ROYCE GLOBAL VALUE TRUST, INC.
Form N-CSRS
August 25, 2016

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: 811-22532

Name of Registrant: Royce Global Value Trust, Inc.

Address of Registrant: 745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151

Name and address of agent for service: John E. Denneen, Esq. 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151

Registrant s telephone number, including area code: (212) 508-4500
Date of fiscal year end: December 31, 2016
Date of reporting period: January 1, 2016 June 30, 2016

Item 1. Reports to Shareholders.

JUNE 30, 2016 **2016 Semiannual** **Review and Report to Stockholders**

A Few Words on Closed-End Funds

Royce & Associates, LP manages three closed-end funds: Royce Global Value Trust, which invests primarily in companies with headquarters outside of the United States, Royce Micro-Cap Trust, which invests primarily in micro-cap securities; and Royce Value Trust, which invests primarily in small-cap securities. A closed-end fund is an investment company whose shares are listed and traded on a stock exchange. Like all investment companies, including open-end mutual funds, the assets of a closed-end fund are professionally managed in accordance with the investment objectives and policies approved by the fund s Board of Directors. A closed-end fund raises cash for investment by issuing a fixed number of shares through initial and other public offerings that may include shelf offerings and periodic rights offerings. Proceeds from the offerings are invested in an actively managed portfolio of securities. Investors wanting to buy or sell shares of a publicly traded closed-end fund after the offerings must do so on a stock exchange, as with any publicly traded stock. Shares of closed-end funds frequently trade at a discount to their net asset value. This is in contrast to open-end mutual funds, which sell and redeem their shares at net asset value on a continuous basis.

A Closed-End Fund Can Offer Several Distinct Advantages

Why Dividend Reinvestment Is Important

A closed-end fund does not issue redeemable securities or offer its securities on a continuous basis, so it does not need to liquidate securities or hold uninvested assets to meet investor demands for cash redemptions.

A very important component of an investor s total return comes from the reinvestment of distributions. By reinvesting distributions, our investors can maintain an undiluted investment in a Fund. To get a fair idea of the impact of reinvested distributions, please see the charts on pages 12 and 13. For additional information on the Funds Distribution Reinvestment and Cash Purchase Options and the benefits for stockholders, please see page 14 or visit our website at www.roycefunds.com.

Managed Distribution Policy

The Board of Directors of each of Royce Micro-Cap Trust and Royce Value Trust has authorized a managed distribution policy (MDP). Under the MDP, Royce Micro-Cap Trust and Royce Value Trust pay quarterly distributions at an annual rate of 7% of the average of the prior four quarter-end net asset values, with the fourth quarter being the greater of these annualized rates or the distribution required by IRS regulations. With each distribution, the Fund will issue a notice to its stockholders and an accompanying press release that provides detailed information regarding the amount and composition of the distribution (including whether any portion of the distribution represents a return of capital) and other information required by a Fund s MDP. You should not draw any conclusions about a Fund s investment performance from the amount of distributions or from the terms of a Fund s MDP. A Fund s Board of Directors may amend or terminate the MDP at any time without prior notice to stockholders; however, at this time there are no reasonably foreseeable circumstances that might cause the termination of any of the MDPs.

In a closed-end fund, not having to meet investor redemption requests or invest at inopportune times can be effective for value managers who attempt to buy stocks when prices are depressed and sell securities when prices are high.

A closed-end fund may invest in less liquid portfolio securities because it is not subject to potential stockholder redemption demands. This is potentially beneficial for Royce-managed closed-end funds, with significant investments in small- and micro-cap securities.

The fixed capital structure allows permanent leverage to be employed as a means to enhance capital appreciation potential.

Royce Micro-Cap Trust and Royce Value Trust distribute capital gains, if any, on a quarterly basis. Each of these Funds has adopted a quarterly distribution policy for its common stock.

We believe that the closed-end fund structure can be an appropriate investment for a long-term investor who understands the benefits of a more stable pool of capital.

This page is not part of the 2016 Semiannual Report to Stockholders

Table of Contents

This page is not part of the 2016 Semiannual Report to Stockholders

Letter to Our Stockholders

A BEAR, A BREXIT, AND A WELCOME START TO 2016

We were happy to greet 2016 with a spirited Hello in the hope that certain emerging trends in the small-cap world would gain a firmer foothold in the new year. We were very pleased, then, to see the market s pronounced shift toward companies with attractive to reasonable valuations, solid balance sheets, and strong profitability attributes found in many of our portfolio holdings arrive in the year s first half. And though domestic small-caps did modestly well in the first half, an achievement that looks more commendable in the context of the high levels of volatility that all equities faced in the first half of 2016, many active managers, ourselves included, did even better. This was a welcome change.

Both the absolute and relative health of domestic equities was in evidence during the first half of 2016. The Nasdaq Composite, which is home to a large number of biotechnology companies that corrected sharply in the first half after leading the market last year, was the only major U.S. index to finish the year-to-date period ended June 30, 2016 in the red. A few non-U.S. indexes remained marginally positive in the first half, but most concluded the semiannual period with at least minor net losses. Among those that fell further behind was one that did notably well in 2015 European small-caps, whose more diminutive size made them most vulnerable to the post-Brexit sell-off. But to participate in these strong first-half results for U.S. equity, investors needed the stomach for a wild ride that started with a steep and speedy initial drop followed by a far smoother, robust recovery. The year began with a more dramatic extension of last year s decline, and we initially failed to grasp that 2015 would, in the manner of Shakespeare s best-known stage direction, Exit, pursued by a bear. From the June 23, 2015 small-cap peak through its year-to-date low on February 11, 2016 , the Russell 2000 Index fell 25.7%, a truly ursine decline.

This seems to have been a remarkably quiet double-digit correction a stealth bear market, as it were. Few outside the small-cap world have acknowledged it, never mind analyzed or discussed it. Yet it was the ninth biggest decline since the Russell 2000 s inception at the end of 1978, and the worst for small-caps since 2011. It included many of the signs that typically accompany a bottoming-out process panic selling in a number of sectors (most notably within the bio-pharma complex), small-caps losing more than large-caps, and greater resilience from value stocks to us, the most significant development in the down phase. This heightened volatility was triggered by the ongoing implosion of oil prices, struggles for other commodities, anxiety over possible bank defaults, and the devaluation of currency in China. Together, these factors led to a few sessions in which hysteria ruled the equity markets. Like many bear markets (and unlike that of the more closely correlated collapse in 2011), it also solidified a rotation in leadership from small-cap growth to small-cap value.

Having invested through many previous small-cap declines (some pre-dating the Russell 2000), we sought to turn the downdraft to our advantage by looking for bargain-priced opportunities amid the volatility and to stay invested for the eventual recovery. Our commitment was rewarded as the Russell 2000 rebounded sharply from its early February low, rising 21.6% by the end of June. **During these tumultuous days, a shift in leadership could be seen clearly in the earnings outlook. We first saw evidence for it in October 2015 and noted it again in February 2016. Many companies, including several of our holdings, reported decent earnings while also not revising guidance downward.** This was viewed as a positive in that expectations had been so low, particularly for companies in more economically sensitive sectors, that pretty good or not that bad was in several instances much better news than people were expecting. The general lack of downward earnings revisions both last fall and in the first half of this year has allowed for some recovery for these companies shares. Brexit, of course, tossed an already highly uncertain global economy into even stormier seas. While we see the vote as more of a political event for the United Kingdom and the European Union than an important economic event for the U.S., there s no question it has made the already tenuous prospects for global growth that much shakier. Still, we do not see it having a lasting or meaningful impact on U.S. small-caps.

For the global economy, however, Brexit and other risks look likely to persist. At this writing, there are negative rates for long-term sovereign debt in Germany and Japan, ominous signals from the banks in Italy, and in both the U.K. and eurozone a political and economic situation that it would be an understatement to call unsettled. Here at home, we have seen record lows for both 10- and 30-year Treasury yields. These more recent developments can be added to the older that is, mid-June s list of concerns about the pace of growth in China and other important emerging markets, stabilizing but still volatile commodity prices, and the ambiguous state of the U.S. economy, in which housing and autos remain strong but consumer confidence, manufacturing, and the job market have been more mixed. It is a daunting set of challenges, to be sure. **Where we differ from some observers, however, is in our belief in the strength and resilience of the economy. This is rooted in our long-established practice of giving more weight to what we are hearing from the management teams we speak to every day than we do to fatalistic headlines and dire or overly sunny prognostications.** The corporate managers with whom we have been meeting are far more cautious and uncertain than pessimistic. Well aware of the fragility of current conditions, they have also offered some measured optimism in terms of growth picking up, however gradually or in fits and starts. In terms of now widespread recession concerns, we also want to stress that, over its long history, the stock market has seldom, if ever, offered false positives that is, shares do not rise when economic growth is about to contract. And in all the tumult of the first half, most U.S. indexes rose, however modestly. The upshot is that, in the midst of heightened global uncertainty, the U.S. economy and markets look far healthier to us than what the rest of the globe has to offer.

SIGNS O THE TIMES THE SIGNIFICANT SHIFT

Most notable to us as small-cap specialists with a value orientation was how thoroughly style drove results. The Russell 2000 Value Index outpaced the large- and mid-cap indexes year-to-date through the end of June, while the Russell 2000 trailed them, and the Russell 2000 Growth was negative. Value indexes in fact did better up and down the market cap range, from micro- to large-cap, in the first half. Although small-cap leadership began to rotate following June 2015 s small-cap peak, the widening performance gap between small-cap value and growth has been the critical development within small-cap so far in 2016. This could be seen in both bear and bull phases during the first half. **The Russell 2000 Value lost far less than its growth counterpart from the end of 2015 through the February 11th small-cap low (-12.9% versus -18.9%); it was then essentially tied with the Russell 2000 Growth from that low through the end of June (+21.8% vs +21.4%).** In prior years (2009-2015), value led in many downdrafts but lagged in up markets. This renewed up market strength is a major reason behind our optimism for value stocks.

Another reason, related to value s emergent leadership, has been the relative strength of many stocks in economically sensitive, cyclical sectors. Defensive areas led within small-cap, with Utilities, Consumer Staples, Telecommunication Services, and REITs enjoying strong first halves. Unlike 2015, however, they were joined by strong turns for Materials, Industrials, and certain non-REIT areas in Financials, with the first particularly strong. Along with Information Technology and Energy, these have been areas of collective investment interest for us over the last several years. Yet even with the recent shift in investor preferences, which eventually sparked the turnaround for many of our holdings, expectations for many of these cyclical businesses remain low. **In many cases, stocks were so deeply oversold during the winter months that, even after having experienced some recovery, their valuations still look attractive to us. Several looked even cheaper in late June.**

Equity Indexes as of June 30, 2016 (%)

	YTD[1]	1-YR	3-YR	5-YR	10-YR
Russell 2000	2.22	-6.73	7.09	8.35	6.20
Russell 2000 Value	6.08	-2.58	6.36	8.15	5.15
Russell 2000 Growth	-1.59	-10.75	7.74	8.51	7.14
S&P 500	3.84	3.99	11.66	12.10	7.42
Russell 1000	3.74	2.93	11.48	11.88	7.51
Nasdaq Composite	-3.29	-2.89	12.48	11.79	8.35
Russell Midcap	5.50	0.56	10.80	10.90	8.07
Russell Microcap	-1.68	-12.06	5.95	8.20	4.31
Russell Global ex-U.S. Small Cap	1.01	-5.77	4.06	1.91	3.82
Russell Global ex-U.S. Large Cap	-1.16	-9.94	1.63	0.36	2.17

1 Not annualized. For details on The Royce Funds performance in the period, please turn to the Managers Discussions that begin on page 6.

LETTER TO OUR STOCKHOLDERS

WHAT A LONG STRANGE TRIP IT S BEEN We could use this title to describe the first half of 2016, the entire post-Financial Crisis period, and, perhaps most fitting, the peculiar span from 2011-2015, when QE (quantitative easing) and zero (or near zero) interest rate policies inflated many asset values but also created a barbell-shaped range of small-cap returns, with bouts of leadership from defensive, typically high-yield stocks at one extreme and fast-growing healthcare and/or tech issues at the other. Most companies in the middle spent the period struggling to catch up. This was bad news for active small-cap management, as comparative returns during this otherwise robust five-year period make clear. In what seemed at times like a perverse inversion of the usual patterns of stock market behavior, there were penalties in the form of lower relative returns for those managers who, like us, generally emphasize qualities such as earnings, profitability, low leverage, and steady dividends (as distinct from high yields).

We are pleased to say that so far in 2016, things have changed. Investors have been showing greater interest in the attributes that had been out of fashion for too long steady dividends, profits, and effective capital allocation, to name a few. And as share prices began to rise following the February low, these qualities stayed in demand. We remain confident that an extended period of even slow economic growth should be enough to boost the shares of many companies in sectors such as Industrials, Financials, Information Technology, Materials, and Energy all of which are home to cyclical businesses with earnings and, in some cases, high ROIC (returns on invested capital). Those that also have reasonable to attractive valuations are the companies that we expect to lead small-cap going forward. Recent data from Furey Research Partners reinforces this point. It showed that at the end of June 2016 small-caps were the cheapest they have been versus large-caps in the last 13 years, that value is cheap relative to growth, and that cyclicals are cheap compared with defensive stocks. **In addition, we have seen anomalous markets before including the large-cap led Nifty Fifty of the 1970s, the sudden crash in 1987, and the Tech Bubble in 2000. As challenging as each of these was, the stock market eventually resumed more historically typical performance patterns.** These resumptions often signaled better times for risk-conscious, research-driven small-cap investors as well. So we feel as though there are many reasons to feel good about the long-term potential for both profitable small companies and small-cap value.

Not that the equity world is without very real risks. The added layer of Brexit-bred uncertainty to an environment in which interest rates are still historically low could continue to push small-cap investors to safety and/or high yield at one extreme and lead to a fresh run at speculative growth at the other. **We see four factors, however, that in our view should prevent a repeat of the pattern that dominated 2011-2015.** First is the first-half success for cyclicals, particularly during the recovery phase when many helped to give small-cap value its post-bottom lift. Second, valuations for many defensive stocks look stretched to us, which should enhance the appeal of many of our holdings. Third, credit spreads remain wider than they were a year ago at this time, even with the 10-year Treasury making new lows. As long as the cost of capital remains higher, it should help profitable, lower leverage businesses. Finally, there is reversion to the mean the middle of 2015 marked a two standard deviation event in terms of a performance edge for the Russell 2000 Growth versus its small-cap value sibling.

On balance, then, we see ongoing leadership for small-cap value and we recently did some research, posted on roycefunds.com, which shows that the kind of sustained advantage growth previously enjoyed is rare. **Over the life of the small-cap style indexes, value still owns a compelling relative edge. The Russell 2000 Value beat the Russell 2000 Growth in 65% of monthly rolling three-year periods, 73% of monthly rolling five-year periods, and 83% of monthly rolling 10-year periods ended June 30, 2016 (see roycefunds.com/connection for more details).** And this same research showed that when small-cap value beat growth, active management did better as well. So while we still expect returns for stocks to be low, we also think that leadership for value now in place for more than a year has ample room to run. We will be tireless in our collective efforts to run with it.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Royce	Christopher D. Clark	Francis D. Gannon
Chairman, Royce & Associates, LP	*President, Chief Executive Officer, and Co-Chief Investment Officer, Royce & Associates, LP*	*Co-Chief Investment Officer, Royce & Associates, LP*

August 1, 2016

Performance

NAV Average Annual Total Returns As of June 30, 2016 (%)

	YTD1	**1-YR**	**3-YR**	**5-YR**	**10-YR**	**15-YR**	**20-YR**	**25-YR**	**SINCE INCEPTION**	**INCEPTION DATE**
Royce Global Value Trust	3.86	-5.05	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-1.26	10/17/13
Royce Micro-Cap Trust	5.39	-6.47	7.07	7.90	5.51	8.27	9.73	N/A	10.35	12/14/93
Royce Value Trust	8.17	-2.24	6.13	5.77	5.05	7.10	9.37	10.49	10.15	11/26/86

INDEX Russell 2000 Index 2.22 -6.73 7.09 8.35 6.20 6.96 7.61 9.52 N/A N/A Russell Microcap Index -1.68 -12.06 5.95 8.20 4.31 6.46 N/A N/A N/A N/A Russell Global Small Cap Index 1.40 -6.37 5.11 4.12 4.51 7.71 N/A N/A N/A N/A

1 Not Annualized

Important Performance and Risk Information

All performance information in this *Review and Report* reflects past performance, is presented on a total return basis, net of the Fund s investment advisory fee, and reflects the reinvestment of distributions. Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Investment return and principal value of an investment will fluctuate, so that shares may be worth more or less than their original cost when sold. Current performance may be higher or lower than performance quoted. Current month-end performance may be obtained at www.roycefunds.com. The Funds are closed-end registered investment companies whose respective shares of common stock may trade at a discount to the net asset value. Shares of each Fund s common stock are also subject to the market risk of investing in the underlying portfolio securities held by each Fund. Certain immaterial adjustments were made to the net assets of Royce Micro-Cap Trust at 12/31/12, as well as 12/31/14, for financial reporting purposes, and as a result the net asset value originally calculated on that date and the total return based on that net asset value differs from the adjusted net asset value and total return reported in the Financial Highlights. All indexes referenced are unmanaged and capitalization-weighted. Each index s returns include net reinvested dividends and/or interest income. Russell Investment Group is the source and owner of the trademarks, service marks and copyrights related to the Russell Indexes. Russell® is a trademark of Russell Investment Group. The Russell 2000 Index is an index of domestic small-cap stocks that measures the performance of the 2,000 smallest publicly traded U.S. companies in the Russell 3000 Index. The Russell Microcap Index includes 1,000 of the smallest securities in the small-cap Russell 2000 Index, along with the next smallest eligible securities as determined by Russell. The Russell Global Small Cap Index is an unmanaged, capitalization-weighted index of global small-cap stocks. The performance of an index does not represent exactly any particular investment, as you cannot invest directly in an index. Index returns include net reinvested dividends and/or interest income. Royce Value, Micro-Cap and Global Value Trust shares of common stock trade on the NYSE. Royce Fund Services, Inc (RFS) is a member of FINRA and has filed this *Review and Report* with FINRA on behalf of each Fund. RFS is not an underwriter or distributor of any of the Funds.

MANAGER S DISCUSSION

Royce Global Value Trust (RGT)

Chuck Royce **FUND PERFORMANCE**

Royce Global Value Trust (RGT) increased 3.9% on a net asset value (NAV) basis and 2.0% on a market price basis for the year-to-date period ended June 30, 2016, outperforming its unleveraged benchmark, the Russell Global Small Cap Index, which was up 1.4% for the same period. The year began on a distinctly bearish note, with small-cap stocks across much of the globe declining into the middle of February before recovery for many began. The Fund outperformed on an NAV basis in the first quarter, up 2.3% (while falling 1.1% on a market price basis) compared to a decline of 0.2% for its benchmark.

The second quarter was moving along at a modestly bullish pace until the Brexit vote upended capital markets on a worldwide basis. For many markets outside Europe, however, the disarray proved very temporary, with many global small-caps already rebounding before the end of June. RGT, notwithstanding its much greater weighting in Western Europe and in the United Kingdom in particular fell only fractionally behind its benchmark in the period. For the second quarter, the Fund was virtually even with the Russell Global Small Cap, up 1.6% on an NAV basis (and +3.1% based on market price) versus 1.6% for the benchmark. The Fund s strong first half helped it to outperform the Russell Global Small Cap on an NAV basis for the one-year period ended June 30, 2016.

WHAT WORKED... AND WHAT DIDN T Materials and Financials led the list of five of the Fund s nine equity sectors that made net contributions to first-half results. Health Care, Consumer Discretionary, Energy, and Telecommunication Services detracted, with comparatively modest net losses. The metals & mining group in the Materials sector had by far the biggest net gains of the portfolio s industry groups. We were overweight in this industry in the first half, holding what we think is an attractive balance of industrial metals companies and businesses involved in precious metals mining. Three of the Fund s top five contributing holdings hailed from the industry Pan American Silver, Agnico Eagle Mines, and Major Drilling Group International and benefited from the rebound in precious metals prices during the first half. Canada s Major Drilling Group International was also helped by increased revenues and margins in what was a challenging environment for its business in early 2016. Moving from Materials to Financials, Genworth MI Canada is one of that country s leading residential mortgage insurance providers. Its stock rebounded with consecutive quarters of strong results which were driven by a loss ratio that remains below the low end of its guidance. This has eased investor anxieties about the impact of lower oil prices in resource-rich Alberta, where about 20% of its policies are written. The recovery in oil prices also helped its shares to surge. Positions that detracted from first-half performance included two holdings in the Health Care sector. Virbac is a French firm that makes vaccines, antibiotics, and other veterinary medications. Its shares suffered mostly from the negative results of a 2014 FDA investigation of its U.S. plant in St. Louis that were released earlier this year. We were confident that the company had dealt effectively with these issues, though we reduced our position in the first half. Consort Medical is a U.K. based business that supplies drug delivery devices and development services to pharmaceutical companies. It continued to execute effectively and profitably in the first half, but its shares were caught up first in the widespread sell-off for biopharma companies and then in the crashing wave of Brexit.

On a country level, the largest positive contributions came from Canada, Brazil, and Japan while the U.K. and Hong Kong detracted most. Relative to its benchmark, RGT was helped chiefly by its overweight and savvy stock picking in the previously mentioned metals & mining group, its underweight in biotechnology, and successful stock selection both in thrifts & mortgage services and in a number of industries in Information Technology. Conversely, our underweight in REITs, ineffective stocks picks in pharmaceuticals, and our lack of exposure to Utilities all hurt versus the benchmark.

Top Contributors to Performance

Year-to-Date Through 6/30/16 (%)1

Pan American Silver	0.61
Genworth MI Canada	0.60
CETIP - Mercados Organizados	0.46
Agnico Eagle Mines	0.42
Major Drilling Group International	0.38

1 Includes dividends

Top Detractors from Performance

Year-to-Date Through 6/30/16 (%)2

Virbac	-0.49
Consort Medical	-0.29
Value Partners Group	-0.29
Midland Holdings	-0.26
Gaztransport Et Technigaz	-0.21

2 Net of dividends

CURRENT POSITIONING AND OUTLOOK While the corporate earnings picture is a phenomenon we continue to watch quite carefully, we are cautiously optimistic about RGT s near- and long-term prospects, basing our belief primarily on two factors the growing performance advantage of small-cap value versus growth and the relatively attractive valuation and earnings picture for many cyclical stocks. We continue to believe that an extended period of slow growth should be enough to keep profitable cyclicals climbing, especially after factoring in the ways in which low expectations and for some industries oversold conditions depressed the stock prices of so many small-caps that we see as attractive that is, solidly profitable businesses. In many cases, it appears that several global markets have just begun to reward steady earnings and high profitability and are only gradually recognizing how low valuations had become for many cyclicals. Going forward, we remain confident that earnings, profitability, and low leverage will matter more and more to investors through what we expect should be a long-running cycle.

PERFORMANCE AND PORTFOLIO REVIEW SYMBOLS **MARKET PRICE** RGT **NAV** XRGTX

Performance Average Annual Total Return (%) Through 6/30/16

	JAN-JUN 20161	1-YR	SINCE INCEPTION (10/17/13)
RGT (NAV)	3.86	-5.05	-1.26

1 Not Annualized

Market Price Performance History Since Inception (10/17/13)

Cumulative Performance of Investment1

	1-YR	5-YR	10-YR	15-YR	20-YR	SINCE INCEPTION (10/17/13)
RGT	-7.3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-12.5%

1 Reflects the cumulative performance experience of a continuous common stockholder who purchased one share at inception ($8.975 IPO) and reinvested all distributions. 2 Reflects the actual month-end market price movement of one share as it has traded on NYSE and, prior to 12/1/03, on the Nasdaq.

The **Morningstar Style Map** is the **Morningstar Style BoxTM** with the center 75% of fund holdings plotted as the **Morningstar Ownership ZoneTM**. The Morningstar Style Box is designed to reveal a fund s investment strategy. The Morningstar Ownership Zone provides detail about a portfolio s investment style by showing the range of stock sizes and styles. The Ownership Zone is derived by plotting each stock in the portfolio within the proprietary Morningstar Style Box. Over time, the shape and location of a fund s ownership zone may vary. See page 58 for additional information.

Top 10 Positions % of Net Assets SEI Investments 2.1 Kirby Corporation 1.9 VZ Holding 1.6 Clarkson 1.3 Santen Pharmaceutical 1.3 Spirax-Sarco Engineering 1.2 Vetoquinol 1.2 Bajaj Finance 1.1 USS 1.1 Meitec Corporation 1.1

Portfolio Sector Breakdown % of Net Assets Industrials 26.4 Financials 20.6 Information Technology 17.7 Health Care 13.0 Consumer Discretionary 10.6 Materials 9.8 Consumer Staples 2.9 Energy 1.4 Telecommunication Services 0.1 Outstanding Line of Credit, Net of Cash and Cash Equivalents -2.5

Calendar Year Total Returns (%) **YEAR** **RGT** 2015 -3.4 2014 -6.2

Portfolio Country Breakdown1,2 % of Net Assets United States 26.1 United Kingdom 13.0 Japan 12.2 Canada 7.5 Germany 5.6 France 5.5 Switzerland 4.8 Hong Kong 3.3 1 Represents countries that are 3% or more of net assets. 2 Securities are categorized by the country of their headquarters.

Portfolio Diagnostics Fund Net Assets $95 million Number of Holdings 271 Turnover Rate 34% Net Asset Value $9.15 Market Price $7.60 Net Leverage1 2.5% Average Market Capitalization2 $1,431 million Weighted Average P/E Ratio3,4 18.0x Weighted Average P/B Ratio3 2.4x Active Share5 98% 1

Net leverage is the percentage, in excess of 100%, of the total value of equity type investments, divided by net assets.

2

Geometric Average. This weighted calculation uses each portfolio holding s market cap in a way designed to not skew the effect of very large or small holdings; instead, it aims to better identify the portfolio s center, which Royce believes offers a more accurate measure of average market cap than a simple mean or median.

3

Harmonic Average. This weighted calculation evaluates a portfolio as if it were a single stock and measures it overall. It compares the total market value of the portfolio to the portfolio s share in the earnings or book value, as the case may be, of its underlying stocks.

4

The Fund s P/E ratio calculation excludes companies with zero or negative earnings (6% of portfolio holdings as of 6/30/16).

5

Active Share is the sum of the absolute values of the different weightings of each holding in the Fund versus each holding in the benchmark, divided by two.

Important Performance and Risk Information

All performance information reflects past performance, is presented on a total return basis, net of the Fund s investment advisory fee, and reflects the reinvestment of distributions. Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Current performance may be higher or lower than performance quoted. Returns as of the most recent month-end may be obtained at www.roycefunds.com. The market price of the Fund s shares will fluctuate, so that shares may be worth more or less than their original cost when sold. The Fund invests primarily in securities of small- and micro-cap companies, which may involve considerably more risk than investments in securities of larger-cap companies. The Fund s broadly diversified portfolio does not ensure a profit or guarantee against loss. From time to time, the Fund may invest a significant portion of its net assets in foreign securities, which may involve political, economic, currency and other risks not encountered in U.S. investments. Regarding the Top Contributors and Top Detractors tables shown on page 10, the sum of all contributors to, and all detractors from, performance for all securities in the portfolio would approximate the Fund s year-to-date performance for 2016.

MANAGER S DISCUSSION Royce Micro-Cap Trust (RMT)

Chuck Royce

FUND PERFORMANCE

Royce Micro-Cap Trust (RMT) increased 5.4% on a net asset value (NAV) basis and 5.8% on a market price basis for the year-to-date period ended June 30, 2016, ahead of both of its unleveraged benchmarks: the small-cap Russell 2000 Index was up 2.2% while the Russell Microcap Index declined 1.7% for the same period. RMT was solid in a first quarter that was challenging for micro-cap stocks, up 0.1% on an NAV basis and down 1.2% based on market price, compared to first-quarter declines of 1.5% for the Russell 2000 and 5.4% for the Russell Microcap.

The second quarter was mostly a period of gradual recovery that favored more defensive areas, such as REITs and utilities, while cyclical areas within Materials, Industrials, and Energy also continued to do well. The aftermath of the Brexit vote wound up doing little to impede this low-key bullish phase. Although it had little exposure to defensive stocks, the Fund excelled in the second quarter, advancing 5.3% on an NAV basis and 7.1% on a market price basis, outpacing the Russell 2000 (+3.8%) and the Russell Microcap (+4.0%). On an NAV basis RMT outpaced the Russell Microcap for the one-, three-, 10-, and 15-year periods ended June 30, 2016 while also beating the Russell 2000 for the one-, 15-, 20-year, and since inception (12/14/93) periods. (Returns for the Russell Microcap Index only go back to 2000.) **RMT s average annual NAV total return for the since inception period ended June 30, 2016 was 10.3%.**

WHAT WORKED... AND WHAT DIDN T

Eight of the Fund s 10 equity sectors were in the black at the end of June, led by Materials, Information Technology, and Financials, with the net losses posted by Health Care and Consumer Discretionary more modest in comparison. RMT s leading industry group by a wide margin was metals & mining (Materials), where we were significantly overweight relative to the Russell 2000. We hold what we think is an effective balance in this group between industrial metals companies and precious metals and mining companies. It contributed two of the portfolio s top five net gainers in the first half. Major Drilling Group International performs contract drilling for companies involved in mining and mineral exploration. In a challenging environment for miners early in 2016, the company increased revenues and margins, helping its shares to climb. Exeter Resource mines for gold primarily in Argentina and Chile and benefited mostly from increased gold prices. We were drawn to its large cash reserves and promising mining properties. ASA Gold and Precious Metals, part of the capital markets group in Financials, is a closed-end fund that invests primarily in gold mining companies that was also rewarded by the rebound in precious metals prices. Electronic equipment, instruments & components is another key industry overweight that made a large contribution to first-half results. Its top performer was Newport Corporation, a photonics technology specialist whose shares climbed by more than 50% in February after the company agreed to be acquired by MKS Instruments.

As for those holdings that detracted from performance, we held our position in ZAIS Group Holdings, an investment manager focused on specialized credit strategies an asset management segment with what we think is ample long-term potential. Its shares fell with a quarterly loss reported in March and were mostly down through the end of June. A falling stock price in the first half and our confidence in its long-term prospects led us to add shares of Fenix Parts, which recycles and resells original equipment manufacturer automotive parts and products. Consecutive quarterly losses drove investors away, but we like its business and the acquisitions it made in 2015, which have not diluted its balance sheet to a worrisome level.

Relative to the Russell 2000, the Fund benefited most from both its overweight and effective stock picking in metals & mining (Materials), the combination of an underweight and stock picking success in biotechnology (Health Care), our larger weighting and savvy stock picks in electronic equipment, instruments & components, and the same mix in the energy equipment & services group. Conversely, first-half results were hampered most by our underweight in REITs (Financials) and lack of exposure to the Utilities sector.

Top Contributors to Performance
Year-to-Date Through 6/30/16 (%)1 Major Drilling Group International 0.74 Newport Corporation 0.50 ASA Gold and Precious Metals 0.48 Care.com 0.41 Exeter Resource 0.37 1 Includes dividends

Top Detractors from Performance
Year-to-Date Through 6/30/16 (%)2 ZAIS Group Holdings Cl. A -0.53 Fenix Parts -0.35 Avalanche Biotechnologies -0.35 Liberty Tax Cl. A -0.33 SeaChange International -0.32 2 Net of dividends

CURRENT POSITIONING AND OUTLOOK While the corporate earnings picture is a phenomenon we continue to watch quite carefully, we are cautiously optimistic about RMT s near-and long-term prospects, basing our belief primarily on two factors the growing performance advantage of both small- and micro-cap value versus growth and the relatively attractive valuation and earnings picture for many cyclical stocks. We continue to believe that an extended period of slow growth should be enough to keep profitable cyclicals climbing, especially after factoring in the ways in which low expectations and for some industries oversold conditions depressed the stock prices of so many small-caps that we see as attractive that is, solidly profitable businesses. In many cases, it appears that the market has just begun to reward steady earnings and high profitability and is only gradually recognizing how low valuations had become for many cyclicals. Going forward, we remain confident that earnings and low leverage will matter more to investors through what we expect should be a long-running cycle. We have been researching and investing in micro-cap stocks for more than two decades and believe that our experience in this asset class can be a differentiator as the markets continue to normalize.

PERFORMANCE AND PORTFOLIO REVIEW SYMBOLS **MARKET PRICE** RMT **NAV** XOTCX

Performance Average Annual Total Return (%) Through 6/30/16 **JAN-JUN 20161 1-YR 3-YR 5-YR 10-YR 15-YR 20-YR SINCE INCEPTION (12/14/93)** RMT (NAV) 5.39 -6.47 7.07 7.90 5.51 8.27 9.73 10.35 1 Not Annualized

Market Price Performance History Since Inception (12/14/93)
Cumulative Performance of Investment1

1-YR 5-YR 10-YR 15-YR 20-YR SINCE INCEPTION (12/14/93) RMT -7.3% 43.4% 42.9% 230.6% 521.7% 658.5%

1 Reflects the cumulative performance experience of a continuous common stockholder who purchased one share at inception ($7.50 IPO), reinvested all distributions and fully participated in the primary subscription of the Fund s 1994 rights offering. 2 Reflects the actual month-end market price movement of one share as it has traded on NYSE and, prior to 12/1/03, on the Nasdaq.

The **Morningstar Style Map** is the **Morningstar Style BoxTM** with the center 75% of fund holdings plotted as the **Morningstar Ownership ZoneTM**. The Morningstar Style Box is designed to reveal a fund s investment strategy. The Morningstar Ownership Zone provides detail about a portfolio s investment style by showing the range of stock sizes and styles. The Ownership Zone is derived by plotting each stock in the portfolio within the proprietary Morningstar Style Box. Over time, the shape and location of a fund s ownership zone may vary. See page 58 for additional information.

Top 10 Positions % of Net Assets SurModics 1.8 Seneca Foods Corporation 1.5 Major Drilling Group International 1.4 IES Holdings 1.1 Care.com 1.1 Exactech 1.0 Orbotech 1.0 Atrion Corporation 1.0 Heritage-Crystal Clean 0.9 MVC Capital 0.9

Portfolio Sector Breakdown % of Net Assets Information Technology 22.5 Financials 17.7 Industrials 16.0 Health Care 15.6 Consumer Discretionary 15.2 Materials 6.5 Energy 5.2 Consumer Staples 2.3 Utilities 0.1 Telecommunication Services 0.1 Miscellaneous 3.2 Preferred Stock 0.5 Outstanding Line of Credit, Net of Cash and Cash Equivalents -4.9

Calendar Year Total Returns (%) **YEAR RMT** 2015 -11.7 2014 3.5 2013 44.5 2012 17.3 2011 -7.7 2010 28.5 2009 46.5 2008 -45.5 2007 0.6 2006 22.5 2005 6.8 2004 18.7 2003 55.5 2002 -13.8 2001 23.4

Portfolio Diagnostics Fund Net Assets $321 million Number of Holdings 348 Turnover Rate 15% Net Asset Value $8.65 Market Price $7.34 Net Leverage1 4.9% Average Market Capitalization2 $329 million Weighted Average P/B Ratio3 1.7x Active Share4 95% U.S. Investments (% of Net Assets) 86.1% Non-U.S. Investments (% of Net Assets) 18.8% 1 Net leverage is the percentage, in excess of 100%, of the total value of equity type investments, divided by net assets. 2 **Geometric Average.** This weighted calculation uses each portfolio holding s market cap in a way designed to not skew the effect of very large or small holdings; instead, it aims to better identify the portfolio s center, which Royce believes offers a more accurate measure of average market cap than a simple mean or median. 3 **Harmonic Average.** This weighted calculation evaluates a portfolio as if it were a single stock and measures it overall. It compares the total market value of the portfolio to the portfolio s share in the earnings or book value, as the case may be, of its underlying stocks. 4 **Active Share** is the sum of the absolute values of the different weightings of each holding in the Fund versus each holding in the benchmark, divided by two.

Important Performance and Risk Information

All performance information reflects past performance, is presented on a total return basis, net of the Fund s investment advisory fee, and reflects the reinvestment of distributions. Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Current performance may be higher or lower than performance quoted. Returns as of the most recent month-end may be obtained at www.roycefunds.com. Certain immaterial adjustments were made to the net assets of Royce Micro-Cap Trust at 12/31/12 and 12/31/14 for financial reporting purposes, and as a result the net asset value originally calculated on that date and the total return based on that net asset value differs from the adjusted net asset value and total return reported in the Financial Highlights. The market price of the Fund s shares will fluctuate, so that shares may be worth more or less than their original cost when sold. The Fund normally invests in micro-cap companies, which may involve considerably more risk than investments in securities of larger-cap companies. The Fund s broadly diversified portfolio does not ensure a profit or guarantee against loss. From time to time, the Fund may invest a significant portion of its net assets in foreign securities, which may involve political, economic, currency and other risks not encountered in U.S. investments. Regarding the Top Contributors and Top Detractors tables shown on page 8, the sum of all contributors to, and all detractors from, performance for all securities in the portfolio would approximate the Fund s year-to-date performance for 2016.

MANAGER S DISCUSSION **Royce Value Trust (RVT)**

Chuck Royce **FUND PERFORMANCE**

Royce Value Trust gained 8.2% on a net asset value (NAV) basis and 4.4% on a market price basis for the year-to-date period ended June 30, 2016, compared to respective increases of 2.2% and 6.2% for its unleveraged small-cap benchmarks, the Russell 2000 and S&P SmallCap 600 Indexes, for the same period. We were pleased to see the Fund show its down market resilience early in 2016, as it often has throughout its long history. First-quarter NAV returns for RVT were notable on an absolute and relative basis. The Fund gained 4.4% based on NAV (and advanced 1.7% on a market price basis), outperforming each of its benchmarks: the Russell 2000 declined 1.5% while the S&P SmallCap 600 rose 2.7% for the first quarter.

The second quarter was mostly a period of gradual recovery that favored more defensive areas, such as REITs and utilities. Some of the growth stocks that had been hurt in the winter sell-off also rebounded, while cyclical areas within Materials, Industrials, and Energy continued to do well, in sharp contrast to what we experienced in 2015. The wave of volatility that hit the markets in the wake of the Brexit vote wound up doing little to impede this low-key bullish phase. Although it had little exposure to defensive stocks, RVT barely lost ground to the Russell 2000 during the second quarter, gaining 3.6% on an NAV basis and 2.6% based on market price versus 3.8% for the Russell 2000 and 3.5% for the S&P SmallCap 600. The Fund also beat the Russell 2000 on both an NAV and market price basis for the one-, 20-, 25-year, and since inception (11/26/86) periods ended June 30, 2016. **RVT s average annual NAV total return since inception was 10.1%.**

WHAT WORKED... AND WHAT DIDN T Each of the Fund s 10 equity sectors finished 2016 s first half with net gains. The resurgent Materials and Industrials sectors led by a sizable margin while a meaningful net contribution also came from Information Technology. Three industry groups from three different sectors dominated performance metals & mining (Materials), electronic equipment, instruments & components (Information Technology), and machinery (Industrials). Net losses at the industry level were comparatively modest. The leading detractors were professional services (also from Industrials) and capital markets (Financials). Each of these five industry groups is an area of investment focus in the portfolio, and we were overweight in all of them relative to the Russell 2000 at the end of June.

Three of RVT s top four contributing positions came from the electronic equipment, instruments & components group, and two were acquisition targets. The stock price of Newport Corporation climbed by more than 50% in February after the company, which specializes in photonics technology, agreed to be acquired by MKS Instruments, prompting us to begin selling our position. FEI Company produces specialized electron microscopes for protein analysis, which was a complementary business for Thermo Fisher Scientific. The acquisition was announced in May. Long-time holding Coherent manufactures lasers and laser-based technology for scientific, commercial, and industrial customers. In January the company reported record setting quarterly bookings, boosted by orders for its VyperTM Linebeam systems, which helped its stock to soar. From the metals & mining group, Toronto s Franco-Nevada Corporation owns royalties and streams in gold mining and other commodity and natural resource investments. The company paid down debt, increased its dividend, and offered upward earnings revisions, all as gold prices surged during the first half. As for those holdings that detracted from performance, we held our position in ZAIS Group Holdings, an investment manager focused on specialized credit strategies a segment of the capital markets with what we think is considerable long-term potential. Its shares fell with a net quarterly loss reported in March and then were volatile, though mostly down, through the end of June. We added shares of The Advisory Board Company, which provides best practice research and analysis to the health care industry, after its decelerating core healthcare business and warnings of lower revenues sank its shares. We like its niche business and think its long-term prospects remain promising.

Top Contributors to Performance

Year-to-Date Through 6/30/16 (%)1 Newport Corporation 0.43 Coherent 0.41 Franco-Nevada Corporation 0.38 FEI Company 0.34 Ritchie Bros. Auctioneers 0.33 1 Includes dividends

Top Detractors from Performance

Year-to-Date Through 6/30/16 (%)2 ZAIS Group Holdings Cl. A -0.31 Advisory Board (The) -0.24 On Assignment -0.20 Zealand Pharma -0.16 Artisan Partners Asset Management Cl. A -0.15 2 Net of dividends

CURRENT POSITIONING AND OUTLOOK While the corporate earnings picture is a phenomenon we continue to watch quite carefully, we are cautiously optimistic about RVT s near- and long-term prospects, basing our belief primarily on two factors the growing performance advantage of small-cap value versus growth and the relatively attractive valuation and earnings picture for many cyclical stocks. We continue to believe that an extended period of slow growth should be enough to keep profitable cyclicals climbing, especially after factoring in the ways in which low expectations and for some industries oversold conditions depressed the stock prices of so many small-caps that we see as attractive that is, solidly profitable businesses. In many cases, it appears that the market has just begun to reward steady earnings and high profitability and is only gradually recognizing how low valuations had become for many cyclicals. Going forward, we remain confident that earnings, profitability, and low leverage will matter more and more to investors through what we expect should be a long-runn