NORTH Dakota | State Investment Board
Be Legendary. RETIREMENT & INVESTMENT

Investment Committee
Friday July 10, 2026, 9:00 a.m.
Virtual Only
Click here to join the meeting

AGENDA

I. **CALL TO ORDER AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA** – ***(Committee Action)***
   A. Roll Call & Conflict of Interest Disclosure

II. **ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES (May 8, 2026)** – ***(Committee Action)***

III. **BENCHMARK MEMO (30 minutes)** – ***(Committee Action)*** – *Mr. Gesell, Cerity*

IV. **MANAGER UPDATE (5 minutes)** – ***(Information Only)***
   A. Private Markets – *Mr. Collins, Mr. Ziettlow*
   B. Public Markets – *Mr. Posch*

V. **TEMPORARY GUIDELINE WAIVER (10 minutes)** – ***(Committee Action)***
   A. Wellington – *Mr. Anderson*

VI. **COMMITTEE SCHEDULE (5 minutes)** – ***(Committee Action)***
   A. Fiscal Year 2027 – *Mr. Anderson*

VII. **DISCUSSION**

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**

Any individual requiring an auxiliary aid or service, please contact the Retirement and Investment Office (701) 328-9885 at least three (3) days prior to the scheduled meeting.

STATE INVESTMENT BOARD INVESTMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES OF THE JUNE 18, 2026, MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT
Thomas Beadle, State Treasurer, Chair
Prodosh Simlai, External Representative, Vice Chair
Scott Anderson, Chief Investment Officer
Eric Chin, Deputy Chief Investment Officer
Todd Van Orman, External Representative

MEMBERS ABSENT
Pete Jahner, External Representative

STAFF PRESENT
Jac Collins, Senior Investment Analyst
Cory Cox, Investment Analyst
Derek Dukart, Senior Investment Analyst
Jennifer Ferderer, Fiscal Operations Admin
Timothy Forsythe, Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Chirag Gandhi, Portfolio Manager
Ross Hambrick, Portfolio Manager
Erik Jodock, Investment Analyst
Robbie Morey, Investment Operations Analyst
George Moss, Portfolio Manager
Sarah Mudder, Communications & Outreach Director
Chuck Napp, Senior Investment Operations Manager
Adam Otteson, Chief Financial Officer
Daphne Pfleiger, Investment Accountant
Matthew Posch, Portfolio Manager
Jodi Smith, Executive Director
Sam Suchy, Risk Analyst
Alexander Weissman, Investment Analyst
Lance Ziettlow, Portfolio Manager

GUESTS
Members of the Public

CALL TO ORDER
Treasurer Beadle called the State Investment Board (SIB) Investment Committee (IC) meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. on Thursday, June 18, 2026. The meeting was held virtually.

The following members were present representing a quorum: Mr. Van Orman, Mr. Anderson, Dr. Simlai, Mr. Chin, and Treasurer Beadle.

AGENDA

The agenda was considered for the June 18, 2026, meeting.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SIMLAI AND SECONDED BY MR. CHIN AND CARRIED BY A VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE JUNE 18, 2026, MEETING AS DISTRIBUTED.

AYES: MR. ANDERSON, MR. CHIN, DR. SIMLAI, MR. VAN ORMAN, AND TREASURER BEADLE
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: MR. JAHNER
MOTION CARRIED

MINUTES

The minutes were considered for the May 8, 2026, meeting.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ANDERSON AND SECONDED BY MR. VAN ORMAN AND CARRIED BY A VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE MAY 8, 2026, MEETING AS DISTRIBUTED.

AYES: MR. ANDERSON, MR. CHIN, DR. SIMLAI, MR. VAN ORMAN, AND TREASURER BEADLE
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: MR. JAHNER
MOTION CARRIED

STRATEGY REVIEW

Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Moss presented an update on RIO's internal equity and fixed income program, highlighting its growth from index replication toward more active investment management. Internal portfolios now represent approximately $4.2 billion of RIO's $28.8 billion program and generated an estimated $16.3 million in FY26 savings. The presenters discussed plans to expand internal capabilities through active management, additional asset classes, and enhanced investment strategies, supported by continued investments in technology, operations, and staffing.

Mr. Hambrick, Mr. Gandhi, and Mr. Moss presented updated Cash Overlay Portfolio guidelines for approval. The revisions broaden the portfolio's mandate from U.S. equities and Treasuries to a framework that more closely aligns with SIB policy allocations for public equity and fixed income. The updated guidelines also clarify permitted investment instruments, collateral and liquidity requirements, rebalancing procedures, and exposure limits.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SIMLAI AND SECONDED BY MR. VAN ORMAN AND CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE UPDATED INVESTMENT GUIDELINES FOR THE CASH OVERLAY PORTFOLIO.

AYES: MY. CHIN, MR. VAN ORMAN, MR. ANDERSON, DR. SIMLAI, AND TREASURER BEADLE
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: MR. JAHNER
MOTION CARRIED

The Committee recessed at 11:17 a.m. and reconvened at 11:22 a.m.

CONSULTANT UPDATE

Mr. Otteson reported that the performance measurement and benchmark consulting contract was awarded to Callan and executed on June 5, 2026. Staff have begun the transition process, which is proceeding on schedule.

INVESTMENT POLICY STATEMENT UPDATE

Mr. Chin presented an updated Investment Policy Statement (IPS) for the City of Bismarck Deferred Sick Leave Account. The update aligns the policy with RIO’s standard IPS template and consolidates multiple equity allocations into a single global equity allocation to better reflect the investable universe and improve consistency across client portfolios.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. SIMLAI AND SECONDED BY MR. VAN ORMAN AND CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE UPDATED INVESTMENT POLICY STATEMENT FOR THE CITY OF BISMARCK DEFERRED SICK LEAVE ACCOUNT TO THE SIB.

AYES: MY. ANDERSON, MR. CHIN, MR. VAN ORMAN, DR. SIMLAI, AND TREASURER BEADLE
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: MR. JAHNER
MOTION CARRIED

MANAGER UPDATE

Mr. Collins provided an update on Altor Fund VII, L.P., a private equity fund focused on lower middle-market companies in the Nordic and DACH regions of Europe. The fund includes a €63 million commitment.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

Mr. Anderson presented the first quarter 2026 investment service contract report, which included a no-cost Morgan Stanley data access agreement and a Verus benchmark hurdle-rate contract valued at $133,000 annually.

GUIDELINE WAIVERS

Mr. Chin presented temporary guideline waivers for Allspring and PIMCO for Committee ratification. The waivers had previously been discussed but not formally approved and were subsequently ratified by the Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. VAN ORMAN AND SECONDED BY DR. SIMLAI AND CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE TEMPORARY GUIDELINE WAIVERS FOR ALLSPRING AND PIMCO.

AYES: MR. VAN ORMAN, MR. ANDERSON, DR. SIMLAI, MR. CHIN, AND TREASURER BEADLE
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: MR. JAHNER
MOTION CARRIED

COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

Ms. Smith reviewed the proposed FY2027 Investment Committee meeting schedule. Staff recommended continuing monthly meetings despite the quarterly minimum required under the governance policy, with meeting dates to be finalized following a survey of Committee members.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the committee, Treasurer Beadle adjourned the meeting at 11:37 a.m.

Prepared by:

Jennifer Ferderer, Assistant to the Board

CERITY PARTNERS®

Memorandum

ceritypartners.com

To: Members of the North Dakota State Investment Board
From: Cerity Partners
Date: July 29, 2026
RE: 2026 Annual Strategic Benchmark Recommendations

The purpose of this memorandum is to update the benchmark recommendations for the strategic asset classes which comprise the asset allocation policies for the respective Plans under the SIB's purview and given the asset allocation harmonization process currently underway.

Summary of Current Benchmarks

Current Asset Class	Current Benchmark
Total Fund	***Custom asset class weighted policy index***
Total Equity	**Roll-up of asset class strategy benchmarks**
Total Public Equity	Blend of Russell 3000 & MSCI ACWI ex-US IMI (net) *(ACWI IMI weighted)*
Total Public Equity *(custom US/Non-US policy)*	Blend of Russell 3000 & MSCI ACWI ex-US IMI (net) *(policy weighted)*
U.S. Equity	Russell 3000
U.S Equity (*custom Large/Small cap policy*)	Blend of Russell 1000 & Russell 2000 *(policy weighted*)
Private Equity	Hamilton Lane Private Equity Index - 1 quarter lagged [1]
Total Fixed Income	**Roll-up of asset class strategy benchmarks**
Investment Grade Fixed Income	Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index
U.S. Government Securities (*State Historical Society*)	Bloomberg U.S. Government Bond Index
Non-Investment Grade Bonds	Bloomberg High Yield 2% Issuer Constrained
Long-term Government/Credit Bonds	Bloomberg U.S. Long Government/Credit Bond Index
Private Credit	Morningstar LSTA Leveraged Loan Index + 100 bps
Total Real Assets	**Roll-up of asset class strategy benchmarks**
Core Real Estate	NCREIF ODCE (net) - 1 quarter lagged
Timber	NCREIF Timberland Index - 1 quarter lagged
Infrastructure	NCREIF ODCE (net) + 100 bps - 1 quarter lagged
TIPS (*WSI Plan*)	Bloomberg US Government Inflation Linked Bond Index
Short Term Fixed Income	Bloomberg 1-3 Year US Government/Corporate Index
In-state Equity	Benchmark against itself
In-state Infrastructure Loan	Benchmark against itself
BND CD Match Program	Benchmark against itself
Cash	90-day T-Bills

[1] SIB adopted three-tiered approach to benchmarking private equity. For new or start up PE funds (Tier 1), accounts will be benchmarked against themselves; between years 4 and 9 (Tier 2), PE fund accounts will be benchmarked against the Hamilton Lane Private Equity Index, weighted by vintage year; year 10 and afterwards (Tier 3), PE fund accounts will be benchmarked against the Hamilton Lane Private Equity Index, aggregate version. For periods when the Hamilton Lane indices are not available before the reporting date, account returns will be used until the index returns become available.

Overview

Selecting benchmarks is among the most important decisions the SIB makes behind setting asset allocation policy for the Plans under its purview. Benchmarks provide the mechanism through which to evaluate the success of the respective investment program in meeting its stated policy objectives. They provide the link between expectations and success.

Benchmarks serve essential functions in the realm of investment program oversight for fiduciaries. From a policy viewpoint, they reflect the desired asset class risk, or 'beta' exposures. The overarching goal of SIB's benchmarks should be to provide the SIB a measurement tool in order to evaluate and understand the degree to which the Plans, asset classes and strategies are successful in meeting policy objectives over both the short term (i.e., 3 or less years) and long term (i.e., 5 or more years).

Benchmarks provide insight into how capital markets are performing, in general, and help the Board understand how individual asset classes, sub-asset classes and strategies are contributing to overall results. The qualities that are desirable in benchmarks used to evaluate investment performance are typically:

- Representative of the opportunity set
- Investable and known and set ex ante (before the fact)
- Transparent
- Measurable
- Unambiguous

Other desirable qualities are:

- Consistent with the proxies used in asset allocation policy development
- Reflective of risk as well as the return of the asset class
- Available in a timely, cost-efficient manner
- Commonly used by Public Fund and other institutional investor peers

Asset classes are defined by the asset allocation policy; thus, the benchmarks for asset classes need to be reflective of the benchmarks used in the policy setting process. The goal of the SIB should be to ensure SIB's benchmarks meet industry standards for benchmark quality and that these benchmarks fairly and accurately represent the asset classes and strategies employed in the various Plans. Benchmarks for the most liquid asset classes (Global Public Equities, Public Fixed Income and Cash) tend to meet all the benchmark quality criteria. For Private Equity, Private Credit, Real Estate and Real Assets, some of the above criteria cannot be fully met and choosing which items to emphasize entails subjective judgement, including the tradeoff between short-term tracking error and long-term compatibility with the desired outcomes.

Cerity is not recommending any additional or revised benchmarks for the upcoming fiscal year. The main rationale in support of the current benchmarks is that the respective benchmarks provide the best representation of capital market "beta" for that market segment as well as reflect the proxies that were employed in the asset allocation policy development process. Additionally, most of the current benchmarks are widely utilized by SIB's peers for those same market segments. The public markets benchmarks are all published benchmarks which meet the preferred benchmark quality standards articulated earlier in this memorandum. Lastly, the benchmarks are simple and easy to understand.

Rationale Supporting Current Benchmarks

Total Equity – The current benchmark is a roll-up of the two Equity sub-asset class (i.e., Public Equities and Private Equities) benchmarks. This represents an industry standard approach to benchmarking an aggregate asset class.

Total Public Equity – The current Total Public Equity benchmark is the MSCI ACWI IMI, which is the broadest published global equity benchmark and is widely used by SIB's peers to benchmark their respective global (or total) public equity asset classes. However, the implicit use of the US component of this index is inconsistent with the use of the Russell 3000 Index to benchmark the US exposure in plans with custom policy weights for US and Non-US Equity (see bullet directly below). For plans without such custom weights the US component of the MSCI ACWI IMI is currently replaced with the Russell 3000 Index. In other words, a plan with a simple policy allocation to the Global Public Equity asset class will have that portfolio benchmarked against a market weighted blend of the Russell 3000 & MSCI ACWI ex-US IMI (net). The market weighting of the blended index will mirror that of the MSCI ACWI IMI Index.

Total Public Equity (custom US/Non-US policy weights) – For plans with policy level sub-allocations within Total Public Equity, i.e., specific weights to US and Non-US Equity, the plan's Total Public Equity portfolio is benchmarked against a policy-weighted blend of the Russell 3000 and the MSCI ACWI ex-US IMI (net). The decision to deviate from market weights is made at the level of strategic policy, not at the asset class level. Therefore, any related out-performance (or under-performance) should not be attributed to asset class management but instead be benchmarked against the policy-weighted index. For a similar reason, the custom policy weights are used in the corridor benchmark calculation, which represents an adjustment of the policy benchmark for Private Markets exposures. Such exposures are not fully within the control of fund management because of the inherent unpredictability of Private Markets cash flow.

US Equity – For plans which do not specify sub-allocations within US Equity, Cerity recommends continued use of the Russell 3000 Index, the broadest published U.S. equity benchmark and which is also widely used by SIB's peers to benchmark their respective U.S. equity sub-asset class portfolios.

US Equity (custom Large/Small policy weights) – For plans with policy level sub-allocations within US Equity, i.e., specific weights to US Large Cap and US Small Cap stocks, the plans' US Equity portfolio is benchmarked against a policy-weighted blend of the Russell US Large Cap (Russell 1000) and US Small Cap indices (Russell 2000). As in the case of Total Public Equity (second bullet above), the decision to deviate from market weights is made at the level of strategic policy, not at the asset class level. Therefore, any related out-performance (or under-performance) should not be attributed to the asset class management and is instead benchmarked against the policy-weighted index. Again, the custom policy weights are used in the corridor benchmark calculation, which represents an adjustment of the policy benchmark for Private Markets cash flows.

Non-US Equity – The current benchmark is the MSCI ACWI ex-US IMI (net). US-based investors commonly rely on the "net" version, which reflects the payment of dividend taxes withheld by foreign governments. This is the broadest published non-US equity benchmark and is widely used by SIB's peers. Cerity recommends use of these net returns for performance comparisons as they more accurately reflect the returns that can be achieved by investment in the benchmark indices by US based funds.

These current sub-asset class benchmarks represent a best practices consideration under prevailing investment theory that the broad capital market benchmarks represent the best 'portfolio' in terms of return to risk relationship. Additionally, these benchmarks are typical proxies employed for these sub-asset classes within the asset allocation policy setting process, so they provide for good alignment with the Plans' various asset allocation policy targets.

Private Equity – The current lifecycle-based benchmark is based on the Hamilton Lane Private Equity Indexes and represents an appropriate strategic and implementation benchmark for Private Equities. For periods when the Hamilton Lane data is not available prior to the reporting deadline, Cerity historically recommended that the actual fund returns be used as a substitute until the Hamilton Lane data becomes available (presumably in the subsequent period). In other words, it may occasionally be necessary to benchmark the funds against themselves over the most recent quarter, and the record would be corrected in the next quarterly reporting period.

Total Fixed Income – like the Total Equity benchmark, the current Total Fixed Income benchmark is a roll-up of the sub asset class benchmarks. This is an industry standard approach to benchmarking an aggregate asset class.

- Investment Grade Fixed Income – The current benchmark is the Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index, which is by far the broadest published core fixed income benchmark and is widely used by SIB's peers.
- US Government Securities – The Bloomberg US Government Index is the appropriate benchmark for the State Historical Society's allocation to high quality fixed income investments, as this index is commensurate with the fund's risk profile and board-approved policy objective.
- Private Credit – The benchmark for this discreet strategic exposure is currently an industry standard benchmark for the asset class, the Morningstar LSTA Leveraged Loan Index + 100 basis points. This benchmark enables the Board to evaluate the decision to employ a private markets asset class versus a public markets alternative.

Real Assets – the current benchmark is a roll-up of the sub asset class benchmarks. This is an industry standard approach to benchmarking an aggregate asset class.

- Core Real Estate – The current benchmark is a pooled benchmark comprised of institutional, managed Real Estate commingled funds, similar to the SIB's real estate portfolio. The NCREIF ODCE (i.e., Open-end Diversified Core Equity) Index (net), is a capitalization-weighted, time-weighted return series of open-end, diversified core real estate funds. Thus, it nicely represents the core real estate universe and performance of the asset class. It is the most widely employed Core Real Estate benchmark by SIB's peers and is the asset class proxy employed in the typical asset allocation policy setting process. Like the Non-US Equity benchmark, more than one method is used to calculate returns on the NCREIF ODCE Index. In this case, returns are calculated either net of the management fees paid by the underlying funds or calculated prior to deducting those fees. Again, Cerity has historically recommended the use of net returns for this index, as they best reflect the experience of a passive investor in the asset class.
- Infrastructure – The current benchmark is the same benchmark assigned to SIB's Core Real Estate program (NCREIF ODCE (net)) plus a 100 basis points premium to capture both the value-added component and the idiosyncrasies of an infrastructure portfolio. While imperfect, the benchmark does capture the strategic objective of this sub-asset class (real income generation), which is the goal for the strategic benchmarks being recommended to the Board. The challenge with Infrastructure is that it is a relatively nascent sub-asset class and there currently does not exist a widely accepted industry standard benchmark. However, SIB is unique in that it has a well-developed Infrastructure investment program, which is ahead of most peers. Given the existence of multiple strategies and the fact that the program was developed to be income oriented with a return/risk profile similar to a 75%/25% Core/Value-add Real Estate program, Cerity continues to recommend the current benchmark.

In-State Investments – The In-State investment program is relatively new and in the process of being built. Additionally, in-state investments are idiosyncratic in nature and do not lend themselves to traditional benchmarks, particularly at the very immature stage. Thus, Cerity continues to recommend benchmarking these investments against themselves in the initial years. Benchmarking idiosyncratic assets against themselves is not uncommon in institutional investments. Benchmarks should be revisited every 3 years or so as a matter of industry best practice. At the next strategic benchmark review, these three program components will be evaluated to determine what alternative benchmarks may be appropriate to consider based upon the composition of the respective investment portfolios at that time.

Regarding the practical use of the above recommendations in periodic investment reporting, it should be noted that whenever timing issues (e.g., monthly reporting) require the use of lagged data for a particular asset class, the benchmark data for that asset class should be lagged to the same degree. Matching the period of benchmark performance to the period of portfolio performance is absolutely necessary for accurate measurement of the value added by portfolio management.

Benchmark Education and Recommendations

North Dakota State Investment Board

July 29, 2026

Table of Contents

CERITY PARTNERS®

Why benchmarks matter?

- Benchmarks matter because they:
  - Reflect Board's desired asset class and sub-asset class risk, or 'beta' exposures
  - Enable Board and Staff to adequately monitor whether investment program is meeting established goals
    - Provides link between expectations and success
- Benchmark selection is the most important investment decision Board makes behind setting asset allocation policy

Preferred benchmark qualities[1]

1. ***Specified in advance*** – benchmark is specified prior to start of evaluation period and known to all parties
2. ***Appropriate*** – benchmark is consistent with manager’s investment style or area of expertise
3. ***Measurable*** – benchmark return is readily calculable on reasonably frequent, consistent basis
4. ***Unambiguous*** – benchmark securities’ identities and weights are clearly defined
5. ***Reflective of current investment opinions*** – manager has current knowledge of benchmark securities or factor exposures
6. ***Accountable*** – manager is aware of and accepts accountability for benchmark constituents and performance
7. ***Investable*** – benchmark can be passively replicated

[1] *Source:* ***Managing Investment Portfolios***: A Dynamic Process (CFA Institute Investment Series), by John L. Maginn, Donald L. Tuttle, Dennis W. McLeavey and Jerald E. Pinto, 2007

Other preferred qualities

- Consistent with proxies used in asset allocation policy development
- Reflective of risk as well as return of the asset class, sub-asset class or strategy
- Available in a timely, cost-efficient manner
- Commonly used by similar investors

ND SIB benchmark summary

Current Asset Class	Current Benchmark	Benchmark Quality Summary of Current Benchmarks					
		Opportunity Set / Guideline Alignment	Investable and Known Ex-Ante	Transparent/ Unambiguous / Available	Consistent with Asset Allocation	Reflective of Asset Class Risk/Return	Commonly Used by Similar Investors
Total Fund	***Custom asset class weighted policy index***	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*Yes*
Total Equity	**Roll-up of asset class strategy benchmarks**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Total Public Equity	Blend of Russell 3000 & MSCI ACWI ex-US IMI (net) *(ACWI IMI weighted)*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total Public Equity *(custom US/Non-US policy)*	Blend of Russell 3000 & MSCI ACWI ex-US IMI (net) *(policy weighted)*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
U.S. Equity	Russell 3000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
U.S Equity (*custom Large/Small cap policy*)	Blend of Russell 1000 & Russell 2000 (*policy weighted*)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Private Equity	Hamilton Lane Private Equity Index - 1 quarter lagged [1]	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total Fixed Income	**Roll-up of asset class strategy benchmarks**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Investment Grade Fixed Income	Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
U.S. Government Securities (*State Historical Society*)	Bloomberg U.S. Government Bond Index	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Non-Investment Grade Bonds	Bloomberg High Yield 2% Issuer Constrained	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Long-term Government/Credit Bonds	Bloomberg U.S. Long Government/Credit Bond Index	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Private Credit	Morningstar LSTA Leveraged Loan Index + 100 bps	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total Real Assets	**Roll-up of asset class strategy benchmarks**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Core Real Estate	NCREIF ODCE (net) - 1 quarter lagged	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Timber	NCREIF Timberland Index - 1 quarter lagged	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Infrastructure	NCREIF ODCE (net) + 100 bps - 1 quarter lagged	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
TIPS (*WSI Plan*)	Bloomberg US Government Inflation Linked Bond Index	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Short Term Fixed Income	Bloomberg 1-3 Year US Government/Corporate Index	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
In-state Equity	Benchmark against itself	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	N/A
In-state Infrastructure Loan	Benchmark against itself	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	N/A
BND CD Match Program	Benchmark against itself	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	N/A
Cash	90-day T-Bills	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

[1] SIB adopted three-tiered approach to benchmarking private equity. For new or start up PE funds (Tier 1), accounts will be benchmarked against themselves; between years 4 and 9 (Tier 2), PE fund accounts will be benchmarked against the Hamilton Lane Private Equity Index, weighted by vintage year; year 10 and afterwards (Tier 3), PE fund accounts will be benchmarked against the Hamilton Lane Private Equity Index, aggregate version. For periods when the Hamilton Lane indices are not available before the reporting date, account returns will be used until the index returns become available.

Benchmarking issues – private markets

- Private markets benchmarks do not fulfill the following benchmark quality criteria:
  - Investable
  - Transparent
  - Appropriately representative (*of exposures that can be invested in today*)
- Private markets cannot be rebalanced to strategic targets
- Different return calculation methodology (*IRR vs. TWR*)
- Valuation timing
- Fund life cycle

Benchmarking issues - private markets

- Three primary types of benchmarks for private markets:
  1. Public markets benchmark
  2. Peer group universe
  3. Public markets equivalent ("PME")

- Most widely used private equity benchmarks are public benchmarks "plus" premium
  - However, more benchmark-aware, or sensitive, plan sponsors tend towards utilization of peer group universe as they reduce tracking error and benchmark misfit issues

- PME benchmarking for private equities is often incorporated in more detailed supplemental reporting
  - PME benchmarks are custom public market benchmarks where private market fund's cash flows are employed to create commensurate public market proxy
  - Helps answer question: "What if we had invested in the public markets instead?"

Summary of benchmark recommendations

- Cerity reviewed all of the updated client Fund IPS and did not identify any new asset classes or sub-asset classes that require revised or new benchmarks
- ***Thus, no change to current benchmarks is recommended***
- However, Cerity recommends that for the 2026-2027 fiscal year, we review the Private Credit benchmark now offered by Hamilton Lane

Private Markets Manager Update

Investment Committee

July 2026

Private Equity

DMH III

- Targets lower middle market companies in the DACH (Austria, Germany and Switzerland) region of Europe.
- Total Commitment: €60 million
    - Pension Pool: €20 million
    - Legacy Fund: €40 million

Public Equities Manager Update

Manager Update

Public Equities

- CC&L International Equity All Cap funded in June with an initial funding amount of approximately ~$1,070 million
  - $820 million Non-Qualified Pool
  - $250 million Pension Pool
- RS International Equity Large Cap funded in June with an initial funding amount of approximately ~$545 million
  - $360 million Non-Qualified Pool
  - $185 million Pension Pool

NORTH Dakota | Retirement & Investment
Be Legendary.

MEMORANDUM

TO: **Investment Committee**

FROM: **Matt Posch, Portfolio Manager**

DATE: **July 10, 2026**

RE: **Wellington – Temporary Guideline Waiver Request**

Wellington has requested a guideline temporary waiver guideline following the annual Russell 2000 reconstitution, which occurred on June 26, 2026 with the following language:

"The Client hereby authorizes Wellington to rely on a temporary guideline waiver in connection with the Russell 2000 reconstitution. This waiver permits Wellington to manage the account with a temporary minimum benchmark exposure of 65% for a period of 30 days to facilitate orderly implementation of index changes. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Manager is permitted to actively deviate from benchmark constituents and guideline thresholds during the waiver period, including the ability to purchase securities outside of the benchmark and to sell benchmark constituents, where deemed appropriate for portfolio repositioning. The account will otherwise continue to be managed in accordance with all applicable guidelines. This waiver will expire automatically following the 30-day period unless otherwise agreed in writing."

The current guideline limits exposure outside the benchmark to less than 25% of the portfolio. Following the reconstitution, benchmark exposure declined from approximately 80% before the reconstitution to approximately 66% currently, resulting in exposure outside the benchmark of approximately 34%. The decline was driven by changes to the underlying securities in the Russell 2000 Index as part of the reconstitution, rather than active trading decisions within the portfolio.

Staff believes this is a temporary, operational request related to the annual Russell 2000 reconstitution and does not represent a change in Wellington's investment process or the account's investment objectives. Staff recommends approval of the temporary waiver.

This waiver request will be presented to the full Investment Committee at the next scheduled meeting.

Emergency Approval: On an emergency basis when it is impractical to timely convene a meeting of the Committee, either the Chair or Vice Chair of the Committee with the concurrence of the Chief Investment Officer or the Executive Director, may approve a waiver. That waiver will be brought to the Committee for ratification at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Investment Committee Chair or Vice Chair	Scott M Anderson Chief Investment Officer or Executive Director

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

July 2026
July 10, 2026: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m.
July 29, 2026: SIB - 8:30 a.m.
July 29, 2026: TFFR - 1:00 p.m.

August 2026
August 4, 2026: TFFR – 10:00 a.m.
August 10, 2026: Budget & Finance Comm - 11:00 a.m.
August 11, 2026: SIB ERCC - 10:00 a.m.
August 11, 2026: TFFR GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
August 12, 2026: SIB GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
August 13, 2026: SIB ARCC - 2:30 p.m.
August 14, 2026: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
August 26, 2026: SIB – 8:30 a.m.

September 2026
September 8, 2026: TFFR GPRC – 3:30 p.m.
September 11, 2026: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
September 30, 2026: SIB - 8:30 a.m.

October 2026
October 9, 2026: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
October 13, 2026: TFFR GPRC – 3:30 p.m.
October 28, 2026: SIB - 8:30 a.m.
October 28, 2026: TFFR – 1:00 p.m.

November 2026
November 9, 2026: Budget & Finance Comm - 11:00 a.m.
November 10, 2026: SIB ERCC - 10:00 a.m.
November 10, 2026: TFFR GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
November 12, 2026: SIB ARCC - 2:30 p.m.
November 13, 2026: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
November 16, 2026: SIB GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
November 18, 2026: TFFR - 3:30 p.m. (Tentative)
November 25, 2026: SIB - 8:30 a.m.

December 2026
December 8, 2026: TFFR GPRC – 3:30 p.m.
December 11, 2026: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m

January 2027
January 8, 2027: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
January 27, 2027: SIB - 8:30 a.m.
January 27, 2027: TFFR - 1:00 p.m.

February 2027
February 8, 2027: Budget & Finance Comm - 11:00 a.m.
February 9, 2027: SIB ERCC - 10:00 a.m.
February 9, 2027: TFFR GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
February 10, 2027: SIB GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
February 11, 2027: SIB ARCC - 2:30 p.m.
February 12, 2027: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
February 24, 2027: SIB – 8:30 a.m.
February 24, 2027: TFFR – 3:30 p.m. (Tentative)

March 2027
March 12, 2027: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
March 31, 2027: SIB - 8:30 a.m.
March 31, 2027: TFFR - 3:30 p.m. (Tentative)

April 2027
April 9, 2027: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m

May 2027
May 10, 2027: Budget & Finance Comm - 11:00 a.m.
May 11, 2027: SIB ERCC - 10:00 a.m.
May 11, 2027: TFFR GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
May 12, 2027: SIB GPR Comm - 3:30 p.m.
May 13, 2027: SIB ARCC - 2:30 p.m.
May 14, 2027: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
May 26, 2027: SIB – 8:30 a.m.
May 26, 2027: TFFR – 1:00 p.m.

June 2027
June 11, 2027: Investment Comm - 10:30 a.m
June 30, 2027: SIB – 8:30 a.m.