

#	Recommendation	Response
1	Stand up a responsible investment and purchasing/ contracting advisory committee	The Foundation is open and interested in meeting on a recurring, annual basis with organized members of the campus community to listen to concerns or perspectives regarding specific industries or social causes. The chair of the Board of Trustees' Finance and Facilities Committee would be invited to attend as well.
2, 3	Review and strengthen definition of ethics in formal procurement policies; Strengthen ethical and sustainable procurement guidelines for units	UO will launch a working group including representatives from across campus; review and revise the Sustainable Purchasing Plan and Equity Contracting, Purchasing, and Data Reporting Procedures; and explore merging these into a unified Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Procurement Program, consistent with institutional values related to, for example, sustainability and related policies.
4	Adopt human rights due diligence practices in procurement	Currently, no unit on campus, including PCS, is resourced adequately enough to implement a robust vendor due diligence program. Operating such a program in-house for a supply chain as diverse as UO's would be costly and would require significant employee travel. Alternatively, there are tools on the market, like Tealbook and others, that provide vendor due diligence as a service. UO will conduct a comparative analysis of vendor due diligence tools (e.g., EcoVadis, Tealbook, Sedex, Assent); evaluate tools based on cost, ease of integration, and alignment with UN Guiding Principles and OECD Guidelines; and submit a funding request to the Budget Advisory Group for funding if an investment would appear to significantly enhance the data available to help make more informed purchasing decisions.
5	Adopt the American Bar Association's Model Contract Clauses for supply-chain management	UO has a robust set of standard terms and conditions that are tailored to cover the unique legal, risk, and compliance issues that UO faces. Once the sustainable purchasing and equitable contracting policies are updated, PCS will revise the standard terms as needed to align with those new policies and will conduct a gap analysis between UO's current standard terms and the ABA Model Contract Clauses; identifying clauses that can be integrated without requiring mandates or significantly increasing negotiating effort.
6	Demonstrate university leadership in ethical and sustainable Procurement through STARS, Second Nature's Climate Leadership Network (SNCLN), and the Sustainable Purchasing Leadership Council (SPLC)	We agree there are areas of focus in the STARS report criteria where sustainable purchasing could increase UO's score. We are open to exploring options for involvement in the Climate Leadership Network. We recently held a membership in SPLC and did not find it particularly useful. UO will explore ways to earn two additional STARS credits (OP-9: Sustainable Procurement System – Develop a formal system that includes ESG criteria, training, and tracking (See actions in response to Recommendations 2 and 3; and OP-10: Purchased Goods – Promote procurement of certified sustainable goods (e.g., Green Seal, ENERGY STAR)); encourage voluntary adoption among campus departments through recognition programs and peer learning; and explore options for joining the Climate Leadership Network as either a signatory or as an affiliate.
7	Improve alignment of UO Foundation investments with ESG principles	UO Foundation has maintained and followed our ESG policy for over a decade. Jasper Ridge adheres to this policy, which is reviewed annually. The investments they consider fall well within acceptable ESG standards. They do not invest in areas like private prisons or weapons manufacturing. Our direct investments primarily include companies in sectors such as technology, healthcare, and business services. Jasper Ridge assesses ethical stewardship and governance as part of their due diligence and performs deeper risk assessments when concerns are present.
8	Update university investment policies	The Foundation reviews and updates its Investment Policy annually. They (we) believe our current approach reflects best practices and incorporates ESG-related expectations appropriately.

9	Adopt human rights due diligence practices in investing	Human rights considerations are part of the Foundation's existing ESG framework. As noted earlier, very few opportunities they evaluate pose concerns so serious that they would be excluded from our portfolio. Our investment focus remains on sectors like technology, healthcare, and services, where such risks are minimal.
10	Become a signatory to the Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI)	While PRI appears well-aligned with many of our values, becoming a signatory would commit the Foundation to external guidelines that may not align with our core mandate: to maximize long-term returns within a responsible risk profile. External frameworks often incorporate political or ideological objectives, which may inadvertently constrain our investment flexibility.
11	Require ESG reporting to the university community	The Foundation will develop a public ESG report in collaboration with Jasper Ridge. This report will be available no later than December 31, 2025.
12	Provide more clarity on ESG weighting criteria	There is currently no uniform standard for ESG scoring across the industry. Rating agencies often apply different criteria, and their evaluations can vary significantly. Nonetheless, the Foundation and Jasper Ridge will continue to evaluate the ESG process at Jasper Ridge Partners.
13	Actively pursue investments that support social good and human thriving	The Foundation believes that the principles of social good and human thriving are embedded in the evaluation of all investments. However, these values can be difficult to measure objectively. The Foundation's approach remains focused on strong ethical practices, responsible business conduct, and long-term sustainability.