



PRIVATE TRANSPARENCY REPORT

2024

University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (re University of Toronto Endowment)

Generated 25-11-2024

About this report

PRI reporting is the largest global reporting project on responsible investment. It was developed with investors, for investors. PRI signatories are required to report publicly on their responsible investment activities each year. In turn, they receive a number of outputs, including a public and private Transparency Report.

The private Transparency Reports, which are produced using signatories' reported information, support signatories to have internal discussions about their practices. Signatories can also choose to make these available to clients, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders.

This private Transparency Report is an export of your responses to the PRI Reporting Framework during the 2024 reporting period. It includes all responses (public and private) to core and plus indicators.

In response to signatory feedback, the PRI has not summarised your responses – the information in this document is presented exactly as it was reported.

For each of the indicators in this document, all options that you selected are presented, including links and qualitative responses. In some indicators, all applicable options are included for additional context.

Disclaimers

Legal Context

PRI recognises that the laws and regulations to which signatories are subject differ by jurisdiction. We do not seek or require any signatory to take an action that is not in compliance with applicable laws. All signatory responses should therefore be understood to be subject to and informed by the legal and regulatory context in which the signatory operates.

Responsible investment definitions

Within the PRI Reporting Framework Glossary, we provide definitions for key terms to guide reporting on responsible investment practices in the Reporting Framework. These definitions may differ from those used or proposed by other authorities and regulatory bodies due to evolving industry perspectives and changing legislative landscapes. Users of this report should be aware of these variations, as they may impact interpretations of the information provided.

Data accuracy

This document presents information reported directly by signatories in the 2024 reporting cycle. This information has not been audited by the PRI or any other party acting on its behalf. While this information is believed to be reliable, no representations or warranties are made as to the accuracy of the information presented.

The PRI has taken reasonable action to ensure that data submitted by signatories in the reporting tool is reflected in their official PRI reports accurately. However, it is possible that small data inaccuracies and/or gaps remain, and the PRI shall not be responsible or liable for such inaccuracies and gaps.

Table of Contents

Module	Page
SENIOR LEADERSHIP STATEMENT (SLS)	4
ORGANISATIONAL OVERVIEW (OO)	8
POLICY, GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGY (PGS)	20
MANAGER SELECTION, APPOINTMENT AND MONITORING (SAM)	47
CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES (CBM)	60

SENIOR LEADERSHIP STATEMENT (SLS)

SENIOR LEADERSHIP STATEMENT

SENIOR LEADERSHIP STATEMENT

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SLS 1	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Senior Leadership Statement	GENERAL

Section 1. Our commitment

- Why does your organisation engage in responsible investment?
- What is your organisation's overall approach to responsible investment, and what major responsible investment commitment(s) have you made?

As the University of Toronto's ("University" or "UofT") investment manager, UTAM takes a comprehensive approach to responsible investing believing that ESG factors can have material impacts on the long-term risk-return of investments and considering such potential material impacts is consistent with our fiduciary duty and the mandate given to us by UofT. We believe that incorporating ESG and other material considerations into our investment processes helps us make better-informed decisions and potentially achieve better long-term outcomes for the beneficiaries of UofT's Endowment. As active owners, we aim to positively influence corporations, policymakers, regulators, and investment managers consistent with our ESG outlook and our objective to realize greater and sustained long-term value for the Endowment while contributing to UofT's sustainability objectives and a better society at large.

We define responsible investing as the incorporation of ESG considerations into investment analysis, risk management, and decision-making processes, active ownership, and disclosures, especially regarding external investment managers.

Our Responsible Investing Committee and all investment, operational due diligence, and risk staff routinely consider ESG risks and opportunities in alignment with our Responsible Investing Policy, our commitments below, and best practices outlined by organizations such as the PRI, NZAOA and the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD).

Active ownership is integral to our approach, which utilizes engagement with investment managers and portfolio companies, proxy voting using ESG-focused policies, and investor advocacy.

In our engagement with portfolio companies, we extend our reach by partnering with EOS at Federated Hermes, a stewardship service provider, and with like-minded investors through collaborative initiatives, including Climate Action 100+, Climate Engagement Canada (CEC), CDP, Canadian Coalition for Good Governance (CCGG), 30% Club Canada, and the University Network for Investor Engagement (UNIE).

We take leadership roles to advance and promote best practices. Members of our senior management team variously sit on the Steering Committee Of Intentional Endowment Network (IEN), the PRI's Asset Owner Technical Advisory Committee, the Responsible Investment Association's board (RIA), and the CCGG's Environmental & Social Committee.

To further UofT's climate action and sustainability goals, in October 2021, UTAM committed to the following climate commitments:

- Divest from direct exposure to fossil fuel companies (achieved in October 2022).
- Divest from indirect exposure to fossil fuel companies, typically held through pooled and commingled investment vehicles, by 2030.
- Allocate 10% of the Endowment at time of commitment to sustainable and low-carbon investment strategies by 2025; this represented approximately CAD \$400M at the time that this allocation commitment was made.
- Continue to engage with current and prospective investment managers to emphasize reducing GHG emissions in their portfolios and reducing climate impact in the real economy.
- Reach net zero emissions in the Endowment portfolio by 2050.
- Set five-year targets following the framework developed by the Net Zero Asset Owner Alliance (NZAOA).

- Work with peer asset owners and investment managers to drive industry-wide commitment to net zero.
- Report to stakeholders regularly on the progress towards divestment, fossil fuel exposure targets, and net zero goals.

In 2022, to help achieve our long-term net zero objective, we set an interim carbon reduction target of 50% by 2030 (using a 2019 baseline) for a subset of the Endowment portfolio consisting of public equities, private equity, private real estate and corporate bonds (the “Sub-Portfolio”).

Section 2. Annual overview

- Discuss your organisation’s progress during the reporting year on the responsible investment issue you consider most relevant or material to your organisation or its assets.
- Reflect on your performance with respect to your organisation’s responsible investment objectives and targets during the reporting year. Details might include, for example, outlining your single most important achievement or describing your general progress on topics such as the following (where applicable):
 - refinement of ESG analysis and incorporation
 - stewardship activities with investees and/or with policymakers
 - collaborative engagements
 - attainment of responsible investment certifications and/or awards

During the reporting year, the most relevant and material responsible investing achievement is the progress we have made towards meeting our climate commitments set by UofT (refer to Section 1), including divestment from fossil fuel companies, investments in sustainable and low-carbon strategies, and the reduction of the carbon footprint of the Endowment’s Sub-Portfolio as we approach the interim carbon footprint reduction target of 50% by 2030 (using 2019 baseline) and moves toward achieving a net zero portfolio by 2050.

After removing all direct fossil fuel holdings in the Endowment portfolio during 2022, in 2023, we progressed towards removing indirect fossil fuel exposure by making changes to our public equity investment manager line-up and progressing discussions with investment managers about launching ex-fossil fuel strategies and considering separate accounts where we can exclude fossil fuel companies. Moreover, we continued towards transitioning the asset class benchmarks indexes of the Endowment’s reference portfolio to indexes that exclude fossil fuels – throughout 2023, the fixed income benchmarks were comprised of ex-fossil fuel indexes, and we continued to transition the equity benchmark to an ex-fossil fuel benchmark.

We continued to progress towards achieving our commitment to invest at least 10% of the Endowment in sustainable and low-carbon strategies by 2025, as we have now either invested or committed to such strategies across multiple asset classes. As of December 31, 2023, these strategies represented 6.8% of the Endowment.

Upon UofT setting a target of net zero emissions in the Endowment by 2050, UTAM joined the Net-Zero Asset Owner Alliance (the “Alliance”), making UofT the first university in the world to do so.

The Alliance has established a target-setting framework that guides members in setting interim targets on various decarbonization initiatives to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. In accordance with the Alliance’s target-setting protocol, we have set interim targets for emissions, engagement, and transition financing, and during 2023, we reported to the NZAOA on our progress toward achieving each of these targets (see our website for more information: <https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/climate-commitments/>).

Emissions: The current carbon footprint target for the Endowment is a 50% reduction by 2030, using 2019 baseline levels for the Sub-Portfolio that includes publicly traded corporate bonds in addition to equity and equity-like securities. This target represents a second emissions reduction target, as we achieved the first target approximately one decade ahead of schedule. For the third consecutive year, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP was engaged to conduct a limited assurance engagement to review our carbon footprint calculations and reporting for the Endowment’s Sub-Portfolio.

Stewardship:

- In 2023, we continued engaging with publicly traded companies through collaborative initiatives, our investment managers, and via EOS at Federated Hermes (our engagement service provider). While the engagement initiatives covered a wide array of topics, climate-related engagement focused on the largest corporate GHG emitters and those that contribute to the most owned emissions in the Endowment.
- We engaged with investment managers, urging them to adopt more robust responsible investing practices, including engaging with portfolio companies on ESG risks.

Industry-wide contributions: We continued to promote responsible investing domestically and abroad:

- Presenting at industry events, contributing our perspective to forums of other institutional investors.

- Hosting the International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN) stewardship course offered alongside ICGN's annual conference held in Toronto.
- Collaborating on advocacy initiatives and policy-related discussions.
- Participating in consultations and initiatives (e.g., UNPRI, Climate Action 100+, EOS, NZAOA, RIA, and MSCI ESG) to share our feedback on relevant topics.
- Actively participating (including providing feedback) in the Endowment Impact Benchmark pilot project sponsored by the Intentional Endowment Network and conducted by BlueMark. In this pilot, we were awarded a Gold rating, the second highest tier achievable.

Section 3. Next steps

- What specific steps has your organisation outlined to advance your commitment to responsible investment in the next two years?

As described in Section 2, the University has set targets for its Endowment with respect to fossil fuel divestment and toward achieving net zero, and progress achieved during 2023 is summarized. These are reflected in UTAM's climate commitments outlined in Section 1. Our focus in the next two years is to further advance the achievement of those objectives and commitments and to ensure that we continue to develop and refine our investment approach to address not just carbon-related issues but broader responsible investing risks and opportunities.

The increasing availability of research and reliable data to support responsible investing practices, as well as other significant emerging issues, such as water management, biodiversity, and labour and human capital, means that our ability to assess, react, and impact those areas must continue to evolve in the context of preserving and growing the value of the Endowment to support the University's mission.

Accordingly, we have outlined several activities for the next two years and beyond to advance our responsible investing commitment, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Complete the transition of the equity portion of the reference portfolio benchmark to an ex-fossil fuel index by the end of 2024.
- Identify and underwrite new high-quality, sustainable, low-carbon investment strategies for potential inclusion in the Endowment portfolio.
- Work with prospective and existing investment managers to launch new strategies to advance our fossil fuel and carbon reduction objectives.
- Make progress towards our climate commitments as specified in Section 1.
- Continue stewardship activities, including proxy voting and engagement with corporate issuers, investment managers, and policymakers, and contribute to industry-wide responsible investing developments as specified in Section 2.
- Fulfil the responsibilities of a Net Zero Asset Owner Alliance member, including participating in various Alliance working groups, progressing on interim targets on emissions, engagement and transition financing, and reporting against those targets to the Alliance annually.
- Further enhance our responsible investing processes and reporting to the University and its stakeholders.
- Assess climate and other responsible investing targets of peer allocators against which to benchmark our standards.

Section 4. Endorsement

'The Senior Leadership Statement has been prepared and/or reviewed by the undersigned and reflects our organisation-wide commitment and approach to responsible investment'.

Name

Chuck O'Reilly

Position

President and Chief Investment Officer

Organisation's Name

University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (re University of Toronto Endowment)

● A

'This endorsement applies only to the Senior Leadership Statement and should not be considered an endorsement of the information reported by the above-mentioned organisation in the various modules of the Reporting Framework. The Senior Leadership Statement serves as a general overview of the above-mentioned organisation's responsible investment approach. The Senior Leadership Statement does not constitute advice and should not be relied upon as such. Further, it is not a substitute for the skill, judgement and experience of any third parties, their management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions'.

○ B

ORGANISATIONAL OVERVIEW (OO)

ORGANISATIONAL INFORMATION

REPORTING YEAR

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 1	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Reporting year	GENERAL

What is the year-end date of the 12-month period you have chosen to report for PRI reporting purposes?

	Date	Month	Year
Year-end date of the 12-month period for PRI reporting purposes:	31	12	2023

SUBSIDIARY INFORMATION

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 2	CORE	N/A	OO 2.1	PUBLIC	Subsidiary information	GENERAL

Does your organisation have subsidiaries?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No

ASSETS UNDER MANAGEMENT

ALL ASSET CLASSES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 4	CORE	OO 3	N/A	PUBLIC	All asset classes	GENERAL

What are your total assets under management (AUM) at the end of the reporting year, as indicated in [OO 1]?

USD

(A) AUM of your organisation, including subsidiaries, and excluding the AUM subject to execution, advisory, custody, or research advisory only

US\$ 3,234,031,013.00

(B) AUM of subsidiaries that are PRI signatories in their own right and excluded from this submission, as indicated in [OO 2.2]

US\$ 0.00

(C) AUM subject to execution, advisory, custody, or research advisory only

US\$ 0.00

ASSET BREAKDOWN

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 5	CORE	OO 3	Multiple indicators	PRIVATE	Asset breakdown	GENERAL

Provide a percentage breakdown of your total AUM at the end of the reporting year as indicated in [OO 1].

	(1) Percentage of Internally managed AUM	(2) Percentage of Externally managed AUM
(A) Listed equity	0%	25.9%
(B) Fixed income	0%	13.4%
(C) Private equity	0%	9.8%
(D) Real estate	0%	1.3%
(E) Infrastructure	0%	0%
(F) Hedge funds	0%	13.3%
(G) Forestry	0%	0%
(H) Farmland	0%	0%
(I) Other	36.3%	0%
(J) Off-balance sheet	0%	0%

(I) Other - (1) Percentage of Internally managed AUM - Specify:

36.3

ASSET BREAKDOWN: EXTERNALLY MANAGED ASSETS

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 5.1	CORE	OO 5	Multiple	PRIVATE	Asset breakdown: Externally managed assets	GENERAL

Provide a further breakdown of your organisation's externally managed listed equity and/or fixed income AUM.

	(1) Listed equity	(2) Fixed income - SSA	(3) Fixed income - corporate	(4) Fixed income - securitised	(5) Fixed income - private debt
(A) Active	100%	0%	32.76%	0%	67.24%
(B) Passive	0%	0%	0%		

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 5.2	CORE	OO 5, OO 5.1	SAM 3, SAM 8	PRIVATE	Asset breakdown: Externally managed assets	GENERAL

Provide a breakdown of your organisation's externally managed AUM between segregated mandates and pooled funds or investments.

	(1) Segregated mandate(s)	(2) Pooled fund(s) or pooled investment(s)
(A) Listed equity - active	0%	100%
(C) Fixed income - active	0%	100%
(E) Private equity	0%	100%
(F) Real estate	0%	100%
(H) Hedge funds	0%	100%

MANAGEMENT BY PRI SIGNATORIES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 6	CORE	OO 5	N/A	PRIVATE	Management by PRI signatories	GENERAL

What percentage of your organisation's externally managed assets are managed by PRI signatories?

80%

GEOGRAPHICAL BREAKDOWN

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 7	CORE	Multiple, see guidance	N/A	PUBLIC	Geographical breakdown	GENERAL

How much of your AUM in each asset class is invested in emerging markets and developing economies?

AUM in Emerging Markets and Developing Economies

(A) Listed equity	(3) >10 to 20%
(C) Fixed income – corporate	(1) 0%
(E) Fixed income – private debt	(2) >0 to 10%
(F) Private equity	(3) >10 to 20%
(G) Real estate	(2) >0 to 10%
(I) Hedge funds	(3) >10 to 20%

STEWARDSHIP

STEWARDSHIP

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 8	CORE	Multiple, see guidance	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Stewardship	GENERAL

Does your organisation conduct stewardship activities, excluding (proxy) voting, for any of your assets?

	(1) Listed equity - active	(3) Fixed income - active	(5) Private equity	(6) Real estate	(8) Hedge funds	(11) Other
(A) Yes, through internal staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(B) Yes, through service providers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(C) Yes, through external managers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(D) We do not conduct stewardship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STEWARDSHIP: (PROXY) VOTING

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 9 HF	CORE	OO 5	OO 9	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	GENERAL

Does your organisation have direct investments in listed equity across your hedge fund strategies?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 9	CORE	Multiple, see guidance	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	GENERAL

Does your organisation conduct (proxy) voting activities for any of your listed equity holdings?

(1) Listed equity - active

(A) Yes, through internal staff	<input type="checkbox"/>
(B) Yes, through service providers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(C) Yes, through external managers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(D) We do not conduct (proxy) voting	<input type="radio"/>

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 9.1	CORE	OO 9	PGS 10.1, PGS 31	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	GENERAL

For each asset class, on what percentage of your listed equity holdings do you have the discretion to vote?

Percentage of your listed equity holdings over which you have the discretion to vote

(A) Listed equity – active	(2) >0 to 10%
----------------------------	---------------

ESG INCORPORATION

INTERNALLY MANAGED ASSETS

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 11	CORE	Multiple, see guidance	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Internally managed assets	1

For each internally managed asset class, does your organisation incorporate ESG factors, to some extent, into your investment decisions?

(1) Yes, we incorporate ESG factors into our investment decisions

(2) No, we do not incorporate ESG factors into our investment decisions

(V) Other: 36.3

EXTERNAL MANAGER SELECTION

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 12	CORE	OO 5, OO 5.1	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	External manager selection	1

For each externally managed asset class, does your organisation incorporate ESG factors, to some extent, when selecting external investment managers?

(1) Yes, we incorporate ESG factors when selecting external investment managers

(2) No, we do not incorporate ESG factors when selecting external investment managers

(A) Listed equity - active

(C) Fixed income - active

(E) Private equity

(F) Real estate

(H) Hedge funds

EXTERNAL MANAGER APPOINTMENT

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 13	CORE	OO 5, OO 5.1	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	External manager appointment	1

For each externally managed asset class, does your organisation incorporate ESG factors, to some extent, when appointing external investment managers?

	(1) Yes, we incorporate ESG factors when appointing external investment managers	(2) No, we do not incorporate ESG factors when appointing external investment managers
(A) Listed equity - active	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(C) Fixed income - active	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(E) Private equity	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(F) Real estate	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(H) Hedge funds	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

EXTERNAL MANAGER MONITORING

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 14	CORE	OO 5, OO 5.1	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	External manager monitoring	1

For each externally managed asset class, does your organisation incorporate ESG factors, to some extent, when monitoring external investment managers?

	(1) Yes, we incorporate ESG factors when monitoring external investment managers	(2) No, we do not incorporate ESG factors when monitoring external investment managers
(A) Listed equity - active	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(C) Fixed income - active	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(E) Private equity	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(F) Real estate	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(H) Hedge funds	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ESG IN OTHER ASSET CLASSES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 15	CORE	OO 11, OO 12–14	N/A	PUBLIC	ESG in other asset classes	1

Describe how your organisation incorporates ESG factors into the following asset classes.

Internally managed
(C) Other

Our “Other” category is comprised of derivatives instruments that provide passive public equity exposure and passive public fixed income exposure. We apply negative screening to these passive derivative instruments by transacting the vast majority of this exposure on indexes that exclude fossil fuel companies. At December 31, 2023, 88% of the passive derivatives exposure that comprised our “Other” category was transacted on indexes that exclude fossil fuel companies.

ESG/SUSTAINABILITY FUNDS AND PRODUCTS

LABELLING AND MARKETING

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 18	CORE	OO 11–14	OO 18.1	PUBLIC	Labelling and marketing	1

Do you explicitly market any of your products and/or funds as ESG and/or sustainable?

- (A) Yes, we market products and/or funds as ESG and/or sustainable
- (B) No, we do not offer products or funds explicitly marketed as ESG and/or sustainable
- (C) Not applicable; we do not offer products or funds

SUMMARY OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SUMMARY OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 21	CORE	Multiple indicators	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Summary of reporting requirements	GENERAL

The following table shows which modules are mandatory or voluntary to report on in the separate PRI asset class modules. Where a module is voluntary, indicate if you wish to report on it.

Applicable modules	(1) Mandatory to report (pre-filled based on previous responses)	(2.1) Voluntary to report. Yes, I want to opt-in to reporting on the module	(2.2) Voluntary to report. No, I want to opt-out of reporting on the module
Policy, Governance and Strategy	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confidence Building Measures	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(T) External manager selection, appointment and monitoring (SAM) – listed equity - active	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(V) External manager selection, appointment and monitoring (SAM) – fixed income - active	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(X) External manager selection, appointment and monitoring (SAM) – private equity	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(Y) External manager selection, appointment and monitoring (SAM) – real estate	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(AA) External manager selection, appointment and monitoring (SAM) – hedge funds	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

REPORT DISCLOSURE

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
OO 32	CORE	OO 3, OO 31	N/A	PUBLIC	Report disclosure	GENERAL

How would you like to disclose the detailed percentage figures you reported throughout the Reporting Framework?

- (A) Publish as absolute numbers
- (B) Publish as ranges

POLICY, GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGY (PGS)

POLICY

RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT POLICY ELEMENTS

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 1	CORE	OO 8, OO 9	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy elements	1, 2

Which elements are covered in your formal responsible investment policy(ies)?

- (A) Overall approach to responsible investment
- (B) Guidelines on environmental factors
- (C) Guidelines on social factors
- (D) Guidelines on governance factors
- (E) Guidelines on sustainability outcomes
- (F) Guidelines tailored to the specific asset class(es) we hold
- (G) Guidelines on exclusions
- (H) Guidelines on managing conflicts of interest related to responsible investment
- (I) Stewardship: Guidelines on engagement with investees
- (J) Stewardship: Guidelines on overall political engagement
- (K) Stewardship: Guidelines on engagement with other key stakeholders
- (L) Stewardship: Guidelines on (proxy) voting
- (M) Other responsible investment elements not listed here

Specify:

- PRI principles and our obligations under each principle
- TCFD reporting
- Responsible investing governance at UTAM (structure and overseeing bodies, transparency guidelines, policy review timeline)

- (N) Our organisation does not have a formal responsible investment policy and/or our policy(ies) do not cover any responsible investment elements

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 2	CORE	PGS 1	Multiple, see guidance	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy elements	1

Does your formal responsible investment policy(ies) include specific guidelines on systematic sustainability issues?

- (A) Specific guidelines on climate change (may be part of guidelines on environmental factors)
- (B) Specific guidelines on human rights (may be part of guidelines on social factors)
- (C) Specific guidelines on other systematic sustainability issues

Specify:

- Tobacco securities investment policy (exclusion), cluster munitions/landmines exclusions

- (D) Our formal responsible investment policy(ies) does not include guidelines on systematic sustainability issues

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 3	CORE	PGS 1, PGS 2	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy elements	6

Which elements of your formal responsible investment policy(ies) are publicly available?

(A) Overall approach to responsible investment

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/>

(B) Guidelines on environmental factors

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(C) Guidelines on social factors

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(D) Guidelines on governance factors

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(F) Specific guidelines on climate change (may be part of guidelines on environmental factors)

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/climate-commitments/>

(H) Specific guidelines on other systematic sustainability issues

(J) Guidelines on exclusions

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(K) Guidelines on managing conflicts of interest related to responsible investment

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(L) Stewardship: Guidelines on engagement with investees

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(M) Stewardship: Guidelines on overall political engagement

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(N) Stewardship: Guidelines on engagement with other key stakeholders

Add link:

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

(O) Stewardship: Guidelines on (proxy) voting

Add link:

<https://www.issgovernance.com/file/policy/active/specialty/Sustainability-International-Voting-Guidelines.pdf>

- (P) Other responsible investment aspects not listed here
- (Q) No elements of our formal responsible investment policy(ies) are publicly available

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 4	PLUS	PGS 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy elements	1 – 6

Does your formal responsible investment policy(ies) identify a link between your responsible investment activities and your fiduciary duties or equivalent obligations?

(A) Yes

Elaborate:

As written in our Responsible Investing Policy, we believe that ESG factors can have a material impact on a given investment's long-term risk and return and that incorporating relevant and material ESG factors into our decision-making processes is consistent with our fiduciary duty.

It is, therefore, our policy to take ESG factors into account in our investment decisions together with other relevant and material considerations (i.e., we take an integration approach). Moreover, by being active owners through our voting and engagement policies and practices, we can realize greater long-term value for the beneficiaries of the assets that we manage.

Our comprehensive Responsible Investing Policy is designed to guide all of our decision-making in this area, from the management of our internal processes and systems to our conduct of proxy voting and ESG-related engagements. To read more refer to <https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/investing/responsible-investing/utam-responsible-investing-policy/>

- (B) No

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 5	CORE	PGS 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy elements	2

Which elements are covered in your organisation's policy(ies) or guidelines on stewardship?

- (A) Overall stewardship objectives
- (B) Prioritisation of specific ESG factors to be advanced via stewardship activities
- (C) Criteria used by our organisation to prioritise the investees, policy makers, key stakeholders, or other entities on which to focus our stewardship efforts
- (D) How different stewardship tools and activities are used across the organisation
- (E) Approach to escalation in stewardship
- (F) Approach to collaboration in stewardship
- (G) Conflicts of interest related to stewardship
- (H) How stewardship efforts and results are communicated across the organisation to feed into investment decision-making and vice versa
- (I) Other
- (J) None of the above elements is captured in our policy(ies) or guidelines on stewardship

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 6	CORE	PGS 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy elements	2

Does your policy on (proxy) voting include voting principles and/or guidelines on specific ESG factors?

- (A) Yes, it includes voting principles and/or guidelines on specific environmental factors
- (B) Yes, it includes voting principles and/or guidelines on specific social factors
- (C) Yes, it includes voting principles and/or guidelines on specific governance factors
- (D) Our policy on (proxy) voting does not include voting principles or guidelines on specific ESG factors

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 7	CORE	OO 9	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy elements	2

Does your organisation have a policy that states how (proxy) voting is addressed in your securities lending programme?

- (A) We have a publicly available policy to address (proxy) voting in our securities lending programme
Add link(s):
<https://www.issgovernance.com/file/policy/active/specialty/Sustainability-International-Voting-Guidelines.pdf>
- (B) We have a policy to address (proxy) voting in our securities lending programme, but it is not publicly available
- (C) We rely on the policy of our external service provider(s)
- (D) We do not have a policy to address (proxy) voting in our securities lending programme
- (E) Not applicable; we do not have a securities lending programme

RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT POLICY COVERAGE

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 8	CORE	PGS 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy coverage	1

What percentage of your total AUM is covered by the below elements of your responsible investment policy(ies)?

Combined AUM coverage of all policy elements

(A) Overall approach to responsible investment

(B) Guidelines on environmental factors

(C) Guidelines on social factors

(D) Guidelines on governance factors

(7) 100%

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 9	CORE	PGS 2	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy coverage	1

What proportion of your AUM is covered by your formal policies or guidelines on climate change, human rights, or other systematic sustainability issues?

AUM coverage

(A) Specific guidelines on climate change

(1) for all of our AUM

(C) Specific guidelines on other systematic sustainability issues

(2) for a majority of our AUM

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 10	CORE	OO 8, OO 9, PGS 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy coverage	2

Per asset class, what percentage of your AUM is covered by your policy(ies) or guidelines on stewardship with investees?

(A) Listed equity

(1) Percentage of AUM covered

- (1) >0% to 10%
- (2) >10% to 20%
- (3) >20% to 30%
- (4) >30% to 40%
- (5) >40% to 50%
- (6) >50% to 60%
- (7) >60% to 70%
- (8) >70% to 80%
- (9) >80% to 90%
- (10) >90% to <100%

(11) 100%

(B) Fixed income

(1) Percentage of AUM covered

- (1) >0% to 10%
- (2) >10% to 20%
- (3) >20% to 30%
- (4) >30% to 40%
- (5) >40% to 50%
- (6) >50% to 60%
- (7) >60% to 70%
- (8) >70% to 80%
- (9) >80% to 90%
- (10) >90% to <100%

(11) 100%

(C) Private equity

(1) Percentage of AUM covered

- (1) >0% to 10%
- (2) >10% to 20%
- (3) >20% to 30%
- (4) >30% to 40%
- (5) >40% to 50%
- (6) >50% to 60%
- (7) >60% to 70%
- (8) >70% to 80%
- (9) >80% to 90%
- (10) >90% to <100%

(11) 100%

(D) Real estate

(1) Percentage of AUM covered

- (1) >0% to 10%
- (2) >10% to 20%
- (3) >20% to 30%
- (4) >30% to 40%
- (5) >40% to 50%
- (6) >50% to 60%
- (7) >60% to 70%
- (8) >70% to 80%

- (9) >80% to 90%
- (10) >90% to <100%

● (11) 100%

(F) Hedge funds

(1) Percentage of AUM covered

- (1) >0% to 10%
- (2) >10% to 20%
- (3) >20% to 30%
- (4) >30% to 40%
- (5) >40% to 50%
- (6) >50% to 60%
- (7) >60% to 70%
- (8) >70% to 80%
- (9) >80% to 90%
- (10) >90% to <100%

● (11) 100%

(I) Other

(1) Percentage of AUM covered

- (1) >0% to 10%
- (2) >10% to 20%
- (3) >20% to 30%
- (4) >30% to 40%
- (5) >40% to 50%
- (6) >50% to 60%
- (7) >60% to 70%
- (8) >70% to 80%
- (9) >80% to 90%
- (10) >90% to <100%

● (11) 100%

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 10.1	CORE	OO 9.1, PGS 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment policy coverage	2

What percentage of your listed equity holdings is covered by your guidelines on (proxy) voting?

(A) Actively managed listed equity

(1) Percentage of your listed equity holdings over which you have the discretion to vote

- (1) >0% to 10%
- (2) >10% to 20%
- (3) >20% to 30%
- (4) >30% to 40%
- (5) >40% to 50%
- (6) >50% to 60%
- (7) >60% to 70%
- (8) >70% to 80%
- (9) >80% to 90%
- (10) >90% to <100%

● (11) 100%

GOVERNANCE

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 11	CORE	N/A	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Roles and responsibilities	1

Which senior level body(ies) or role(s) in your organisation have formal oversight over and accountability for responsible investment?

- (A) Board members, trustees, or equivalent
- (B) Senior executive-level staff, or equivalent

Specify:

Chief Investment Officer, Chief Risk Officer, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Compliance Officer

- (C) Investment committee, or equivalent

Specify:

Responsible Investing Committee (RIC), Management Investment Committee (MIC), Management Investment Risk Committee (MIRC)

- (D) Head of department, or equivalent

Specify department:

Head of Public Equities, Head of Fixed Income, Head of Private Markets, Chief Risk Officer, Chief Operating Officer

- (E) None of the above bodies and roles have oversight over and accountability for responsible investment

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 11.1	CORE	PGS 1, PGS 2, PGS 11	N/A	PUBLIC	Roles and responsibilities	1, 2

Does your organisation's senior level body(ies) or role(s) have formal oversight over and accountability for the elements covered in your responsible investment policy(ies)?

(1) Board members, trustees, or equivalent

(2) Senior executive-level staff, investment committee, head of department, or equivalent

(A) Overall approach to responsible investment

(B) Guidelines on environmental, social and/or governance factors

(D) Specific guidelines on climate change (may be part of guidelines on environmental factors)

(F) Specific guidelines on other systematic sustainability issues	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(H) Guidelines on exclusions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(I) Guidelines on managing conflicts of interest related to responsible investment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(J) Stewardship: Guidelines on engagement with investees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(K) Stewardship: Guidelines on overall political engagement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(L) Stewardship: Guidelines on engagement with other key stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(M) Stewardship: Guidelines on (proxy) voting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(N) This role has no formal oversight over and accountability for any of the above elements covered in our responsible investment policy(ies)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 11.2	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Roles and responsibilities	1 – 6

Does your organisation have governance processes or structures to ensure that your overall political engagement is aligned with your commitment to the principles of PRI, including any political engagement conducted by third parties on your behalf?

(A) Yes

Describe how you do this:

We participate in formal engagement collaborations through memberships of various organizations by teaming up with other like-minded investors and using service providers to engage on our behalf; these may include political engagements. To identify and prioritize collaborative engagements, we use several criteria, including the value we can add to the collaboration, the materiality of the specific ESG risks being addressed and the potential impact on client portfolios. Whether our political influence is aligned with our position on sustainability is considered in the deliberations of whether to participate as determined by the Responsible Investing Committee (RIC) or specific members, including our President and the COO.

- (B) No
- (C) Not applicable, our organisation does not conduct any form of political engagement directly or through any third parties

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 12	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Roles and responsibilities	1

In your organisation, which internal or external roles are responsible for implementing your approach to responsible investment?

(A) Internal role(s)

Specify:

All employees are responsible for successfully implementing our RI approach, including C suite (President & CIO, COO, CRO), investment heads, portfolio managers, and investment, risk, & operational due diligence staff. Our RIC considers strategic matters in developing & implementing RI practices. Our MIC assesses and manages climate risks and opportunities and carries out certain RI policy activities. Our MIRC incorporates climate risk into the regular risk measurement and monitoring.

(B) External investment managers, service providers, or other external partners or suppliers

Specify:

External investment managers contribute to our RI implementation. We evaluate managers and strategies across decision-making, active ownership, reporting, disclosure, and ESG factors (carbon footprint, risks) generating a proprietary ESG-integration rating. Service providers (EOS, SHARE, etc.) and collaborative initiatives (CA100+, CEC, CCGG, PRI, NZAOA, etc.) extend our stewardship reach and knowledge sharing. Information and data service providers (MSCI ESG, Factset) support our analysis.

- (C) We do not have any internal or external roles with responsibility for implementing responsible investment

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 13	CORE	PGS 11	N/A	PUBLIC	Roles and responsibilities	1

Does your organisation use responsible investment KPIs to evaluate the performance of your board members, trustees, or equivalent?

- (A) Yes, we use responsible investment KPIs to evaluate the performance of our board members, trustees, or equivalent
- (B) No, we do not use responsible investment KPIs to evaluate the performance of our board members, trustees, or equivalent**

Explain why: (Voluntary)

Developing and implementing RI is delegated to UTAM based on client directions. Our board's role in responsible investing is to ensure that management has the appropriate resources to implement client directions, which it does through various means, including the budget approval processes, approval of the Responsible Investing Policy, oversight of the independent assurance of carbon footprint calculations and reporting, and regular receipt of management reporting. The board ensures that management is either progressing towards achieving targets set by the client or has achieved them and is maintaining compliance. As such, the board is not subject to responsible investment KPIs. However, while the board is not subject to such KPIs, management has established responsible investing KPIs that are reviewed and approved by the board. Each quarter, management reports to the board on its status towards achieving these KPIs.

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 14	CORE	PGS 11	N/A	PUBLIC	Roles and responsibilities	1

Does your organisation use responsible investment KPIs to evaluate the performance of your senior executive-level staff (or equivalent), and are these KPIs linked to compensation?

(A) Yes, we use responsible investment KPIs to evaluate the performance of our senior executive-level staff (or equivalent)

Indicate whether these responsible investment KPIs are linked to compensation

(1) KPIs are linked to compensation

(2) KPIs are not linked to compensation as these roles do not have variable compensation

(3) KPIs are not linked to compensation even though these roles have variable compensation

Describe: (Voluntary)

(B) No, we do not use responsible investment KPIs to evaluate the performance of our senior executive-level staff (or equivalent)

EXTERNAL REPORTING AND DISCLOSURES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 16	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	External reporting and disclosures	6

What elements are included in your regular reporting to clients and/or beneficiaries for the majority of your AUM?

(A) Any changes in policies related to responsible investment

(B) Any changes in governance or oversight related to responsible investment

(C) Stewardship-related commitments

(D) Progress towards stewardship-related commitments

(E) Climate-related commitments

(F) Progress towards climate-related commitments

(G) Human rights-related commitments

(H) Progress towards human rights-related commitments

(I) Commitments to other systematic sustainability issues

(J) Progress towards commitments on other systematic sustainability issues

(K) We do not include any of these elements in our regular reporting to clients and/or beneficiaries for the majority of our AUM

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 17	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	External reporting and disclosures	6

During the reporting year, did your organisation publicly disclose climate-related information in line with the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures' (TCFD) recommendations?

(A) Yes, including all governance-related recommended disclosures

- (B) Yes, including all strategy-related recommended disclosures
 - (C) Yes, including all risk management-related recommended disclosures
 - (D) Yes, including all applicable metrics and targets-related recommended disclosures
 - (E) None of the above
- Add link(s):

https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/reports/?_type=tcf-d-reports
<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2023-UTAM-TCFD-Report.pdf>

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 19	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	External reporting and disclosures	6

During the reporting year, did your organisation publicly disclose its membership in and support for trade associations, think tanks or similar bodies that conduct any form of political engagement?

- (A) Yes, we publicly disclosed our membership in and support for trade associations, think tanks, or similar bodies that conduct any form of political engagement

Add link(s):

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/stewardship/collaboration-affiliations/>

- (B) No, we did not publicly disclose our membership in and support for trade associations, think tanks, or similar bodies that conduct any form of political engagement
- (C) Not applicable, we were not members in or supporters of any trade associations, think tanks, or similar bodies that conduct any form of political engagement during the reporting year

STRATEGY

CAPITAL ALLOCATION

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 20	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Capital allocation	1

Which elements do your organisation-level exclusions cover?

- (A) Exclusions based on our organisation's values or beliefs regarding particular sectors, products or services
- (B) Exclusions based on our organisation's values or beliefs regarding particular regions or countries
- (C) Exclusions based on minimum standards of business practice aligned with international norms such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the International Bill of Human Rights, UN Security Council sanctions or the UN Global Compact
- (D) Exclusions based on our organisation's climate change commitments
- (E) Other elements

Specify:

Fossil fuel and tobacco. Legally required exclusions (e.g. those required by domestic/international law, bans, treaties or embargoes), including economic sanctions and cluster munitions.

- (F) Not applicable; our organisation does not have any organisation-level exclusions

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 21	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Capital allocation	1

How does your responsible investment approach influence your strategic asset allocation process?

(A) We incorporate ESG factors into our assessment of expected asset class risks and returns

Select from dropdown list:

- (1) for all of our AUM subject to strategic asset allocation**
- (2) for a majority of our AUM subject to strategic asset allocation
- (3) for a minority of our AUM subject to strategic asset allocation

(B) We incorporate climate change–related risks and opportunities into our assessment of expected asset class risks and returns

Select from dropdown list:

- (1) for all of our AUM subject to strategic asset allocation**
- (2) for a majority of our AUM subject to strategic asset allocation
- (3) for a minority of our AUM subject to strategic asset allocation

(C) We incorporate human rights–related risks and opportunities into our assessment of expected asset class risks and returns

(D) We incorporate risks and opportunities related to other systematic sustainability issues into our assessment of expected asset class risks and returns

- (E) We do not incorporate ESG factors, climate change, human rights or other systematic sustainability issues into our assessment of expected asset class risks and returns
- (F) Not applicable; we do not have a strategic asset allocation process

STEWARDSHIP: OVERALL STEWARDSHIP STRATEGY

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 22	CORE	OO 8, OO 9	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: Overall stewardship strategy	2

For the majority of AUM within each asset class, which of the following best describes your primary stewardship objective?

	(1) Listed equity	(2) Fixed income	(3) Private equity	(4) Real estate	(6) Hedge funds
(A) Maximise our portfolio-level risk-adjusted returns. In doing so, we seek to address any risks to overall portfolio performance caused by individual investees' contribution to systematic sustainability issues.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(B) Maximise our individual investments' risk-adjusted returns. In doing so, we do not seek to address any risks to overall portfolio performance caused by individual investees' contribution to systematic sustainability issues.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 24	CORE	OO 8, OO 9	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: Overall stewardship strategy	2

Which of the following best describes your organisation's default position, or the position of the external service providers or external managers acting on your behalf, concerning collaborative stewardship efforts?

- (A) We recognise the value of collective action, and as a result, we prioritise collaborative stewardship efforts wherever possible
- (B) We collaborate on a case-by-case basis
- (C) Other
- (D) We do not join collaborative stewardship efforts

STEWARDSHIP: (PROXY) VOTING

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 29	CORE	OO 9, PGS 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	2

When you use external service providers to give recommendations, how do you ensure those recommendations are consistent with your organisation's (proxy) voting policy?

- (A) Before voting is executed, we review external service providers' voting recommendations for controversial and high-profile votes
- (B) Before voting is executed, we review external service providers' voting recommendations where the application of our voting policy is unclear
- (C) We ensure consistency with our voting policy by reviewing external service providers' voting recommendations only after voting has been executed
- (D) We do not review external service providers' voting recommendations
- (E) **Not applicable; we do not use external service providers to give voting recommendations**

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 30	CORE	OO 9	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	2

How is voting addressed in your securities lending programme?

- (A) **We recall all securities for voting on all ballot items**
- (B) When a vote is deemed important according to pre-established criteria (e.g. high stake in the company), we recall all our securities for voting
- (C) Other
- (D) We do not recall our securities for voting purposes
- (E) Not applicable; we do not have a securities lending programme

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 31	CORE	OO 9.1	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	2

For the majority of votes cast over which you have discretion to vote, which of the following best describes your decision making approach regarding shareholder resolutions (or that of your external service provider(s) if decision making is delegated to them)?

- (A) **We vote in favour of resolutions expected to advance progress on our stewardship priorities, including affirming a company's good practice or prior commitment**
- (B) We vote in favour of resolutions expected to advance progress on our stewardship priorities, but only if the investee company has not already publicly committed to the action(s) requested in the proposal
- (C) We vote in favour of shareholder resolutions only as an escalation measure
- (D) We vote in favour of the investee company management's recommendations by default
- (E) Not applicable; we do not vote on shareholder resolutions

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 32	CORE	OO 9	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	2

During the reporting year, how did your organisation, or your external service provider(s), pre-declare voting intentions prior to voting in annual general meetings (AGMs) or extraordinary general meetings (EGMs)?

- (A) We pre-declared our voting intentions publicly through the PRI's vote declaration system on the Resolution Database
- (B) We pre-declared our voting intentions publicly by other means, e.g. through our website
- (C) We privately communicated our voting decision to investee companies prior to the AGM/EGM
- (D) **We did not privately or publicly communicate our voting intentions prior to the AGM/EGM**
- (E) Not applicable; we did not cast any (proxy) votes during the reporting year

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 33	CORE	OO 9	PGS 33.1	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	2

After voting has taken place, do you publicly disclose your (proxy) voting decisions or those made on your behalf by your external service provider(s), company by company and in a central source?

- (A) Yes, for all (proxy) votes
- (B) Yes, for the majority of (proxy) votes
- (C) Yes, for a minority of (proxy) votes
- (D) **No, we do not publicly report our (proxy) voting decisions company-by-company and in a central source**

Explain why:

In 2023, all proxy voting under our control, which are relatively few in number, was in accordance with the ISS Sustainability Guidelines; accordingly there is no particular value to stakeholders for publishing voting decisions company by company.

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 34	CORE	OO 9	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: (Proxy) voting	2

After voting has taken place, did your organisation, and/or the external service provider(s) acting on your behalf, communicate the rationale for your voting decisions during the reporting year?

(1) In cases where we abstained or voted against management recommendations

(2) In cases where we voted against an ESG-related shareholder resolution

(A) Yes, we publicly disclosed the rationale

(B) Yes, we privately communicated the rationale to the company

(C) We did not publicly or privately communicate the rationale, or we did not track this information

(D) Not applicable; we did not abstain or vote against management recommendations or ESG-related shareholder resolutions during the reporting year

STEWARDSHIP: ESCALATION

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 36	CORE	OO 8, OO 9 HF, OO 9	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: Escalation	2

For your listed equity holdings, what escalation measures did your organisation, or the external investment managers or service providers acting on your behalf, use in the past three years?

(1) Listed equity

(A) Joining or broadening an existing collaborative engagement or creating a new one



(B) Filing, co-filing, and/or submitting a shareholder resolution or proposal



(C) Publicly engaging the entity, e.g. signing an open letter



(D) Voting against the re-election of one or more board directors



(E) Voting against the chair of the board of directors, or equivalent, e.g. lead independent director



(F) Divesting



(G) Litigation



(H) Other



(I) In the past three years, we did not use any of the above escalation measures for our listed equity holdings



Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 37	CORE	Multiple, see guidance	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: Escalation	2

For your corporate fixed income assets, what escalation measures did your organisation, or the external investment managers or service providers acting on your behalf, use in the past three years?

- (A) **Joining or broadening an existing collaborative engagement or creating a new one**
- (B) Publicly engaging the entity, e.g. signing an open letter
- (C) Not investing
- (D) Reducing exposure to the investee entity
- (E) Divesting
- (F) Litigation
- (G) **Other**

Specify:

ESG engagements facilitated the external investment manager to continue holding the investment based on positive ESG findings and progress.

- o (H) In the past three years, we did not use any of the above escalation measures for our corporate fixed income assets

STEWARDSHIP: ENGAGEMENT WITH POLICY MAKERS

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 39	CORE	OO 8, OO 9	PGS 39.1, PGS 39.2	PUBLIC	Stewardship: Engagement with policy makers	2

Did your organisation, or the external investment managers or service providers acting on your behalf, engage with policy makers as part of your responsible investment approach during the reporting year?

- (A) **Yes, we engaged with policy makers directly**
- (B) **Yes, we engaged with policy makers through the leadership of or active participation in working groups or collaborative initiatives, including via the PRI**
- (C) **Yes, we were members of, supported, or were in another way affiliated with third party organisations, including trade associations and non-profit organisations, that engage with policy makers, excluding the PRI**
- o (D) We did not engage with policy makers directly or indirectly during the reporting year beyond our membership in the PRI

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 39.1	CORE	PGS 39	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: Engagement with policy makers	2

During the reporting year, what methods did you, or the external investment managers or service providers acting on your behalf, use to engage with policy makers as part of your responsible investment approach?

- (A) **We participated in 'sign-on' letters**
- (B) **We responded to policy consultations**

(C) We provided technical input via government- or regulator-backed working groups

Describe:

We participated in 'sign-on' letters and responded to policy consultations with collaborative partners. Many of our external managers have engaged with and provided technical expertise to government- or regulator-backed working groups. For example, an investment manager of a public equities fund participated in a roundtable for financial institutions convened by the UK Treasury Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Ministers on UK policy to tackle deforestation-linked finance.

Through our service provider, EOS, we use a range of methods to engage with policymakers for a more sustainable financial system. This is achieved through engagements and meetings with government officials, financial regulators, stock exchanges, industry associations, and other key parties. It also includes participating in public consultations. EOS provides technical input on ESG policy change. For example, in 2023 EOS attended a virtual delegation meeting alongside the Asian Corporate Governance Association (ACGA) to give its views on the latest action plan from Japan's Financial Services Agency (FSA). EOS asked the FSA to set a requirement for companies to disclose their cross-shareholding voting results. EOS said that this practice negatively impacts capital efficiency and corporate governance, as companies mutually vote in support of each other and support the appointment of 'independent' directors affiliated with these companies.

(D) We engaged policy makers on our own initiative

Describe:

We participated in engagement with policymakers in coordination with collaborative partners. Many of our external managers have engaged with and provided technical expertise to government- or regulator-backed working groups. For example, an investment manager of a public equities fund responded to the EU consultation on the draft of European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) and the future of Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR).

Through our service provider, EOS, we use a range of methods to engage with policymakers for a more sustainable financial system. This is achieved through engagements and meetings with government officials, financial regulators, stock exchanges, industry associations, and other key parties. It also includes participating in public consultations. EOS engages on financial regulatory topics regarding ESG integration, stewardship, and disclosure. For example, EOS met in Amsterdam with the core sub-group of the public policy advocacy working group of the Finance for Biodiversity Foundation. The goal was to define a strategy and agree on actions to support the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework following COP15 in December 2022. EOS discussed developing a report or guide about the different measures governments and regulators could implement, ranging from disclosure requirements to economic incentives.

(E) Other methods

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 39.2	CORE	PGS 39	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship: Engagement with policy makers	2

During the reporting year, did your organisation publicly disclose details of your engagement with policy makers conducted as part of your responsible investment approach, including through external investment managers or service providers?

- (A) We publicly disclosed all our policy positions
- (B) We publicly disclosed details of our engagements with policy makers

Add link(s):

https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/annual-review_utam_2023_public.pdf

- (C) No, we did not publicly disclose details of our engagement with policy makers conducted as part of our responsible investment approach during the reporting year

CLIMATE CHANGE

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 41	CORE	N/A	PGS 41.1	PUBLIC	Climate change	General

Has your organisation identified climate-related risks and opportunities affecting your investments?

(A) Yes, within our standard planning horizon

Specify the risks and opportunities identified and your relevant standard planning horizon:

Within risk management, climate risk analysis is integrated into our overall market risk framework. We use exposure-based and scenario-based analysis to take a two-fold risk identification and measurement approach. This allows us to view risks to the Endowment portfolio via current positions and provides insight into future potential risk via individual country/sector/security exposures as well as through specific scenarios. In identifying and measuring sector (country, security) exposures to climate risk, we employ several data sources (e.g., MSCI ESG Scores, Climate Risk Indices and Vulnerability/Readiness scores). These scores, which capture the impacts from both transition and physical risks (e.g., weather-related events, exposure to stranded assets, exposure to regions most at risk to climate change, population change, and access to water), give us a snapshot of the Endowment's current risk profile and which asset group (or assets) is currently exposed to (i.e., within our investment time horizon) and/or likely to be exposed to climate risk over time (i.e., beyond our investment time horizon).

Our scenario analysis work complements this by applying specific projected paths. We use external platform tools and models developed in-house and published climate scenarios (e.g., Network for Greening the Financial System scenarios). Taking the projected changes in macroeconomic variables, we can evaluate the impact of climate risk on the Endowment on different pathways and at different horizons (i.e., within our investment time horizon and beyond our investment time horizon). Climate-related risks are evaluated by asset class, sector, country, and time horizon. For example, asset class physical risks are likely more material and will impact certain asset classes (e.g., real estate) more than others in the long term.

Some of these impacts will be within our investment time horizon, and some will be beyond it.

Conversely, while climate change creates many risks, it also creates opportunities. For example, there are opportunities to benefit from investing in companies that offer products and services that provide solutions for a lower-carbon economy. There may also be opportunities to invest in companies that more effectively manage their climate-related risks and are likely to outperform.

In addition, companies operating in less carbon-intensive sectors and countries are likely better positioned in a negative climate scenario. One of our climate-related commitments is to reduce the carbon footprint (tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per million dollars invested) of the Endowment portfolio by 50% by 2030 compared to 2019 levels. To achieve this goal, we undertake a variety of actions, including shifting assets to lower-emitting countries and sectors and to sustainable strategies, as well as investing in strategies and asset classes with lower carbon emissions. We also expect carbon emissions reductions at the company level to occur over time as companies manage their carbon footprints more effectively.

(B) Yes, beyond our standard planning horizon

Specify the risks and opportunities identified and your relevant standard planning horizon:

Refer to our response to (A).

- (C) No, we have not identified climate-related risks and/or opportunities affecting our investments

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 41.1	CORE	PGS 41	N/A	PUBLIC	Climate change	General

Does your organisation integrate climate-related risks and opportunities affecting your investments in its overall investment strategy, financial planning and (if relevant) products?

- (A) Yes, our overall investment strategy, financial planning and (if relevant) products integrate climate-related risks and opportunities**

Describe how climate-related risks and opportunities have affected or are expected to affect your investment strategy, financial planning and (if relevant) products:

We integrate consideration of climate-related risks and opportunities in a manner that is consistent with how we consider traditional financial risks and opportunities. In doing so, we analyze climate-related risks and opportunities at the aggregate Endowment portfolio level via various analytical tools, including exposure analysis as well as scenario analysis. As our knowledge base grows and we accumulate metrics, we expect to expand and refine the analysis to better inform portfolio construction, monitoring, and risk management processes.

UTAM's approach centres on the management of climate-related risks, investing in sustainable and low carbon strategies (including climate opportunities) and promoting effective stewardship activities.

Our approach has three steps:

(1) Identify: We identify the climate-related risks and opportunities relevant to the Endowment portfolio and its associated time horizon. We consider transition and physical risks, and which countries and sectors could be impacted most significantly or are well-positioned to adapt. We have identified proxies for each type of climate-related risk.

(2) Measure: We measure the identified climate-related risks and opportunities and engage in detailed internal discussions to evaluate them.

This includes modelling our exposure to at-risk sectors and countries via carbon footprinting, and forward-looking scenario analysis. We have introduced a scoring system that evaluates, among other things, an investment manager's approach to climate risk management and, where available compares its ESG ratings and carbon footprint against relevant benchmarks. A selection of portfolio-level metrics is publicly disclosed.

(3) Manage: We use the information gleaned from the previous steps to inform investment decisions, manage the Endowment portfolio, and monitor existing investments.

We work with new and existing managers to create products with lower-carbon portfolios.

To manage the potential impact of climate change on the Endowment portfolio, and take concrete actions to address systemic climate risks, we have set the following climate-related targets:

- Divest from direct exposure to fossil fuel companies (achieved in October 2022).
- Divest from indirect exposure to fossil fuel companies, typically held through pooled and commingled investment vehicles, by 2030.
- Allocate 10% of the Endowment (currently, approximately CAD \$400 million) to sustainable and low-carbon investment strategies by 2025.
- Continue to engage with current and prospective investment managers to emphasize GHG emissions reduction in their portfolios and climate impact in the real economy.
- Reach net zero emissions in the Endowment portfolio by 2050.
- Set five-year targets following the framework developed by the Net Zero Asset Owner Alliance (NZAOA).
- Work with peer asset owners and investment managers to drive industry-wide commitment to net zero.
- Report to stakeholders regularly on the progress towards divestment and net zero goals.

- o (B) No, our organisation has not yet integrated climate-related risks and opportunities into its investment strategy, financial planning and (if relevant) products

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 43	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Climate change	General

Has your organisation assessed the resilience of its investment strategy in different climate scenarios, including one in which the average temperature rise is held to below 2 degrees Celsius (preferably to 1.5 degrees Celsius) above pre-industrial levels?

- (A) Yes, using the Inevitable Policy Response Forecast Policy Scenario (FPS) or Required Policy Scenario (RPS)
- (B) Yes, using the One Earth Climate Model scenario
- (C) Yes, using the International Energy Agency (IEA) Net Zero scenario
- (D) Yes, using other scenarios

Specify:

Since 2017, we have integrated quantitative climate scenario analysis into our investment risk management framework. While our approach continues to evolve as we gain knowledge and experience working with the climate data set and models, our core steps have remained consistent. We first consider scenario/climate pathways published by industry experts such as the International Energy Agency (IEA). Our approach then focuses on taking these transition risk scenarios and attempting to translate them into portfolio impacts expressed as "Value at Risk" stress results. This analysis leverages internal and external tools to further integrate physical risk scenarios, scenario attribution by country and sector levels, and measurement of portfolio resilience under a transition scenario. We are advancing our ability to integrate in more granularity, physical risk scenarios which leverage scenario information provided by Network for Greening Financial Systems. The results of our scenario analysis spur discussion on potential impacts on the Endowment and help us gauge the resilience of our investment strategy across multiple time horizons. Climate scenario analysis is constantly developing, and we adapt our processes as more decision-ready data and improved techniques become available.

- (E) No, we have not assessed the resilience of our investment strategy in different climate scenarios, including one that holds temperature rise to below 2 degrees

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 44	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Climate change	General

Does your organisation have a process to identify, assess, and manage the climate-related risks (potentially) affecting your investments?

(A) Yes, we have a process to identify and assess climate-related risks

(1) Describe your process

See response to PGS 41.1.

Our process seeks to identify and assess climate-related risks both from the top-down (i.e., overall portfolio level) as well as from the bottom-up (manager/strategy level):

- Our risk team conducts the top-down assessment. We leverage a holdings-based portfolio system to conduct various climate scenarios/stress tests, exposure analysis, and finally, calculation of the carbon footprint and fossil fuel exposure for a subset of the Endowment Portfolio (as discussed in PGS 41.1). The output of these analyses is reviewed periodically by the Management Investment Risk Committee and/or the Responsible Investing Committee.

- Our investment team conducts the bottom-up assessment. It is responsible for understanding our managers' investment processes and expected exposures and assessing and scoring the ESG integration of each strategy in which the Endowment portfolio invests, following our proprietary scoring framework, which incorporates environmental/climate considerations.

- The investment team's detailed assessment of an external investment manager's ESG integration approach is included in the investment due diligence recommendation memo that is reviewed by the Management Investment Committee.

Where available, this write-up will include detailed analysis of the strategy's ESG ratings and historical carbon footprint.

All referenced committees include a variety of our senior leaders.

(2) Describe how this process is integrated into your overall risk management

See response to PGS 41.1. This approach can be illustrated through our investment due diligence process, which includes a detailed assessment of how external investment managers manage climate-related risks in their strategies as part of our manager assessment and selection framework. In 2018, we introduced a proprietary ESG integration scoring framework for new and existing investment managers, which includes our assessment of each investment manager's ESG capabilities and, where possible, a detailed analysis of the strategy's ESG rating and its carbon footprint, including attribution, to assess the companies with the best/worst ESG ratings and the highest/lowest carbon emissions. We use MSCI's ESG and carbon emissions data to identify potential climate-related risks in investment manager portfolios and use that information in our discussions with investment managers to understand better their processes and how they integrate climate considerations into their strategies. Our propriety ESG integration scoring framework will evolve as ESG risks and opportunities, and best practices emerge.

While the example above is manager/strategy-focused (i.e., bottom-up), as noted, the risk team also executes a top-down portfolio-level process.

(B) Yes, we have a process to manage climate-related risks

(1) Describe your process

See response to PGS 41.1. and PGS 44.

(2) Describe how this process is integrated into your overall risk management

See the responses to PGS 41 and PGS 44. In addition to the quantitative risk management aspects, we also undertake a number of other risk management activities.

Engagement:

- A key part of our climate risk management strategy is to engage with companies on climate issues. We use engagement and other stewardship activities to increase accountability on climate-related risks within our portfolio companies.

Through effective engagement, we better understand a company's position on climate change. Given our size and use of external investment managers, we typically undertake engagement through our external investment managers and as part of formal and informal collaborative groups. Many of these groups have prioritized engagement on climate change, notably:

UTAM was a founding member of Climate Action 100+ and Climate Engagement Canada (CEC) and the first university to join the Net-Zero Owner Alliance.

- o We participate in the Canadian Coalition for Good Governance (CCGG), which have increasingly broadened the focus of their engagements to include environmental and social issues, as well as climate change.

- o We are an active contributor to various CDP (formerly Carbon Disclosure Project) initiatives, including the Non-Disclosure Campaign, in which we engage with companies that have not responded to CDP's disclosure requests.

- o We use EOS at Federated Hermes (EOS), a corporate engagement service, and the University for Network Engagement (UNIE) to amplify our impact.

- EOS prides itself on having a consultative process with clients when determining its engagement priorities, and we are an active participant in this process.

Engagement with companies on climate change is one of EOS's top priorities. The focus is on ensuring companies have a business model consistent with net-zero emissions and an effective transition plan to achieve this by 2050. In the near term, EOS engages with companies on corporate objectives, including:

- 1) development of a strategy consistent with the goals of the Paris Agreement, including that each new material capex investment is consistent with the Paris goals;

- 2) development of science-based emissions reduction targets for Scope 1 and 2 emissions and Scope 3 emissions (where a methodology exists, or the equivalent ambition);

- 3) development of a public policy position supportive of the Paris goals and alignment of both direct and indirect lobbying activity by member industry associations; board oversight and understanding of climate risks and opportunities; and

- 4) adoption and implementation of the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures recommendations.

- As with all its corporate objectives with companies, EOS tracks and manages its progress of climate-related objectives using the milestones listed below:

- 1) Milestone one - EOS' concern is raised with the company at the appropriate level.

- 2) Milestone two - the company acknowledges the issue as a serious investor concern worthy of a response.

- 3) Milestone three - the company develops a credible strategy to achieve the objective, or stretching targets are set to address the concern.

- 4) Milestone four - the company implements a strategy or measures to address the concern.

Proxy voting: We have adopted the ISS Sustainability Guidelines for proxy voting, which considers climate change, and apply it wherever possible.

- o (C) No, we do not have any processes to identify, assess, or manage the climate-related risks affecting our investments

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 45	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Climate change	General

During the reporting year, which of the following climate risk metrics or variables affecting your investments did your organisation use and publicly disclose?

(A) Exposure to physical risk

(1) Indicate whether this metric or variable was used and disclosed, including the methodology

(1) Metric or variable used

- (2) Metric or variable used and disclosed
- (3) Metric or variable used and disclosed, including methodology

(B) Exposure to transition risk

(1) Indicate whether this metric or variable was used and disclosed, including the methodology

(1) Metric or variable used

(2) Metric or variable used and disclosed

- (3) Metric or variable used and disclosed, including methodology

(2) Provide link to the disclosed metric or variable, including the methodology followed, as applicable

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2023-UTAM-TCFD-Report.pdf>

(C) Internal carbon price

(D) Total carbon emissions

(1) Indicate whether this metric or variable was used and disclosed, including the methodology

- (1) Metric or variable used
- (2) Metric or variable used and disclosed

(3) Metric or variable used and disclosed, including methodology

(2) Provide link to the disclosed metric or variable, including the methodology followed, as applicable

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/UTAM-Annual-Report-2023.pdf>

(E) Weighted average carbon intensity

(F) Avoided emissions

(G) Implied Temperature Rise (ITR)

(1) Indicate whether this metric or variable was used and disclosed, including the methodology

(1) Metric or variable used

- (2) Metric or variable used and disclosed
- (3) Metric or variable used and disclosed, including methodology

(H) Non-ITR measure of portfolio alignment with UNFCCC Paris Agreement goals

(I) Proportion of assets or other business activities aligned with climate-related opportunities

(J) Other metrics or variables

Specify:

We calculate the carbon footprint (CO₂e/\$CAD) for approximately 70% of the Endowment portfolio (i.e., the Sub-Portfolio as referenced earlier) and track securities that have exposure to fossil fuels. We also calculate/track WACI (based on revenue) for internal purposes, although we do not disclose.

(1) Indicate whether this metric or variable was used and disclosed, including the methodology

- (1) Metric or variable used
- (2) Metric or variable used and disclosed

(3) Metric or variable used and disclosed, including methodology

(2) Provide link to the disclosed metric or variable, including the methodology followed, as applicable

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2023-UTAM-Carbon-Footprint-Report.pdf>

- (K) Our organisation did not use or publicly disclose any climate risk metrics or variables affecting our investments during the reporting year

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 46	CORE	N/A	N/A	PUBLIC	Climate change	General

During the reporting year, did your organisation publicly disclose its Scope 1, Scope 2, and/or Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions?

(A) Scope 1 emissions

(1) Indicate whether this metric was disclosed, including the methodology

o (1) Metric disclosed

● (2) Metric and methodology disclosed

(2) Provide links to the disclosed metric and methodology, as applicable

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2023-UTAM-Carbon-Footprint-Report.pdf>

(B) Scope 2 emissions

(1) Indicate whether this metric was disclosed, including the methodology

o (1) Metric disclosed

● (2) Metric and methodology disclosed

(2) Provide links to the disclosed metric and methodology, as applicable

<https://www.utam.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2023-UTAM-Carbon-Footprint-Report.pdf>

(C) Scope 3 emissions (including financed emissions)

o (D) Our organisation did not publicly disclose its Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions during the reporting year

SUSTAINABILITY OUTCOMES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 47	CORE	N/A	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Sustainability outcomes	1, 2

Has your organisation identified the intended and unintended sustainability outcomes connected to its investment activities?

● (A) Yes, we have identified one or more specific sustainability outcomes connected to our investment activities

o (B) No, we have not yet identified the sustainability outcomes connected to any of our investment activities

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 47.1	CORE	PGS 47	N/A	PUBLIC	Sustainability outcomes	1, 2

Which widely recognised frameworks has your organisation used to identify the intended and unintended sustainability outcomes connected to its investment activities?

(A) The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and targets

(B) The UNFCCC Paris Agreement

(C) The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs)

(D) OECD frameworks: OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Guidance on Responsible Business Conduct for Institutional Investors

(E) The EU Taxonomy

- (F) Other relevant taxonomies
- (G) The International Bill of Human Rights
- (H) The International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the eight core conventions
- (I) The Convention on Biological Diversity
- (J) Other international framework(s)
- (K) Other regional framework(s)
- (L) Other sectoral/issue-specific framework(s)
- (M) Our organisation did not use any widely recognised frameworks to identify the intended and unintended sustainability outcomes connected to its investment activities

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 47.2	CORE	PGS 47	PGS 48	PUBLIC	Sustainability outcomes	1, 2

What are the primary methods that your organisation has used to determine the most important intended and unintended sustainability outcomes connected to its investment activities?

- (A) Identify sustainability outcomes that are closely linked to our core investment activities
- (B) Consult with key clients and/or beneficiaries to align with their priorities
- (C) Assess which actual or potential negative outcomes for people are most severe based on their scale, scope, and irreparable character
- (D) Identify sustainability outcomes that are closely linked to systematic sustainability issues
- (E) Analyse the input from different stakeholders (e.g. affected communities, civil society, trade unions or similar)
- (F) Understand the geographical relevance of specific sustainability outcome objectives
- (G) Other method
- (H) We have not yet determined the most important sustainability outcomes connected to our investment activities

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
PGS 48	CORE	PGS 47.2	PGS 48.1, SO 1	PUBLIC	Sustainability outcomes	1, 2

Has your organisation taken action on any specific sustainability outcomes connected to its investment activities, including to prevent and mitigate actual and potential negative outcomes?

- (A) Yes, we have taken action on some of the specific sustainability outcomes connected to our investment activities
- (B) No, we have not yet taken action on any specific sustainability outcomes connected to our investment activities

MANAGER SELECTION, APPOINTMENT AND MONITORING (SAM)

OVERALL APPROACH

EXTERNAL INVESTMENT MANAGERS

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 1	CORE	OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	External investment managers	4

For the majority of your externally managed AUM in each asset class, which responsible investment aspects does your organisation consider important in the assessment of external investment managers?

	(1) Listed equity (active)	(3) Fixed income (active)	(5) Private equity	(6) Real estate	(8) Hedge funds
Organisation					
(A) Commitment to and experience in responsible investment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(B) Responsible investment policy(ies)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(C) Governance structure and senior-level oversight and accountability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People and Culture					
(D) Adequate resourcing and incentives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(E) Staff competencies and experience in responsible investment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Investment Process					
(F) Incorporation of material ESG factors in the investment process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(G) Incorporation of risks connected to systematic sustainability issues in the investment process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(H) Incorporation of material ESG factors and ESG risks connected to systematic sustainability issues in portfolio risk assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Stewardship					
(I) Policy(ies) or guidelines on stewardship	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(J) Policy(ies) or guidelines on (proxy) voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(K) Use of stewardship tools and activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(L) Incorporation of risks connected to systematic sustainability issues in stewardship practices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(M) Involvement in collaborative engagement and stewardship initiatives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(N) Engagement with policy makers and other non-investee stakeholders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(O) Results of stewardship activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Performance and Reporting					
(P) ESG disclosure in regular client reporting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(Q) Inclusion of ESG factors in contractual agreements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(R) We do not consider any of the above responsible investment aspects important in the assessment of external investment managers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SERVICE PROVIDERS

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 2	CORE	OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	Service providers	4

Which responsible investment aspects does your organisation consider important when assessing all service providers that advise you in the selection, appointment and/or monitoring of external investment managers?

- (A) Incorporation of their responsible investment policy into advisory services
- (B) Ability to accommodate our responsible investment policy
- (C) Level of staff's responsible investment expertise
- (D) Use of data and analytical tools to assess the external investment manager's responsible investment performance
- (E) Other
- (F) We do not consider any of the above responsible investment aspects important when assessing service providers that advise us in the selection, appointment and/or monitoring of external investment managers
- (G) Not applicable; we do not engage service providers in the selection, appointment or monitoring of external investment managers

SELECTION

RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT PRACTICES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 4	CORE	OO 12, OO 21	SAM 5, SAM 6, SAM 7	PUBLIC	Responsible investment practices	General

During the reporting year, did your organisation select new external investment managers or allocate new mandates to existing investment managers?

- (A) Yes, we selected external investment managers or allocated new mandates to existing investment managers during the reporting year
- (B) No, we did not select new external investment managers or allocate new mandates to existing investment managers during the reporting year
- (C) Not applicable; our organisation is in a captive relationship with external investment managers, which applies to 90% or more of our AUM

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 5	CORE	SAM 4	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment practices	4

During the reporting year, what responsible investment aspects did your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, review and evaluate when selecting new external investment managers or allocating new mandates to existing investment managers?

Organisation

(A) Commitment to and experience in responsible investment (e.g. commitment to responsible investment principles and standards)

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

(B) Responsible investment policy(ies) (e.g. the alignment of their responsible investment policy with the investment mandate)

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

(C) Governance structure and senior-level oversight and accountability (e.g. the adequacy of their governance structure and reported conflicts of interest)

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

People and Culture

(D) Adequate resourcing and incentives (e.g. their team structures, operating model and remuneration structure, including alignment of interests)

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

(E) Staff competencies and experience in responsible investment (e.g. level of responsible investment responsibilities in their investment team, their responsible investment training and capacity building)

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

Investment Process

(F) Incorporation of material ESG factors in the investment process (e.g. detail and evidence of how such factors are incorporated into the selection of individual assets and in portfolio construction)

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

(G) Incorporation of risks connected to systematic sustainability issues in the investment process (e.g. detail and evidence of how such risks are incorporated into the selection of individual assets and in portfolio construction)

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

- (H) Incorporation of material ESG factors and ESG risks connected to systematic sustainability issues in portfolio risk assessment (e.g. their process to measure and report such risks)**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

Performance and Reporting

- (I) ESG disclosure in regular client reporting**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

- (J) Inclusion of ESG factors in contractual agreements**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

- (K) We did not review and evaluate any of the above responsible investment aspects when selecting new external investment managers or allocating new mandates to existing investment managers during the reporting year

STEWARDSHIP

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 6	CORE	OO 8, OO 21, SAM 4	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship	4

During the reporting year, which aspects of the stewardship approach did your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, review and evaluate when selecting new external investment managers or allocating new mandates to existing investment managers?

- (A) The alignment of their policy(ies) or guidelines on stewardship with the investment mandate**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

- (B) Evidence of how they implemented their stewardship objectives, including the effectiveness of their activities**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

- (C) Their participation in collaborative engagements and stewardship initiatives**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

- (D) Details of their engagements with companies or issuers on risks connected to systematic sustainability issues**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates**
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates

- (E) Details of their engagement activities with policy makers

- (F) Their escalation process and the escalation tools included in their policy on stewardship**

Select from dropdown list

- (1) for all of our mandates
- (2) for a majority of our mandates
- (3) for a minority of our mandates**

- (G) We did not review and evaluate any of the above aspects of the stewardship approach when selecting new external investment managers or allocating new mandates to existing investment managers during the reporting year

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 7	CORE	OO 9, OO 21, SAM 4	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship	4

During the reporting year, which aspects of (proxy) voting did your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, review and evaluate when selecting new external investment managers or allocating new mandates to existing investment managers?

- (A) The alignment of their policy(ies) or guidelines on (proxy) voting with the investment mandate
- (B) Historical information on the number or percentage of general meetings at which they voted
- (C) Analysis of votes cast for and against
- (D) Analysis of votes cast for and against resolutions related to risks connected to systematic sustainability issues
- (E) Details of their position on any controversial and high-profile votes
- (F) Historical information of any resolutions on which they voted contrary to their own voting policy and the reasons why
- (G) Details of all votes involving companies where the external investment manager or an affiliate has a contractual relationship or another potential conflict of interest
- (H) We did not review and evaluate any of the above aspects of (proxy) voting when selecting new external investment managers or allocating new mandates to existing investment managers during the reporting year
- (I) **Not applicable; our organisation did not select new external investment managers or allocated new mandates to existing investment managers for listed equity and/or hedge funds that hold equity.**

MONITORING

RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT PRACTICES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 9	CORE	OO 14, OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment practices	4

For the majority of your externally managed AUM in each asset class, which aspects of your external investment managers' responsible investment practices did your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, monitor during the reporting year?

	(1) Listed equity (active)	(3) Fixed income (active)	(5) Private equity	(6) Real estate	(8) Hedge funds
Organisation					
(A) Commitment to and experience in responsible investment (e.g. commitment to responsible investment principles and standards)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(B) Responsible investment policy(ies) (e.g. the continued alignment of their responsible investment policy with the investment mandate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(C) Governance structure and senior level oversight and accountability (e.g. the adequacy of their governance structure and reported conflicts of interest)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People and Culture					
(D) Adequate resourcing and incentives (e.g. their team structures, operating model and remuneration structure, including alignment of interests)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(E) Staff competencies and experience in responsible investment (e.g. level of responsible investment responsibilities in their investment team, their responsible investment training and capacity building)

Investment Process

(F) Incorporation of material ESG factors in the investment process (e.g. detail and evidence of how such factors are incorporated into the selection of individual assets and in portfolio construction)

(G) Incorporation of risks connected to systematic sustainability issues in the investment process (e.g. detail and evidence of how such risks are incorporated into the selection of individual assets and in portfolio construction)

(H) Incorporation of material ESG factors and ESG risks connected to systematic sustainability issues in portfolio risk assessment (e.g. their process to measure and report such risks, their response to ESG incidents)

Performance and Reporting

(I) ESG disclosure in regular client reporting (e.g. any changes in their regular client reporting)

(J) Inclusion of ESG factors in contractual agreements

(K) We did not monitor any of the above aspects of our external investment managers' responsible investment practices during the reporting year

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 12	CORE	OO 14, OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	Responsible investment practices	1

For the majority of your externally managed AUM in each asset class, how often does your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, monitor your external investment managers' responsible investment practices?

	(1) Listed equity (active)	(3) Fixed income (active)	(5) Private equity	(6) Real estate	(8) Hedge funds
(A) At least annually	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(B) Less than once a year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(C) On an ad hoc basis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

STEWARDSHIP

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 13	CORE	OO 8, OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship	1, 2

For the majority of your externally managed AUM in each asset class, which aspects of your external investment managers' stewardship practices did your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, monitor during the reporting year?

	(1) Listed equity (active)	(3) Fixed income (active)	(5) Private equity	(6) Real estate	(8) Hedge funds
(A) Any changes in their policy(ies) or guidelines on stewardship	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(B) The degree of implementation of their policy(ies) or guidelines on stewardship	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(C) How they prioritise material ESG factors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(D) How they prioritise risks connected to systematic sustainability issues	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(E) Their investment team's level of involvement in stewardship activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(F) Whether the results of stewardship actions were fed back into the investment process and decisions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(G) Whether they used a variety of stewardship tools and activities to advance their stewardship priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(H) The deployment of their escalation process in cases where initial stewardship efforts were unsuccessful	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(I) Whether they participated in collaborative engagements and stewardship initiatives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(J) Whether they had an active role in collaborative engagements and stewardship initiatives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(K) Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(L) We did not monitor our external investment managers' stewardship practices during the reporting year	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 14	CORE	OO 9, OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	Stewardship	1, 2

For the majority of your AUM in each asset class where (proxy) voting is delegated to external investment managers, which aspects of your external investment managers' (proxy) voting practices did your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, monitor during the reporting year?

(1) Listed equity (active)

(A) Any changes in their policy(ies) or guidelines on (proxy) voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(B) Whether their (proxy) voting decisions were consistent with their stewardship priorities as stated in their policy and with their voting policy, principles and/or guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(C) Whether their (proxy) voting decisions were consistent with their stated approach on the prioritisation of risks connected to systematic sustainability issues	<input type="checkbox"/>
(D) Whether their (proxy) voting track record was aligned with our stewardship approach and expectations	<input type="checkbox"/>
(E) The application of their policy on securities lending and any implications for implementing their policy(ies) or guidelines on (proxy) voting (where applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(F) Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(G) We did not monitor our external investment managers' (proxy) voting practices during the reporting year	<input type="radio"/>

(F) Other - Specify:

We also monitor votes against management recommendations and votes in favour of shareholder proposals.

ENGAGEMENT AND ESCALATION

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 16	CORE	OO 14, OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	Engagement and escalation	4

What actions does your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, include in its formal escalation process to address concerns raised during monitoring of your external investment managers' responsible investment practices?

	(1) Listed equity (active)	(3) Fixed income (active)	(5) Private equity	(6) Real estate	(8) Hedge funds
(A) Engagement with their investment professionals, investment committee or other representatives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(B) Notification about their placement on a watch list or relationship coming under review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(C) Reduction of capital allocation to the external investment managers until any concerns have been rectified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(D) Termination of the contract if failings persist over a (notified) period, including an explanation of the reasons for termination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(E) Holding off selecting the external investment managers for new mandates or allocating additional capital until any concerns have been rectified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(F) Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(G) Our organisation does not have a formal escalation process to address concerns raised during monitoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(F) Other - Specify:

Place external investment managers on a watch list and/or review our relationship with them should we have concerns regarding their responsible investing practices.

VERIFICATION

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
SAM 17	CORE	OO 14, OO 21	N/A	PUBLIC	Verification	1

For the majority of your externally managed AUM in each asset class, how did your organisation, or the service provider acting on your behalf, verify that the information reported by external investment managers on their responsible investment practices was correct during the reporting year?

	(1) Listed equity (active)	(3) Fixed income (active)	(5) Private equity	(6) Real estate	(8) Hedge funds
(A) We checked that the information reported was verified through a third-party assurance process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(B) We checked that the information reported was verified by an independent third party	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(C) We checked for evidence of internal monitoring or compliance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(D) Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(E) We did not verify the information reported by external investment managers on their responsible investment practices during the reporting year	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES (CBM)

CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

APPROACH TO CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
CBM 1	CORE	N/A	Multiple indicators	PUBLIC	Approach to confidence-building measures	6

How did your organisation verify the information submitted in your PRI report this reporting year?

- (A) We conducted independent third-party assurance of selected processes and/or data related to the responsible investment processes reported in our PRI report, which resulted in a formal assurance conclusion
- (B) We conducted a third-party readiness review and are making changes to our internal controls or governance processes to be able to conduct independent third-party assurance next year
- (C) We conducted an internal audit of selected processes and/or data related to the responsible investment processes reported in our PRI report
- (D) **Our board, trustees (or equivalent), senior executive-level staff (or equivalent), and/or investment committee (or equivalent) signed off on our PRI report**
- (E) We conducted an external ESG audit of our holdings to verify that our funds comply with our responsible investment policy
- (F) We conducted an external ESG audit of our holdings as part of risk management, engagement identification or investment decision-making
- (G) **Our responses in selected sections and/or the entirety of our PRI report were internally reviewed before submission to the PRI**
- (H) We did not verify the information submitted in our PRI report this reporting year

INTERNAL REVIEW

Indicator	Type of indicator	Dependent on	Gateway to	Disclosure	Subsection	PRI Principle
CBM 6	CORE	CBM 1	N/A	PUBLIC	Internal review	6

Who in your organisation reviewed the responses submitted in your PRI report this year?

- (A) Board, trustees, or equivalent
- (B) **Senior executive-level staff, investment committee, head of department, or equivalent**
 - Sections of PRI report reviewed
 - (1) **the entire report**
 - (2) selected sections of the report
 - (C) None of the above internal roles reviewed selected sections or the entirety of the responses submitted in our PRI report this year