# VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING STATE OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION OPEN SESSION

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2020 10:03 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

### APPEARANCES

### BOARD MEMBERS:

- Mr. Henry Jones, President
- Ms. Theresa Taylor, Vice President
- Ms. Margaret Brown
- Mr. Rob Feckner
- Ms. Fiona Ma, represented by Mr. Frank Ruffino
- Ms. Lisa Middleton
- Mr. David Miller
- Ms. Stacie Olivares
- Ms. Eraina Ortega
- Mr. Jason Perez
- Mr. Ramon Rubalcava
- Ms. Betty Yee

### STAFF:

- Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer
- Mr. Doug Hoffner, Chief Operating Officer
- Mr. Matthew Jacobs, General Counsel
- Mr. Kelly Fox, Chief, Stakeholder Relations
- Ms. Pam Hopper, Board Secretary
- Mr. Michelle Tucker, Chief, Human Resources Division

# APPEARANCES CONTINUED

# ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Sidney Baumgartner, Korn Ferry

Dr. Robert Girling

Mr. J.J. Jelincic

Mr. Michael Kennedy, Korn Ferry

	I N D E X	PAGE		
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1		
(Closed Session)				
2.	Call to Order and Roll Call	5		
3.	Approval of the October 16, 2020 Board of Administration Timed Agenda 5			
4.	Pledge of Allegiance - Henry Jones 7			
5.	Chief Executive Officer's Report (Oral) - Marcie Frost 7			
6.	Action Agenda Items a. Incentive Compensation Recommendations for the Chief Investment Officer Position - Michelle Tucker; Eric Gonzaga of Grant Thornton LLP	9		
7.	<pre>Information Agenda Items a. Chief Investment Officer Recruitment:     Recruitment Search Process and Timeline and     Solicitation of Board Member Input on CIO     Skills and Characteristics- Marcie Frost;     Michael Kennedy of Korn Ferry b. Summary of Board Direction - Marcie Frost c. Public Comment</pre>	43 79 80		
Adjournment				
Reporter's Certificate 8				

## PROCEEDINGS 1 PRESIDENT JONES: I'd like to call the CalPERS 2 3 Board of Administration meeting to order, the open session. So with that, roll call. Mrs. Hopper, please. 4 BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Good morning, Mr. 5 President. 6 PRESIDENT JONES: Good morning. 7 8 BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones? 9 PRESIDENT JONES: Here. BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Margaret Brown? 10 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Here. 11 BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner? 12 BOARD MEMBER FECKNER: Good morning. 13 BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for Fiona 14 Ma? 15 16 ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton? 17 BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Present. 18 BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller? 19 20 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Here. BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares? 21 Eraina Ortega? 2.2 23 Eraina Ortega? Jason Perez? 24 25 BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: He's on mute

```
BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Ramon Rubalcava?
1
             BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Present.
2
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?
 3
             VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Here.
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?
 5
             PRESIDENT JONES: Excused
 6
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Betty Yee?
7
8
             BOARD MEMBER YEE: Here.
9
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. Frank Ruffino for
   Fiona Ma?
10
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Here.
11
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: I got it.
12
             Stacie Olivares?
1.3
             I don't see her yet, Mr. President.
14
             PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah. She said she would be --
15
16
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah, I got a
   message from her.
                       I need to send her the dial-in info.
17
             PRESIDENT JONES: Okay.
18
19
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
20
             BOARD MEMBER ORTEGA: Here.
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
21
             Jason Perez?
2.2
23
             BOARD MEMBER PEREZ: (Waves hand.)
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. I see you.
24
   Gotcha.
25
```

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I think his sound is not working.

PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah, he said yes he's here.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: And it sounds like it's the chipmunks.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah.

President, I have everyone but Stacie Olivares with an excused from Shawnda Westly.

BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Okay. So, Mr.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Mrs. Frost, is -- will the dial-in number for the closed session be the same for Stacie or is it a different number?

Okay.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I'm going to send her both. I know she had some responsibilities outside of her home, so I'm going to send her both numbers.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Okay. So that will be good. Okay. So we will now recess into closed session for items 1 and 2 from the closed session agenda. So at this time, the Board members will exit this open session meeting and connect to the closed session meeting. For the members of the public watching on the livestream, the Board of Administration open session meeting will convene immediately following the closed session. So thank you

```
and now we will move over to the closed session agenda.
1
2
             Thank you.
             (Off record:
                           10:03 a.m.)
 3
             (Thereupon the meeting recessed
             into closed session.)
 5
             (Thereupon the meeting reconvened
 6
             open session.)
7
8
             (On record: 11:40 a.m.)
9
             PRESIDENT JONES: Good morning. I'd like to call
    the Board of Administration meeting to order. And the
10
11
    first order of business is roll call, please.
             Mrs. Hopper?
12
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Henry Jones?
1.3
             PRESIDENT JONES: Here.
14
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                       Margaret Brown?
15
16
             BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Good morning?
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER:
                                       Rob Feckner?
17
             BOARD MEMBER FECKNER: Good morning.
18
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for Fiona
19
20
   Ma?
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Present.
21
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?
2.2
23
             BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Present.
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
24
             BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Here.
25
```

```
BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
1
2
             Eraina Ortega?
             BOARD MEMBER ORTEGA: Here.
 3
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
             Ramon Rubalcava?
 5
             BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA:
                                      Here.
 6
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER:
7
                                      Theresa Taylor?
8
             VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Here.
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?
9
             PRESIDENT JONES: Excused.
10
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Betty Yee?
11
             BOARD MEMBER YEE: Here.
12
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, I --
13
   Stacie Olivares?
14
             BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Here.
15
16
             BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: And Jason Perez?
             I do not show Jason as of yet, Mr. President.
17
             PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Well, we'll go through
18
   these first two items and see if he can join us by then.
19
20
             The next item on the agenda is approval of the
   October 16 Board of Administration timed agenda. Do I
21
2.2
   have a motion?
23
             VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Move approval.
             PRESIDENT JONES: Moved by Ms. Taylor.
24
25
             BOARD MEMBER MILLER: (Hand raised.)
```

1		PRESIDENT JONES: Second by Mr. Miller.
2		Mrs. Hopper, please.
3		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Margaret Brown?
4		BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Aye.
5		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Rob Feckner?
6		BOARD MEMBER FECKNER: Yes.
7		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Frank Ruffino for Fiona
8	Ma?	
9		ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Yes.
10		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Lisa Middleton?
11		BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Aye.
12		BOARS SECRETARY HOPPER: David Miller?
13		BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Aye.
14		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Stacie Olivares?
15		BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Aye.
16		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Eraina Ortega?
17		BOARD MEMBER ORTEGA: Aye.
18		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Jason Perez?
19		Ramon Rubalcava?
20		BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Aye.
21		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Theresa Taylor?
22		VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Aye.
23		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Shawnda Westly?
24		PRESIDENT JONES: Excused.
25		BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Betty Yee?

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Aye.

2.2

BOARD SECRETARY HOPPER: Mr. President, I have Theresa Taylor making the motion and David Miller seconding it. And I have all ayes and -- with the exception of Jason Perez.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Hopper.

The next item on the agenda is the Pledge of Allegiance and I've asked Mrs. Taylor to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Great. Hand over heart.

(Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you. These are trying times.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is the Chief Executive Officer's report. Ms. Frost.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

I just have a very brief report for this additional meeting. I'll do a full report at our November Board meeting. But I just wanted to say thank you to our employer partners for attending the 2020 Educational Forum that we held over the last two days. We had just over 1,600 people in attendance. We also had about 16 of the 21 Board members or their delegates who were also in

attendance. So really appreciate that as well. We'll be promoting our Spotlight on Excellence winner Trieste Huey through social media. And if you haven't had a chance to look at the video associated with her award, I highly encourage you to do so. If it's not out on our website, it will be very soon.

2.2

And then I wanted again just to thank everyone who attended, as well as our own team, who was able to deliver some really important content and information that the public employers are really needing right now and all of this through this new virtual format. So we had a few little technical hiccups here and there, but overall, I think the event was really well done. People were patient and I think really received a high quality program.

So we are certainly hoping to return to more larger in-person events later this year, but we do believe that these virtual meetings will be with us far into the future and likely will become a part of our permanent ongoing offerings both to our members and to our employers. We've gotten, you know, pretty significant feedback from our membership that they really do like us coming to them in their homes in some of these virtual one-on-one appointments or the 98 percent satisfaction rating in the last virtual CBEE.

So we do believe that these will be with us for a

while, but certainly are looking forward to more of that in-person and networking opportunities as well. So again, I'll have a regular update for you in our November meeting and I'll conclude my remarks at this time.

Thank you.

2.2

PRESIDENT JONES: Thank you, Ms. Frost.

Okay. Seeing no questions for Ms. Frost, I note that -- Ms. Hopper note that Mr. Perez has joined the meeting.

And so we now will go to the next item on the agenda, which is an action agenda item, incentive compensation recommendations for Chief Investment Officer position. Ms. Tucker, please.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, Board. This is Michelle Tucker, Calpers team member.

Today, we have the Board's compensation consultant, Eric Gonzaga of Grant Thornton here to present this item and I'll turn it over to him in just a moment.

As a reminder, compensation for the CIO position was revised in June 2018 when the position was vacant.

The Board reviewed market data and consultant recommendations based on our comparator groups and adopted revised base pay and incentive ranges to ensure we could attract highly qualified individuals. By that time, the

Board had not yet finalized the pay philosophy and compensation structure for all executive and investment management positions, so there was not yet a long-term investment component included.

1.3

2.2

In February of 2019, the Board adopted revised base pay and incentive ranges effective fiscal year 2019-20 for all investment management positions, as well as approved the inclusion of long term incentive component for those positions within the Investment Office.

In September of 2019, the Board approved details of implementation for the long-term incentive plan effective beginning fiscal year 20 19 through 2020. The CIO position was excluded from the long-term incentive as compensation had been recently revised when the position had been vacant.

In November of 2019, the Board approved Grant Thornton's recommendation to add the long-term incentive to the compensation package for the Chief Executive Officer position. Please note that in our agenda item, we have two mentions of this that says the decision was made in November 2019 and one incorrectly had a typographical error and noted it as June 2020, but the actual decision was made in November of 2019, just so you can note for your records.

With the CIO position currently being vacant and

in recruitment, it's an opportune time for the Board to consider inclusion of the long-term incentive plan in the compensation package for this position.

Unless you have any questions for me, I can turn it over to Mr. Gonzaga to present his search firm's recommendations.

PRESIDENT JONES: Thank you, Ms. Tucker. I see no questions from Board members, so you can proceed.

MR. GONZAGA: Great.

1.3

2.2

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: And before he proceeds, I just wanted to thank -- thank you, Eric and thank you and Grant Thornton for your partnership over the years.

And with that, I can turn it back to you. Thank you.

MR. GONZAGA: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to work with such an outstanding organization.

But our recommendations are pretty straightforward. You know, you think about what we're trying to do is align the CIO position consistent with that for other investment office professionals. And the rationale is it's consistent, which is to blend, you know, focus in terms of both annual overall performance, in addition to long-term incentive performance. So there's a blend in making sure that decisions that are made now are

rewarded for based on performance over the long term.

2.2

So with that, our recommendations are straightforward, to maintain the existing salary range. Secondarily, you're going to reduce the targets and the maximum incentives for the annual incentives, and adopt a long-term incentive plan opportunity and structure consistent with that -- that provide for the rest of the Investment Office.

The results will simply be that at target, you'll position yourself within 2 percent of your current philosophy with the median total cash compensation for an approved peer group of organizations. And if performance is met at outstanding levels, obviously, that would require exceeding peers significantly in terms of relative performance, you know, they would be, you know, modestly amount above the 75th percentile.

So those are the recommendations in and of itself. The rationale is just simply -- you know, one, it's good practice in terms of combination of annual and long-term incentives that it aligns well with pension holders. And secondarily, it meets your total compensation philosophy -- stated total compensation philosophy.

And finally, it ensures alignment amongst all of the various executives and professionals in the Investment

Office. So with that, nice and simple, so...

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you for the presentation.

Mr. Feckner.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER FECKNER: Thank you, Mr. President. This isn't about the presentation. I wanted to, along with Michelle, thank Eric and his partner Eric and Grant Thornton in general for all of the help over the last few years and we really appreciate it and I just wanted publicly -- publicly thank you. So thanks, Eric.

MR. GONZAGA: Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Olivares.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you.

Eric, I'd like to get a better understanding of the recommendation that Grant Thornton is making. So it seems like it would be a doubling of the CIO compensation, if we're looking at the max potential --

MR. GONZAGA: Um-hmm.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: -- right?

And we're looking at a bonus range or an annual incentive range of 0 to 120 percent and then the LTI range of 80 percent to 120 percent.

MR. GONZAGA: That's right.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: So it's almost like two

bonuses, right. So one is something that they would receive on an annualized basis with a look-back period. And then the other one is that long-term incentive, so that would help retention.

2.2

Can you walk us through the LTI a little bit more in terms of how that's structured? And then secondarily, I'd like to understand what some of our peers are doing in this space.

MR. GONZAGA: Sure. Yeah. And so how it works is that the foundation of the annual incentive award -- I mean we have it there. It is based on overall organizational performance. And certainly fund performance is a part of that.

And to the extent that you achieve a certain award based on annual incentive performance, what would occur is that outside of paying out the annual incentive award, the equivalent of what was earned under -- in the annual incentive plan would be deferred into an account, and it would go up or down based on total fund performance, you know, and measured over a period of years. And so that award could go up or down and, you know, it's based on absolute fund performance.

And the purpose for that is through the annual incentive to get relative performance and that will fund a long-term incentive plan allocation, and subsequent, no

different than the pension holders, you know, those amounts will go up or down -- you know, just like the funding does, it will go up or down based on the return for the fund from an absolute basis. Does that make sense?

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: I'd like to better understand the mechanics of it. So I think that was a helpful narrative, but in terms of the actual mechanics, because this does get a little bit complicated and it is a different structure. So -- and the annual incentive is based on relative performance.

MR. GONZAGA: Right.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: So let's break that down a little bit more. So if our goal is to meet a particular benchmark --

MR. GONZAGA: Right.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: -- and that benchmark s met or is not met, can you kind of go through that tier please?

MR. GONZAGA: Yeah. So I'll put it this way. To the extent that you exceed relative performance under the annual incentive plan -- let's say that a hundred thousand dollar award is earned, okay. And that will be paid out as part of the annual incentive plan. Now, a hundred -- an additional hundred thousand dollars will be set aside.

And those dollar amounts will go up or down based on absolute performance, you know, subject to a cap of 150 percent of that allocation. So if a hundred thousand dollars is allocated specifically to that long-term incentive award, if the -- if you go up by say 7 percent over the remaining performance period as part of that long-term incentive plan, you know, the award will payout at 107 percent -- 107,000. If it goes down by 7 percent, you will receive an award of 93,000, you know, at the end of it.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Okay. So it's almost like a one-to-one match. So if we're thinking about -- let's talk about deferred comp, right? So let's find a way of looking at this, right? I have a 401(k) and I'm setting aside a certain percent. My employer matches one to one, so I earn a bonus. I get that \$100,000. And then one-to-one match \$100,000 goes into this LTI and the value of that goes up and down with the total fund performance, correct?

MR. GONZAGA: That's right.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Got it. Okay. So let's go back to the annual incentive. I want to understand the actual structure of that in terms of tiers. So if I meet the benchmark, do I get zero?

MR. GONZAGA: I think that we're --

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: If I'm going to get meet 1 versus below --2 MR. GONZAGA: Right 3 BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: -- how does that work, 4 versus, you know, I've exceeded the benchmark by 5 5 percent, by 10 percent, et cetera? 6 7 MR. GONZAGA: Right. So -- and I don't have the 8 exact numbers in front of me. But if you beat the benchmark, you will receive a target award. There is a 9 modest amount. You know, I think it goes down by maybe 10 9.5 points. If you miss relative performance by say a 11 modest amount, you'll receive 50 percent of that target 12 award. If you exceed by, I think it may be, you know, 1.3 maybe it's at 8 and a half or 9 percent, somewhere around 14 there. If you get to 8 and a half to 9 percent, you'll 15 16 payout a maximum award of an annual incentive plan standpoint. And so --17 BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: And we beat the benchmark 18 19 by 800 to 900 bps, is that what we're talking about? 20 MR. GONZAGA: No, it would be 140 bps, if --BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Oh. Okay. I would think 21 that would be tremendous. 2.2 23 (Laughter.) MR. GONZAGA: Yeah, exactly. 24 25 BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: I would love to see that

breakdown, because as we look at this compensation structure, this incentive structure, I want to make sure every -- all of our incentives are correctly aligned, so that we are really inducing excellent performance in terms of our investments, so that we're not just providing an annual incentive for somebody who just meets performance goals and doesn't exceed them.

MR. GONZAGA: Right.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: But I'm really -- and that's where I think it would help to have more clarity. Is there a document that can be shared with us?

MR. GONZAGA: Yeah. There is plan documentation. And it would go back, you know, the period over a couple of years. You know, we've worked with your RIA in terms of coming up with the performance standards, along with, obviously, you know, different folks from your organization, just understanding historical performance. But there should be adequate documentation, you know, sitting out there.

There's a formal plan document that describes the rationale, you know, for the existing annual incentive and long-term incentive plan component and it's in one document.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Yeah, that would be helpful to get as we go through this, because I don't

have, I think, the context I need to fully understand this.

1.3

2.2

And then the second part I have -- the second question I have, sorry, on the LTI range, so say that match has been (inaudible) that hundred thousand dollars, for example, and that the value goes up and down, the total funds, where does that money go?

So 2021 probably we won't see the best market returns I'm expecting. So then that \$100,000 would decrease accordingly. But what -- how are -- how are we doing that? Like, is -- and that's -- I guess I'm not sure how that money is actually invested or what type of account it's held in, so that that's adjusted. That part is not clear to me at all.

MR. GONZAGA: Yeah, it's -- it's set up as a separate account. There -- you know, based on the accounting systems. And HR keeps a track record of what the award balance was at the beginning and tracks it on an annual basis. As to whether or not it goes up or down, so...

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: And then the -- those -so if it does go down, for example, that money goes where?

MR. GONZAGA: It just -- it won't payout until -BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: It just won't payout.

MR. GONZAGA: Yeah, it won't payout until the end

of the investment period. Yeah, that's right.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Okay. Got it. Okay. Thank you.

this is Doug Hoffner, maybe I can answer the first question. We'd be happy to share the document. There's a -- there's the incentive comp and executive management policy in your resource enter of your Diligent Board books. It's a about 25-page policy, which includes sample incentive calculations, I think, to your -- your previous point. We'd be happy to share that with the entire Board, as well as -- it's in there as part of the policies and documents related to the Board's program.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Under -- it's in policies?

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: The resource guide -- resource center of the Diligent Board books titled --

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Yes, in policies.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Your compen -- yes, compensation policy for executive and investment management positions.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Got it. Thank you.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: You're welcome.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you. And Mr.

2.1

Hoffner, yes, go ahead and just shoot a note to the Board 1 members to access that information. That would be good. 2 Mrs. Brown. 3 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. Ms. Brown. PRESIDENT JONES: Ms. Brown, sorry. 5 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Mrs. Brown was my mother. 6 7 Thank you. 8 (Laughter.) BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I want to thank Stacie for 9 10 her comments. I, too, have questions about the incentives. And, Grant, let me -- let me ask this -- I'm 11 sorry. Let me ask this question about incentive awards 12 for when the Investment staff does not beat the benchmark, 1.3 because I think this is what Stacie was talking about. 14 15 Because my understanding is even if they fall short of the 16 benchmark, they still get an incentive, is that correct? 17 MR. GONZAGA: A very, very modest amount. that was put in for risk management purposes, just to make 18 sure that there's incentivization on a short-term basis 19

that was put in for risk management purposes, just to make sure that there's incentivization on a short-term basis to, you know, absolutely achieve the benchmark. It's a common policy out there to promote, you know, sound investment. That's -- that's correct.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: It's so they don't -CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: And maybe I

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC 916.476.3171

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

can --

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: It's so they don't cheat and take on more risk in making the fund riskier just so they could get their incentive award, is that correct?

MR. GONZAGA: That's right, Ms. Brown.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Maybe I can help clarify Mrs. Brown's -- Ms. Brown's question. So the annual incentive is related to benchmark that were identified. And the long-term incentive, the LTI, is related to absolute returns.

So if you do not get the absolute returns as identified, there is no payout. There -- really, the goal of that is then over the long term not only retention, but the improved funded status, et cetera, of the fund. So they're two different things measured by two different methodologies.

MR. GONZAGA: That's right.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Hoffner. So when we -- when we say absolute return, are we measuring it against the 7 percent target, is that what you're saying?

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. And then the annual incentive award is measured against the benchmark. But I have concerns because we change that benchmark. The staff makes a recommendation. We change the benchmark. And now

we're able to basically -- basically stagger over the hurdles staffer over the bar and everybody gets an incentive award.

And so I really have concerns about staff making the recommendations to change the benchmark. Specifically in private equity, we lowered it by -- it used to be -- you had to beat it -- there was a combination of plus 300 bps and then we lowered it, and we cut it in half to 150 bps and now everyone is getting their incentive award.

So I really want our new consultant, when they come onboard, to really go back and take a look at this beating the benchmark when staff is setting those benchmark levels. I -- I think there's a little conflict there.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gonzaga -- Gonzaga, I have a question. And it's regarding your section on the caveats, regarding the internal revenue potential changes and you talk about it could end up being retroactive. Are you referring to the discussions that are being held regarding the \$400,000 threshold, the changes in the brackets, or are you referring to something that currently exists?

MR. GONZAGA: Oh, it's just -- it's our standard disclosure. And really what it comes down to is that

these recommendations are based on -- you know, and how the tax ramifications would work for this are based on existing law and they're always subject to change.

But it's our standard caveat. You know, we sit in the tax practice, and it's just -- you know, just -- it just speaks to the fact that we're dealing with the known regulations as they now exist.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Rubalcava

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: There you go.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: I'm having problems. There we go. Don't move. Okay. Thank you. I had a --

can you hear me?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PRESIDENT JONES: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. I had a question Mr. Gonzaga -- Eric. In the recommendation, the second point is a reduction in the current annual incentive range.

MR. GONZAGA: Um-hmm.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: And I'm assuming it's a total package, so that makes sense with the introduction of the long term. But my question is how does it compare with the practice for everybody else in the Investment Office? Is that consistent? And I support the whole

thing about trying to look at it's a total fund and getting everybody in the same program, so -- but how does it compare to the same policy that was adopted?

MR. GONZAGA: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Is it consistent with what happens with everybody in the office? Thank you.

MR. GONZAGA: It would be -- Yeah, and that's a great point. It would be the exact same plan that the Investment Office is being incentivized under.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you.

MR. GONZAGA: Sure.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Yee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

18

21

2.2

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Thank you, President Jones.

Just following on to Mr. Rubalcava's question,

16 Mr. Gonzaga, could you comment also on the (inaudible)

17 | positioning impact after these changes, that we have more

of our peers looking at long-term incentive as a

19 | significant portion of compensation at the end of the day

20 | in trying to sync with what's happening with the rest of

the Investment Office. And then with these changes, just

kind of what the -- I guess the ultimate positioning is of

23 | the CIO LTIP here.

MR. GONZAGA: And, Ms. Yee, you were breaking up

25 a little bit at the initial --

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay. I can re -- yeah, I can repeat it. I'm sorry. Just following on to Mr.

Rubalcava's question about internal positioning, but also external positioning. To the extent the market data that you have us looking at comping doesn't include the LTIP, kind of what the -- and LTIP is becoming more of the significant portions of compensation with peer organizations. Kind of at the end of the day, where do we find ourselves in terms of relative external position?

MR. GONZAGA: Yeah. No, that's a -- that's a great point. And, you know, what I'll say is it's at the very low end for, you know, comparable-sized asset managers in the for-profit industry. However, when you take a look, if you were to include, you know, the various, you know, pension and other peers sitting out there in the larger pensions, it would position you, you know, at about -- you know, it's going to be below the Canadian pension funds, but it will be, you know, competitive, you know, with the larger pension funds out there.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay.

MR. GONZAGA: Now, you know, the issue, of course, is always -- and I think CalPERS is always going to struggle with this. I mean, you're not looking to pay somebody what industry will provide. You're looking for

somebody who has mission orientation and is willing to take, you know, essentially a pay cut from what they otherwise could earn in industry. These are still very significant amounts. And so this is consistent with your philosophy. It actually brings your CIO up to 50th percentile competitive total cash positioning in the aggregate.

2.2

It's not as competitive as what other folks could earn out there in industry. But as you can see, I mean, these are still obviously very meaningful dollars, particularly when we start thinking about, you know, this as a pay level for a public servant.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay. I just think important to keep in mind as we're obviously undergoing a recruitment.

MR. GONZAGA: That's right.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Ms. Middleton.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: I think Ms. Yee asked exactly the question that I was going to ask. So let me just state and make sure I understood the answer correctly. The package that's being proposed here will put us at the low end in comparison to for-profit entities, below the Canadian public pension funds, and essentially at level, approximately 50 percent level, to

U.S. pension funds, is that accurate?

1.3

2.2

MR. GONZAGA: Yeah, based on a blended peer group, that's correct.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: All right. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: Ms. Olivares.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you. And I'm following up to Ms. Middleton's and Ms. Yee's questions. So where does our LTIP compare to -- or how does it compare to CalSTRS and UC Regents?

MR. GONZAGA: Well, and I can't -- you know, I'm with the CalSTRS, you know, plan. And, you know, it does position you, I think, all in from a total compensation standpoint moderately above, but they don't have a long-term incentive plan.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: They don't have one.

MR. GONZAGA: No, they don't.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: So they just have an incentive plan. So let's back that up a little bit. So how does our annual incentive range compare with that of CalSTRS?

MR. GONZAGA: It's moderately lower. You know, to the extent that you were to make the change, it's maybe 20 percentage points lower. But in the aggregate when you couple on the long-term incentive, you know, it puts you at moderately higher than CalSTRS.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: So our annual incentive range is 20 percent lower than that of CalPERS. I mean, are you saying that it -- CalSTRS -- CalSTRS is 0 to 140 percent?

1.3

2.2

MR. GONZAGA: I think that they are -- if I heard correctly, they may be 0 to 200 percent.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Zero to 200 percent. Okay.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Yeah. So Ms. Olivares, so they were in the 19-20 fiscal year for the Chief Investment Officer, 0 to 150. They've been moving gradually up. They just approved a recent change to go to 0 to 200 with not a target for the 20-21 fiscal year, but they do not have a long-term incentive as of yet. I believe that's one of the discussion points they're having with their third-party investment comp consultant as well.

And then the salary bands for that role are all -- somewhat moderately less than ours, as I think they -- last time they did a salary review was prior to our revisions in the 2019 -- or 2018 period. So they're close, but they're higher on the annual and a little lower on the overall base salary.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Lower on the base salary, right? And that's the part that becomes pension income, and higher on the annual incentive, which is going to

vary. How is their retention, right? Because part of having this long-term incentive plan is to retain investment talent. So within their investment executive team, how has their retention been?

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: I don't know if I can answer the question about the retention of the entire investment team. You know, clearly, their CIO has been in the role for quite some time.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Yeah.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: They have a smaller team. Much of it's, you know, managed -- they manage, you know, through third-party consultant work, so it's a different makeup, but I don't -- I can't speak to that.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Okay.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: We could -- we could look into the -- that kind of data or work with the Board's comp consultant to help pull that information.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: And then UC Regents, do we have insight into that model?

MR. GONZAGA: I do not have that data in front of me, but what I'll tell you is that when you take a look at the amounts that we're talking about here, I mean, when you -- if you were to take a look at, you know, other university investment funds, you know, the amounts that

we're talking about would nowhere -- would not be anywhere near the type of the market for, you know, other comparable university funds.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Well, I'm not talking Yale and Harvard, not that I ever want to put Yale and Harvard in the same bucket.

(Laughter.)

8 MR. GONZAGA: No, no, no. Understood. 9 Understood.

10 CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: So, Ms.

11 Olivares, I think my --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Uh-huh

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: If I can answer that question about the Regents, my last understanding was I believe our salary is basically nearly identical --

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Okay.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER HOFFNER:

-- in the top of the range for that row. And I believe they have a -- sort of more of a rolling three-year sort of deferred compensation on the annual -- sort of an annual long term kind of blended. We can conform that, but I believe that's over a three-year period of time, which gets paid out in sort of different percentage chunks each year. So by the third year you're fully paid out and then it starts again in terms of that.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Like a vesting period. 1 CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: 2 BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Interesting. 3 CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Sort of a 4 deferred vesting. 5 BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Yeah. Yeah. That's an 6 7 interesting structure. And what about the other 8 California pensions, like some of the county and city 9 structures. MR. GONZAGA: You know, I'm familiar with a 10 couple of them. And, you know, the only thing -- and, you 11 know, CalPERS would be higher than the great majority of 12 them. Now, it's -- they tend to be different, because, 1.3 you know, just having, you know, spoken and worked with a 14 couple of different ones. I know that, you know, they 15 16 tend to be externally managed as opposed to, you know, housing a lot of the investments internally. 17 dollars for, you know, some of the ones that I've worked 18 with and spoken with historically are lower than what 19 20 we're talking about here. BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Okay. Thank you. 21 helpful. 2.2 23

MR. GONZAGA: Sure.

24

25

PRESIDENT JONES: Mr. Miller.

BOARD MEMBER MILLER: My question was kind of

toward the university and other foundations. And I think it was pretty well covered by Ms. Olivares' questions, so I have no further questions on that.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

2.2

Okay. Seeing no add -- further questions from the Board, before -- this is an action item, but before we go there, we do have requests to speak on this item from the public. So, Mr. Fox, are you there?

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Yes. Mr. President. We have one caller. J.J. Jelincic for Item 6a.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JELINCIC: Hi. This is J.J. Jelincic, a beneficiary. Risk adjustment is necessary if you're going to create incentives. Otherwise, you create an incentive to take excess risk. Global Governance Advisors, your new consultant, recommends that. Grant Thornton and the Board's position has been to begin to pay bonuses for almost reaching the benchmark, and that is not, I think, the appropriate way to handle it.

A little history lesson for the audience, since I though the Board has done its homework. In December of 2018, there was a discussion, and it was basically a history lesson and identification of next steps on long-term performance, but no details. On February '19,

the consultant presented a proposal and the Board changed the base rate and the incentive ranges. It also selected option C, which had the -- had the long-term incentive in it, but had no details, and staff was directed to go back and prepare some details.

2.2

In September of 2019, the Board adopted the concept of a long-term incentive program, but it had no details. November '19, the Board adopted a policy which includes the long-term incentive, but however, it was done as a consent item, so there really was no discussion of what it was. And it's really based on compound growth rate. It's not particularly consistent with the description that Grant Thornton just gave.

In June of 2020, the Board did adopt the consultant's recommendation on the compensation for the Chief Executive Officer, but it has no mention of long-term incentive in it. I will acknowledge the previous article had a letter from the consultant saying that the Board had adopted it.

I will point out that this proposal does not define what it is. I think the constituents deserve to know what the long-term incentive is. I don't know what the Board has discussed in closed session. But since it's a policy issue, I would assume there has been no discussion in closed session and the members and the

beneficiaries deserve to know what is being adopted.

Thank you for your time.

2.2

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

We have one more question. Ms. Olivares.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you. I don't know what that was.

Okay. I had a question regarding pay equity. So I would like to know what the lowest compensation range is within the Investment Office and how that would compare to the max potential compensation under Grant Thornton's recommendation?

MR. GONZAGA: You know, Doug, do you have that at your disposal? Mr. Hoffner, I should say.

This chief operating officer hoffner: Yeah. Let me -- I'm trying to -- have the document in front of me.

I'm trying to make sure I understand the question. So are you looking, Ms. Olivares, for any pay scale range for investment-related positions that are incentive eligible or are we talking rank-and-file? I just want to make sure I clarify it.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Including rank-and-file. And as a pay equity question, what I'm looking at is kind of this in terms of multiples. And we look at this with some of the publicly-traded companies that we invest in. So for the lowest paid worker versus the highest paid

worker, which is often the CEO, in this case, with CalPERS it's the CIO, I want to know what that multiple is and what range we're talking about, so that we are also considering pay equity, so that we're recruiting and retaining the best talent possible.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: So Doug, do you have the pay range? So if I'm understanding her question, pay range for an Investment Officer I and those are not -
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: I don't have the --

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- incentive eligible positions.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Correct.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Right.

15 CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: They are not.

16 They are not incentive eligible. I know Investment
17 Officer --

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: And they're not part of 20098, that is salaries set by the Board.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Correct. So the Investment Officer IIs, which just became incentive eligible through bargaining -- and I -- we can get that information. I do not have it at my fingertips, but I'm -- I think the team is trying to gather that now. I do have it for the Associate Investment Manager positions,

37

```
which is in that same policy I referenced earlier.
1
             BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Yeah. I would want to
2
    see IO I -- the minimum for IO I.
 3
             CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER:
             PRESIDENT JONES: So why don't we just have that
5
    as a follow-up item, Ms. Frost, to provide that
6
    information to the Board.
7
8
             Okay. So as I mentioned, this is an action item.
9
   Do we have a motion?
             VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I'll make the motion
10
             PRESIDENT JONES: It's been moved by Ms. Taylor.
11
             BOARD MEMBER MILLER: I'll second.
12
             BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: There's a comment and a
13
    question.
14
             PRESIDENT JONES: I beg your pardon?
15
16
             BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES:
                                     There's a comment.
             PRESIDENT JONES: Wait a minute, Ms. Olivares.
17
             It's been moved by Ms. Taylor and second by Mr.
18
   Miller.
19
20
             Question, Ms. Olivares.
             BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: No, I was saying before
21
   that, there was a comment and a question, before you --
2.2
23
             VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Yeah, Eraina and Lisa it
    looks like.
24
25
             PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. So, Ms. Ortega.
```

BOARD MEMBER ORTEGA: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

2.2

And it's -- the timing is fine. It's a comment on the motion. I -- I have the same concern about this proposal that I had as it related to the staff in terms of the long-term incentive simply being added onto the compensation structure on top of the annual incentive.

And I think what I would like to see is maybe a further reduction of the annual incentive and the focus on the long-term incentive. I think that would more align with the other stated goal of wanting to have somebody who will hopefully stay for the five-year period as was discussed earlier. I think that this just becomes otherwise a very high salary that I think is -- it's very hard for me to support in terms of our role as a public pension.

I think the point that was made earlier about where these numbers put us in terms of our comparators, but -- and the comparisons that are made in our market study, I realize that it doesn't put us at the top, and, in fact, may make us look less desirable. But I still would go back to earlier objections that I know that I've made and others from CalHR have made about who is, in fact, in the comparison group when we do that salary study.

And I think the question -- the responses to the questions to -- that Ms. Olivares asked about UC Regents,

and CalSTRS, and some of the other California pension funds and the fact that that information isn't kind of part of this discussion, it is -- it's, in my opinion, largely because the comparators that are looked at are outside, private industry, other types of funds that I -- I'm not convinced are the best candidates for us to compare ourselves too.

So for those reasons, I will not be supporting the motion and I just wanted to make that clear.

Thank you.

2.2

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Ms. Middleton.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Thank you, Mr.

President. I realize how important it is for us to move forward with a decision today, but the question I would ask, it will be a few months before we complete the process, and while the decision we make today informs us and will inform candidates, is there anything in the decision we're making today that would preclude us from making alterations to what the incentive package is going to be by the time that we conclude a agreement with a potential new CIO?

PRESIDENT JONES: Ms. Frost.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Jones. Yeah, Ms. Middleton I think it's -- you know, as we are out doing our own candidate outreach or we have

candidates reaching out to us, you know, certainly a part of that conversation, and in particular for those who have, you know, the competencies and the talent that we are actively seeking, there are some knowns that they would like to have. And one of the knowns certainly would be around the compensation.

2.2

If we were -- so if I'm understanding you question, you know, maybe delaying this, and, you know, getting a little more detail together for the Board for November. November is probably okay. But I think in order to get candidates seriously interested, they -- one of the knowns, not the unknowns, but one of the knowns would be what is the comps structure?

If I'm, you know, thinking about leaving, you know, my company, I'm thinking about relocating my family to Sacramento, you know, compensation has to be factored into that decision.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Ms. Yee.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

I guess there are a couple of considerations here. I -- actually, given the nature of the questions, if we could put this off until November until we get some of the questions answered that have been posed. And I understand, Ms. Frost, the need to really come to a conclusion about this certainly for recruitment purposes,

so I do want to not hold that up. But the other factor too is just I don't want to end up being in a situation of where we kind of have a bifurcated system with respect to the LTIPs within the Investment Office.

And so I think there's a consistency issue and certainly an internal positioning issue that we're going to have to contend with, if there aren't changes to this. So that -- I would be open to getting more information back just to see if we could be more informed about any further adjustments to the annual incentive.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. We do have a motion and a second on the floor, but I'm going to go ahead and ask Ms. Olivares she has a question. And then we have to decide whether you're asking the maker of the motion to rescind that motion or are you willing to make a substitute motion.

So Ms. Olivares.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: I'm sorry, was that -PRESIDENT JONES: Ms. Olivares.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Did you have something, Ms. Yee?

BOARD MEMBER YEE: No. I was just going to see if the maker of the motion would be willing to rescind the motion and to put this item off until November.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Let's go ahead and hear

Ms. Olivares. We have a couple more requests to speak and then we'll entertain that decision.

Ms. Olivares.

2.2

You're muted, Ms. Olivares.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Sorry about that.

On the IO I position, I -- the Investment Officer I position, there's a bulletin for it online, on a job site for California, and the base salary is \$44,736. So if we're looking at the difference between the lowest range annual salary in the Investment Office and comparing it to the highest range, we're talking about 53.77 X or the CIO would make more than 50 times more.

And as we look at pay equity when it comes to publicly-traded companies, I think we also need to be cognizant of what message that sends to our own team.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Mr. Ruffino.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Thank you, Mr.

Jones. I -- for the reason already stated, I'm not going to -- I believe that my principal would support the Controller's request to rescind the motion and to get some additional information that's been requested prior to act the final -- prior to make a final decision. So thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

So now, we go back to Ms. Yee's request. Ms. Taylor and Mr. Miller.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: So my question to that is are we -- I can just rescind the motion and you can direct staff. Would that be easier than making a substitute motion?

PRESIDENT JONES: Yes.

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. So then I rescind the motion as the maker of the motion.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Mr. Miller, you concur?

BOARD MEMBER MILLER: I agree. I'm in accord. I

concur.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. So the direction is to return to the November meeting to continue this discussion providing the feedback that the Board members have requested.

Okay. So that concludes this item.

We will now move on to Information Agenda Item 7a, Chief Investment Officer recruitment, recruitment search process, and timeline, and solicitation of Board members input on CIO and characteristics.

Mrs. Frost.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. Thank you, President Jones. So good afternoon. This agenda item is really intended to engage the Board as well as to receive

public comment on the competencies, the skills, the attributes, behaviors, necessary for the CalPERS Chief Investment Officer. We have an active recruitment underway and have hired Korn Ferry who's with us today to assist in the search. So I'll -- before I turn this over to Michael Kennedy, I will walk through a couple of more pieces for you.

1.3

2.2

But our goal on this agenda item is to take the feedback and incorporate that into all of the selection processes. So, for example, we would create candidate screens. We would create candidate assessments. And Korn Ferry will talk about a candidate assessment tool that they use. We will devise or create the interview questions, as well as doing reference checking on -- on those points.

As you know, CalPERS has really experienced quite significant turnover in its Chief Investment Officer relative to its peers, and in particular the public pension space. And so we are really looking for a candidate who can make a minimum commitment of five years. And what that will also allow us to do is to better build an internal pipeline of individuals who can compete. Not that we would not have internal candidates who are highly qualified to do it, but we want a very strong wide candidate pool to select from, which would include

internal candidates.

1.3

2.2

So I would -- you know, Michael Kennedy will talk about that assessment tool, as I mentioned. And then for the public who are watching and for the Board, the process really will be as follows.

So once a candidate pool has been determined, interviews will be scheduled. And typically, we do two rounds of interviews. The Board President will determine the Board members who will participate during the interview processes. And typically that's three Board members per interview round. These interview rounds will be publicly noticed. However we would not be providing the actual candidate name on that notice.

And once a candidate is selected, we will bring that candidate or finalist back to the full Board, also publicly noticed. No candidate name provided at that time, but to give the full Board an opportunity to interact, engage that candidate's fit based on the competent -- competency, skills, behaviors, attributes, et cetera that have been defined through this session.

So with that, hopefully, Mr. Kennedy has been promoted to the open session and we can go into his prepared remarks, as well again, I think he -- the assessment tool that will be used. There could be some good questions from the Board on that as well.

So with that, thank you, and ask Michael Kennedy to get started.

1.3

2.2

CONFERENCE MODERATOR: Michael is in the room and he should be able to share his audio and his video.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: All right. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone.

This is Michael Kennedy. And I'm a senior partner at Korn

Ferry based in the Atlanta office. Have been with the

firm for 21 years and do conduct a lot of searches for

public pension plans focused on CEOs as well as chief

investment officers. And I'm joined on this call by my

colleague Sidney Baumgartner, who's based in the New York

office.

So what we want to do today is really a couple of things. We want to engage with the Board and start to get feedback from the Board as we talk about the attributes and competencies that are going to be used in this search. And also, we want to tell you a little bit more about the Korn Ferry assessment tool KF4D, which is going to be a vital part of the search process.

So just to give you a little bit of color around what KF4D is and what it's meant to do. This is a proprietary assessment tool that Korn Ferry has developed and has used over the last 20 years and this is the latest

iteration of it. And in some respects, it's sort of like a psychometric tool. And what it's designed to do is to really get at cultural fit for an organization. So we look at the competencies and the traits of the candidates, and really take a look at how they stack up against what we will build -- call a benchmark for CalPERS.

1.3

2.2

And how that works is the tool -- the way it works is that we will be following up with each of you to send out a link over the next week and we'll ask you to fill the link out. And the link you'll receive will have a list of competencies. And you're going to be asked to rank those competencies. And then we will take all of those competencies and aggregate them into the top five. And then we'll come back to you with a listing of these are the five top competencies that the Board at CalPERS has come up with that you want us to focus on as we conduct the search.

Now, the last time we conducted the search two years ago, the five mission critical competencies that we worked with were as follows: ensure accountability, aligns execution, courage, strategic vision, and develops talent.

So you may come to a different listing of mission-critical competencies when we conduct this exercise this time. Now, what we do with that information is that we put together what we call a CalPERS benchmark.

And then later in the search, when we have a short list of candidates, we have that short list of candidates take the KF4D assessment. But it's a different sort of exercise from what you're going to be doing. They'll be talking about a 45-minute case study where they're given decisions along the way and they're asked to rank their responses. And after they rank their responses, they've given -- then given another exercise or question and then asked to rank their responses and rank them again.

2.2

And from that, we will get a profile on the individual candidates that we can then overlay against the benchmark of CalPERS to determine how the candidates match up against the so-called cultural benchmark of CalPERS.

There will be areas where they -- that they fall below the line for CalPERS and there were maybe specific areas they're above the line in CalPERS.

So, for example, one of their choices could be that they're position of power, the - if you look at the competency power - may fall below the benchmark of CalPERS. So what that may mean is that this candidate is not really driven by power. So even though a person in the benchmark that CalPERS has put together, that particular item maybe at a certain level, the person you're looking for, this person is not going to be driven by that, which is actually a good thing.

So there will be more to follow on that. But the reason why we use this assessment tool is to provide you with more data on cultural fit. When we conduct our searches, we find that candidates are higher because of their technical knowledge, and experience, and track records, and things of that nature. And most of the time when it doesn't work out, it's due to lack of cultural fit.

1.3

2.2

Since we designed this tool and have used this tool, we've done probably seven million executives that we've put through the assessment tool to date. And what we have found is that many of our candidates stick for a longer period of time than without using this assessment tool. And we've done some research around all of that. And again, it's just an additional data tool for you to understand culturally how they fit.

And then in addition to that, the Korn Ferry team will be interviewing each of the candidates and coming back to you with our appraisal on each one sharing with you our views on their strengths, their weaknesses, why they're motivated for this role, a bit more information on their previous experiences. We ask the candidates to put together some information on their investment performance. So all of that is going to be part of the process as the candidates are being interviewed and vetted. As they go

through the system. The KF4D is the last step once you get to the short list of candidates.

So I wanted to make sure you're aware of that, because you will be getting a link from Korn Ferry, again within the next week. It will take you all of 10 or 15 minutes to fill it out. And then that will give us the competencies. We're more than happy to share those competencies back to the Board to make sure that you're comfortable with that. And then that's what we'll be using along the way as we talk to candidates, and they'll show up later in the KF4D.

So that's what the KF4D assessment is designed to do. When we get to that point, we actually have a person on our team who is a Ph.D. And that's all that she does is work with our clients to share their perspective in some detail on the results of the KF4D assessment.

So let me stop there and see if there are any questions and then I do have one other thing I want to chat with the Board about.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Yeah, we do have a couple questions.

Ms. Taylor.

1.3

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Kennedy, just a quick question. You were going over the list. Could you do that again for me?

MR. KENNEDY: Oh, sure. So the list of the mission-critical competencies from last time?

1.3

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: (Nods head.)

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. So ensure accountability, align execution, courage, strategic vision and develops talent.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: All right. Great. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. And just to give you a little bit of color around some of those, some of them are pretty straightforward. So develop talent, you have a large organization, 350 investment professionals, and this individual is going to be very, very involved in that.

Strategic vision. Someone who can be creative, strategic as they look at investment strategies, thinks of that nature.

Courage. This individual is -- is leading a large, complex, sophisticated investment organization and will need to feel confident and have courage to put ideas on the table.

Aligns execution. To make sure the team is fully aligned, so everyone knows what the strategy is.

And then ensure accountability throughout the organization.

So that just gives you a little bit of color

52

```
around, I think, why these were mission critical
1
    competencies. But again, you'll have the opportunity to
2
    weigh in and develop your own set of competencies for this
3
    particular search.
 4
             VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Great.
5
                                             Thank you.
             PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.
 6
             Mr. Ruffino.
7
8
             You're muted.
             Mr. Ruffino, you're muted.
9
             Mr. Ruffino, you're muted.
10
             VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: He's not talking. I
11
    don't know if he can hear us.
12
             PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah, he probably can't.
13
             Why don't we ask David to follow up with him.
14
   And while we're waiting on that, we'll go on to Ms.
15
16
    Olivares and we'll return -- oh, wait. Hold on. Mr.
    Ruffino, can you hear me?
17
             Okay.
                    Still not going --
18
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Yes. There seems
19
20
   to be issues with connectivity. Can you hear?
             PRESIDENT JONES: I can hear you now.
21
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Okay. Thank you,
2.2
23
   Mr. Jones. I have a clarification questions -- question,
    and that might be answered by the HR. The -- it says
24
25
    position specification. Are these the same -- is this the
```

53

```
same as the SPB, the State Personnel Board, specification?
1
    That's my first question. I'm not sure if those are the
2
    same or is this unique to our Board?
3
             MR. KENNEDY: Okay. I --
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Thank
5
   you, Mr. Ruffino.
6
7
             Oh, sorry.
8
             PRESIDENT JONES: Go ahead.
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: This
9
10
   is --
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Go ahead,
11
   Michelle.
12
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Okay.
13
    Thank you. And I think I heard your question, Mr.
14
   Ruffino. You were breaking up a bit. But this is a
15
16
    CalPERS classification, so it's Chief Investment Officer
    Public Employees' Retirement System.
17
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: I cannot hear
18
19
   any -- I can't hear anything.
20
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Was that
   your question?
21
             PRESIDENT JONES: Did you hear her, Mr. Ruffino?
2.2
23
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: I did not hear the
```

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay.

answer. I'm not sure.

24

25

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: So, Mr. Ruffino, this is the job --

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: We're having a connectivity problem.

1.3

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Okay.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Why don't we ask David to work on that and we'll come back to -- Ms. Tucker we'll come back to -- for you to answer his question and see if we can clear that up.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I think --

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Mr. Jones, I've got a follow-up question real quick. I do not answer -- I assume that these are not -- these -- so I assume that this is not SPB spec, correct?

So because I was -- I was trying to determine when was the last time it was revised and whether this Board has the ability to revise the job specs without the traditional process in the civil service process.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yes, Mr. Ruffino, can you hear us now?

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Can this Board revise or change. Yes, I think --

PRESIDENT JONES: You're still backing up, Mr. Ruffino. And I don't think the total -- entire question was heard.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: So I think we understand the question. (Inaudible.)

2.2

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: I'm sorry. I'm not sure if it's me.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: (inaudible) answer it and get it into the record. And then I will follow up directly with Mr. Ruffino to answer it, but let's get it into the record.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. So you will --

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: So I think the system is working now. I mean, I think -- sorry. Can you guys hear me or was it just me?

PRESIDENT JONES: No, I can hear you -- I can hear you now.

Thank you, Jason. Okay. We're going -- we're going to get that in the record. Okay. So while we're working out -- Mr. Ruffino, we'll come back to you. Can you hear me?

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Yes.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. We'll come back to you. Okay. Ms. Olivares.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Mr. President.

This is for -- this question is for Mr. Kennedy.

24 Mr. Kennedy, thank you for that context about Korn Ferry's

25 process. While you were speaking, I went to look it up

online, on Korn Ferry's site and I found the Korn Ferry four-dimensional executive assessment. A very thorough document, about 200 pages, a little bit more than that. Could we have that sent to us, so that we understand the assessment process as well.

1.3

2.2

MR. KENNEDY: Sure. Sure. We can send that to you --

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: -- as well as the sample profile, so you can see what the document will look like at the end. So therefore you'll be able to see what a benchmark will look like for Calpers. It won't be Calpers in that document, but we could get that to you.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you. The more information, the better.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay.

MR. KENNEDY: I don't know if you want 200 pages though, but we can get you quite a bit.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: I have it open and have been reading it. It's just a statistical analysis. (inaudible)

MR. KENNEDY: Oh, great. Okay. Sure. We can get that to you.

PRESIDENT JONES: So, Mr. Hoffner, Ms. Frost has stepped out. So you got that as a to do follow-up

1 direction, okay?

1.3

2.2

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Correct, we got that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Mr. Perez.

Mr. Perez?

Okay. We'll come back -- Mr. Perez?

Okay. We'll go on to Ms. Middleton.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Mr. President, thank

you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Mr. Kennedy, could you describe your impression of what the CalPERS CIO job is, like in terms of being attractive to candidates in comparison to other assignments that are out there in the public pension world and what it is about CalPERS that would be exciting to some of the best and strongest individuals in this field?

MR. KENNEDY: Sure. That's a very good question. My first response would be that CalPERS has an international reputation. So it has a global reputation. And I think that's going to differentiate it from just about every other U.S. public pension plan. And that's why I think a lot of candidates here in the U.S. are going to be excited to raise their hand to participate in the process, because they view this as an opportunity to lead

the largest pension plan in the U.S. but also be viewed as a global investor and -- and have relationships with pension plans all over the world. So the scale is going to be one thing. The reputation of the organization is going to be another.

2.2

I think the -- also, the other dynamic is the internal management. I think candidates will be attracted to having a staff where they can do some pretty innovative and interesting things with an internal staff and not have to outsource everything to external managers. So that's going to be a plus.

But I think those would be sort of the major reasons why people are going to be very interested in CalPERS that differentiates CalPERS from other CIO opportunities in the marketplace.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: So it's fair to say we're not simply looking for someone to lead our Investment Office. We're looking for someone who will be a leader within this industry.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. Because of the position and reputation of scale of CalPERS, this person will be viewed as a leader in representing the public pension arena. So, for example, if CalPERS is doing something interesting as pertains to private equity, or infrastructure, or something like that, it's going to gain notice within the

industry. So other U.S. pension plans are going to be interested in learning what CalPERS is doing. So from that aspect, there is a leadership component to it. And this individual will be the one who you may see on CNBC and other media outlets more so than other public pension plan chief investment officers around the country, which is why again we need for this person to have very strong communication skills.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Great. Thank you, sir. PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Frost, have you gotten the -- Mr. Ruffino's question.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yes, I did answer what we had already placed into the record.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Okay. So there's no further questions from Mr. Ruffino at this time.

Okay. All right. Okay. Then, Mr. Perez, you're -- I guess you're still not on. So we'll go on to Ms. Yee.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. President.

I really appreciate the focus on the competencies, Mr. Kennedy. And I think particularly setting an expectation that, you know, through the position spec as well that there's an emphasis on these more public facing duties, which I think is something that

I think we all understand, but the candidates may not coming in just to --

MR. KENNEDY: Right.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER YEE: -- understand the extent of that. So I very much appreciate that being front and center, as well as the work with the stakeholders. So I think that I really applaud you for that. My question has to do with -- and I'm sorry, I keep getting stuck on this position specification. And I think it has to do with my mindset kind of being on State position statements. But on the professional experience and qualifications, I'm still not reading it as the qualification being one that requires a college degree.

Usually, when we say equivalent to graduation from college, it's kind of a proxy. And so I just want it to be clear that -- I mean, I assume that all these candidates are going to have college degrees, so I'm not necessarily worried about it, but I just -- I just don't want there to be any question that, you know, comes up on educational background. And so I don't know if others share that concern, but it's just my own kind of orientation around the world "equivalent", which in State service means something different.

PRESIDENT JONES: Mr. Kennedy, you want to respond to that?

MR. KENNEDY: Sure. So, yeah, Ms. Tucker, you want to respond to that.

PRESIDENT JONES: Ms. Tucker -- Ms. Tucker first and then Mr. Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Right.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: I apologist, Mr. Kennedy. So there is a classification specification, which is an SPB document.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: And that lays out the education patterns. And so it does -- there are three patterns. Two are internal and then there's a third external pattern, which does require education equivalent to graduation from a college with a major work in business administration, economics, finance or closely related fields.

And so the position description that's in your agenda packet is the more specific position description that we can change, if we wish for this particularly recruitment to this particular vacancy versus the spec, which is a more permanent legal document.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay. I mean, I guess, Ms.

Tucker, you're -- am I kind of being -- am I making sense
in terms of what I'm trying to drive at? Because I guess

I'm just worried that it's not clear, even though we talk about graduation from college with certain work. It's just that word "equivalent", which I think generally speaking in State service kind of suggests that it's something other than, but equal to.

MR. KENNEDY: So, Ms. Yee, are you suggesting that you would feel more comfortable if we had wording in the position description that required a college degree.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Yes, I think -- I don't know that we need to be ambiguous about it. And I think --

MR. KENNEDY: Okay.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER YEE: -- just in terms of optics, so we're not having to deal with it down the road, that that might be a good idea up front, if it's possible --

MR. KENNEDY: Sure.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: -- to change that.

Okay. That would be terrific.

And then secondly, given this environment in which we find ourselves, I guess both to Mr. Kennedy and to Mr. Jones, the interview process. I guess the concern about how do we accurately measure fit, if most of what we're going to have to do may have to be virtual or are we contemplating in-person interviews and meetings?

PRESIDENT JONES: That's an excellent question.

25 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yes.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FIRST: And let me -- let me address that, Ms. Yee.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Yes.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: So we -- we do believe that we need some in-person contact --

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Yeah. Yeah.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- with any real candidate for the Calpers CIO. And Calpers has some pretty large conference rooms that we can mic up and keep appropriately socially distanced. Have a small interview panel toward the end of the rounds where we know we've got the top one or two candidates. But the idea is we would have an in-person with anyone that we would extend a job offer to.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Good. Good. All right. And Mr. Kennedy, (inaudible).

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. And let me weigh in on that, because what we're seeing in all of our searches today for public plans is that we're able to interview candidates pretty effectively on Zoom for the first round and maybe the second round. But you get to a point where we would recommend, and it's a given, that you have to have the candidate there in person. We would not recommend you hiring someone for this role without people having the

opportunity to be there in person to interview them.

2.2

But in the early stages of the search, I think we're all comfortable utilizing Zoom. That gives us enough insight into the candidates to learn about their experiences and things of that nature to narrow it down. But once you narrow it down, it's important that you see the person face-to-face.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay. Great. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. You're welcome.

Okay Ms. Olivares.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Ms. Yee?

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Can I -- can I interrupt rea quick, Mr. Chair?

ahead, Doug. I think, Michelle, we need to clarify the question about the college degree. There are three patterns for this position. It is a civil service job. And so I think let Michelle just clarify the three different outcomes you can get based upon that specification that was approved by the State Personnel Board for this type of position.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICE HOFFNER: Michelle, can you provide that feedback.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Thank

you, Mr. Hoffner. Yes, absolutely.

2.2

So there are three patterns. The third pattern, which is the external pattern, has an education requirement that we discussed. And so the first two patterns are internal patterns, which is typical for civil classifications. So there's a way where if you've served, for example, as a senior investment officer at other types of positions in CalPERS, where you would already have had a degree required from that path, you can take the position, or there is some language for equivalency.

However, I don't think, unless we're using pattern three, we can absolutely require it. But what we can do is work with Mr. Kennedy and add it as a strongly, highly desirable qualification. That's something that we can, you know, screen for and look for through the process. But I think we can't absolutely require it from people who meet pattern one or two.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: Okay.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: I just wanted to clarify that before we moved on at this point.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: I appreciate that. Okay.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Good.

BOARD MEMBER YEE: I appreciate the explanation.

24 And I guess I would ask you to work with Mr. Kennedy on

25 | that option about trying to just bolster that --

66

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. 1 2 BOARD MEMBER YEE: -- at that end. Okay. PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Good. 3 Mr. Perez, did you have any additional Okay. 4 question or a comment? Are you okay? 5 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ: No, I'm good. 6 PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. 7 Thanks. 8 Okay. Ms. Olivares. BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you. My question 9 is about the experience. So as I read through the 10 professional experience qualifications, in the first 11 bullet it says that one year of the required experience 12 may be substituted for a graduate degree. And in the next 1.3 bullet, you have as a minimum seven years of increasingly 14 responsible experience. So hypothetically, a candidate 15 16 could have six years of experience -- of increasing responsible investment experience and a graduate degree. 17 If we're talking about six years, seven years -- honestly, 18 19 anything fewer than ten years, I would think that this 20 position would require substantial investment experience. Given the size of the portfolio, given the global 21 exposure, the communications that will be required, I want 2.2 23 to know how we came to the number of years experience in this document? 24 25 MR. KENNEDY: Okay. I've got my thoughts on

that, but Michelle, do -- did you have any thoughts around that. And I'll give you my thoughts on what it's seven.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Yes

Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. I can answer that --

MR. KENNEDY: Okay.

1.3

2.2

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: -- briefly and then I think turn it to you for the context.

MR. KENNEDY: Yeah.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: So it is a class specification that has minimum qualifications. So this would be the minimum that a person would need to have to be appointed to this position. That does not mean that that would be what we would necessarily go for. We can always look for something higher, for greater qualifications, but that is the minimum amount that we could accept.

And also, I would expect that we would combine with other relevant characteristics, other backgrounds, other things that would be compelling. And I think that's what Mr. Kennedy was going to kind of add and -- so I can turn it back to you, Mr. Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Sure. So -- so Ms. Olivares, to answer your question, the kind of candidates we're going to be looking for are going to have a lot more than seven years experience in investment management. There will be

some candidates though who may have gotten their start in investment banking and worked for Wall Street firms for the first ten years in their careers, and then decided that they really wanted to move into investment management. And then shifted over into investment management where they now may be chief investment officers at a significant public plan. So they may have 20 or 25 years of financial services experience, but not all of that is going to be in investment management. But even with that, we would expect them to have more than seven years in investment management and a leadership role.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.

I don't get that from what the second bullet reads -
MR. KENNEDY: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: -- because it says, "or trading of a varied and complex investment portfolio". So you can trade, and you can manage investments, and that seems like it's within the seven years. So I'd like us to clarity that bullet. And I don't think seven plus years is adequate. I think we're looking at a minimum of 10 to 15 years. And there's a big difference between trading a portfolio --

MR. KENNEDY: Yeah.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: -- and managing a very large and global -- a very large investment team and a

global portfolio.

2.2

MR. KENNEDY: Right. Right. And I would say that Korn Ferry would typically be looking for people a little more -- more senior with different types of experiences. But I think we're having to work with the staff at CalPERS, because they have certain minimum requirements that have been added to the document. So what you're seeing may be blended.

So I think some of the things that you're pointing that I would probably not have typically included in my document. So I'm trying to thread the needle to a certain extent. So that's why the seven years, for example, I don't think that would be something that I would have put -- placed in my document. I'll be looking for someone with a lot more experience than that. When you look at the candidates that we have today that we're pursuing, all of these are very seasoned investment professionals who have been in the industry for a number of years in leadership roles and they've got pretty extensive track records, and they're pretty well known in the industry, so they have a lot more than just seven years.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: Thank you. That's reassuring. I want to make it clear to the investment community that we are seeking the best candidates that are

extremely seasoned.

2.2

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. Yes.

BOARD MEMBER OLIVARES: And this does not reflect that. So I would like a document that reflects that, because I also want to -- I want us to put our best foot forward too in recruiting candidates. And I think showing a requirement for more experience in investment and investment management, in addition in some other areas that would be quite helpful.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah, agreed.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Ms. Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, President Jones.

So my questions follow almost exactly along the lines of Ms. Yee and Ms. Olivares, which is first about the degree. And so now I understand Michelle, according to you, pattern three are for people coming from outside the state. And that would be require a mandatory degree, is that correct? And if not, can we change that for pattern three?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: Yes, ma'am. Yes, Ms. Brown. That would require a degree. That's correct.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Great. So we're good on that.

And then in terms of the experience, I also would

agree that it -- we -- I would like to see a minimum of ten years experience. And so, Michelle, is there a problem with changing it to say that?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF TUCKER: We can certainly work with Mr. Kennedy to add that language to the bulletin. We can't change the spec language quite so readily, but we can certainly add that additional preference to the job description. That's no problem. And we'll work with Mr. Kennedy after today's meeting to get that updated.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Great. And then I also think the criteria of leadership experience. I mean, even if you manage a pension fund, you still -- we are looking for that sort of leadership skill that someone that's already been out front for many years. I know, Mr. Kennedy, you're saying that the people you're looking at or trying to recruit will meet that goal. And I just want to make sure that, you know, we don't get someone who hasn't been sort of in that top spot previously, because that hasn't work out for us so far to date.

Thank you.

2.2

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So I think Ms. Olivares -- I mean, not

25 Olivares, but Ms. Ortega, are you okay?

BOARD MEMBER ORTEGA: (Nods head.)

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. And, Ms. Taylor, you are okay or are you back in?

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I'm back in. I just want to reiterate, I think under professional experience qualifications, I think we'r trying to keep closely to the SPB thing, as Ms. Tucker said.

So if we can do the qualification for professional experience qualifications, I don't know where you would put that, because if we're trying to adhere to the SPB document, if you put that elsewhere, the 10 to 15 years, I would assume you'd have to put that elsewhere, because it wouldn't want match is my only concern.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. Ms.

Taylor, we'll put it into the recruitment brochure and we'll use it as an initial screen for candidates coming in is how we'll do it.

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: Okay. Great. Thank you.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Um-hmm.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Mr. Ruffino.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Thank you, Mr.

Jones.

1.3

So I just looked up the -- the SPB specs on the position and I just want to point out that it was established in 2004 and there has been no revisions since

2004. So that's a long time. So I certainly don't think we need to stall or we need -- but I think at some point, it would be wise to reevaluate the -- and take a look, because the minimum qualification, as well as the specs itself, as it is right now, only three years of experience is required (inaudible) senior investment officer, or five years and as senior portfolio manager, so -- or seven years in planning and directing. So it certainly -- it needs some revisions (inaudible) should try to get these revisions.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Thank you, Mr. Ruffino. We'll put with the Board -- we'll go ahead and put that down as Board direction to bring that back perhaps next year. But for this recruitment, I think that we can manage it through the recruitment brochure itself on these additional screens on qualifications that we'd want to see the candidates have in order to get an interview.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Okay, Mr. Ruffino? Okay.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER RUFFINO: Yes. Thank you. PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Okay -- oh, Mr.

Rubalcava.

1.3

2.2

VICE PRESIDENT TAYLOR: I think you also missed Lisa.

PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah. Mr. Rubalcava, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

I'm still having problems.

2.2

I just had a quick comment. One is I do want to get a clarification, so there's a recruitment brochure that's -- I guess gives a more outward focus of what we're looking for. So if you could get some clarification on that versus the position and classification -- position specifications.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Right.

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: And -- but speaking to position classifi -- position classification, I thought it was very well written. I liked -- at least what I liked is how it conveys the whole public face that's, you know, very Calpers, because that's what the CIO will face and also the need for relationships and the roles between the different -- between the Board and the CEO. I thought it was very -- very good.

And I also wanted to comment, but I guess it's obvious, is that no matter what the minimum requirements are, there will be a screening and, you know, that's done by Korn Ferry. And that will -- I'm sure, once we get a final pool, it would meet the Board's expectations. So I just want to make sure that's clear.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yes

BOARD MEMBER RUBALCAVA: Thank you very much.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah.

2.2

PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah. Ms. Middleton.

BOARD MEMBER MIDDLETON: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

President. And I appreciate the discussion around what's the minimum number of years that -- of experience that someone should have. I'm not necessarily opposed to increasing those numbers of years, but I'd remind my colleagues when we set a minimum, that's simply a minimum that allows someone to compete for the job. And I don't think Mr. Kennedy in his firm is going to bring us anyone, who is not an extremely qualified talent. And I would be nervous about us creating too many minimum and potentially missing out on the extraordinary talent, the extraordinary younger talent that might be the perfect fit for CalPERS.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. And I can -- I can assure you that we're going to be bringing very senior and seasoned professionals to CalPERS. So even though there may be minimums in the California specific spec or guidelines that are much less than that, that's not going to be the caliber of candidate we're going to be bringing to CalPERS. So I think I can -- I can assure the Board of that, just based on the people that we're talking to so far.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Okay. Well, thank you, Board members. And we do have a request to speak on this item from the public.

Mr. Fox.

1.3

2.2

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Yes, Mr.

President. We have one caller. Mr. -- or excuse me, Dr.

Robert Girling, CSU retiree faculty.

PRESIDENT JONES: Thank you.

DR. GIRLING: Yes. Thank you for this opportunity to talk on this very important topic. I've reviewed the document that's available and I have a major concern and that is given the recent history of CalPERS leadership with regard to the position of the CIO, I think it's imperative that you include in the characteristics that you screen for a demonstrated track record of ethical leadership and practice.

And what I'm referring to specifically is you want to make sure that whoever makes it to the final cut is someone who has a demonstrated track record of obeying the law, of being honest, and with a -- with documentation of demonstrated integrity, respect for co-workers, any avoidance of conflict of interest must be ruled out, and a commitment to principles of equity.

In addition to which I think leading a team of professionals is something that is -- what is required of

this position. And each and every one of the people who works at CalPERS is a highly trained and qualified staff member. So it is very important that whoever is selected for that position or whoever even makes it to the interview level, must have at least a Master's degree in order to be able to be on the same footing as the staff that they will be leading.

2.2

And I would hope that you will actually document and verify any degrees that the candidates might have. That is s very important thing.

I'd like to close by saying that since CalPERS is a public agency in the State of California, we are a state which prides ourselves on our ethical leadership on a national and global level, so -- and finally, this is a highly desirable position, as you've mentioned, and so the candidate will -- will earn, in addition to a financial remuneration, substantial non-pecuniary remuneration. And I think that it's important that -- that you not hire someone who is mainly interested in a high salary. And if that's the case, then this may not be the right person.

And I question the earlier presentation about -which focused on the very -- you know, a maximal level of
remuneration. I'd ask the Board to kind of reconsider
that, as you have.

So thank you very much for this opportunity and

that's what I have to say.

1.3

2.2

Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you very much. And just a comment, I think, Mr. Kennedy, the ethical standards will be part of the process in terms of your tool and your process of interviewing and background checks. So that will be addressed, I'm sure, so --

MR. KENNEDY: Yeah. Let me --

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay.

MR. KENNEDY: -- let me just -- let me just weigh in for one minute, Henry, on that, because we recognize that these are public pension plans. And as such, you can't afford to hire someone who doesn't have high ethics and high integrity. So that's something we're going to be very, very attuned to.

And, Mr. Fox, I believe, if that's your name, you mentioned verifying education, things of that nature, we verify the candidate's educational credentials before they bring -- we bring them into CalPERS for an interview. You will be surprised at the number of executives who are in their fifties even in the country today, who, for whatever reason, their education was never verified, and they're pretty senior in their careers, and now the CFA or the MBA from Columbia that is on the resume is not really accurate.

So we try to catch that before we even bring them into CalPERS for an interview, so we're going to be very attuned to ethics and integrity and those things.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay. That moves us to the next item on the agenda is summary of Board direction.

Ms. Frost.

1.3

2.2

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Mr. Jones, this is Mat Jacobs. Ms. Frost had to leave to catch a flight, so I'm going to stand in for her for this part.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: And what I have is bring back an agenda item to the -- to remind the Board of the current incentive structures, bring back the long-term incentive item to the November meeting, and address questions regarding what per -- in connection with that item, address questions regarding what peers are doing relative to base pay, incentives, and long-term pay structures.

That is what I have. Did I miss something?

PRESIDENT JONES: Doug, I think there was one
thing -- one other thing that I think Doug was going to -I didn't -- I don't think I heard that one.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER HOFFNER: Yeah. So the one other item, Mr. Jacobs, was the KF4D, the document

that Mr. Kennedy talked about. I think there's a -- kind of a description document, which is quite voluminous that we would be sharing that as a link or as an attachment.

PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. Okay. Okay. Ms. Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I just wanted to remind about the KF4D, but Doug beat me to it.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah. Right. Okay. I think that's all then. That's fine, Mr. Jacobs.

And so now we will move to the last item, public comment -- I beg your pardon?

Public comment. Mr. Fox, do we -- I think I got a note that there's a request to speak under public comment.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS CHIEF FOX: Mr. President, we had a caller that has since terminated the call, so we are finished with public comment.

PRESIDENT JONES: Oh. Okay. Well, thank you very much.

So then that brings us to the conclusion of this Board meeting. And thank all of the Board members for convening with very short notice to deal with this very important task that we have before us. And so we look forward to our next discussion surrounding our recruitment for our new CIO.

```
So with that, this meeting is adjourned. Thank
 1
    you very much.
 2
              (Thereupon California Public Employees'
 3
              Retirement System, Board of Administration
              meeting open session adjourned at 1:16 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System,

Board of Administration open session meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of October, 2020.

1.3

James & Detter

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063