



**Arkansas Public Employee Retirement System
Investments and Finance Committee Meeting
June 23, 2026**



Investment and Finance Committee

Tuesday, June 23, 2026, 10:00 a.m.

124 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 400, Little Rock 72201

Hybrid Meeting: Arkansas Public Employees' Retirement System Board Room and Video Conference

AGENDA

1. Call to order – Larry Walther, Committee Chair
2. Investments - Carlos Borromeo, CIO and Mr. Larry Middleton and Mr. Bo Brister, Stephens, Inc.
 - a. Update on investments
 - b. Consideration of two new investment managers - Apollo and KKR
Action Item: Investment Finance Committee reviews the staff recommendation and vote.
3. Legal - Ms. Laura Gilson, General Counsel
 - a. Consideration of request for lead plaintiff in the Sportradar security litigation case
Action Item: Investment Finance Committee reviews the staff recommendation and vote.
4. New Business
5. Old Business
6. Adjournment

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE SUMMARY

Manager: Apollo · Asset Class: Public/Private Fixed Income

Apollo Fixed Income Replacement Strategies

IG Short Duration & IG Core — private investment-grade alternatives to traditional public bond exposure

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Approve Apollo for investment in their core and short-duration fixed income strategies that offer incremental investment grade yields over appropriate benchmarks.

OVERVIEW

Apollo proposes two investment-grade fixed income strategies designed to sit alongside, or in place of, traditional public bond allocations. Both maintain 100% investment-grade-rated or IG-equivalent risk and target a net return of **100–150 bps over their respective benchmarks**, with the excess return sourced primarily from Apollo's proprietary origination ecosystem. Exposure spans private investment-grade corporates, asset-backed finance, warehouse facilities, and high-conviction public IG credit, with low overlap to public benchmarks.

STRATEGY SNAPSHOT

Metric	IG Short Duration	IG Core
Benchmark	Bloomberg 1–5 Yr Corporate Index	Bloomberg US Aggregate Index
Net target excess return	100–150 bps	100–150 bps
Invested average rating	A–	A–
Invested yield	6.7%	6.4%
Duration	2.8 yrs	6.0 yrs
Spread duration	2.9 yrs	3.9 yrs
Invested UST spread	279 bps	237 bps
Credit quality mandate	100% IG / IG-equivalent	100% IG / IG-equivalent

YIELD VS. PUBLIC BENCHMARKS

Yield to worst (%)	Type	Yield
Apollo IG Short Duration	Apollo strategy	6.7%
Apollo IG Core	Apollo strategy	6.4%
Bloomberg IG Corp Index	Public benchmark	5.1%
Bloomberg US Aggregate Index	Public benchmark	4.7%
Bloomberg 1–5 Yr IG Corp Index	Public benchmark	4.6%

Source: Apollo Analysts, Barclays, ICE BofA. Data as of May 31, 2026.

INVESTMENT MERITS

Risk-adjusted returns

- Targets **100–150 bps net** over the corresponding benchmark.
- Manager reports **lower volatility** relative to benchmarks and favorable information ratios since inception.

Diversification

- **Low overlap (less than 1%)** with traditional corporate benchmarks — a genuine complement, not a repackaging, of existing public exposure.
- Broad book of **issuers** across corporate and asset-backed markets.

Downside protection

- **Structurally senior** positions intended to improve recovery and lender control.
- Manager reports **zero credit losses** since fund inception and **<6 bps** average annual credit losses over 15+ years.*

Fit within the existing public/private framework

- IG Core maps to the **core fixed income bucket**, with duration consistently hedged toward the Aggregate index.
- IG Short Duration suits **liquidity-sensitive** mandates seeking income with low duration risk.

POSITIONING BY STRATEGY

IG Short Duration

- Higher spreads/yields driven by short-dated asset-backed finance exposures.
- Lower rate and spread volatility given the ~3-year duration profile.
- Greater diversification relative to corporate benchmarks via ABF and warehouse positions.

IG Core

- Locks in yield with lower reinvestment risk given the ~6-year duration.
- Natural fit for a core allocation; duration consistently hedged to the Aggregate.
- Positioned to capture public/private convergence and dislocations across the curve.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Risks to weigh

- **Liquidity & lock-up:** private credit is materially less liquid than public bonds; Apollo offers both Annual and Monthly liquidity sleeves.
- **Valuation:** reliance on manager/model marks for private positions; understand the independent pricing and audit process.
- **Ratings basis:** “IG-equivalent” relies in part on Apollo’s internal ratings — verify methodology and NRSRO coverage.

Source & basis. Figures sourced from Apollo manager materials dated May 31, 2026 and are manager-reported, illustrative, and subject to change.
*Credit-loss and zero-loss-since-inception figures are manager-reported and pending independent verification. Target returns are not guarantees, predictions, or projections of future performance; there can be no assurance objectives will be achieved.

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE SUMMARY

Manager: KKR · Asset Class: Core Infrastructure
Source deck dated January 2026

KKR Diversified Core Infrastructure Fund (“DCIF”)

Evergreen, diversified commingled fund investing in essential, contracted or regulated infrastructure across OECD North America & Western Europe.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Approve KKR for investment in DCIF that offers core infrastructure investments with consistent cash flows in an Evergreen structure.

OVERVIEW

DCIF is KKR’s core infrastructure strategy, designed to deliver a durable cash yield plus modest capital appreciation through a perpetual “buy-and-hold” approach. The Fund targets an **8–10% gross / 7–9% net** time-weighted return with a particular emphasis on cash yield, and has performed in line with or above target since inception.

FUND PROFILE & STRATEGY

Investment Approach

- Open-ended, perpetual “buy-and-hold” structure
- Contracted or regulated, cash-generative assets
- Conservative, predominantly fixed-rate leverage

Key Fund Facts

Structure	Open-ended, diversified, commingled
Total Strategy Capital	\$21.8B
Fund Committed Capital	\$13.9B
Inception	Q2 2021 (~4.5 yrs)
GP Commitment	\$538M (\$500M KKR + \$38M execs)

MANAGER: KKR — SCALE & INFRASTRUCTURE PLATFORM

\$723B+ KKR firm-wide AUM	\$95B Infrastructure AUM	17 yrs Infra. track record	#3 Mgr. 2024 Infra Investor 100
-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

Capital Committed by Theme

Digitalization — towers, fiber, contracted data centers	\$4.4B
Energy Transition — renewables, district energy	\$3.5B
Critical Networks — electric & water utilities	\$3.1B
Partnering with Governments — PPP / social infra.	\$2.8B

Risk positioning: within KKR’s infrastructure risk-return spectrum, DCIF sits at the lowest-risk “Core” end (illustrative target net returns of ~7–9%), below Core-Plus, Value-Added and Private Equity strategies. Target returns are hypothetical, illustrative and may not materialize.

PORTFOLIO & PERFORMANCE

Performance as of 30 Sep 2025; portfolio as of Dec 2025

PORTFOLIO ALLOCATION (% OF FUND NAV)

By Sector	%	By Geography	%
Towers	15%	United States	37%
Electric Utilities	14%	United Kingdom	15%
Renewables	12%	Spain	8%
District Energy	10%	Ireland	7%
Water Utilities	10%	Australia	7%
Data Centers	10%	Germany	6%
PPP Transport	7%	Norway	6%
Social	7%	Italy	4%
Dark Fiber	7%	Finland	2%
Lit Fiber	5%	Other	7%
Energy Transition	4%		

PERFORMANCE TRACK RECORD (NET OF FEES)

Return Measure	Quarter	YTD	One Year	Three Year	Since Incep.
Gross Return	2.2%	5.9%	9.0%	8.5%	10.3%
Net Total Return	1.9%	5.3%	8.2%	7.6%	9.4%
Model Net Return	1.8%	5.1%	7.8%	7.3%	8.9%
Distribution Yield	1.2%	3.4%	4.7%	4.3%	4.6%

Since-inception annualized from 1 Apr 2021. Model Net Return assumes the highest fee tier (0.85% mgmt / 5% incentive). Returns are presented net of fund-level leverage, which can enhance reported results. Past performance is not indicative of future results.

RISK-ADJUSTED PROFILE & DEFENSIVE CHARACTERISTICS

Annualized Return vs. Volatility (Q2'21–Q3'25)

	KKR DCIF	S&P 500	DJ Brookfield Global Infra.
Annualized Return	9.4%	13.9%	7.5%
Annualized Volatility	5.3%	15.2%	13.9%

Portfolio Resilience

~95% Contracted or regulated revenue	90%+ Inflation resilience	~5% GDP sensitivity (low cyclical)	~90% Fixed / hedged debt
--	-------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

45.0% asset-level leverage · 7-yr weighted-avg debt tenor · investment-grade capital structures.

DCIF delivered a 9.4% annualized net return at roughly one-third the volatility of public equities (5.3% vs. 15.2% for the S&P 500) and below the listed-infrastructure benchmark (13.9%) over the same window. Private-market valuations are manager-determined and inherently less volatile than public indices; the comparison is illustrative and not directly comparable.

TERMS, ALIGNMENT & COMMITTEE VIEW

Terms indicative; see PPM

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Strengths / Rationale

- **Defensive, all-weather profile:** ~95% contracted/regulated revenue and low (~5%) GDP sensitivity supported low realized volatility (5.3%).
- **Durable cash yield:** consistent ~4.6% distribution yield since inception, with quarterly distributions and inflation linkage.
- **Structural advantages:** open-ended vehicle minimizes the J-curve and enables immediate deployment and access to distributions.
- **Scaled, proprietary sourcing:** KKR platform (#3 global infra manager) sources take-privates, carve-outs and platform deals.
- **Strong GP alignment:** \$538M commitment; incentive fee on realized cash yield above a 4% hurdle, not on unrealized marks.

Key Risks / Diligence Items

- **Liquidity:** 3-yr soft lock-up; redemptions gated by available liquidity; no secondary market — suited only to long-term capital.
- **Limited track record:** ~4.5 years since inception (2021); performance is unaudited/estimated and partly model-based.
- **Leverage & return optics:** 45% asset-level leverage; fund-level credit facility can flatter reported time-weighted returns.
- **Valuation subjectivity:** illiquid assets carried at manager-determined NAV — an inherent conflict in fee/incentive calculation.
- **Concentration:** single largest position (John Laing PPPs) ~20% of NAV; single-manager and key-person dependence.
- **Regulatory:** private placement; not registered under the Investment Company Act — fewer investor protections.

Important information. This summary was prepared by Stephens Inc. from KKR's confidential marketing presentation dated January 2026 for internal investment-committee discussion only. It is not investment, legal or tax advice, nor an offer or solicitation; any investment may be made only pursuant to the Fund's confidential private placement memorandum (PPM) and related documents, which should be reviewed in full. Figures are as reported by KKR as of the dates indicated and are based on estimated and/or unaudited information that may change. Target and model returns are hypothetical and may not be achieved; past performance does not predict future results. Private funds are speculative, illiquid and involve the risk of substantial or total loss of capital. Stephens Inc. is not a lawyer or tax advisor and makes no representation as to the accuracy or completeness of third-party information reproduced herein.

SECURITIES LITIGATION CASE SUMMARY

2026

Case: **Sportradar Group AG**

Lead Plaintiff Deadline: **July 17, 2026**

Clas Period: **November 7, 2024 – April 21, 2026**

CUSIP #: **252131107**

Securities Litigation Firms Filing Lead Plaintiff Claim Review Forms (in order of submittal):

- Kessler Topaz Meltzer Check
- Berger Montague
- Saxena White
- Motley Rice
- Kahn Swick Foti
- Dicello Levitt
- Bleichmar Fonti & Auld – withdrawn
- Lieff Cabraser

APERS Losses: Approximately **\$2,800,000 million**

Summary of Case

A lawsuit filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York alleges violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by Sportradar, a Swiss corporation which provides platform services for the global sports betting industry.

The lawsuit alleges that Sportradar concealed from investors that its revenues were being bolstered in part through business dealings with black market and grey market gambling operators, in violation of strict legal and regulatory compliance. While Sportradar publicly represented that it had strong compliance, licensing, and “Know Your Customer” controls to ensure it only worked with legal and licensed gambling operators, the complaint alleges that Sportradar was secretly deriving significant revenue from illegal or “black market” betting operations around the world.

REPORT DATE

SECURITIES ACTION CLAIM

PREPARED BY

CLAIM SUMMARY

Briefly state the claim basis (Securities Act of 1933 or 1934 or other) and strength of the claim.

Filing deadline for lead plaintiff status:

JUSTIFICATION

Briefly explain how APERS can increase recoveries for the class through lead plaintiff status.

What expertise of your firm is specifically suited to the nature of the claim?

Will APERS have the ability in this case to negotiate a favorable contingency fee with your firm?

Yes

No

Continued on page 2

INVESTMENT PROJECTED LOSS/CLASS PERIOD

CUSIP number: Issuer:

Name of Investment Manager(s) who purchased the security for APERS during the class action period:

Projected class period start: Projected class period end:

APERS loss for the class period - include calculated LIFO loss and loss using weighted average:

Number of shares purchased by APERS during the class action period:

Number of shares sold by APERS during the class action period:

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - APERS USE ONLY - DO NOT COMPLETE SECTION BELOW



REPORT DATE

SECURITIES ACTION CLAIM

PREPARED BY

CLAIM SUMMARY

Briefly state the claim basis (Securities Act of 1933 or 1934 or other) and strength of the claim.

Filing deadline for lead plaintiff status:

JUSTIFICATION

Briefly explain how APERS can increase recoveries for the class through lead plaintiff status.

What expertise of your firm is specifically suited to the nature of the claim?

Will APERS have the ability in this case to negotiate a favorable contingency fee with your firm?

Yes

No

Continued on page 2

INVESTMENT PROJECTED LOSS/CLASS PERIOD

CUSIP number: Issuer:

Name of Investment Manager(s) who purchased the security for APERS during the class action period:

Projected class period start: Projected class period end:

APERS loss for the class period - include calculated LIFO loss and loss using weighted average:

Number of shares purchased by APERS during the class action period:

Number of shares sold by APERS during the class action period:

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - APERS USE ONLY - DO NOT COMPLETE SECTION BELOW



**Securities Litigation
Lead Plaintiff Claim Review Form**

REPORT DATE	SECURITIES ACTION CLAIM	PREPARED BY
06/03/2026	Sportradar Group AG	Saxena White P.A.

CLAIM SUMMARY

Briefly state the claim basis (Securities Act of 1933 or 1934 or other) and strength of the claim.

Saxena White has investigated and developed securities fraud claims against Sportradar Group asserting violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 on behalf of purchasers of Sportradar Class A ordinary shares from 11/7/24 - 4/21/26 (Class Period). Switzerland-based Sportradar is a sports betting data company that offers services to professional sports leagues and online betting operators. During the Class Period, Sportradar assured investors of its due diligence into its customers through its Know Your Customer (KYC) programs and that the Company "only work[s] with licensed operators." In reality, between 20% and 40% of the Company's revenue is derived from illegal sports betting operators, which subjected the Company to an undisclosed and heightened risk of regulatory scrutiny. The truth emerged on April 22, 2026 when Muddy Waters Research and Callisto Research published reports detailing the Company's participation in the illegal online gambling world. Notably, the district judge assigned to the Sportradar case, Hon. Gregory H. Woods, has previously sustained securities fraud claims based on a Muddy Waters report in the KE Holdings case.

Filing deadline for lead plaintiff status:

7/17/26

JUSTIFICATION

Briefly explain how APERS can increase recoveries for the class through lead plaintiff status.

APERS is a sophisticated institutional investor with a substantial \$2.8 million-dollar stake in the outcome of the Sportradar securities litigation, precisely the type of lead plaintiff Congress envisioned when enacting the PSLRA. Indeed, studies conducted since passage of the PSLRA show a correlation between public pension funds serving as lead plaintiff and higher class recoveries. By supervising the litigation as Lead Plaintiff, APERS can ensure that the Sportradar Class achieves the maximum possible recovery.

What expertise of your firm is specifically suited to the nature of the claim?

Saxena White is highly experienced in representing sophisticated institutional investors like APERS in securities class actions, including cases against foreign issuers in this judicial district. For example, Saxena White served as sole lead counsel in the In Re Perrigo Company PLC Securities Litigation (S.D.N.Y.). Saxena White has also achieved positive results before the district judge assigned to this matter, Hon. Gregory H. Woods, in the In re Vertiv Holdings Co. Securities Litigation (S.D.N.Y.), which is currently pending.

Will APERS have the ability in this case to negotiate a favorable contingency fee with your firm?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Continued on page 2

INVESTMENT PROJECTED LOSS/CLASS PERIOD

CUSIP number:

Issuer:

H8 08 8L 1 03

Sportradar Group AG (NASDAQ: SRAD)

Name of Investment Manager(s) who purchased the security for APERS during the class action period:

CastleArk Managment and Stephens, Inc.

Projected class period start:

Projected class period end:

4/7/24

4/21/26

APERS loss for the class period - include calculated LIFO loss and loss using weighted average:

APERS sustained a loss of \$2,837,955 on its transactions in Sportradar Class A ordinary shares on a last-in, first-out (LIFO) basis.

Number of shares purchased by APERS during the class action period:

339.50

Number of shares sold by APERS during the class action period:

43.90

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - APERS USE ONLY - DO NOT COMPLETE SECTION BELOW



REPORT DATE

SECURITIES ACTION CLAIM

PREPARED BY

CLAIM SUMMARY

Briefly state the claim basis (Securities Act of 1933 or 1934 or other) and strength of the claim.

Filing deadline for lead plaintiff status:

JUSTIFICATION

Briefly explain how APERS can increase recoveries for the class through lead plaintiff status.

What expertise of your firm is specifically suited to the nature of the claim?

Will APERS have the ability in this case to negotiate a favorable contingency fee with your firm?

Yes

No

Continued on page 2

INVESTMENT PROJECTED LOSS/CLASS PERIOD

CUSIP number: Issuer:

Name of Investment Manager(s) who purchased the security for APERS during the class action period:

Projected class period start: Projected class period end:

APERS loss for the class period - include calculated LIFO loss and loss using weighted average:

Number of shares purchased by APERS during the class action period:

Number of shares sold by APERS during the class action period:

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - APERS USE ONLY - DO NOT COMPLETE SECTION BELOW



**Securities Litigation
Lead Plaintiff Claim Review Form**

124 W. Capitol Ave., Ste. 400
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 682-7800 / (800) 682-7377
www.apers.org

REPORT DATE	SECURITIES ACTION CLAIM	PREPARED BY
June 3, 2026	Sportradar Group AG	Kahn Swick & Foti, LLC

CLAIM SUMMARY

Briefly state the claim basis (Securities Act of 1933 or 1934 or other) and strength of the claim.

This case arises under the federal securities laws against Sportradar Group AG (“Sportradar” or the “Company”), its CEO Carsten Koerl, and its CFO Craig Felenstein (collectively, “Defendants”). A complaint was filed on May 18, 2026, in the Southern District of New York, *Smale v. Sportradar Group AG*, No. 26-cv-4112 (S.D.N.Y.) (the “Complaint”). The Complaint alleges Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and SEC Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, during the period of November 7, 2024 to April 21, 2026, inclusive (the “Class Period”). Throughout the Class Period, Defendants assured investors that Sportradar “only work[s] with licensed operators” and repeatedly touted the Company’s robust compliance processes and general “high standards of ethics and integrity.” Then, on April 22, 2026, two market research firms—Muddy Waters Research (“Muddy Waters”) and Callisto Research (“Callisto”)—independently published reports revealing that Sportradar derived as much as 40% of its revenue from illegal grey and black-market gambling operators. Sportradar’s stock price plummeted on these revelations. Less than a week later, on April 28, 2026, during the Company’s Q126 Earnings Call, Defendant Koerl admitted, contrary to previous representations, that Sportradar derived 5-13% of its revenue from unlicensed grey market operators, causing another significant drop in the Company’s stock price.

The facts of this case align with Arkansas policy on illegal gambling. AG Tim Griffin issued a press release last year and signed the corresponding letter denouncing illegal offshore gaming. “Illegal online sports betting and gaming operations are largely operated by foreign-based companies that routinely operate without proper licensure, offer intentionally insufficient consumer protections, fail to effectively verify the age of users, ignore state boundaries, and evade tax obligations.” See attachments.

In the letter, Griffin and the coalition highlight the significant harm caused to states and residents by these unlawful platforms—particularly to young people, vulnerable adults, and state and local economies. Specifically, illegal gaming operations expose users to fraudulent schemes and encourage gambling addictions without any oversight or accountability; undercut state-regulated markets; and have been linked to money laundering, human trafficking, and other illegal conduct.

Filing deadline for lead plaintiff status:

July 17, 2026

JUSTIFICATION

Briefly explain how APERS can increase recoveries for the class through lead plaintiff status.

APERS’ historical results in securities litigation are well known to defense counsel. This reputation adds significant value as a lead plaintiff. More, the current complaint does not allege Koerl’s April 28, 2026 statement as a corrective disclosure. If appointed, KSF would likely advise APERS allege that disclosure in an amended complaint, as doing so would marginally increase APERS’s recoverable losses (to approximately \$(2,889,895)) as well as the aggregate damages of the putative Class.

What expertise of your firm is specifically suited to the nature of the claim?

KSF brings focused expertise to securities litigation. While many firms tout Top 10 ISS rankings which are based on settlement volume, KSF is highly selective. For example, KSF was sole Lead Counsel in *Pearlstein v. BlackBerry Limited, et al.*, where the Firm secured a \$165 million settlement for the class, the fourth largest class action settlement in 2022 which allowed shareholders to recover 100% of their losses on a claims made basis, after attorney’s fees. KSF was also class counsel in the *Halliburton* securities class action in which KSF replaced another national securities firm that attempted to settle the case for \$6 million. KSF ultimately achieved a \$100 million settlement with co-class counsel.

Will APERS have the ability in this case to negotiate a favorable contingency fee with your firm?

☒ Yes ☐ No

INVESTMENT PROJECTED LOSS/CLASS PERIOD

CUSIP number:

Issuer:

H8088L103

Sportradar Group AG

Name of Investment Manager(s) who purchased the security for APERS during the class action period:

STEPHENS MCG
STEPHENS CAPITAL MGT
CASTLEARK MGMT

Projected class period start:

Projected class period end:

11/7/2024

4/21/2026

APERS loss for the class period - include calculated LIFO loss and loss using weighted average:

KSF estimates that APERS has sustained a loss of approximately \$(2,870,089).

Number of shares purchased by APERS during the class action period:

333,700

Number of shares sold by APERS during the class action period:

38,096

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - APERS USE ONLY - DO NOT COMPLETE SECTION BELOW

See Below



REPORT DATE

SECURITIES ACTION CLAIM

PREPARED BY

CLAIM SUMMARY

Briefly state the claim basis (Securities Act of 1933 or 1934 or other) and strength of the claim.

Filing deadline for lead plaintiff status:

JUSTIFICATION

Briefly explain how APERS can increase recoveries for the class through lead plaintiff status.

What expertise of your firm is specifically suited to the nature of the claim?

Will APERS have the ability in this case to negotiate a favorable contingency fee with your firm?

Yes

No

Continued on page 2

INVESTMENT PROJECTED LOSS/CLASS PERIOD

CUSIP number: Issuer:

Name of Investment Manager(s) who purchased the security for APERS during the class action period:

Projected class period start: Projected class period end:

APERS loss for the class period - include calculated LIFO loss and loss using weighted average:

Number of shares purchased by APERS during the class action period:

Number of shares sold by APERS during the class action period:

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - APERS USE ONLY - DO NOT COMPLETE SECTION BELOW



REPORT DATE

SECURITIES ACTION CLAIM

PREPARED BY

CLAIM SUMMARY

Briefly state the claim basis (Securities Act of 1933 or 1934 or other) and strength of the claim.

Filing deadline for lead plaintiff status:

JUSTIFICATION

Briefly explain how APERS can increase recoveries for the class through lead plaintiff status.

What expertise of your firm is specifically suited to the nature of the claim?

Will APERS have the ability in this case to negotiate a favorable contingency fee with your firm?

Yes

No

Continued on page 2

INVESTMENT PROJECTED LOSS/CLASS PERIOD

CUSIP number: Issuer:

Name of Investment Manager(s) who purchased the security for APERS during the class action period:

Projected class period start: Projected class period end:

APERS loss for the class period - include calculated LIFO loss and loss using weighted average:

Number of shares purchased by APERS during the class action period:

Number of shares sold by APERS during the class action period:

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - APERS USE ONLY - DO NOT COMPLETE SECTION BELOW

