January 9, 2020

Via email: shareholderproposals@sec.gov

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington, DC 20549

RE: Stockholder Proposal of the National Center for Public Policy Research,
Securities Exchange Act of 1934 – Rule 14a-8

Dear Sir or Madam,

This correspondence is in response to the letter of Shelley J. Dropkin on behalf of Citigroup, Inc. (the “Company”) dated December 20, 2019, requesting that your office (the “Commission” or “Staff”) take no action if the Company omits our Shareholder Proposal (the “Proposal”) from its 2020 proxy materials for its 2020 annual shareholder meeting.

RESPONSE TO CITIGROUP’S CLAIM

Our Proposal asks the Board of Directors to “create a standing committee to oversee the Company’s responses to domestic and international developments in human rights that affect Bank of America’s business.” Proposal (attached to Company No-Action Request Letter (“Request Letter”) at enclosure 1). The Company has responded by pointing out that it already maintains a Nomination, Governance and Public Affairs Committee of its Board of Directors, which has been assigned the responsibility to, inter alia, “receive reports from and advise management on the Company’s sustainability policies and programs, including … human rights.” Request Letter at enclosure 2. It further indicated that it has already adopted a policy on human rights which informs its conduct. Id. For these reasons, it believes that it has “substantially implemented our proposal” and thereby satisfied Rule 14a-8(i)(10). Id. It therefore seeks a determination by the Staff that the SEC will take no action should the Company, as it intends, exclude our Proposal from its 2020 shareholder proxy materials.
We demur. Our Proposal requests that the Company establish an independent and unique standing committee to deal exclusively with human rights issues. We think that the Company’s recent behavior demonstrates that its aggregate committee is faced with too many responsibilities to pay adequate attention to human rights questions, and thus does not provide substantial implementation of our proposal. We therefore ask you to find that the Company has not yet substantially implemented our Proposal, and thus should not be permitted to exclude our Proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(10).

Rule 14a-8(i)(10) permits an issuer to exclude a proposal if the company has already “substantially implemented the proposal.” The purpose of Rule 14a-8(i)(10) is “to avoid the possibility of shareholders having to consider matters which have already been favorably acted upon by management.” SEC Release No. 34-12598 (July 7, 1976). However, Rule 14a-8(i)(10) does not require exact correspondence between the actions sought by a proponent and the issuer’s actions in order to exclude a proposal. See SEC Release No. 34-20091 (Aug. 16, 1983). Rather, the Staff has stated that “a determination that the [c]ompany has substantially implemented the proposal depends upon whether [the company’s] particular policies, practices and procedures compare favorably” with those requested under the proposal, and not on the exact means of implementation. Texaco, Inc. (avail. March 28, 1991).

As we have noted, our Proposal seeks the establishment of a board committee explicitly and solely dedicated to human rights issues. The Company instead points to its Nomination, Governance and Public Affairs Committee, and suggests that this aggregate-duty committee compares favorably with our Proposal. But of course it does not. According to Citigroup itself, this committee has been assigned four broad headings of responsibility, which include 32 specified subheads.1 Human rights is mentioned in only one of these 32 subheads. Few of the others have anything whatever to do with issues even tangentially related to human rights. It need not be elaborated that 1/32nd of a committee’s focus does not compare favorably with all of a committee’s focus.

The only way that the Company might reasonably have claimed that its Nomination, Governance and Public Affairs Committee were “good enough” would have been if Citigroup had demonstrated a deep and nuanced treatment of human rights issues throughout the years under its current structure. But it made no attempt at such a showing. In the supporting statement of our Proposal, we highlighted some ongoing ways in which Citigroup not only fails to protect human rights, but in which the Company actively thwarts citizen efforts to exercise those rights.2 Citigroup made no effort to demonstrate that we were wrong in our characterizations, or that it has taken any steps to avoid such human rights violations in the future. It did point the Staff and us to its Statement on Human Rights, but that Statement failed to address any of our concerns in even the most perfunctory manner. A commitment to human rights requires taking all human

1 See CITIGROUP, INC., NOMINATION, GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHARTER (January 16, 2019) (attached to Request Letter at enclosure 3).
2 See Proposal, at Request Letter, enclosure 1.
rights seriously, not merely those to which a Company’s leaders already have already developed personal attachments.

The only effort that the Company has made even to acknowledge our specific concerns serves only to underscore how much it needs a separate committee assigned to deal honestly and respectfully with its human rights duties. The rights we highlighted in the supporting statement to our Proposal were, inter alia, the human rights – also protected in the United States by the U.S. Constitution – to practice one’s own religion without sanction, and to bear arms and to conduct self-defense.3 We noted there that Citigroup has placed “extra-governmental restrictions on Americans seeking to exercise their Second Amendment rights.”4 Citigroup had indeed done – and continues to do – exactly that.5 Rather than address this concern, however, the Company in its filing here pretended to misunderstand it, suggesting that it had understood “extra-governmental,” which demonstrably means “[b]eing beyond the province, powers, or proper sphere of government,”6 as instead meaning something like “very governmental indeed.” It then tendentiously assured you, and us, that Citigroup “is not, nor has it ever been, a state or federal governmental body and does not have the ability to impose regulatory restrictions on any American’s Second Amendment rights.”7

However this aside was intended, it turns out to be revealing and important. It suggests that Citibank considers itself not to have obligations to protect human rights – or the ability to interfere with human rights – unless it wields governmental power. And this, as it rightly notes, it does not do. But it follows from this logic that it therefore thinks itself incapable of having an impact on human rights in any context, and – by extension – to be free of any obligation to consider or protect human rights because it is not a government. This reveals its Statement on Human Rights to be nothing but window dressing, and its dedication to advancing human rights from its position as a global bank to be in practice even less than the 1/32nd interest that it purports to dedicate through its omnibus Nomination, Governance and Public Affairs Committee.8 We hope and trust that an independent and sole-focused human rights committee would understand its task better, and take it more seriously, than the Company currently appears

3 See id.
4 Id.
5 See, e.g., Tiffany Hsu, Citigroup Sets Restrictions on Gun Sales by Business Partners, NEW YORK TIMES (March 22, 2019) (“Citigroup is setting restrictions on the sale of firearms by its business customers, making it the first Wall Street bank to take a stance in the divisive nationwide gun control debate.”); Matthew Rocco, Citigroup sets gun rules for its retail clients, FOXBUSINESS (March 22, 2018) (same).
7 Request Letter, enclosure 2, n. 12.
8 Perhaps, given that the committee is also, as the Company itself underscored in its submission, responsible for maintaining the Company’s reputation, see id., enclosure 2, we should understand Citibank’s current minimal commitment to human rights as to act as though it is interested in human rights insofar as necessary to protect its reputational interests.
to do. This is why we submitted our Proposal, and why we urge the Commission to reject the company’s no-action request.

Under Rule 14a-8(g), the Company bears the burden of persuading the Staff that it may omit our Proposal. The Company has failed to meet that burden. Therefore, based upon the analysis set forth above, we respectfully request that the Staff reject Citigroup’s request for a no-action letter concerning our Proposal.

A copy of this correspondence has been timely provided to the Company. If I can provide additional materials to address any queries the Staff may have with respect to this letter, please do not hesitate to call me at 202-507-6398 or email me at sshepard@nationalcenter.org.

Sincerely,

Scott Shepard

cc: Justin Danhof
    Shelley J. Dropkin (dropkins@citi.com)
December 20, 2019

BY E-MAIL [shareholderproposals@sec.gov]

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
100 F Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20549

Re: Stockholder Proposal to Citigroup Inc. from the National Center for Public Policy Research

Dear Sir or Madam:

Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j) of the rules and regulations promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Act”), attached hereto for filing is a copy of the stockholder proposal and supporting statement (together, the “Proposal”) submitted by the National Center for Public Policy Research (the “Proponent”) for inclusion in the proxy statement and form of proxy (together, the “2020 Proxy Materials”) to be furnished to stockholders by Citigroup Inc. (the “Company”) in connection with its 2020 annual meeting of stockholders. The Proponent’s mailing address, email address, and telephone numbers, as stated in the correspondence of the Proponent, are listed below.

Also attached for filing is a copy of a statement of explanation outlining the reasons the Company believes that it may exclude the Proposal from its 2020 Proxy Materials pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10).

By copy of this letter and the attached material, the Company is notifying the Proponent of its intention to exclude the Proposal from its 2020 Proxy Materials.

The Company is filing this letter with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) not less than 80 calendar days before it intends to file its 2020 Proxy Materials. The Company intends to commence printing its Notice and Access materials on March 6, 2020 and file its 2020 Proxy Materials on or about March 11, 2020.
The Company respectfully requests that the Staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the “Staff”) of the Commission confirm that it will not recommend any enforcement action to the Commission if the Company excludes the Proposal from its 2020 Proxy Materials.

If you have any comments or questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (212) 793-7396.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Shelley J. Dropeit
Deputy Corporate Secretary and
General Counsel, Corporate Governance

cc:  Justin Danhof, Esq., General Counsel
National Center for Public Policy Research
20 F Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington DC 20001
202-507-6398 (t)
603-557-3873 (c)
JDanhof@nationalcenter.org
ENCLOSURE 1

THE PROPOSAL AND RELATED CORRESPONDENCE (IF ANY)
Via FedEx

November 6, 2019

Rohan Weerasinghe
Corporate Secretary
Citigroup
388 Greenwich Street
New York, New York 10013

Dear Mr. Weerasinghe,

I hereby submit the enclosed shareholder proposal ("Proposal") for inclusion in the Citigroup Inc. (the "Company") proxy statement to be circulated to Company shareholders in conjunction with the next annual meeting of shareholders. The Proposal is submitted under Rule 14(a)-8 (Proposals of Security Holders) of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission's proxy regulations.

I submit the Proposal as General Counsel of the National Center for Public Policy Research, which has continuously owned Citigroup stock with a value exceeding $2,000 for a year prior to and including the date of this Proposal and which intends to hold these shares through the date of the Company’s 2020 annual meeting of shareholders. A Proof of Ownership letter is forthcoming and will be delivered to the Company.

Copies of correspondence or a request for a “no-action” letter should be forwarded to Justin Danhof, Esq., General Counsel, National Center for Public Policy Research, 20 F Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20001 and emailed to JDanhof@nationalcenter.org.

Sincerely,

Justin Danhof, Esq.

Enclosure: Shareholder Proposal
Human Rights – Standing Committee

Resolved: Shareholders of Citigroup request that the Board of Directors create a standing committee to oversee the Company’s responses to domestic and international developments in human rights that affect Citigroup’s business.

Supporting Statement

Citigroup’s exposure to conflict in human rights risk is significant as our company operates in many dozens of countries and territories, some of which have a significant risk of human rights violations.

Companies can face risks related to human rights even when they only perform support functions. Companies such as Amazon, Intel, International Business Machines, Johnson & Johnson, and Apple have come under fire for doing business with or providing support to anti-religious causes. Companies such as Amazon, Alphabet, Facebook, and Twitter have all specifically received criticism for working the anti-religious freedom group, the Southern Poverty Law Center which smears Americans of faith with fake “hate” labels. Citigroup is likewise affiliated with an anti-religious freedom organization, the Human Rights Campaign.

Religious freedom is a human right.

Furthermore, Citigroup has come under fire for other attacks on Constitutional protections here in the United States. The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution notes that “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” Despite this, Citigroup is placing extra-governmental restrictions on Americans seeking to exercise their Second Amendment rights. A 2018 Reuters report quoted the Gun Owners of America noting, “Citigroup and Bank of America are threatening our Second-Amendment rights. They do not realize how much more there is to lose than to gain.”

Constitutional rights are human rights.

We urge shareholders to support this proposal.

---

i https://www.2ndvote.com/human-rights-campaign/
ii https://dailycaller.com/2018/06/06/sple-partner-google-facebook-amazon/
iii https://www.hrc.org/hrc-story/corporate-partners
VIA UPS and Email

November 7, 2019

National Center for Public Policy Research
20 F Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001
Attention: Justin Danhof, Esq.

Dear Mr. Danhof:

Citigroup Inc. (the "Company") acknowledges receipt of the stockholder proposal (the "Proposal") submitted by you pursuant to Rule 14a-8 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Rule 14a-8") for inclusion in the Company's proxy statement for its 2019 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the "Annual Meeting").

Please note that your submission contains certain procedural deficiencies. Rule 14a-8(b) requires that in order to be eligible to submit a proposal, a stockholder must submit proof of continuous ownership of at least $2,000 in market value, or 1%, of a company's shares entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of the date the proposal is submitted. The Company's records do not indicate that you are the record owner of the Company's shares, and we have not received other proof that you have satisfied this ownership requirement.

In order to satisfy this ownership requirement, you must submit sufficient proof that you held the required number of shares of Company stock continuously for at least one year as of the date that you submitted the Proposal. November 7, 2019 is considered the date you submitted the Proposal. You may satisfy this proof of ownership requirement by submitting either:

- A written statement from the "record" holder of your shares (usually a broker or bank) verifying that you held the required number of shares of Company stock continuously for at least one year as of the date you submitted the Proposal, or
- If you have filed a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting your ownership of the required number of shares of Company stock as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins, (i) a copy of the schedule and/or form and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in your ownership and (ii) a written statement that you continuously held the required number of shares for the one-year period.

If you plan to demonstrate your ownership by submitting a written statement from the "record" owner of your shares, please be aware that most large U.S. banks and
brokers deposit customers' securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), a registered clearing agency acting as a securities depository. DTC is also sometimes known by the name of Cede & Co., its nominee. Under SEC Staff Legal Bulletins Nos. 14F and 14G, only DTC participants (and their affiliates) are viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. Accordingly, if your shares are held through DTC, you must submit proof of ownership from the DTC participant (or an affiliate thereof) and may do so as follows:

- If your bank or broker is a DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant, you need to submit a written statement from your bank or broker verifying that you continuously held the required number of shares of Company stock for at least one year as of the date the Proposal was submitted. You can confirm whether your bank or broker is a DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant by asking your bank or broker or by checking the DTC participant list, which is currently available at [http://www.dtcc.com/~/media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx].

- If your bank or broker is not a DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant, then you need to submit proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which your shares are held. You should be able to find out the identity of the DTC participant by asking your bank or broker. In addition, if your broker is an "introducing broker," you may be able to find out the identity of the DTC participant by reviewing your account statements because the "clearing broker" listed on those statements will generally be a DTC participant. It is possible that the DTC participant that holds your shares may only be able to confirm the holdings of your bank or broker and not your individual holdings. In that case, you will need to submit two proof of ownership statements verifying that the required number of shares were continuously held for at least one year as of the date you submitted the Proposal: (i) a statement from your bank or broker confirming your ownership and (ii) a separate statement from the DTC participant confirming your bank or broker's ownership.

The response to this letter, correcting all procedural deficiencies noted above, must be postmarked, or electronically transmitted, no later than 14 days from the date you receive this letter. Please address any response to my attention at: Citigroup Inc., 388 Greenwich Street, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10013. You may also transmit it to me by email at jonesp@citi.com. For your reference, I have enclosed a copy of Rule 14a-8 and SEC Staff Legal Bulletins No. 14F and 14G.

If you have any questions with respect to the foregoing requirements, please contact me at (212) 793-3863.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Paula F. Jones
Assistant Secretary and
Associate General Counsel, Corporate Governance

Enclosures
ENCLOSURE 1

RULE 14A-8 OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
§ 240.14a-8

Shareholder proposals.

This section addresses when a company must include a shareholder's proposal in its proxy statement and identifies the proposal in its form of proxy when the company holds an annual or special meeting of shareholders. In summary, in order to have your shareholder proposal included on a company's proxy card, and included along with any supporting statement in its proxy statement, you must be eligible and follow certain procedures. Under a few specific circumstances, the company is permitted to exclude your proposal, but only after submitting its reasons to the Commission. We structured this section in a question-and-answer format so that it is easier to understand. The references to "you" are to a shareholder seeking to submit the proposal.

(a) Question 1: What is a proposal? A shareholder proposal is your recommendation or requirement that the company and/or its board of directors take action, which you intend to present at a meeting of the company's shareholders. Your proposal should state as clearly as possible the course of action that you believe the company should follow. If your proposal is placed on the company's proxy card, the company must also provide in the form of proxy means for shareholders to specify by boxes a choice between approval or disapproval, or abstention. Unless otherwise indicated, the word "proposal" as used in this section refers both to your proposal, and to your corresponding statement in support of your proposal (if any).

(b) Question 2: Who is eligible to submit a proposal, and how do I demonstrate to the company that I am eligible? (1) In order to be eligible to submit a proposal, you must have continuously held at least $2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal. You must continue to hold those securities through the date of the meeting.

(2) If you are the registered holder of your securities, which means that your name appears in the company's records as a shareholder, the company can verify your eligibility on its own, although you will still have to provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders. However, if like many shareholders you are not a registered holder, the company likely does not know that you are a shareholder, or how many shares you own. In this case, at the time you submit your proposal, you must prove your eligibility to the company in one of two ways:

(1) The first way is to submit to the company a written statement from the "record" holder of your securities (usually a broker or bank) verifying that, at the time you submitted your proposal, you continuously held the securities for at least one year. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders; or

(2) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you have filed a Schedule 13D (§240.13d-101), Schedule 13G (§240.13g-102), Form 3 (§249.103 of this chapter), Form 4 (§249.104 of this chapter) and/or Form 5 (§249.105 of this chapter).
Securities and Exchange Commission

§240.14a-8

chapter), or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting your ownership of the shares as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins. If you have filed one of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility by submitting to the company:

(A) A copy of the schedule and/or form, and say subsequent amendments reporting a change in your ownership level;

(B) Your written statement that you continuously held the required number of shares for the one-year period as of the date of the statement; and

(C) Your written statement that you intend to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

Question 3: How many proposals may I submit? Each shareholder may submit no more than one proposal to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting.

Question 4: How long can my proposal be? The proposal, including any accompanying supporting statement, may not exceed 500 words.

Question 5: What is the deadline for submitting a proposal? (1) If you are submitting your proposal for the company's annual meeting, you can in most cases find the deadline in last year's proxy statement. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting last year, or has changed the date of its meeting for this year more than 30 days from last year's meeting, you can usually find the deadline in one of the company's quarterly reports on Form 10-Q (§249.308a of this chapter), or in shareholder reports of investment companies under §270.30d-1 of this chapter of the Investment Company Act of 1940. In order to avoid controversy, shareholders should submit their proposals by means, including electronic means, that permit them to prove the date of delivery.

(2) The deadline is calculated in the following manner if the proposal is submitted for a regularly scheduled annual meeting. The proposal must be received at the company's principal executive offices not less than 120 calendar days before the date of the company's proxy statement released to shareholders in connection with the previous year's annual meeting. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting the previous year, or if the date of this year's annual meeting has been changed by more than 30 days from the date of the previous year's meeting, then the deadline is a reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

(3) If you are submitting your proposal for a meeting of shareholders other than a regularly scheduled annual meeting, the deadline is a reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

Question 6: What if I fail to follow one of the eligibility or procedural requirements explained in answers to Questions 1 through 4 of this section? (1) The company may exclude your proposal, but only after it has notified you of the problem, and you have failed adequately to correct it. Within 14 calendar days of receiving your proposal, the company must notify you in writing of any procedural or eligibility deficiencies, as well as of the time frame for your response. Your response must be postmarked, or transmitted electronically, no later than 14 days from the date you received the company's notification. A company need not provide you such notice of a deficiency if the deficiency cannot be remedied, such as if you fail to submit a proposal by the company's properly determined deadline. If the company intends to exclude the proposal, it will later have to make a submission under §240.14a-8 and provide you with a copy under Question 10 below, §240.14a-8(j).

(2) If you fail in your promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years.

Question 7: Who has the burden of persuading the Commission or its staff that my proposal can be excluded? Except as otherwise noted, the burden is on the company to demonstrate that it is entitled to exclude a proposal.

Question 8: Must I appear personally at the shareholders' meeting to present the proposal? (1) Either you, or your representative who is qualified
§ 240.14a-8

under state law to present the proposal on your behalf, must attend the meeting to present the proposal. Whether you attend the meeting yourself or send a qualified representative to the meeting in your place, you should make sure that you, or your representative, follow the proper state law procedures for attending the meeting and/or presenting your proposal.

(2) If the company holds its shareholder meeting in whole or in part via electronic media, and the company permits you or your representative to present your proposal via such media, then you may appear through electronic media rather than traveling to the meeting to appear in person.

(3) If you or your qualified representative fail to appear and present the proposal, without good cause, the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meetings held in the following two calendar years.

(1) Question 9: If I have complied with the procedural requirements, on what other bases may a company rely to exclude my proposal? (1) Improper under state law: If the proposal is not a proper subject for action by shareholders under the laws of the jurisdiction of the company’s organization;

NOTE TO PARAGRAPH (1)(1): Depending on the subject matter, some proposals are not considered proper under state law if they would be binding on the company if approved by shareholders. In our experience, most proposals that are cast as recommendations or requests that the board of directors take specified action are proper under state law. Accordingly, we will assume that a proposal drafted as a recommendation or suggestion is proper unless the company demonstrates otherwise.

(2) Violation of law: If the proposal would, if implemented, cause the company to violate any state, federal, or foreign law to which it is subject;

NOTE TO PARAGRAPH (1)(2): We will not apply this basis for exclusion to permit exclusion of a proposal on grounds that it would violate foreign law if compliance with the foreign law would result in a violation of any state or federal law.

(3) Violation of proxy rules: If the proposal or supporting statement is contrary to any of the Commission’s proxy rules, including §240.14a-9, which prohibits materially false or misleading statements in proxy soliciting materials;

(4) Personal grievance; special interest: If the proposal relates to the redress of a personal claim or grievance against the company or any other person, or if it is designed to result in a benefit to you, or to further a personal interest, which is not shared by the other shareholders at large;

(5) Relevance: If the proposal relates to operations which account for less than 5 percent of the company’s total assets at the end of its most recent fiscal year, and for less than 5 percent of its net earnings and gross sales for its most recent fiscal year, and is not otherwise significantly related to the company’s business;

(6) Absence of power/authority: If the company would lack the power or authority to implement the proposal;

(7) Management functions: If the proposal deals with a matter relating to the company’s ordinary business operations;

(8) Director elections: If the proposal:

(i) Would disqualify a nominee who is standing for election;

(ii) Would remove a director from office before his or her term expired;

(iii) Questions the competence, business judgment, or character of one or more nominees or directors;

(iv) Seeks to include a specific individual in the company’s proxy materials for election to the board of directors; or

(v) Otherwise could affect the outcome of the upcoming election of directors.

(9) Conflicts with company’s proposal: If the proposal directly conflicts with one of the company’s own proposals to be submitted to shareholders at the same meeting;

NOTE TO PARAGRAPH (1)(9): A company’s submission to the Commission under this section should specify the points of conflict with the company’s proposal.

(10) Substantially implemented: If the company has already substantially implemented the proposal;

NOTE TO PARAGRAPH (1)(10): A company may exclude a shareholder proposal that would provide an advisory vote or seek future advisory votes to approve the compensation of executives as disclosed pursuant
§240.14a-21(b)

§240.14a-3

Question 11: May I submit my own statement to the Commission responding to the company's arguments?

Yes, you may submit a response, but it is not required. You should try to submit any response to us, with a copy to the company, as soon as possible after the company makes its submission. This way, the Commission staff will have time to consider your submission before it issues its response. You should submit six paper copies of your response.

Question 12: If the company includes my shareholder proposal in its proxy materials, what information about me must it include along with the proposal itself?

The company's proxy statement must include your name and address, as well as the number of the company's voting securities that you hold. However, instead of providing that information, the company may instead include a statement that it will provide the information to shareholders promptly upon receiving an oral or written request.

Question 13: What can I do if the company includes in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should not vote in favor of my proposal, and I disagree with some of its statements?

(1) The company cannot be responsible for the contents of your proposal or supporting statement.

(m) Question 13: What can I do if the company includes in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should not vote in favor of my proposal, and I disagree with some of its statements?

(1) The company may elect to include in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should vote against your proposal. The company is allowed to make arguments reflecting its own point of view, just as you may
express your own point of view in your proposal's supporting statement.

(2) However, if you believe that the company's opposition to your proposal contains materially false or misleading statements that may violate our anti-fraud rule, §240.14a-9, you should promptly send to the Commission staff and the company a letter explaining the reasons for your view, along with a copy of the company's statements opposing your proposal. To the extent possible, your letter should include specific factual information demonstrating the inaccuracy of the company's claims. Time permitting, you may wish to try to work out your differences with the company by yourself before contacting the Commission staff.

(3) We require the company to send you a copy of its statements opposing your proposal before it sends its proxy materials, so that you may bring to our attention any materially false or misleading statements, under the following timeframes:

(i) If our no-action response requires that you make revisions to your proposal or supporting statement as a condition to requiring the company to include it in its proxy materials, then the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 5 calendar days after the company receives a copy of your revised proposal; or

(ii) In all other cases, the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 30 calendar days before its files definitive copies of its proxy statement and form of proxy under §240.14a-6.

§ 240.14a-9 False or misleading statements.

(a) No solicitation subject to this regulation shall be made by means of any proxy statement, form of proxy, notice of meeting or other communication, written or oral, containing any statement which, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it is made, is false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or which omits to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements therein not false or misleading or necessary to correct any statement in any earlier communication with respect to the solicitation of a proxy for the same meeting or subject matter which has become false or misleading.

(b) The fact that a proxy statement, form of proxy or other soliciting material has been filed with or examined by the Commission shall not be deemed a finding by the Commission that such material is accurate or complete or not false or misleading, or that the Commission has passed upon the merits of or approved any statement contained therein or any matter to be acted upon by security holders. No representation contrary to the foregoing shall be made.

(c) No nominee, nominating shareholder or nominating shareholder group, or any member thereof, shall cause to be included in a registrant's proxy materials, either pursuant to the Federal proxy rules, an applicable state or foreign law provision, or a registrant's governing documents as they relate to including shareholder nominees for director in a registrant's proxy materials, include in a notice on Schedule 14N (§240.14n-101), or include in any other related communication, any statement which, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it is made, is false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or which omits to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements therein not false or misleading or necessary to correct any statement in any earlier communication with respect to a solicitation for the same meeting or subject matter which has become false or misleading.

Note: The following are some examples of what, depending upon particular facts and circumstances, may be misleading within the meaning of this section.

a. Predictions as to specific future market values.

b. Material which directly or indirectly impugns character, integrity or personal reputation, or directly or indirectly makes charges concerning improper, illegal or immoral conduct or associations, without factual foundation.
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A. The purpose of this bulletin

This bulletin is part of a continuing effort by the Division to provide guidance on important issues arising under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8. Specifically, this bulletin contains information regarding:

- Brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8 (b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8;

- Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies;

- The submission of revised proposals;

- Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests regarding proposals submitted by multiple proponents; and

- The Division's new process for transmitting Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email.

You can find additional guidance regarding Rule 14a-8 in the following bulletins that are available on the Commission's website: SLB No. 14, SLB No. 14A, SLB No. 14B, SLB No. 14C, SLB No. 14D and SLB No. 14E.
B. The types of brokers and banks that constitute “record” holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

1. Eligibility to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

To be eligible to submit a shareholder proposal, a shareholder must have continuously held at least $2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the shareholder meeting for at least one year as of the date the shareholder submits the proposal. The shareholder must also continue to hold the required amount of securities through the date of the meeting and must provide the company with a written statement of intent to do so.1

The steps that a shareholder must take to verify his or her eligibility to submit a proposal depend on how the shareholder owns the securities. There are two types of security holders in the U.S.: registered owners and beneficial owners.4 Registered owners have a direct relationship with the issuer because their ownership of shares is listed on the records maintained by the issuer or its transfer agent. If a shareholder is a registered owner, the company can independently confirm that the shareholder's holdings satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)'s eligibility requirement.

The vast majority of investors in shares issued by U.S. companies, however, are beneficial owners, which means that they hold their securities in book-entry form through a securities intermediary, such as a broker or a bank. Beneficial owners are sometimes referred to as “street name” holders. Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) provides that a beneficial owner can provide proof of ownership to support his or her eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting a written statement "from the 'record' holder of [the] securities (usually a broker or bank)," verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the shareholder held the required amount of securities continuously for at least one year.2

2. The role of the Depository Trust Company

Most large U.S. brokers and banks deposit their customers' securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), a registered clearing agency acting as a securities depository. Such brokers and banks are often referred to as “participants” in DTC. The names of these DTC participants, however, do not appear as the registered owners of the securities deposited with DTC on the list of shareholders maintained by the company or, more typically, by its transfer agent. Rather, DTC’s nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants. A company can request from DTC a "securities position listing" as of a specified date, which identifies the DTC participants having a position in the company's securities and the number of securities held by each DTC participant on that date.5

3. Brokers and banks that constitute “record” holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

In The Hain Celestial Group, Inc. (Oct. 1, 2008), we took the position that an introducing broker could be considered a “record” holder for purposes of
Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). An introducing broker is a broker that engages in sales and other activities involving customer contact, such as opening customer accounts and accepting customer orders, but is not permitted to maintain custody of customer funds and securities. Instead, an introducing broker engages another broker, known as a “clearing broker,” to hold custody of client funds and securities, to clear and execute customer trades, and to handle other functions such as issuing confirmations of customer trades and customer account statements. Clearing brokers generally are DTC participants; introducing brokers generally are not. As introducing brokers generally are not DTC participants, and therefore typically do not appear on DTC’s securities position listing, Hain Celestial has required companies to accept proof of ownership letters from brokers in cases where, unlike the positions of registered owners and brokers and banks that are DTC participants, the company is unable to verify the positions against its own or its transfer agent’s records or against DTC’s securities position listing.

In light of questions we have received following two recent court cases relating to proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8 and in light of the Commission’s discussion of registered and beneficial owners in the Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, we have reconsidered our views as to what types of brokers and banks should be considered “record” holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). Because of the transparency of DTC participants’ positions in a company’s securities, we will take the view going forward that, for Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) purposes, only DTC participants should be viewed as “record” holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. As a result, we will no longer follow Hain Celestial.

We believe that taking this approach as to who constitutes a “record” holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) will provide greater certainty to beneficial owners and companies. We also note that this approach is consistent with Exchange Act Rule 12g5-1 and a 1988 staff no-action letter addressing that rule,8 under which brokers and banks that are DTC participants are considered to be the record holders of securities on deposit with DTC when calculating the number of record holders for purposes of Sections 12(g) and 15(d) of the Exchange Act.

Companies have occasionally expressed the view that, because DTC’s nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants, only DTC or Cede & Co. should be viewed as the “record” holder of the securities held on deposit at DTC for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). We have never interpreted the rule to require a shareholder to obtain a proof of ownership letter from DTC or Cede & Co., and nothing in this guidance should be construed as changing that view.

---

How can a shareholder determine whether his or her broker or bank is a DTC participant?

Shareholders and companies can confirm whether a particular broker or bank is a DTC participant by checking DTC’s participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at http://www.dtcc.com/~/media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx.

What if a shareholder’s broker or bank is not on DTC’s participant list?
The shareholder will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held. The shareholder should be able to find out who this DTC participant is by asking the shareholder’s broker or bank.2

If the DTC participant knows the shareholder’s broker or bank’s holdings, but does not know the shareholder’s holdings, a shareholder could satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the required amount of securities were continuously held for at least one year—one from the shareholder’s broker or bank confirming the shareholder’s ownership, and the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank’s ownership.

How will the staff process no-action requests that argue for exclusion on the basis that the shareholder’s proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant?

The staff will grant no-action relief to a company on the basis that the shareholder’s proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant only if the company’s notice of defect describes the required proof of ownership in a manner that is consistent with the guidance contained in this bulletin. Under Rule 14a-8(f)(1), the shareholder will have an opportunity to obtain the requisite proof of ownership after receiving the notice of defect.

C. Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies

In this section, we describe two common errors shareholders make when submitting proof of ownership for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2), and we provide guidance on how to avoid these errors.

First, Rule 14a-8(b) requires a shareholder to provide proof of ownership that he or she has “continuously held at least $2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company’s securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal” (emphasis added).10 We note that many proof of ownership letters do not satisfy this requirement because they do not verify the shareholder’s beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted. In some cases, the letter speaks as of a date before the date the proposal is submitted, thereby leaving a gap between the date of the verification and the date the proposal is submitted. In other cases, the letter speaks as of a date after the date the proposal was submitted but covers a period of only one year, thus failing to verify the shareholder’s beneficial ownership over the required full one-year period preceding the date of the proposal’s submission.

Second, many letters fail to confirm continuous ownership of the securities. This can occur when a broker or bank submits a letter that confirms the shareholder’s beneficial ownership only as of a specified date but omits any reference to continuous ownership for a one-year period.

We recognize that the requirements of Rule 14a-8(b) are highly prescriptive and can cause inconvenience for shareholders when submitting proposals. Although our administration of Rule 14a-8(b) is constrained by the terms of
the rule, we believe that shareholders can avoid the two errors highlighted above by arranging to have their broker or bank provide the required verification of ownership as of the date they plan to submit the proposal using the following format:

“As of [date the proposal is submitted], [name of shareholder] held, and has held continuously for at least one year, [number of securities] shares of [company name] [class of securities].” 11

As discussed above, a shareholder may also need to provide a separate written statement from the DTC participant through which the shareholder’s securities are held if the shareholder’s broker or bank is not a DTC participant.

D. The submission of revised proposals

On occasion, a shareholder will revise a proposal after submitting it to a company. This section addresses questions we have received regarding revisions to a proposal or supporting statement.

1. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. The shareholder then submits a revised proposal before the company’s deadline for receiving proposals. Must the company accept the revisions?

Yes. In this situation, we believe the revised proposal serves as a replacement of the initial proposal. By submitting a revised proposal, the shareholder has effectively withdrawn the initial proposal. Therefore, the shareholder is not in violation of the one-proposal limitation in Rule 14a-8 (c). 12 If the company intends to submit a no-action request, it must do so with respect to the revised proposal.

We recognize that in Question and Answer E.2 of SLB No. 14, we indicated that if a shareholder makes revisions to a proposal before the company submits its no-action request, the company can choose whether to accept the revisions. However, this guidance has led some companies to believe that, in cases where shareholders attempt to make changes to an initial proposal, the company is free to ignore such revisions even if the revised proposal is submitted before the company’s deadline for receiving shareholder proposals. We are revising our guidance on this issue to make clear that a company may not ignore a revised proposal in this situation. 12

2. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. After the deadline for receiving proposals, the shareholder submits a revised proposal. Must the company accept the revisions?

No. If a shareholder submits revisions to a proposal after the deadline for receiving proposals under Rule 14a-8(e), the company is not required to accept the revisions. However, if the company does not accept the revisions, it must treat the revised proposal as a second proposal and submit a notice stating its intention to exclude the revised proposal, as required by Rule 14a-8(j). The company’s notice may cite Rule 14a-8(e) as the reason for excluding the revised proposal. If the company does not accept the revisions and intends to exclude the initial proposal, it would also need to submit its reasons for excluding the initial proposal.
3. If a shareholder submits a revised proposal, as of which date must the shareholder prove his or her share ownership?

A shareholder must prove ownership as of the date the original proposal is submitted. When the Commission has discussed revisions to proposals, it has not suggested that a revision triggers a requirement to provide proof of ownership a second time. As outlined in Rule 14a-8(b), proving ownership includes providing a written statement that the shareholder intends to continue to hold the securities through the date of the shareholder meeting. Rule 14a-8(f)(2) provides that if the shareholder "fails in [his or her] promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of [the same shareholder's] proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years." With these provisions in mind, we do not interpret Rule 14a-8 as requiring additional proof of ownership when a shareholder submits a revised proposal.

E. Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests for proposals submitted by multiple proponents

We have previously addressed the requirements for withdrawing a Rule 14a-8 no-action request in SLB Nos. 14 and 14C. SLB No. 14 notes that a company should include with a withdrawal letter documentation demonstrating that a shareholder has withdrawn the proposal. In cases where a proposal submitted by multiple shareholders is withdrawn, SLB No. 14C states that, if each shareholder has designated a lead individual to act on its behalf and the company is able to demonstrate that the individual is authorized to act on behalf of all of the proponents, the company need only provide a letter from that lead individual indicating that the lead individual is withdrawing the proposal on behalf of all of the proponents.

Because there is no relief granted by the staff in cases where a no-action request is withdrawn following the withdrawal of the related proposal, we recognize that the threshold for withdrawing a no-action request need not be overly burdensome. Going forward, we will process a withdrawal request if the company provides a letter from the lead filer that includes a representation that the lead filer is authorized to withdraw the proposal on behalf of each proponent identified in the company's no-action request.

F. Use of email to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses to companies and proponents

To date, the Division has transmitted copies of our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses, including copies of the correspondence we have received in connection with such requests, by U.S. mail to companies and proponents. We also post our response and the related correspondence to the Commission's website shortly after issuance of our response.

In order to accelerate delivery of staff responses to companies and proponents, and to reduce our copying and postage costs, going forward, we intend to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email to companies and proponents. We therefore encourage both companies and proponents to include email contact information in any correspondence to each other and to us. We will use U.S. mail to transmit our no-action response to any company or proponent for which we do not have email contact information.
Given the availability of our responses and the related correspondence on the Commission's website and the requirement under Rule 14a-8 for companies and proponents to copy each other on correspondence submitted to the Commission, we believe it is unnecessary to transmit copies of the related correspondence along with our no-action response. Therefore, we intend to transmit only our staff response and not the correspondence we receive from the parties. We will continue to post to the Commission's website copies of this correspondence at the same time that we post our staff no-action response.

1 See Rule 14a-8(b).

2 For an explanation of the types of share ownership in the U.S., see Concept Release on U.S. Proxy System, Release No. 34-62495 (July 14, 2010) [75 FR 42982] ("Proxy Mechanics Concept Release"), at Section II.A. The term "beneficial owner" does not have a uniform meaning under the federal securities laws. It has a different meaning in this bulletin as compared to "beneficial owner" and "beneficial ownership" in Sections 13 and 16 of the Exchange Act. Our use of the term in this bulletin is not intended to suggest that registered owners are not beneficial owners for purposes of those Exchange Act provisions. See Proposed Amendments to Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12598 (July 7, 1976) [41 FR 29982], at n.2 ("The term 'beneficial owner' when used in the context of the proxy rules, and in light of the purposes of those rules, may be interpreted to have a broader meaning than it would for certain other purpose[s] under the federal securities laws, such as reporting pursuant to the Williams Act.").

3 If a shareholder has filed a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 reflecting ownership of the required amount of shares, the shareholder may instead prove ownership by submitting a copy of such filings and providing the additional information that is described in Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(ii).

4 DTC holds the deposited securities in "fungible bulk," meaning that there are no specifically identifiable shares directly owned by the DTC participants. Rather, each DTC participant holds a pro rata interest or position in the aggregate number of shares of a particular issuer held at DTC. Correspondingly, each customer of a DTC participant – such as an individual investor – owns a pro rata interest in the shares in which the DTC participant has a pro rata interest. See Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, at Section II.B.2.a.


7 See KBR Inc. v. Chevedden, Civil Action No. H-11-0196, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36431, 2011 WL 1463611 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2011); Apache Corp. v. Chevedden, 696 F. Supp. 2d 723 (S.D. Tex. 2010). In both cases, the court concluded that a securities intermediary was not a record holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b) because it did not appear on a list of the
company’s non-objecting beneficial owners or on any DTC securities position listing, nor was the intermediary a DTC participant.

8 *Techne Corp.* (Sept. 20, 1988).

9 In addition, if the shareholder’s broker is an introducing broker, the shareholder’s account statements should include the clearing broker’s identity and telephone number. See Net Capital Rule Release, at Section II.C.(iii). The clearing broker will generally be a DTC participant.

10 For purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), the submission date of a proposal will generally precede the company’s receipt date of the proposal, absent the use of electronic or other means of same-day delivery.

11 This format is acceptable for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), but it is not mandatory or exclusive.

12 As such, it is not appropriate for a company to send a notice of defect for multiple proposals under Rule 14a-8(c) upon receiving a revised proposal.

13 This position will apply to all proposals submitted after an initial proposal but before the company’s deadline for receiving proposals, regardless of whether they are explicitly labeled as “revisions” to an initial proposal, unless the shareholder affirmatively indicates an intent to submit a second, additional proposal for inclusion in the company’s proxy materials. In that case, the company must send the shareholder a notice of defect pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f)(1) if it intends to exclude either proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on Rule 14a-8(c). In light of this guidance, with respect to proposals or revisions received before a company’s deadline for submission, we will no longer follow *Layne Christensen Co.* (Mar. 21, 2011) and other prior staff no-action letters in which we took the view that a proposal would violate the Rule 14a-8(c) one-proposal limitation if such proposal is submitted to a company after the company has either submitted a Rule 14a-8 no-action request to exclude an earlier proposal submitted by the same proponent or notified the proponent that the earlier proposal was excludable under the rule.


15 Because the relevant date for proving ownership under Rule 14a-8(b) is the date the proposal is submitted, a proponent who does not adequately prove ownership in connection with a proposal is not permitted to submit another proposal for the same meeting on a later date.

16 Nothing in this staff position has any effect on the status of any shareholder proposal that is not withdrawn by the proponent or its authorized representative.
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A. The purpose of this bulletin

This bulletin is part of a continuing effort by the Division to provide guidance on important issues arising under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8. Specifically, this bulletin contains information regarding:

• the parties that can provide proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8;

• the manner in which companies should notify proponents of a failure to provide proof of ownership for the one-year period required under Rule 14a-8(b)(1); and

• the use of website references in proposals and supporting statements.

You can find additional guidance regarding Rule 14a-8 in the following bulletins that are available on the Commission's website: SLB No. 14, SLB No. 14A, SLB No. 14B, SLB No. 14C, SLB No. 14D, SLB No. 14E and SLB No. 14F.

B. Parties that can provide proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8
1. Sufficiency of proof of ownership letters provided by affiliates of DTC participants for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i)

To be eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8, a shareholder must, among other things, provide documentation evidencing that the shareholder has continuously held at least $2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the shareholder meeting for at least one year as of the date the shareholder submits the proposal. If the shareholder is a beneficial owner of the securities, which means that the securities are held in book-entry form through a securities intermediary, Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) provides that this documentation can be in the form of a "written statement from the 'record' holder of your securities (usually a broker or bank)...."

In SLB No. 14F, the Division described its view that only securities intermediaries that are participants in the Depository Trust Company ("DTC") should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). Therefore, a beneficial owner must obtain a proof of ownership letter from the DTC participant through which its securities are held at DTC in order to satisfy the proof of ownership requirements in Rule 14a-8.

During the most recent proxy season, some companies questioned the sufficiency of proof of ownership letters from entities that were not themselves DTC participants, but were affiliates of DTC participants. By virtue of the affiliate relationship, we believe that a securities intermediary holding shares through its affiliated DTC participant should be in a position to verify its customers' ownership of securities. Accordingly, we are of the view that, for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i), a proof of ownership letter from an affiliate of a DTC participant satisfies the requirement to provide a proof of ownership letter from a DTC participant.

2. Adequacy of proof of ownership letters from securities intermediaries that are not brokers or banks

We understand that there are circumstances in which securities intermediaries that are not brokers or banks maintain securities accounts in the ordinary course of their business. A shareholder who holds securities through a securities intermediary that is not a broker or bank can satisfy Rule 14a-8's documentation requirement by submitting a proof of ownership letter from that securities intermediary. If the securities intermediary is not a DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant, then the shareholder will also need to obtain a proof of ownership letter from the DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant that can verify the holdings of the securities intermediary.

C. Manner in which companies should notify proponents of a failure to provide proof of ownership for the one-year period required under Rule 14a-8(b)(1)

As discussed in Section C of SLB No. 14F, a common error in proof of ownership letters is that they do not verify a proponent's beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal was submitted, as required by Rule 14a-8(b)(1). In some cases, the letter speaks as of a date before the date the proposal was submitted, thereby leaving a gap between the date of verification and the...
date the proposal was submitted. In other cases, the letter speaks as of a date after the date the proposal was submitted but covers a period of only one year, thus failing to verify the proponent's beneficial ownership over the required full one-year period preceding the date of the proposal's submission.

Under Rule 14a-8(f), if a proponent fails to follow one of the eligibility or procedural requirements of the rule, a company may exclude the proposal only if it notifies the proponent of the defect and the proponent fails to correct it. In SLB No. 14 and SLB No. 148, we explained that companies should provide adequate detail about what a proponent must do to remedy all eligibility or procedural defects.

We are concerned that companies' notices of defect are not adequately describing the defects or explaining what a proponent must do to remedy defects in proof of ownership letters. For example, some companies' notices of defect make no mention of the gap in the period of ownership covered by the proponent's proof of ownership letter or other specific deficiencies that the company has identified. We do not believe that such notices of defect serve the purpose of Rule 14a-8(f).

Accordingly, going forward, we will not concur in the exclusion of a proposal under Rules 14a-8(b) and 14a-8(f) on the basis that a proponent's proof of ownership does not cover the one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted unless the company provides a notice of defect that identifies the specific date on which the proposal was submitted and explains that the proponent must obtain a new proof of ownership letter verifying continuous ownership of the requisite amount of securities for the one-year period preceding and including such date to cure the defect. We view the proposal's date of submission as the date the proposal is postmarked or transmitted electronically. Identifying in the notice of defect the specific date on which the proposal was submitted will help a proponent better understand how to remedy the defects described above and will be particularly helpful in those instances in which it may be difficult for a proponent to determine the date of submission, such as when the proposal is not postmarked on the same day it is placed in the mail. In addition, companies should include copies of the postmark or evidence of electronic transmission with their no-action requests.

D. Use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements

Recently, a number of proponents have included in their proposals or in their supporting statements the addresses to websites that provide more information about their proposals. In some cases, companies have sought to exclude either the website address or the entire proposal due to the reference to the website address.

In SLB No. 14, we explained that a reference to a website address in a proposal does not raise the concerns addressed by the 500-word limitation in Rule 14a-8(d). We continue to be of this view and, accordingly, we will continue to count a website address as one word for purposes of Rule 14a-8(d). To the extent that the company seeks the exclusion of a website reference in a proposal, but not the proposal itself, we will continue to follow the guidance stated in SLB No. 14, which provides that references to website addresses in proposals or supporting statements could be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(1)(3) if the information contained on the
website is materially false or misleading, irrelevant to the subject matter of the proposal or otherwise in contravention of the proxy rules, including Rule 14a-9.1

In light of the growing interest in including references to website addresses in proposals and supporting statements, we are providing additional guidance on the appropriate use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements.4

1. References to website addresses in a proposal or supporting statement and Rule 14a-8(i)(3)

References to websites in a proposal or supporting statement may raise concerns under Rule 14a-8(i)(3). In SLB No. 14B, we stated that the exclusion of a proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as vague and indefinite may be appropriate if neither the shareholders voting on the proposal, nor the company in implementing the proposal (if adopted), would be able to determine with any reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires. In evaluating whether a proposal may be excluded on this basis, we consider only the information contained in the proposal and supporting statement and determine whether, based on that information, shareholders and the company can determine what actions the proposal seeks.

If a proposal or supporting statement refers to a website that provides information necessary for shareholders and the company to understand with reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires, and such information is not also contained in the proposal or in the supporting statement, then we believe the proposal would raise concerns under Rule 14a-9 and would be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as vague and indefinite. By contrast, if shareholders and the company can understand with reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires without reviewing the information provided on the website, then we believe that the proposal would not be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) on the basis of the reference to the website address. In this case, the information on the website only supplements the information contained in the proposal and in the supporting statement.

2. Providing the company with the materials that will be published on the referenced website

We recognize that if a proposal references a website that is not operational at the time the proposal is submitted, it will be impossible for a company or the staff to evaluate whether the website reference may be excluded. In our view, a reference to a non-operational website in a proposal or supporting statement could be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as irrelevant to the subject matter of a proposal. We understand, however, that a proponent may wish to include a reference to a website containing information related to the proposal but wait to activate the website until it becomes clear that the proposal will be included in the company's proxy materials. Therefore, we will not concur that a reference to a website may be excluded as irrelevant under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) on the basis that it is not yet operational if the proponent, at the time the proposal is submitted, provides the company with the materials that are intended for publication on the website and a representation that the website will become
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operational at, or prior to, the time the company files its definitive proxy materials.

3. Potential issues that may arise if the content of a referenced website changes after the proposal is submitted

To the extent the information on a website changes after submission of a proposal and the company believes the revised information renders the website reference excludable under Rule 14a-8, a company seeking our concurrence that the website reference may be excluded must submit a letter presenting its reasons for doing so. While Rule 14a-8(j) requires a company to submit its reasons for exclusion with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy materials, we may concur that the changes to the referenced website constitute "good cause" for the company to file its reasons for excluding the website reference after the 80-day deadline and grant the company's request that the 80-day requirement be waived.

1 An entity is an “affiliate” of a DTC participant if such entity directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, controls or is controlled by, or is under common control with, the DTC participant.

2 Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(I) itself acknowledges that the record holder is "usually," but not always, a broker or bank.

3 Rule 14a-9 prohibits statements in proxy materials which, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, are false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or which omit to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements not false or misleading.

4 A website that provides more information about a shareholder proposal may constitute a proxy solicitation under the proxy rules. Accordingly, we remind shareholders who elect to include website addresses in their proposals to comply with all applicable rules regarding proxy solicitations.

http://www.sec.gov/interp/legal/cfslb14g.htm

Modified: 10/16/2012
ENCLOSURE 2

STATEMENT OF INTENT TO EXCLUDE STOCKHOLDER PROPOSAL

The Proposal urges the Company’s Board of Directors (the “Board”) to create a standing committee to “oversee the Company’s responses to domestic and international developments in human rights that affect Citigroup’s business.” In its supporting statement, the Proponent asserts that

Citigroup’s exposure to conflict in human rights risk is significant as our company operates in many dozens of countries and territories, some of which have a significant risk of human rights violations.

THE COMPANY HAS SUBSTANTIALLY IMPLEMENTED THE OVERSIGHT URGED BY THE PROPOSAL.

The Proposal may be excluded from the 2020 Proxy Materials pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10) because the Company has substantially implemented the Proposal through the inclusion of oversight responsibilities over human rights programs and policies in the Charter of the Nomination, Governance and Public Affairs Committee of the Board (the “Committee”). Rule 14a-8(i)(10) permits an issuer to exclude a proposal if the company has already “substantially implemented the proposal.” The purpose of Rule 14a-8(i)(10) is “to avoid the possibility of shareholders having to consider matters which have already been favorably acted upon by management.” However, Rule 14a-8(i)(10) does not require exact correspondence between the actions sought by a proponent and the issuer’s actions in order to exclude a proposal. Rather, the Staff has stated that “a determination that the [c]ompany has substantially implemented the proposal depends upon whether [the company’s] particular policies, practices and procedures compare favorably” with those requested under the proposal, and not on the exact means of implementation. In other words, the Rule requires only that a company’s prior actions satisfactorily address the underlying concerns of the proposal and its essential objective.

The Proposal focuses on the establishment of a new standing committee to oversee the Company’s responses to domestic and international developments in human rights that affect the Company’s business. The Proponent’s supporting statement explains that the Company’s exposure to conflict in human rights risk is significant because the Company operates in many dozens of countries and territories, some of which have a significant risk of human rights

---

4 See, e.g., ConAgra Foods, Inc. (avail. Jul. 3, 2006) (recognizing that the board of directors substantially implemented a request for a sustainability report because such a report was already published on the company’s website); Johnson & Johnson (avail. Feb. 17, 2006) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal to verify the “employment legitimacy of all current and future U.S. employees” in light of the company’s substantial implementation through adherence to federal regulations).
violations. However, the Proponent has overlooked the Committee’s Charter, pursuant to which the Board specifically delegated the Committee “oversight of public affairs issues.” This includes the responsibility to “receive reports from and advise management on the Company’s sustainability policies and programs, including . . . human rights.” The Committee is also charged with “reviewing the Company’s policies and programs that relate to public issues of significance to the Company and the public at large . . . and issues that impact the Company’s reputation.” In addition, the Company already has a policy on human rights, which sets out specific procedures addressing how the Company monitors and responds to human rights issues impacting the Company and its stakeholders, and has numerous other policies to address human rights issues. In fact, the Committee regularly reviews, and considers improvements to, this policy. Accordingly, the Company has in fact (to frame it in the words of the Proposal) created a committee to “oversee the Company’s responses to domestic and international developments in human rights that affect Citigroup’s business.”

The Staff has routinely concurred in the exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(10) of proposals requesting a board of directors form a new committee to address an issue already within the scope of responsibility of an existing committee. Here, the Committee’s charter already

---

5 See Citigroup Inc. Nomination, Governance and Public Affairs Committee Charter, at 3. A copy of the Committee’s Charter is attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein.

6 See id.

7 See id. at 1.

8 See Citigroup Inc. Statement on Human Rights, at 6-7, available at https://www.citigroup.com/citi/citizen/data/citi_statement_on_human_rights.pdf (“A dedicated team of . . . specialists screens all transactions subject to the [Environmental and Social Risk Management] Policy to identify specific environmental and social risks that require further due diligence. If the screening identifies concerns about . . . certain “Areas of High Caution” related to human rights impacts, the transaction receives enhanced due diligence . . . . Citi only proceeds with transactions that impact these areas after a thorough and judicious assessment of impacts and risks, and confirmation that mitigation measures have been or will be designed to comply with Citi’s policies and standards.”); id. at 9 (“For impacts [from human rights issues] tied to our operations and role as an employer, we have established a multi-layer approach for employees and others to escalate violations or potential violations of law, regulation, breaches of Citi policy or our Code of Conduct, including our global Ethics Hotline, which provides five channels of communication for employees and any third-party, including members of the general public, to report concerns about unethical behavior to Citi’s Ethics Office.”).


10 See, e.g., Verizon Communications Inc. (avail. Feb. 19, 2019) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10), requesting the board establish a committee to oversee the company’s policies and practices relating to public policy issues, including human rights, where existing committees’ charters
requires it to exercise oversight over the Company’s policies and programs relating to human rights. Thus, there is no gap between what the Proposal seeks (formation of a new “human rights” committee) and the Committee’s Charter.

In addition, the Staff has concurred in the exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(10) of proposals that duplicate a company’s current practices and policies. As described above, the Company has multiple policies designed to monitor and mitigate the potential impacts of human rights issues and violations. To the extent the Proponent is asking the Company to adopt policies and procedures to mitigate the Company’s exposure to “risks related to human rights,” the Company has already done so through its current policies, which specify procedures to monitor and respond to human rights issues that impact the Company.

For the foregoing reasons, the Company believes that the Proposal may be excluded from the 2020 Proxy Materials pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10).

empowered such committees to perform the actions requested in the proposal); Applied Materials, Inc. (avail. Dec. 21, 2018) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10) requesting the board establish a committee to oversee the company’s “policies including human rights . . . affecting the company’s business,” where an existing committee’s charter empowered such committee to perform the actions requested in the proposal); Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. (avail. Feb. 12, 2014) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10), requesting the board form a public policy committee where an existing committee’s charter empowered such committee to perform the actions requested in the proposal).

See Apple Inc. (avail. Dec. 11, 2014) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10), requesting the company establish a public policy committee to oversee the company’s practices relating to certain issues where the company argued, among other things, that it had substantially implemented the proposal through its policies and procedures addressing certain of the issues identified in the proposal); Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (Mar. 27, 2014) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10), urging the company’s compensation committee to include in the metrics used to determine senior executive incentive compensation at least one metric related to employee engagement where the company’s management incentive plan already included this type of metric); Dominion Resources Inc. (avail. Feb. 5, 2013) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10), to prepare a report to address plans for alternative energy sources where the company already adhered to state regulations requiring disclosure of a plan to, among other things, evaluate the benefits of alternative energy options); Deere & Co. (Nov. 13, 2012) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10), requesting the board review and amend the company’s code of business conduct to include human rights as a guide for its operations where the code of business conduct already addressed and articulated the company’s commitment to human rights); The Limited, Inc. (avail. March 15, 1996) (concurring in the exclusion of a proposal, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10), requesting the preparation of a report addressing the company’s reaction to labor violations by suppliers where the company had a policy in place that required suppliers to agree to a code of conduct addressing the concerns of the proposal).

In addition, the Proposal is misleading (and may be excluded pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(3)) to the extent it asserts that the Company is exerting governmental-like force to restrict Second Amendment rights. The Proponent states in the supporting statement that the Company is “placing extra-governmental restrictions on Americans seeking to exercise their Second Amendment rights.” The Company is not, nor has it ever been, a state or federal governmental body and does not have the ability to impose regulatory restrictions on any American’s Second Amendment rights, and any reference to the Company exerting governmental-like force could be confusing to stockholders.
Mission

The Nomination, Governance and Public Affairs Committee (the “Committee”) of Citigroup Inc. (“Citi” or the “Company”) is responsible for (i) identifying individuals qualified to become Board members and recommending to the Board the director nominees for the next annual meeting of stockholders, (ii) leading the Board in its annual review of the Board’s performance, (iii) recommending to the Board directors for each committee for appointment by the Board, (iv) reviewing the Company’s policies and programs that relate to public issues of significance to the Company and the public at large and (v) reviewing the Company’s relationships with external constituencies and issues that impact the Company’s reputation, and advising management as to its approach to each.

Membership

The members of the Committee shall (a) meet the independence requirements of the New York Stock Exchange corporate governance rules and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations governing director independence, as determined by the Board; (b) qualify as “non-employee directors” as defined under Section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act; and (c) qualify as “outside directors” under Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. Members of the Committee and the Committee Chair shall be appointed by and may be removed by the Board on the recommendation of the Committee.

Duties and Responsibilities

The Committee shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

Oversight of Governance Policies

- Review and assess the adequacy of the Company’s policies and practices on corporate governance including the Corporate Governance Guidelines of the Company and recommend any proposed changes to the Board for approval.

- Review transactions between directors, and/or their family members, and the Company for compliance with applicable policies and receive reports from the Transaction Review Committee on any transaction it reviews.
Oversight of Corporate Governance

- Review the appropriateness of the size of the Board relative to its various responsibilities. Review the overall composition of the Board, taking into consideration such factors as business experience and specific areas of expertise of each Board member, and make recommendations to the Board as necessary.

- Develop appropriate criteria and make recommendations to the Board regarding the independence of directors and nominees.

- Nominate annually one of the members of the Board to serve as Chairman of the Board.

- Recommend to the Board the number, identity and responsibilities of Board committees and the Chair and members of each committee. This shall include advising the Board on committee appointments and removal from committees or from the Board, rotation of committee members and Chairs and committee structure and operations.

- Review the adequacy of the charters adopted by each committee of the Board, and recommend changes as necessary.

- Assist the Board in developing criteria for identifying and selecting qualified individuals who may be nominated for election to the Board, which shall reflect at a minimum all applicable laws, rules, regulations and listing standards.

- Recommend to the Board the slate of nominees for election to the Board at the Company’s annual meeting of stockholders.

- As the need arises to fill vacancies, actively seek individuals qualified to become Board members for recommendation to the Board.

- Consider nominations for Board membership recommended by security holders.

- In consultation with the Board and the CEO, either the Committee as a whole or a subcommittee thereof shall, as part of its executive succession planning process, evaluate and nominate potential successors to the CEO. The Committee will also provide an annual report to the Board on CEO succession.

- Periodically review and recommend to the Board the compensation structure for non-employee directors for Board and committee service.
• Periodically assess the effectiveness of the Board in meeting its responsibilities, representing the long-term interests of stockholders.

• Report annually to the Board with an assessment of the Board’s performance.

• Periodically review, and make recommendations to the Board regarding amendments to, the Company’s Major Expenditure Program – Limits of Authority.

Oversight of Public Affairs Issues

• Review Citi’s relationships with major external constituencies, how those constituencies view the Company and the issues raised by them, as it deems appropriate.

• Receive reports from and advise management on the public policy and reputation issues facing Citi.

• Review and advise management on Citi’s relationships with governments and government policies that impact Citi.

• Oversee and receive reports from management on, and review for consistency with applicable policies, political contributions made by the Company and charitable contributions made by the Company and the Citi Foundation.

• Oversee and receive reports from management on the Company’s memberships in trade associations that engage in lobbying activities or make independent expenditures.

• Oversee and receive reports from management on the Company’s lobbying strategy and expenditures.

• Review and make recommendations to the Board on management’s proposed responses to shareholder proposals and consider other shareholder activism issues.

• Review and advise management on Citi’s policies and practices regarding supplier diversity.

• Receive reports from and advise management on the Company’s sustainability policies and programs, including the environment, climate change and human rights.

• Review and advise management on Citi’s global business practices, particularly as they relate to the reputation of the Company, including the
opportunities and challenges of operating in many diverse cultures around the world. The Company’s internal Business Practices Committee shall provide reports to the Committee or to the Board at least annually.

**Other Responsibilities**

- Monitor the orientation and continuing education programs for directors.

- Conduct an annual review of the Committee’s performance and report the results to the Board, periodically assess the adequacy of its charter and recommend changes to the Board as needed.

- Regularly report to the Board on the Committee’s activities.

- Obtain advice and assistance, as needed, from internal or external legal counsel, accounting firms, search firms or other advisors, with the sole authority to retain, terminate and negotiate the terms and conditions of the assignment.

- Delegate responsibility to subcommittees of the Committee as it deems necessary or appropriate.

- Perform any other duties or responsibilities expressly delegated to the Committee by the Board from time to time.