economic growth and that process is far from complete.

Encouragingly, constructive actions are being taken by governments around the world to deal with economic issues. In the U.S., the recent passage of a stimulatory tax bill relieved some of the pressure on the Federal Reserve to promote economic expansion through quantitative easing and offers the promise of sustained economic growth. A number of European governments are undertaking programs that could significantly reduce their budget deficits. Governments across the emerging markets are implementing various steps to deal with global capital flows without undermining international trade and investment.

The success of these government actions could determine whether 2011 brings further economic recovery and financial market progress. One risk associated with the extraordinary efforts to strengthen U.S. economic growth is that the debt of the U.S. government will continue to grow to unprecedented levels. Another risk is that over time there could be inflationary pressures on asset values in the U.S. and abroad, because what happens in the U.S. impacts the rest of the world economy. Also, these various actions are being taken in a setting of heightened global economic uncertainty, primarily about the supplies of energy and other critical commodities. In this challenging environment, your Nuveen investment team continues to seek sustainable investment opportunities and to remain alert to potential risks in a recovery still facing many headwinds. On your behalf, we monitor their activities to assure they maintain their investment disciplines.

As you will note elsewhere in this report, on December 31, 2010, Nuveen Investments completed a strategic combination with FAF Advisors, Inc., the manager of the First American Funds. The combination adds highly respected and distinct investment teams to meet the needs of investors and their advisors and is designed to benefit all fund shareholders by creating a fund organization with the potential for further economies of scale and the ability to draw from even greater talent and expertise to meet those investor needs.

As of the end of June 2011, Nuveen Investments had completed the refinancing of all of the Auction Rate Preferred Securities issued by its taxable closed-end funds and 93% of the MuniPreferred shares issued by its tax-exempt closed-end funds. Please consult the Nuveen Investments web site, www.Nuveen.com, for the current status of this important refinancing program.

As always, I encourage you to contact your financial consultant if you have any questions about your investment in a Nuveen Fund. On behalf of the other members of your Fund Board, we look forward to continuing to earn your trust in the months and years ahead.

Sincerely,

Robert P. Bremner

Chairman of the Board
July 21, 2011

Portfolio Manager's Comments

Nuveen Georgia Premium Income Municipal Fund (NPG)
Nuveen Georgia Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund (NZX)
Nuveen Georgia Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 2 (NKG)
Nuveen North Carolina Premium Income Municipal Fund (NNC)
Nuveen North Carolina Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund (NRB)
Nuveen North Carolina Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 2 (NNO)
Nuveen North Carolina Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 3 (NII)

Portfolio manager Daniel Close reviews economic and municipal market conditions at the national and state levels, key investment strategies, and the twelve-month performance of the Nuveen Georgia and North Carolina Funds. Dan, who joined Nuveen in 2000, assumed portfolio management responsibility for these seven Funds in 2007.

What factors affected the U.S. economic and municipal market environments during the twelve-month reporting period ended May 31, 2011?

During this period, the U.S. economy demonstrated some signs of modest improvement, supported by the efforts of both the Federal Reserve (Fed) and the federal government. For its part, the Fed continued to hold the benchmark fed funds rate in a target range of zero to 0.25% since cutting it to this record low level in December 2008. At its June 2011 meeting (following the end of this reporting period), the central bank stated that it anticipated keeping the fed funds rate at "exceptionally low levels" for an "extended period." The Fed also completed its second round of quantitative easing with the purchase of $600 billion in longer-term U.S. Treasury bonds. The goal of this plan was to lower long-term interest rates and thereby stimulate economic activity and create jobs. The federal government continued to focus on implementing the economic stimulus package passed in early 2009 and aimed at providing job creation, tax relief, fiscal assistance to state and local governments, and expansion of unemployment benefits and other federal social welfare programs.

In the first quarter of 2011, the U.S. economy, as measured by the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP), grew at an annualized rate of 1.9%, marking the seventh consecutive quarter of positive growth. The employment situation slowly improved, with the national jobless rate registering 9.1% in May 2011, down from 9.6% a year earlier. While the Fed's longer-term inflation expectations remained stable, inflation over this period posted its largest twelve-month gain since October 2008, as the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 3.6% year-over-year as of May 2011. The core CPI (which excludes food and energy) increased 1.5%, staying within the Fed's unofficial objective of 2.0% or lower for this measure. The housing market remained a major weak spot in the economy. For the twelve months ended April 2011 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared), the average home price in the Standard & Poor's (S&P)/Case-Shiller Index of

Certain statements in this report are forward-looking statements. Discussions of specific investments are for illustration only and are not intended as recommendations of individual investments. The forward-looking statements and other views expressed herein are those of the portfolio manager as of the date of this report. Actual future results or occurrences may differ significantly from those anticipated in any forward-looking statements, and the views expressed herein are subject to change at any time, due to numerous market and other factors. The Funds disclaim any obligation to update publicly or revise any forward-looking statements or views expressed herein.

Any reference to credit ratings for portfolio holdings denotes the highest rating assigned by a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (NRSRO) such as Standard & Poor's (S&P), Moody's or Fitch. AAA, AA, A and BBB ratings are investment grade; BB, B, CCC, CC C, and D ratings are below investment grade. Holdings and ratings may change over time.

20 major metropolitan areas lost 4.0%, with six of the 20 metropolitan areas hitting their lowest levels since housing prices peaked in 2006.

The municipal bond market was affected by a significant decline in new tax exempt issuance during this period. One reason for the decrease in new tax-exempt supply was the heavy issuance of taxable municipal debt in 2010 under the Build America Bond (BAB) program, which was created as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of February 2009 and expired on December 31, 2010. Between the beginning of this reporting period on June 1, 2010, and the end of the BAB program, taxable Build America Bond issuance totaled $74.5 billion, accounting for 28% of new bonds issued in the municipal market.

After rallying strongly during the first part of the period, the municipal market suffered a reversal in mid-November 2010, due largely to investor concerns about inflation, the federal deficit, and the deficit's impact on demand for U.S. Treasury securities. Adding to this market pressure was media coverage of the strained finances of some state and local governments. As a result, money began to flow out of municipal mutual funds as yields rose and valuations declined. As we moved into the second quarter of 2011, we saw the environment in the municipal market improve.

Over the twelve months ended May 31, 2011, municipal bond issuance nationwide—both tax-exempt and taxable—totaled $335.7 billion, a decrease of 15% compared with the issuance of the twelve-month period ended May 31, 2010. For the first five months of 2011, municipal issuance nationwide was down 50% from the first five months of 2010. This decline reflects the heavy issuance of BABs at the end of 2010, as borrowers took advantage of the program's favorable terms before its expiration at year end.

How were economic and market conditions in Georgia and North Carolina during this period?

Georgia was hard hit by the recent recession, with major job losses in financial services, manufacturing, construction, and the government sector. To date, the state's economic recovery has been weaker than in many other states. In 2010, the Georgia economy expanded at a rate of 1.4%, compared with the national average growth of 2.6%. As of May 2011, unemployment in Georgia was 9.8%, its lowest level since June 2009, down from 10.0% in May 2010 but still higher than the national rate of 9.1%. In the state's housing market, foreclosure activity remained higher than the national average. Although the national inventory of houses in foreclosure has dropped to 2008 levels, Georgia's inventory of foreclosed homes was approximately 20% higher than the national level. According to the S&P/Case-Shiller home price Index, housing prices in Atlanta fell 3.5% between April 2010 and April 2011 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared), compared with a gain of 0.2% for the twelve-month period ended April 2010. In April 2011, Georgia adopted an $18.3 billion fiscal 2012 state budget, which cut spending across all state agencies by an average of 7%. Despite these circumstances, Georgia's recovery appeared to remain on track. The state has a diverse economic base supported by service, manufacturing and agricultural industries. As of May 2011, Georgia's general obligation debt continued to be rated Aaa and AAA, with stable outlooks by both Moody's and S&P, respectively. For the twelve months ended May 31, 2011, municipal issuance in Georgia totaled $6.8 billion, down 39% from the previous twelve months.

In 2010, North Carolina recorded GDP growth of 3.4%, compared with the national measure of 2.6%. In recent months, the state's recovery from recession has stalled somewhat, as job gains in the professional and business services and financial sectors were offset to some degree by continued losses in other sectors, especially construction. As of May 2011, North Carolina's unemployment rate was 9.7%, its lowest level since January 2009, down from 10.8% in May 2010 but still higher than the national rate of 9.1%. In the years preceding the most recent recession, North Carolina worked to transition its economy away from old-line manufacturing into sectors oriented toward research, technology, and services. As a result, the state now serves as an important high-tech base and its major universities attract both technology firms and professionals. Although the pre-recession bubble in housing prices was smaller in North Carolina than nationally, the state's housing market has been slow to reverse the decline. As homes prices nationally lost 4.0% during the twelve months ended April 2011 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared), according to the S&P/Case-Shiller home price Index, housing prices in Charlotte dropped 6.6%, reaching a new low. According to current projections, North Carolina faces a budget gap equal to $2.4 billion, or about 12% of the $19.7 billion fiscal 2012 state budget. As of May 2011, Moody's and S&P rated North Carolina general obligation debt at Aaa and AAA, respectively. During the twelve months ended May 31, 2011, $6.7 billion of municipal debt was issued in North Carolina, down 28% from that issued during the twelve months ended May 31, 2010.

What key strategies were used to manage these Funds during this reporting period?

As previously mentioned, the new issue supply of tax-exempt bonds declined nationally during this period, due largely to the issuance of taxable bonds under the BAB program. The BAB program also affected the availability of tax-exempt bonds in Georgia and North Carolina. Between the beginning of this reporting period on June 1, 2010, and the end of the BAB program, BABs accounted for approximately 8% of municipal supply in Georgia and 15% in North Carolina. Since interest payments from BABs represent taxable income, we did not view these bonds as appropriate investment opportunities for these Funds. Further compounding the supply situation was the drop-off in new municipal issuance during the first five months of 2011, when issuance in Georgia and North Carolina declined 55% and 30%, respectively, from that of the same period in 2010.

In this environment of constrained tax-exempt municipal bond issuance, we continued to take a bottom-up approach to discovering undervalued sectors and individual credits with the potential to perform well over the long term. During this period, we found value in several areas of the market, including health care and water and sewer bonds, which we added to all seven of these Funds. In general, these purchases focused on water and sewer bonds with higher credit quality ratings, while our health care purchases tended to be in the lower-rated categories. NPG and NKG also purchased tax increment financing (TIF) bonds, while NZX added an airport credit. During this period, the Funds generally focused on purchasing longer maturity bonds in order to take advantage of attractive yields at the longer end of the municipal yield curve.

Cash for new purchases during this period was generated primarily by the proceeds from bond calls and maturing bonds, particularly in North Carolina, where a large call involving bonds issued for the Raleigh Durham Airport affected all of the North Carolina Funds. In addition, most of the Georgia and North Carolina Funds sold small amounts of pre-refunded bonds, and the North Carolina Funds sold some credits with structures that were attractive to retail investors. NPG and NKG also trimmed their out-of-state holdings, while NZX sold intermediate-term student housing credits. Throughout the period, we worked to redeploy the proceeds from these calls and sales to keep the Funds as fully invested as possible.

As of May 31, 2011, all of these Funds continued to use inverse floating rate securities. We employ inverse floaters as a form of leverage for a variety of reasons, including duration management, income enhancement and total return enhancement.

How did the Funds perform?

Individual results for the Nuveen Georgia and North Carolina Funds, as well as relevant index and peer group information, are presented in the accompanying table.

Average Annual Total Returns on Common Share Net Asset Value
For periods ended 5/31/11

	1-Year	5-Year	10-Year
Georgia Funds			
NPG	1.81%	4.01%	5.34%
NZX	2.17%	4.57%	N/A
NKG	2.13%	4.22%	N/A
Standard & Poor's (S&P) Georgia Municipal Bond Index1	3.80%	4.56%	4.96%
Standard & Poor's (S&P) National Municipal Bond Index2	3.17%	4.46%	5.02%
Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds Average3	2.49%	4.18%	5.60%
North Carolina Funds			
NNC	2.57%	4.86%	5.78%
NRB	1.72%	5.16%	6.44%
NNO	1.92%	4.91%	N/A
NII	1.79%	5.00%	N/A
Standard & Poor's (S&P) North Carolina Municipal Bond Index1	3.66%	4.95%	5.26%
Standard & Poor's (S&P) National Municipal Bond Index2	3.17%	4.46%	5.02%
Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds Average3	2.49%	4.18%	5.60%

For the twelve months ended May 31, 2011, the total returns on common share net asset value (NAV) for all of the Georgia and North Carolina Funds underperformed the returns for their respective state's Standard & Poor's (S&P) Municipal Bond Index as well as the Standard & Poor's (S&P) National Municipal Bond Index. For the same period, NNC exceeded the average return for the Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds Average, while the remaining Funds lagged this benchmark.

Key management factors that influenced the Funds' returns during this period included duration and yield curve positioning, credit exposure and sector allocation. The use of leverage also had an impact on the Funds' performance. Leverage is discussed in more detail on page nine.

During this period, municipal bonds with intermediate maturities generally outperformed other maturity categories, with credits at both the shorter and longer ends of the yield curve posting weaker returns. Overall, duration and yield curve positioning was a positive contributor to the performance of NPG, NZX, NKG, NNC, NNO, and NII. All of these Funds had good exposure to the intermediate parts of the yield curve that performed best, with NNC being the most advantageously positioned for the market environment of the past

Past performance is not predictive of future results. Current performance may be higher or lower than the data shown. Returns do not reflect the deduction of taxes that shareholders may have to pay on Fund distributions or upon the sale of Fund shares.

For additional information, see the individual Performance Overview for your Fund in this report.

1 The Standard & Poor's (S&P) Municipal Bond Indexes for Georgia and North Carolina are unleveraged, market value-weighted indexes designed to measure the performance of the tax-exempt, investment-grade Georgia and North Carolina municipal bond markets, respectively. These indexes do not reflect any initial or ongoing expenses and are not available for direct investment.

2 The Standard & Poor's (S&P) National Municipal Bond Index is an unleveraged, market value-weighted index designed to measure the performance of the tax-exempt, investment-grade U.S. municipal bond market. This index does not reflect any initial or ongoing expenses and is not available for direct investment.

3 The Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds Average is calculated using the returns of all closed-end funds in this category for each period as follows: 1-year, 46 funds; 5-year, 46 funds; and 10-year, 27 funds. Lipper returns account for the effects of management fees and assume reinvestment of dividends, but do not reflect any applicable sales charges. The Lipper average is not available for direct investment. Shareholders should note that the performance of the Lipper Other States category represents the overall average of returns for funds from ten different states with a wide variety of municipal market conditions, which may make direct comparisons less meaningful.

twelve months. On the other hand, NRB was modestly underweighted in the intermediate part of the curve, which detracted from the Fund's performance during this period.

Credit exposure also played a role in performance. During the market reversal of late 2010, as redemption activity in high-yield funds increased and risk aversion mounted, lower-rated credits were negatively impacted. For the period as a whole, bonds rated BBB typically underperformed those rated AAA. In this environment, the Funds' performance generally benefited from their allocations to higher quality credits. Overall, the North Carolina Funds tended to have smaller weightings of bonds rated BBB than the Georgia Funds, due to the fact that North Carolina generally issues fewer BBB bonds. As of May 31, 2011, NPG had the heaviest exposure to bonds rated BBB among all of these Funds and a correspondingly lower weighting in AAA bonds, which restrained the Fund's performance during this period.

Holdings that generally made positive contributions to the Funds' returns during this period included general obligation (GO) and other tax-supported bonds, housing credits and resource recovery bonds. The electric utilities, water and sewer, and leasing sectors also outperformed the municipal market as a whole. All of these Funds were underweighted in the tax-supported sector, specifically in state GOs, which hurt their performance. In general, these Funds tended to be underweighted in transportation, which helped their performance.

IMPACT OF THE FUNDS' LEVERAGE STRATEGIES ON PERFORMANCE

One important factor impacting the returns of all these Funds relative to the comparative indexes was the Funds' use of leverage. The Funds use leverage because their managers believe that, over time, leveraging provides opportunities for additional income and total return for common shareholders. However, use of leverage also can expose common shareholders to additional volatility. For example, as the prices of securities held by a Fund decline, the negative impact of these valuation changes on common share net asset value and common shareholder total return is magnified by the use of leverage. This is what happened in these Funds during the period, as the use of leverage hurt their overall performance.

APPROVED FUND MERGERS

After the close of this reporting period, the Funds' Board of Trustees approved a series of mergers for all the Georgia and North Carolina funds included in this report. The mergers are subject to shareholder approval at the Funds' regular shareholder meeting later this year. The mergers in each respective state are intended to create a single, larger state fund with enhanced trading appeal and lower operating expenses of traded common shares of the fund.

More information on the proposed mergers will be contained in the proxy materials expected to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission in the coming weeks. The proposed fund mergers are as follows:

Acquired Fund	Acquiring Fund
Georgia Funds	
Nuveen Georgia Premium Income Municipal Fund (NPG)	Nuveen Georgia Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 2 (NKG)
Nuveen Georgia Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund (NZX)	

Acquired Fund	Acquiring Fund
North Carolina Funds	
Nuveen North Carolina Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund (NRB)	Nuveen North Carolina Premium Income Municipal Fund (NNC)
Nuveen North Carolina Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 2 (NNO)	
Nuveen North Carolina Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 3 (NII)	

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS REGARDING THE FUNDS' REDEMPTION OF AUCTION RATE PREFERRED SHARES

Shortly after their respective inceptions, each of the Funds issued auction rate preferred shares (ARPS) to create structural leverage. As noted in past shareholder reports, the ARPS issued by many closed-end funds, including these Funds, have been hampered by a lack of liquidity since February 2008. Since that time, more ARPS have been submitted for sale in each of their regularly scheduled auctions than there have been offers to buy. In fact, offers to buy have been almost completely nonexistent since late February 2008. This means that these auctions have "failed to clear," and that many, or all, of the ARPS shareholders who wanted to sell their shares in these auctions were unable to do so. This lack of liquidity in ARPS did not lower the credit quality of these shares, and ARPS shareholders unable to sell their shares continued to receive distributions at the "maximum rate" applicable to failed auctions, as calculated in accordance with the pre-established terms of the ARPS. In the recent market, with short term rates at multi-generational lows, those maximum rates also have been low. One continuing implication for common shareholders from the auction failures is that each Fund's cost of leverage likely has been incrementally higher at times than it otherwise might have been had the auctions continued to be successful. As a result, each Fund's common share earnings likely have been incrementally lower at times than they otherwise might have been.

As noted in past shareholder reports, the Nuveen funds' Board of Directors/Trustees authorized several methods that can be used separately or in combination to refinance a portion of the Nuveen funds' outstanding ARPS. Some funds have utilized tender option bonds (TOBs), also known as inverse floating rate securities, for leverage purposes. The amount of TOBs that a fund may use varies according to the composition of each fund's portfolio. Some funds have a greater ability to use TOBs than others. Some funds have issued Variable Rate Demand Preferred (VRDP) Shares or Variable MuniFund Term Preferred (VMTP) Shares, which are a floating rate form of preferred stock with a mandatory term redemption. Some funds have issued MuniFund Term Preferred (MTP) Shares, a fixed rate form of preferred stock with a mandatory redemption period of three to five years.

While all these efforts have reduced the total amount of outstanding ARPS issued by the Nuveen funds, the funds cannot provide any assurance on when the remaining outstanding ARPS might be redeemed.

During 2010 and 2011, certain Nuveen leveraged closed-end funds (excluding all the Funds included in this report) received a demand letter from a law firm on behalf of purported holders of common shares of each such fund, alleging that Nuveen and the funds' officers and Board of Directors/Trustees breached their fiduciary duties related to the redemption at par of the funds' ARPS. In response, the Board established an ad hoc Demand Committee consisting of certain of its disinterested and independent Board members to investigate the claims. The Demand Committee retained independent counsel to assist it in conducting an extensive investigation. Based upon its investigation, the Demand Committee found that it was not in the best interests of each fund or its

shareholders to take the actions suggested in the demand letters, and recommended that the full Board reject the demands made in the demand letters. After reviewing the findings and recommendation of the Demand Committee, the full Board of each fund unanimously adopted the Demand Committee's recommendation.

Subsequently, the funds that received demand letters were named in a consolidated complaint as nominal defendants in a putative shareholder derivative action captioned Martin Safier, et al. v. Nuveen Asset Management, et al. that was filed in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, Chancery Division (the "Cook County Chancery Court") on February 18, 2011 (the "Complaint"). The Complaint, filed on behalf of purported holders of each fund's common shares, also name Nuveen Fund Advisors, Inc. as a defendant, together with current and former Officers and interested Directors/Trustees of each of the funds (together with the nominal defendants, collectively, the "Defendants"). The Complaint contains the same basic allegations contained in the demand letters. The suits seek a declaration that the Defendants have breached their fiduciary duties, an order directing the Defendants not to redeem any ARPS at their liquidation value using fund assets, indeterminate monetary damages in favor of the funds and an award of plaintiffs' costs and disbursements in pursuing the action. Nuveen Fund Advisors, Inc. believes that the Complaint is without merit, and is defending vigorously against these charges.

As of May 31, 2011, each of the Funds has redeemed all of their outstanding ARPS at par.

MTP Shares

As of May 31, 2011, the following Funds have issued and outstanding MTP Shares, at liquidation value, as shown in the accompanying table.

Fund	MTP Shares at Liquidation Value
NPG	$28,340,000
NZX	14,340,000
NKG	32,265,000
NNC	49,835,000