



DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

February 29, 2024

Ning Chiu
Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

Re: Discover Financial Services (the "Company")
Incoming letter dated February 29, 2024

Dear Ning Chiu:

This letter is in regard to your correspondence concerning the shareholder proposal (the "Proposal") submitted to the Company by the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (the "Proponent") for inclusion in the Company's proxy materials for its upcoming annual meeting of security holders. Your letter indicates that the Proponent has withdrawn the Proposal and that the Company therefore withdraws its January 8, 2024, request for a no-action letter from the Division. Because the matter is now moot, we will have no further comment.

Copies of all of the correspondence related to this matter will be made available on our website at <https://www.sec.gov/corpfin/2023-2024-shareholder-proposals-no-action>.

Sincerely,

Rule 14a-8 Review Team

cc: Michael Piccirillo
New York City District Council of Carpenters

January 8, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

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

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of Discover Financial Services, a Delaware corporation (the “**Company**”), and in accordance with Rule 14a-8(j) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “**Exchange Act**”), we are filing this letter with respect to the shareholder proposal (the “**Proposal**”) submitted by Joseph A. Geiger on behalf of the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (the “**Proponent**”) for inclusion in the proxy materials the Company intends to distribute in connection with its 2024 Annual Meeting of Shareholders (the “**2024 Proxy Materials**”). The Proposal is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

We hereby request confirmation that the Staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the “**Staff**”) will not recommend any enforcement action if, in reliance on Rule 14a-8, the Company omits the Proposal from the 2024 Proxy Materials.

In accordance with relevant Staff guidance, we are submitting this letter and its attachments to the Staff through the Staff’s online Shareholder Proposal Form. In accordance with Rule 14a-8(j), we are simultaneously sending a copy of this letter and its attachments to the Proponent as notice of the Company’s intent to omit the Proposal from the 2024 Proxy Materials. This letter constitutes the Company’s statement of the reasons it deems the omission of the Proposal to be proper. We have been advised by the Company as to the factual matters set forth herein.

THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal states:

Resolved: That the shareholders of Discover Financial Services (“Company”) hereby request that the board of directors take the necessary action to amend its director election resignation bylaw that requires each director nominee to submit an irrevocable conditional resignation to the Company to be effective upon the director's failure to receive the required shareholder majority vote support in an uncontested election. The proposed amended resignation bylaw shall require the Board to accept a tendered resignation absent the finding of a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation. Further, if the Board does not accept a tendered resignation and the director remains as a “holdover” director, the resignation bylaw shall stipulate that should a “holdover” director not be re-elected at the next annual election of directors, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote. The Board shall report the reasons for its actions to accept or reject a tendered resignation in a Form 8-K filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

REASON FOR EXCLUSION OF THE PROPOSAL

The Company believes that the Proposal may be properly omitted from the 2024 Proxy Materials pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1) because the Proponent failed to provide the requisite proof of continuous share ownership in response to the Company's proper requests for that information.

Background

Based on its postmark date, the Proposal was submitted to the Company by the Proponent on November 29, 2023 (the "**Submission Date**") via FedEx and was received by the Company on November 30, 2023. See Exhibit B. The Proponent's submission did not include any documentary evidence of the Proponent's ownership of Company shares.

On December 1, 2023, the Company acknowledged receipt of the Proposal and requested that the Proponent forward the proof of ownership when available. See Exhibit C. After not hearing further from the Proponent, the Company properly sought verification of share ownership and other documentary support from the Proponent by sending a letter identifying the proof of ownership deficiency, notifying the Proponent of the requirements of Rule 14a-8 and explaining how the Proponent could cure the procedural deficiency (the "**First Deficiency Notice**"). The First Deficiency Notice, which, together with proof of receipt of the hard copy by the Proponent, is attached hereto as Exhibit D, provided detailed information regarding the "record" holder requirements, as clarified by Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (Oct. 18, 2011) ("**SLB 14F**") and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (Nov. 3, 2021) ("**SLB 14G**"), and attached a copy of Rule 14a-8, SLB 14F, and SLB 14G. The Company sent the First Deficiency Notice to the Proponent via email and overnight delivery on December 11, 2023, which was within 14 calendar days of the Company's receipt of the Proposal.

On December 14, 2023, the Proponent replied by email to the First Deficiency Notice and provided a letter from BNY Mellon, also dated December 14, 2023 (the "**BNY Letter**"), verifying ownership of 15,900 Company shares for at least one year prior to and including November 28, 2023. Additionally, a representative from BNY Mellon also sent an email to the Company, attaching the BNY Letter. Both emails are included in Exhibit E. As discussed in more detail in the analysis below, the BNY Letter contained a procedural deficiency in that it verified ownership for the period of 365 days preceding the Submission Date, but *not* up to and including the Submission Date, as required by Rule 14a-8(b).

Accordingly, the Company again sought verification of share ownership from the Proponent. On December 15, 2023, the Company sent a letter, again via both email and overnight delivery (the "**Second Deficiency Notice**," and together with the First Deficiency Notice, the "**Deficiency Notices**") clearly pointing out the relevant procedural deficiency in the BNY Letter. In particular, the Second Deficiency Notice, which together with proof of receipt of the hard copy by the Proponent is attached hereto as Exhibit F, stated:

The Email Response is insufficient because it only provided proof of ownership from the period of November 28, 2023 for "at least one year" prior to that date, rather than at least the period from November 29, 2022 to November 29, 2023 (the Submission Date). As noted in the enclosed Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G, the SEC views a proposal's submission date as the date the proposal was postmarked or transmitted electronically. Therefore, we are asking again that you please provide a revised written statement from

the “record” holder of the securities verifying proof of ownership to cover the requisite period.

The Deficiency Notices make clear that proof of ownership must cover the relevant period “prior to and including the Submission Date.” On December 18, 2023, the Proponent replied to the Company by re-attaching a copy of the same BNY Letter previously submitted and dated December 14, 2023, without correcting the deficiency identified. See Exhibit G. As of the date of this letter, the Company has not received any further proof of ownership from the Proponent. After waiting at least the 14-day period from the date the Proponent would have received the Second Deficiency Notice, on January 3, 2024, the Company sent an email to the Proponent asking the Proponent to withdraw given sufficient proof of ownership had not been received. See Exhibit H. The Proponent did not respond to that correspondence.

The Proposal May Be Excluded under Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1) Because the Proponent Failed to Provide Sufficient Proof of its Continuous Ownership of the Company’s Shares to Satisfy the Ownership Requirements of Rule 14a-8(b).

The Company may exclude the Proposal under Rule 14a-8(f)(1) because the Proponent failed to substantiate its eligibility to submit the Proposal in compliance with Rule 14a-8(b). Rule 14a-8(b) requires that the Proponent demonstrate that the Proponent has continuously owned at least:

- (1) \$2,000 in market value of the Company’s shares entitled to vote on the Proposal for at least three years preceding *and including* the Submission Date;
- (2) \$15,000 in market value of the Company’s shares entitled to vote on the Proposal for at least two years preceding *and including* the Submission Date; or
- (3) \$25,000 in market value of the Company’s shares entitled to vote on the Proposal for at least one year preceding *and including* the Submission Date (each an “Ownership Requirement,” and collectively, the “**Ownership Requirements**”). [emphasis added]

Each of the Ownership Requirements were specifically described by the Company in the Deficiency Notices.

Rule 14a-8(f) provides that a company may exclude a shareholder proposal if the proponent fails to provide evidence of eligibility under Rule 14a-8, including the beneficial ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b), provided that the company timely notifies the proponent of the problem and the proponent fails to correct the deficiency within the required time. SLB 14 specifies that when the shareholder is not the registered holder, the shareholder “is responsible for proving his or her eligibility to submit a proposal to the company,” which the shareholder may do in any of the ways provided for in Rule 14a-8(b)(2). See Section C.1.c, SLB 14. SLB 14F provides that proof of ownership letters may fail to satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)’s requirements if they do not verify ownership “for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal [was] submitted” and notes that this deficiency is a common error by shareholders submitting shareholder proposals. This deficiency may occur if the letter verifies ownership as of a date just before the submission date (leaving a gap between the verification date and the submission date) and thereby failing to provide proof of “beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted.” SLB 14F. The guidance in SLB 14F remains applicable even though Rule 14a-8 has since been amended to provide the tiered ownership thresholds described above. In each case, consistent with the Staff’s guidance in SLB 14F and as required by Rule 14a-8(b), a shareholder proponent must submit adequate proof demonstrating continuous ownership of the requisite amount of company shares for the requisite time period.

The Staff has consistently concurred with the exclusion of proposals pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1) where, after receiving proper notice from a company, the proof of ownership submitted failed to establish that the shareholder had continuously held the requisite amount of company securities for the entire required period. See e.g., *Ansys Inc.* (Mar. 15, 2023) (permitting exclusion where the company received a broker letter verifying the proponent's ownership for two years and 363 days preceding and including the submission date); *Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc.* (Nov. 8, 2022) (same); *Visa Inc.* (Nov. 8, 2022) (permitting exclusion where the company received a broker letter verifying the proponent's ownership for two years and 227 days preceding and including the submission date); *Exxon Mobil Corp.* (Feb. 26, 2021) (permitting exclusion where the company received a broker letter verifying the proponent's ownership for the 12 months preceding November 30, 2020, which was one day less than the required one-year period given proponent submitted the proposal on December 1, 2020); *Mondelēz International, Inc.* (Feb. 11, 2014) (permitting exclusion where the company received a broker letter verifying the proponent's ownership for the 12 months preceding November 27, 2013, which was two days less than the required one-year period given proponent submitted the proposal on November 29, 2013); *PepsiCo, Inc.* (Jan. 10, 2013) (permitting exclusion where the company received a broker letter verifying the proponent's ownership for the 12 months preceding November 19, 2012, which was one day less than the required one-year period given proponent submitted the proposal on November 20, 2012).

As discussed above, the BNY Letter verified continuous ownership of the Company's shares for the period of 365 days preceding but *not* up to and including the Submission Date (i.e., from November 28, 2022 to November 28, 2023 and not from November 29, 2022 to November 29, 2023). The BNY Letter therefore did not contain adequate documentary evidence of the Proponent's continuous ownership of Company shares for the requisite time period set forth in Rule 14a-8(b). The Company satisfied its obligation under Rule 14a-8 by transmitting to the Proponent in a timely manner the Deficiency Notices, which specifically set forth the information and instructions listed above and attached copies of Rule 14a-8, SLB 14F, and SLB 14G. See Exhibit D and Exhibit F. However, despite the clear explanation in the Deficiency Notices that the Proponent had to provide the requisite documentary support within the time period specified and as required by Rule 14a-8(f)(1), the Proponent failed to do so.

Therefore, the Proponent has not demonstrated eligibility under Rule 14a-8 to submit the Proposal. As such, and consistent with the precedents described above, the Proposal is properly excludable under Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, we request your confirmation that the Staff will not recommend enforcement action to the Securities and Exchange Commission if the Company omits the Proposal from its 2024 Proxy Materials.

Respectfully yours,



Ning Chiu

Attachment

cc w/ att: Kevin Coleman, Director & Assistant General Counsel
Discover Financial Services

John Geiger, New York City Carpenters Pension Fund

Proposal

Director Election Resignation Bylaw Proposal

Resolved: That the shareholders of Discover Financial Services (“Company”) hereby request that the board of directors take the necessary action to amend its director election resignation bylaw that requires each director nominee to submit an irrevocable conditional resignation to the Company to be effective upon the director's failure to receive the required shareholder majority vote support in an uncontested election. The proposed amended resignation bylaw shall require the Board to accept a tendered resignation absent the finding of a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation. Further, if the Board does not accept a tendered resignation and the director remains as a “holdover” director, the resignation bylaw shall stipulate that should a “holdover” director not be re-elected at the next annual election of directors, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote. The Board shall report the reasons for its actions to accept or reject a tendered resignation in a Form 8-K filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Supporting Statement: The Proposal requests that the Board amend its director resignation bylaw to enhance director accountability. The Company has established in its bylaws a majority vote standard for use in an uncontested director election, an election in which the number of nominees equal the number of open board seats. Under applicable state corporate law, a director's term extends until his or her successor is elected and qualified, or until he or she resigns or is removed from office. Therefore, an incumbent director who fails to receive the required vote for election under a majority vote standard continues to serve as a “holdover” director until the next meeting of shareholders. A Company resignation bylaw addresses the continued status of an incumbent director who fails to be re-elected by requiring such director to tender his or her resignation for Board consideration.

The proposed new director resignation bylaw will set a more demanding standard of review for addressing director resignations than that contained in the Company's current resignation bylaw. The resignation bylaw will require the reviewing directors to articulate a compelling reason or reasons for not accepting a tendered resignation and allowing an un-elected director to continue to serve as a “holdover” director. Importantly, if a director's resignation is not accepted and he or she continues as a “holdover” director but again fails to be elected at the next annual meeting of shareholders, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days following the election vote certification. While providing the Board latitude to accept or not accept the initial resignation of an incumbent director that fails to receive majority vote support, the amended bylaw will establish the shareholder vote as the final word when a continuing “holdover” director is not re-elected. The Proposal's enhancement of the director resignation process will establish shareholder director election voting as a more consequential governance right.

Correspondence

RCVD

NOV 30 2023

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA
NEW YORK CITY & VICINITY DISTRICT COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS

JOSEPH A. GEIGER
Executive Secretary - Treasurer

PAUL CAPURSO
President / Asst EST

DAVID CARABALOSO
Vice President / Asst EST



395 HUDSON STREET - 9TH FLOOR

NEW YORK, N.Y. 10014

PHONE: (212) 366-7500

FAX: (212) 675-3118

www.nycdistrictcouncil.com

SENT VIA OVERNIGHT UPS

November 28, 2023

Hope D. Mehlman
Executive Vice President, Chief Legal Officer
General Counsel and Secretary
Discover Financial Services
2500 Lake Cook Road
Riverwoods, IL 60015


Dear Ms. Mehlman:

I hereby submit the enclosed shareholder proposal ("Proposal") on behalf of the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund ("Fund"), for inclusion in the Discover Financial Services ("Company") proxy statement to be circulated in conjunction with the next annual meeting of shareholders. The Proposal relates to the issue of director resignations and is submitted under Rule 14(a)-8 (Proposals of Security Holders) of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission proxy regulations.

The Fund is the beneficial owner of shares of the Company's common stock, with a market value of at least \$25,000, which shares have been held continuously for more than a year prior to and including the date of the submission of the Proposal. Verification of this ownership by the record holder of the shares, BNY Mellon, will be sent under separate cover. The Fund intends to hold the shares through the date of the Company's next annual meeting of shareholders. Either the undersigned or a designated representative will present the Fund's Proposal for consideration at the annual meeting of shareholders.

If you would like to discuss the Proposal, please contact Michael Piccirillo at mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org. Mr. Piccirillo will be available to discuss the proposal on Tuesday, December 12, or Tuesday, December 19, from 1:00PM to 5:00PM (ET) either day or other mutually agreeable date and time. Please forward any correspondence related to the proposal to Mr. Piccirillo, New York City District Council of Carpenters, 395 Hudson Street, 9th Floor, New York, NY 10014 or at the email address above.

Sincerely,


Joseph A. Geiger
Fund Co-Chair - Trustee

cc. Michael Piccirillo
Edward J. Durkin
Enclosure

Director Election Resignation Bylaw Proposal

Resolved: That the shareholders of Discover Financial Services (“Company”) hereby request that the board of directors take the necessary action to amend its director election resignation bylaw that requires each director nominee to submit an irrevocable conditional resignation to the Company to be effective upon the director’s failure to receive the required shareholder majority vote support in an uncontested election. The proposed amended resignation bylaw shall require the Board to accept a tendered resignation absent the finding of a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation. Further, if the Board does not accept a tendered resignation and the director remains as a “holdover” director, the resignation bylaw shall stipulate that should a “holdover” director not be re-elected at the next annual election of directors, that director’s new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote. The Board shall report the reasons for its actions to accept or reject a tendered resignation in a Form 8-K filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Supporting Statement: The Proposal requests that the Board amend its director resignation bylaw to enhance director accountability. The Company has established in its bylaws a majority vote standard for use in an uncontested director election, an election in which the number of nominees equal the number of open board seats. Under applicable state corporate law, a director’s term extends until his or her successor is elected and qualified, or until he or she resigns or is removed from office. Therefore, an incumbent director who fails to receive the required vote for election under a majority vote standard continues to serve as a “holdover” director until the next meeting of shareholders. A Company resignation bylaw addresses the continued status of an incumbent director who fails to be re-elected by requiring such director to tender his or her resignation for Board consideration.

The proposed new director resignation bylaw will set a more demanding standard of review for addressing director resignations than that contained in the Company’s current resignation bylaw. The resignation bylaw will require the reviewing directors to articulate a compelling reason or reasons for not accepting a tendered resignation and allowing an un-elected director to continue to serve as a “holdover” director. Importantly, if a director’s resignation is not accepted and he or she continues as a “holdover” director but again fails to be elected at the next annual meeting of shareholders, that director’s new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days following the election vote certification. While providing the Board latitude to accept or not accept the initial resignation of an incumbent director that fails to receive majority vote support, the amended bylaw will establish the shareholder vote as the final word when a continuing “holdover” director is not re-elected. The Proposal’s enhancement of the director resignation process will establish shareholder director election voting as a more consequential governance right.

TO REUSE: Mark through all previous shipping labels and barcodes

Align top of FedEx Express® shipping label

ORIGIN ID:OBKA (224) 405-0900
MAILROOM
DISCOVER FINANCIAL SERVICES
2500 LAKE COOK ROAD
RIVERHOODS, IL 60015
UNITED STATES US


SHIP DATE: 29NOV23
ACTWT: 1.40 LB
CAD: 0270319/CAFE3707

BILL SENDER

TO **POUCH MAIL**
DISCOVER FINANCIAL SERVICES
800 PRIDES CROSSING

NEWARK DE 19713
REF: 451246

DEPT: SUE



FedEx
Express



J231022110201


TRK# 7135 0423 0279
0201

THU - 30 NOV 12:00P
PRIORITY OVERNIGHT

sable Pa **XE ILGA**

19713
DE-US **PHL**

Part # 107077-434 MTW EXP 07/24



Correspondence

From: [REDACTED]
To: mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Shareholder proposal
Date: Friday, December 1, 2023 9:34:50 PM

We are writing to acknowledge receipt of the shareholder proposal on behalf of the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund titled "Director Election Resignation Bylaw Proposal." As indicated in your letter, please provide the verification of ownership by the record holder, BNY Mellon. Thank you.

Hope Mehlman
EVP, CLO, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary
2500 Lake Cook Road, Riverwoods, IL 60015



Executive Assistant: Vicky Kennedy
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Internal

First Deficiency Notice

From: [Elaine Wexler](#) on behalf of [REDACTED]
To: mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org
Subject: Stockholder Proposal Document
Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 10:14:29 AM
Attachments: [Carpenters Proposal Ownership \(Signed with Attachments\).pdf](#)

Good Morning:

Please find the attached stockholder proposal document for your information. I will also have this document overnight mailed to you.

Please notify my assistant, [Elaine Wexler](#), if you have trouble opening the attachment.

Sincerely,
Kevin Coleman

Kevin M. Coleman | Discover Financial Services
Director & Assistant General Counsel

Email: [REDACTED]

Executive Assistant: Elaine Wexler
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Internal



VIA EMAIL AND OVERNIGHT MAIL

December 11, 2023

Re: Notice of Deficiency Related to Stockholder Proposal

Attn: Michael Piccirillo
New York City District Council of Carpenters
395 Hudson Street, 9th Floor
New York
NY 10014

Dear Mr. Piccirillo:

I am writing on behalf of Discover Financial Services (the "Company"), which received a stockholder proposal entitled "Director Election Resignation Bylaw Proposal" submitted on November 29, 2023 (the "Submission Date") via UPS by Joseph A. Geiger on behalf of the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (the "Proponent") for inclusion in the Company's proxy statement for the 2024 annual meeting. The proposal contains a procedural deficiency, which Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") regulations require us to bring to your attention.

Ownership Eligibility. Your letter references a proof of ownership that will be sent under separate cover, which we have not received to date. Rule 14a-8(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, requires that in order to be eligible to submit a proposal for inclusion in the Company's proxy statement for an annual meeting, each proponent must have continuously held as of the Submission Date, at least (i) \$2,000 in market value of the Company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal at the meeting for at least three years, (ii) \$15,000 in market value of the Company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal at the meeting for at least two years or (iii) \$25,000 in market value of the Company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least a year.

Note that SEC rules do not permit a proponent to aggregate the proponent's shareholdings with those of another shareholder or group of shareholders to meet the ownership eligibility requirement.

The Company's stock records do not indicate that the Proponent is currently the registered holder on the Company's books and records of any shares of the Company's common stock, and you have not provided proof of ownership with the proposal.

Method for Demonstrating Proof of Ownership. As explained in Rule 14a-8 and SEC staff guidance, a proponent must provide sufficient proof of its continuous ownership of the requisite number of shares during the applicable time period preceding and including the Submission Date, by providing any of:

- **A written statement from the “record” holder of the securities.** To demonstrate ownership, you must submit to us a written statement from the “record” holder of the shares (usually a bank or broker) verifying that the Proponent continuously held at least \$2,000, \$15,000 or \$25,000 in market value of the Company’s securities entitled to vote on the proposal at the meeting for at least the three-year, two-year, or one-year period, respectively, prior to and including the Submission Date; or
- **SEC filings.** You can alternatively provide a (i) copy of a filed Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4, Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting the Proponent’s ownership of shares as of or before the date on which the required holding period begins and (ii) a written statement that the Proponent continuously held the required number of shares for the required time period through the Submission Date.

To help shareholders comply with the requirements when submitting proof of ownership to companies, the SEC’s Division of Corporation Finance published Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (“SLB 14F”), dated October 18, 2011, and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (“SLB 14G”), dated October 16, 2012. We have attached copies of both for your reference. As the SEC adopted amendments to Rule 14a-8 that became effective in 2021, please note that SLB 14F and SLB 14G do not reflect those amendments and to the extent any provisions are inconsistent, Rule 14a-8 governs in all respects. A copy of Rule 14a-8 is also enclosed for your reference.

Please note that most large U.S. banks and brokers deposit their customers’ securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company (“DTC”), a registered clearing agency that acts as a securities depository (DTC is also known through the account name of Cede & Co.). SLB 14F and SLB 14G provide that for securities held through the DTC, only DTC participants should be viewed as “record” holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. You can confirm whether the Proponent’s bank or broker is a DTC participant by checking DTC’s participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at <http://www.dtcc.com/client-center/dtc-directories>.

If the Proponent holds shares through a bank or broker that is not a DTC participant, you will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the bank or broker holds the Proponent’s shares. You should be able to find out the name of the DTC participant by asking the Proponent’s bank or broker. If the DTC participant that holds the Proponent’s shares knows the Proponent’s bank or broker’s holdings, but does not know the Proponent’s holdings, you may satisfy the proof of ownership requirements by submitting two proof of ownership statements—one from the Proponent’s bank or broker confirming the Proponent’s ownership and the other from the DTC participant confirming the bank or broker’s ownership. Both should verify the Proponent’s ownership for the required time period prior to and including the Submission Date.

SEC rules require that this defect that we have identified be remedied, and your response to this letter must be postmarked or transmitted electronically to us no later than 14 calendar days from the date you receive this letter. Please send such documentation (1) via email to Kevin Coleman at [REDACTED] or (2) via mail to Discover Financial Services, Attn: Elaine Wexler, 2500 Lake Cook Road, Riverwoods, IL 60015, with a copy via email to [REDACTED]. The failure to correct the deficiencies within this time period will provide the Company with a basis to exclude the proposal from the Company's proxy statement for the 2024 annual meeting.

Sincerely,

Kevin Coleman

Kevin M. Coleman
Director & Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure

§ 240.14a-8 Shareholder proposals.

This section addresses when a company must include a shareholder's proposal in its proxy statement and identify 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) To be eligible to submit a proposal, you must satisfy the following requirements:

(i) You must have continuously held:

(A) At least \$2,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years; or

(B) At least \$15,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least two years; or

(C) At least \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year; or

(D) The amounts specified in paragraph (b)(3) of this section. This paragraph (b)(1)(i)(D) will expire on the same date that § 240.14a-8(b)(3) expires; and

(ii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; and

(iii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you are able to meet with the company in person or via teleconference no less than 10 calendar days, nor more than 30 calendar days, after submission of the shareholder proposal. You must include your contact information as well as business days and specific times that you are available to discuss the proposal with the company. You must identify times that are

within the regular business hours of the company's principal executive offices. If these hours are not disclosed in the company's proxy statement for the prior year's annual meeting, you must identify times that are between 9 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. in the time zone of the company's principal executive offices. If you elect to co-file a proposal, all co-filers must either:

(A) Agree to the same dates and times of availability, or

(B) Identify a single lead filer who will provide dates and times of the lead filer's availability to engage on behalf of all co-filers; and

(iv) If you use a representative to submit a shareholder proposal on your behalf, you must provide the company with written documentation that:

(A) Identifies the company to which the proposal is directed;

(B) Identifies the annual or special meeting for which the proposal is submitted;

(C) Identifies you as the proponent and identifies the person acting on your behalf as your representative;

(D) Includes your statement authorizing the designated representative to submit the proposal and otherwise act on your behalf;

(E) Identifies the specific topic of the proposal to be submitted;

(F) Includes your statement supporting the proposal; and

(G) Is signed and dated by you.

(v) The requirements of paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section shall not apply to shareholders that are entities so long as the representative's authority to act on the shareholder's behalf is apparent and self-evident such that a reasonable person would understand that the agent has authority to submit the proposal and otherwise act on the shareholder's behalf.

(vi) For purposes of paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, you may not aggregate your holdings with those of another shareholder or group of shareholders to meet the requisite amount of securities necessary to be eligible to submit a proposal.

(2) One of the following methods must be used to demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal:

(i) 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 requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the meeting of shareholders.

(ii) 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:

(A) 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 at least \$2,000, \$15,000, or \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years, two years, or one year, respectively. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; or

(B) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you were required to file, and filed, a Schedule 13D (§ 240.13d-101), Schedule 13G (§ 240.13d-102), Form 3 (§ 249.103 of this chapter), Form 4 (§ 249.104 of this chapter), and/or Form 5 (§ 249.105 of this chapter), or amendments to those documents or updated forms, demonstrating that you meet at least one of the share ownership requirements under paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section. If you have filed one or more of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting to the company:

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

(2) Your written statement that you continuously held at least \$2,000, \$15,000, or \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years, two years, or one year, respectively; and

(3) Your written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

(c) Question 3: How many proposals may I submit? Each person may submit no more than one proposal, directly or indirectly, to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting. A person may not rely on the securities holdings of another person for the purpose of meeting the eligibility requirements and submitting multiple proposals for a particular shareholders' meeting.

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

(e) 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.

(f) 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.

(g) 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.

(h) Question 8: Must I appear personally at the shareholders' meeting to present the proposal?

(1) Either you, or your representative who is qualified 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.

(i) 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 (i)(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 (i)(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 (i)(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 (i)(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 to Item 402 of Regulation S-K (§ 229.402 of this chapter) or any successor to Item 402 (a "say-on-pay vote") or that relates to the frequency of say-on-pay votes, provided that in the most recent shareholder vote required by § 240.14a-21(b) of this chapter a single year (i.e., one, two, or three years) received approval of a majority of votes cast on the matter and the company has adopted a policy on the frequency of say-on-pay votes that is consistent with the choice of the majority of votes cast in the most recent shareholder vote required by § 240.14a-21(b) of this chapter.

(11) Duplication: If the proposal substantially duplicates another proposal previously submitted to the company by another proponent that will be included in the company's proxy materials for the same meeting;

(12) Resubmissions. If the proposal addresses substantially the same subject matter as a proposal, or proposals, previously included in the company's proxy materials within the preceding five calendar years if the most recent vote occurred within the preceding three calendar years and the most recent vote was:

- (i) Less than 5 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on once;
- (ii) Less than 15 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on twice; or
- (iii) Less than 25 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on three or more times.

(13) Specific amount of dividends: If the proposal relates to specific amounts of cash or stock dividends.

(j) Question 10: What procedures must the company follow if it intends to exclude my proposal?

(1) If the company intends to exclude a proposal from its proxy materials, it must file its reasons with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy with the Commission. The company must simultaneously provide you with a copy of its submission. The Commission staff may permit the company to make its submission later than 80 days before the company files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy, if the company demonstrates good cause for missing the deadline.

(2) The company must file six paper copies of the following:

(i) The proposal;

(ii) An explanation of why the company believes that it may exclude the proposal, which should, if possible, refer to the most recent applicable authority, such as prior Division letters issued under the rule; and

(iii) A supporting opinion of counsel when such reasons are based on matters of state or foreign law.

(k) 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 fully your submission before it issues its response. You should submit six paper copies of your response.

(l) 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?

(1) 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.

(2) The company is not 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.

**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 18, 2011

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the “Division”). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division’s Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://ts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

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.² 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.³

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

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).

DTC.⁴ 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.⁶ 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-8⁷ 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.

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.

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

⁶ See Net Capital Rule, Release No. 34-31511 (Nov. 24, 1992) [57 FR 56973] ("Net Capital Rule Release"), at Section II.C.

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.

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/downloads/membership/directories/dtc/alpha.pdf>.

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.⁹

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.¹³

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,¹⁴ it has not suggested that a revision triggers

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.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Adoption of Amendments Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12999 (Nov. 22, 1976) [41 FR 52994].

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.¹⁵

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.¹⁶

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.

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.

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.

**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 16, 2012

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division"). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division's Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://tts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

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.¹ 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.² 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. 14B, 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(i)(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-9.³

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 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.

From: [Elaine Wexler](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] FedEx Shipment 713504236071: Your package has been delivered
Date: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 9:55:18 AM

See below. FedEx was delivered.

Elaine Wexler | Discover Financial Services

Executive Assistant

Tomas Rivera, VP & Associate General Counsel, Human Resources and Employment Practices Unit

Lachelle Koon, VP & Assistant Corporate Secretary

Efie Vainikos, VP & Associate General Counsel, Assistant Corporate Secretary – Securities, SEC Reporting & Legal Risk

2500 Lake Cook Road, Riverwoods, IL 60015



Internal

From: TrackingUpdates@fedex.com <TrackingUpdates@fedex.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 8:43 AM

To: Elaine Wexler [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL] FedEx Shipment 713504236071: Your package has been delivered

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL

DO NOT open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

FedEx




Hi. Your package was
delivered Tue, 12/12/2023 at
9:33am.



Delivered to 395 HUDSON ST, NEW YORK, NY 10014

[OBTAIN PROOF OF DELIVERY](#)



Delivery picture not showing? [View](#) in browser.

How was your delivery ?



Personal Message

PAPERWORK

TRACKING NUMBER [713504236071](#)

FROM DISCOVER
2500 LAKE COOK ROAD
RIVERWOODS, IL, US, 60015

TO NEW YORK CITY DISTRICT COUNCIL OF
MICHAEL PICCIRILLO
CARPENTERS
395 HUDSON STREET
9TH FLOOR

NEW YORK, NY, US, 10014

DEPARTMENT NUMBER RAYMOND BRZOSTOWSKI

REFERENCE 001145

SHIPPER REFERENCE 001145

SHIP DATE Mon 12/11/2023 06:50 PM

DELIVERED TO Residence

PACKAGING TYPE FedEx Envelope

ORIGIN RIVERWOODS, IL, US, 60015

DESTINATION NEW YORK, NY, US, 10014

NUMBER OF PIECES 1

TOTAL SHIPMENT WEIGHT 0.50 LB

SERVICE TYPE FedEx Standard Overnight

FedEx



Notifications, from start to finish

Get push notifications when you pair FedEx Delivery Manager® with the FedEx® Mobile app. You can activate alerts in the app to track your package. Then listen for the virtual doorbell chime that lets you know your package was delivered.

[DOWNLOAD THE MOBILE APP](#)

This tracking update has been requested by:

Company name: DISCOVER

Name: ELAINE WEXLER- LEGAL

Email: [REDACTED]

FOLLOW FEDEX



Please do not respond to this message. This email was sent from an unattended mailbox. This report was generated at approximately 8:42 AM CST 12/12/2023.

All weights are estimated.

To track the latest status of your shipment, click on the tracking number above.

Standard transit is the date and time the package is scheduled to be delivered by, based on the selected service, destination and ship date. Limitations and exceptions may apply. Please see the FedEx Service Guide for terms and conditions of service, including the FedEx Money-Back Guarantee, or contact your FedEx Customer Support representative.

© 2023 Federal Express Corporation. The content of this message is protected by copyright and trademark laws under U.S. and international law. Review our [privacy policy](#). All rights reserved.

Thank you for your business.

Correspondence

From: [Porco, Robert D](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Verification Letter
Date: Thursday, December 14, 2023 9:34:05 AM
Attachments: [Discover Financial Record Lts BNYM Signed.pdf](#)

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL
DO NOT open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Hi Kevin,

Happy Holidays!

I have attached the stock verification letter for the client New York City Carpenters Pension Fund.

If you have any questions please let me know.

Best Regards,
Rob

Robert D Porco

Vice President

Client Service Delivery

Securities Services - BNY Mellon

Relationship Manager

T 412-234-4991

E robert.porco@bnymellon.com | www.bnymellon.com

-
The information contained in this e-mail is provided to you in response to an inquiry or for your information. BNY Mellon is not responsible or liable for the contents of this e-mail if you should include any portion of this e-mail in a direction letter to BNY Mellon. BNY Mellon's responsibility is to execute your instructions as set forth in any letter you provide. This e-mail is intended to bring you promotional information regarding services offered by BNY Mellon Asset Servicing. The Federal CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 requires us to note that if you do not want to receive promotional e-mails from Asset Servicing at this e-mail address, you may reply to this e-mail with "NO E-MAIL" noted within the subject line.

Notice: The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment, is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Access, copying, or re-use of the e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, please return the e-mail to the sender and delete it from your computer. Emails may be interfered with and may contain viruses or other defects. We provide no warranties in relation to these matters. For information on how to help protect yourself from fraud, including cyberfraud and other fraudulent activity, please visit our [Information Security and Protection Page](#). Please refer to <https://disclaimer.bnymellon.com/eu.htm> for certain disclosures relating to European legal entities. Please note that we may use tracking pixels to monitor your interaction with reports and data delivered via this email. To learn how BNY Mellon uses personal information, please read our [Data Privacy Notice](#).



SENT VIA EMAIL ([REDACTED])

December 14, 2023

Kevin M. Coleman
Director & Assistant General Counsel
Discover Financial Services
2500 Lake Cook Road
Riverwoods, IL 60015

RE: Shareholder Proposal Ownership Verification Letter
Dear Mr. Coleman:

BNY Mellon, a Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation participant, serves as custodian for the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (“Fund”). At the request and instruction of the Fund, BNY Mellon confirms that as custodian it is the record holder of shares of Discover Financial Services common stock (CUSIP#254709108) held for the benefit of the Fund.

As of November 28, 2023, the date of the submission of the Fund’s Director Election Resignation Bylaw shareholder proposal, the Fund held, and has held continuously for at least one year, at least 15,900 shares of Discover Financial Services common stock.

If there are any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (412) 234-4991 or at robert.porco@bnymellon.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert D. Porco", written in black ink.

Robert D. Porco
Vice President
BNY Mellon Relationship Manager

cc. Joseph A. Geiger, Fund Trustee
Michael Piccirillo
Edward J. Durkin

From: [Michael Piccirillo](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Verification Letter re Discover
Date: Thursday, December 14, 2023 9:31:11 AM
Attachments: [Discover Financial Record Lts BNYM Signed.pdf](#)

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL
DO NOT open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

tion, please read our [Data Privacy Notice](#).



SENT VIA EMAIL ([REDACTED])

December 14, 2023

Kevin M. Coleman
Director & Assistant General Counsel
Discover Financial Services
2500 Lake Cook Road
Riverwoods, IL 60015

RE: Shareholder Proposal Ownership Verification Letter
Dear Mr. Coleman:

BNY Mellon, a Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation participant, serves as custodian for the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (“Fund”). At the request and instruction of the Fund, BNY Mellon confirms that as custodian it is the record holder of shares of Discover Financial Services common stock (CUSIP#254709108) held for the benefit of the Fund.

As of November 28, 2023, the date of the submission of the Fund’s Director Election Resignation Bylaw shareholder proposal, the Fund held, and has held continuously for at least one year, at least 15,900 shares of Discover Financial Services common stock.

If there are any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (412) 234-4991 or at robert.porco@bnymellon.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert D. Porco", written in black ink.

Robert D. Porco
Vice President
BNY Mellon Relationship Manager

cc. Joseph A. Geiger, Fund Trustee
Michael Piccirillo
Edward J. Durkin

Second Deficiency Notice

From: [Elaine Wexler](#) on behalf of [REDACTED]
To: mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Stockholder Proposal Document
Date: Friday, December 15, 2023 2:37:18 PM
Attachments: [Discover - 1. NYC Carpenters Pension Fund - Director Election Resignation Bylaw - Secondary Deficiency Notice.pdf](#)

Good Morning:

Please find the attached stockholder document for your information. I will also have this document overnight mailed to you.

Please notify my assistant, [Elaine Wexler](#), if you have trouble opening the attachment.

Sincerely,
Kevin Coleman

Elaine Wexler | Discover Financial Services

Executive Assistant

Tomas Rivera, VP & Associate General Counsel, Human Resources and Employment Practices Unit

Lachelle Koon, VP & Assistant Corporate Secretary

Efie Vainikos, VP & Associate General Counsel, Assistant Corporate Secretary – Securities, SEC Reporting & Legal Risk

2500 Lake Cook Road, Riverwoods, IL 60015



Public



VIA EMAIL AND OVERNIGHT MAIL

December 15, 2023

Re: Notice of Deficiency Related to Stockholder Proposal

Attn: Michael Piccirillo
New York City District Council of Carpenters
395 Hudson Street, 9th Floor
New York
NY 10014

Dear Mr. Piccirillo:

I am writing on behalf of Discover Financial Services (the "Company"), which received a stockholder proposal entitled "Director Election Resignation Bylaw Proposal" submitted on November 29, 2023 (the "Submission Date") by Joseph A. Geiger on behalf of the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (the "Proponent") for inclusion in the Company's proxy statement for the 2024 annual meeting. The submission contained a procedural deficiency, which we referenced in our letter to you dated December 11, 2023 (the "Prior Deficiency Notice"). The Prior Deficiency Notice provided information on how to remedy the deficiency we identified.

We received your email correspondence on December 14, 2023 in response to the Prior Deficiency Notice (the "Response Email"). The Response Email does not properly address your ownership of the Company's stock as required under Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. We are writing once more regarding that specific deficiency.

For your reference, another copy of (a) Rule 14a-8, (b) Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F, dated October 18, 2011, and (c) Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G, dated October 16, 2012 is enclosed. These Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") materials are being provided for your benefit and explain in further detail how stockholders should provide the requisite proof of ownership.

As we explained in the Prior Deficiency Notice, Rule 14a-8(b) provides that a stockholder proponent must submit sufficient proof of its continuous ownership of Company shares. Rule 14a-8 requires that you demonstrate that the Proponent has continuously owned at least:

- (1) \$2,000 in market value of the Company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years preceding and including the Submission Date;
- (2) \$15,000 in market value of the Company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least two years preceding and including the Submission Date; or

- (3) \$25,000 in market value of the Company's shares entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year preceding and including the Submission Date (each an "Ownership Requirement," and collectively, the "Ownership Requirements").

As previously explained in the Prior Deficiency Notice, Rule 14a-8(b) and SEC staff guidance provides that sufficient proof must be in the form of either:

- a) **A written statement from the "record" holder of the securities.** To demonstrate ownership, you must submit to us a written statement from the "record" holder of the shares (usually a bank or broker) verifying that the Proponent continuously met at least one of the Ownership Requirements; or
- b) **SEC filings.** You can alternatively provide a (i) copy of a filed Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4, Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting the Proponent's ownership of shares as of or before the date on which the required holding period begins and (ii) a written statement that the Proponent continuously held the required number of shares for the required time period through the Submission Date.

The Email Response is insufficient because it only provided proof of ownership from the period of November 28, 2023 for "at least one year" prior to that date, rather than at least the period from November 29, 2022 to November 29, 2023 (the Submission Date). As noted in the enclosed Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G, the SEC views a proposal's submission date as the date the proposal was postmarked or transmitted electronically. Therefore, we are asking again that you please provide a revised written statement from the "record" holder of the securities verifying proof of ownership to cover the requisite period.

SEC rules require that this defect that we have identified be remedied, and your response to this letter must be postmarked or transmitted electronically to us no later than 14 calendar days from the date you receive this letter. Please send such documentation (1) via email to Kevin Coleman at [REDACTED] or (2) via mail to Discover Financial Services, Attn: Elaine Wexler, 2500 Lake Cook Road, Riverwoods, IL 60015, with a copy via email to [REDACTED]. The failure to correct the deficiencies within this time period will provide the Company with a basis to exclude the proposal from the Company's proxy statement for the 2024 annual meeting.

Sincerely,



Kevin M. Coleman
Director & Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure

§ 240.14a-8 Shareholder proposals.

This section addresses when a company must include a shareholder's proposal in its proxy statement and identify 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) To be eligible to submit a proposal, you must satisfy the following requirements:

(i) You must have continuously held:

(A) At least \$2,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years; or

(B) At least \$15,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least two years; or

(C) At least \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year; or

(D) The amounts specified in paragraph (b)(3) of this section. This paragraph (b)(1)(i)(D) will expire on the same date that § 240.14a-8(b)(3) expires; and

(ii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; and

(iii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you are able to meet with the company in person or via teleconference no less than 10 calendar days, nor more than 30 calendar days, after submission of the shareholder proposal. You must include your contact information as well as business days and specific times that you are available to discuss the proposal with the company. You must identify times that are within the regular business hours of the company's principal executive offices. If these hours are not disclosed in the company's proxy statement for the prior year's annual meeting, you must identify times that are between 9 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. in the time zone of the company's principal executive offices. If you elect to co-file a proposal, all co-filers must either:

(A) Agree to the same dates and times of availability, or

(B) Identify a single lead filer who will provide dates and times of the lead filer's availability to engage on behalf of all co-filers; and

(iv) If you use a representative to submit a shareholder proposal on your behalf, you must provide the company with written documentation that:

(A) Identifies the company to which the proposal is directed;

(B) Identifies the annual or special meeting for which the proposal is submitted;

(C) Identifies you as the proponent and identifies the person acting on your behalf as your representative;

(D) Includes your statement authorizing the designated representative to submit the proposal and otherwise act on your behalf;

(E) Identifies the specific topic of the proposal to be submitted;

(F) Includes your statement supporting the proposal; and

(G) Is signed and dated by you.

(v) The requirements of paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section shall not apply to shareholders that are entities so long as the representative's authority to act on the shareholder's behalf is apparent and self-evident such that a reasonable person would understand that the agent has authority to submit the proposal and otherwise act on the shareholder's behalf.

(vi) For purposes of paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, you may not aggregate your holdings with those of another shareholder or group of shareholders to meet the requisite amount of securities necessary to be eligible to submit a proposal.

(2) One of the following methods must be used to demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal:

(i) 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 requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the meeting of shareholders.

(ii) 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:

(A) 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 at least \$2,000, \$15,000, or \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years, two years, or one year, respectively. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; or

(B) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you were required to file, and filed, a Schedule 13D (§ 240.13d-101), Schedule 13G (§ 240.13d-102), Form 3 (§ 249.103 of this chapter), Form 4 (§ 249.104 of this chapter), and/or Form 5 (§ 249.105 of this chapter), or amendments to those documents or updated forms, demonstrating that you meet at least one of the share ownership requirements under paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section. If you have filed one or more of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting to the company:

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

(2) Your written statement that you continuously held at least \$2,000, \$15,000, or \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years, two years, or one year, respectively; and

(3) Your written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

(c) Question 3: How many proposals may I submit? Each person may submit no more than one proposal, directly or indirectly, to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting. A person may not rely on the securities holdings of another person for the purpose of meeting the eligibility requirements and submitting multiple proposals for a particular shareholders' meeting.

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

(e) 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.

(f) 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.

(g) 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.

(h) Question 8: Must I appear personally at the shareholders' meeting to present the proposal?

(1) Either you, or your representative who is qualified 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.

(i) 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 (i)(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 (i)(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 (i)(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 (i)(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 to Item 402 of Regulation S-K (§ 229.402 of this chapter) or any successor to Item 402 (a "say-on-pay vote") or that relates to the frequency of say-on-pay votes, provided that in the most recent shareholder vote required by § 240.14a-21(b) of this chapter a single year (i.e., one, two, or three

years) received approval of a majority of votes cast on the matter and the company has adopted a policy on the frequency of say-on-pay votes that is consistent with the choice of the majority of votes cast in the most recent shareholder vote required by § 240.14a-21(b) of this chapter.

(11) Duplication: If the proposal substantially duplicates another proposal previously submitted to the company by another proponent that will be included in the company's proxy materials for the same meeting;

(12) Resubmissions. If the proposal addresses substantially the same subject matter as a proposal, or proposals, previously included in the company's proxy materials within the preceding five calendar years if the most recent vote occurred within the preceding three calendar years and the most recent vote was:

- (i) Less than 5 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on once;
- (ii) Less than 15 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on twice; or
- (iii) Less than 25 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on three or more times.

(13) Specific amount of dividends: If the proposal relates to specific amounts of cash or stock dividends.

(j) Question 10: What procedures must the company follow if it intends to exclude my proposal?

(1) If the company intends to exclude a proposal from its proxy materials, it must file its reasons with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy with the Commission. The company must simultaneously provide you with a copy of its submission. The Commission staff may permit the company to make its submission later than 80 days before the company files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy, if the company demonstrates good cause for missing the deadline.

(2) The company must file six paper copies of the following:

- (i) The proposal;
- (ii) An explanation of why the company believes that it may exclude the proposal, which should, if possible, refer to the most recent applicable authority, such as prior Division letters issued under the rule; and
- (iii) A supporting opinion of counsel when such reasons are based on matters of state or foreign law.

(k) 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 fully your submission before it issues its response. You should submit six paper copies of your response.

(l) 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?

(1) 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.

(2) The company is not 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 it files definitive copies of its proxy statement and form of proxy under § 240.14a-6.

**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 18, 2011

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division"). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division's Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://tts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

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.² 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.³

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

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).

depository. Such brokers and banks are often referred to as “participants” in DTC.⁴ 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.⁶ 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-8⁷ 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

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.

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

⁶ See Net Capital Rule, Release No. 34-31511 (Nov. 24, 1992) [57 FR 56973] (“Net Capital Rule Release”), at Section II.C.

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.

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/downloads/membership/directories/dtc/alpha.pdf>.

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.⁹

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

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.

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.

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.

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.¹³

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,¹⁴ it has not suggested that a revision triggers a

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.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Adoption of Amendments Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12999 (Nov. 22, 1976) [41 FR 52994].

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.¹⁵

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.¹⁶

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.

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.

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.

**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 16, 2012

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division"). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division's Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://tts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

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.¹ 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.² 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. 14B, 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(i)(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-9.³

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 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.

From: [Sue Palmer](#)
To: [Elaine Wexler](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] FedEx Shipment 722092349438: Your package has been delivered
Date: Monday, December 18, 2023 10:29:26 AM

Internal

From: TrackingUpdates@fedex.com <TrackingUpdates@fedex.com>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 9:15 AM
To: Sue Palmer [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FedEx Shipment 722092349438: Your package has been delivered

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL
DO NOT open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.



Hi. Your package was delivered Mon, 12/18/2023 at 10:06am.



Delivered to 395 HUDSON ST, NEW YORK, NY 10014

[OBTAIN PROOF OF DELIVERY](#)

Delivery Picture



Delivery picture not showing? [View](#) in browser.

How was your delivery ?



Personal Message

PAPERWORK

TRACKING NUMBER [722092349438](#)

FROM DISCOVER FINANCIAL
2500 LAKE COOK ROAD
RIVERWOODS, IL, US, 60015

TO NEW YORK CITY DISTRICT COUNCIL
OF
MICHAEL PICCIRILLO
CARPENTERS
395 HUDSON STREET
9TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY, US, 10014

DEPARTMENT NUMBER RAYMOND BRZOSTOWSKI

REFERENCE 001257

SHIPPER REFERENCE 001257
SHIP DATE Fri 12/15/2023 06:57 PM
DELIVERED TO Residence
PACKAGING TYPE FedEx Envelope
ORIGIN RIVERWOODS, IL, US, 60015
DESTINATION NEW YORK, NY, US, 10014
NUMBER OF PIECES 1
TOTAL SHIPMENT WEIGHT 0.50 LB
SERVICE TYPE FedEx Priority Overnight

Image removed by sender. FedEx



Notifications, from start to finish

Get push notifications when you pair FedEx Delivery Manager® with the FedEx® Mobile app. You can activate alerts in the app to track your package. Then listen for the virtual doorbell chime that lets you know your package was delivered.

[DOWNLOAD THE MOBILE APP](#)

This tracking update has been requested by:


Company name: DISCOVER FINANCIAL

Name: SUE PALMER

Email: [REDACTED]

FOLLOW FEDEX



 Please do not respond to this message. This email was sent from an unattended mailbox. This report was generated at approximately 9:15 AM CST 12/18/2023.

All weights are estimated.

To track the latest status of your shipment, click on the tracking number above.

Standard transit is the date and time the package is scheduled to be delivered by, based on the selected service, destination and ship date. Limitations and exceptions may apply. Please see the FedEx Service Guide for terms and conditions of service, including the FedEx Money-Back Guarantee, or contact your FedEx Customer Support representative.

© 2023 Federal Express Corporation. The content of this message is protected by copyright and trademark laws under U.S. and international law. Review our [privacy policy](#). All rights reserved.

Thank you for your business.

Correspondence

From: [Michael Piccirillo](#)
To: [REDACTED] [Elaine Wexler](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Verification Letter re Discover
Date: Monday, December 18, 2023 9:34:50 AM
Attachments: [Discover Financial Record Lts BNYM Signed.pdf](#)

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL
DO NOT open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Mr. Coleman,

BNY Mellon is the Custodian for all stock holdings for the NYCDCC Pension Fund.

Michael Piccirillo

NYC District Council Of Carpenters
Area Standards Manager
917-376-5549
[Mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org](mailto:mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org)

From: Porco, Robert D <robert.porco@bnymellon.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 9:13 AM
To: Kristin O'Brien <kobrien@nyccbf.org>
Cc: Michael Piccirillo <mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org>; Jeffrey Covell <Jeffrey_Covell@ajg.com>
Subject: RE: Verification Letter re Discover

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the District Council organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Kristin,

I hope you are doing well.

Please see the attached verification letter.

Best Regards,
Rob

Robert D Porco
Vice President
Client Service Delivery
Securities Services - BNY Mellon
Relationship Manager

T 412-234-4991

E robert.porco@bnymellon.com | www.bnymellon.com

-

The information contained in this e-mail is provided to you in response to an inquiry or for your information. BNY Mellon is not responsible or liable for the contents of this e-mail if you should include any portion of this e-mail in a direction letter to BNY Mellon. BNY Mellon's responsibility is to execute your instructions as set forth in any letter you provide. This e-mail is intended to bring you promotional information regarding services offered by BNY Mellon Asset Servicing. The Federal CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 requires us to note that if you do not want to receive promotional e-mails from Asset Servicing at this e-mail address, you may reply to this e-mail with "NO E-MAIL" noted within the subject line.

From: Kristin O'Brien <KOBrien@nyccbf.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 6:53 AM
To: Porco, Robert D <robert.porco@bnymellon.com>
Cc: Michael Piccirillo <mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org>; Jeffrey Covell <Jeffrey_Covell@ajg.com>
Subject: Verification Letter re Discover

Good morning Robert,

Please see the attached verification letter for Discover Financial.

Thank you,
KOB

Kristin O'Brien Fowlkes, LMSW, CEBS
Executive Director - New York City District Council of Carpenters Benefit Funds
395 Hudson Street
New York, NY 10014
Phone: 212-366-7322
Fax: 212-366-7457
Cell: 646-737-2419
kobrien@nyccbf.org

NYCDCC Benefit Funds logo Hi Def



This email and any attached files are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which this mail is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any use, disclosure, copying or distribution of this email or the attached files by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete this email and attached files from your system.
Thank you.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

Notice: The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment, is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Access, copying, or re-use of the e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, please return the e-mail to the sender and delete it from your computer. Emails may be interfered with and may contain viruses or other defects. We provide no warranties in relation to these matters. For information on how to help protect yourself from fraud, including cyberfraud and other fraudulent activity, please visit our [Information Security and Protection Page](#). Please refer to <https://disclaimer.bnymellon.com/eu.htm> for certain disclosures relating to European legal entities. Please note that we may use tracking pixels to monitor your interaction with reports and data delivered via this email. To learn how BNY Mellon uses personal information, please read our [Data Privacy Notice](#).



SENT VIA EMAIL ([REDACTED])

December 14, 2023

Kevin M. Coleman
Director & Assistant General Counsel
Discover Financial Services
2500 Lake Cook Road
Riverwoods, IL 60015

RE: Shareholder Proposal Ownership Verification Letter
Dear Mr. Coleman:

BNY Mellon, a Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation participant, serves as custodian for the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (“Fund”). At the request and instruction of the Fund, BNY Mellon confirms that as custodian it is the record holder of shares of Discover Financial Services common stock (CUSIP#254709108) held for the benefit of the Fund.

As of November 28, 2023, the date of the submission of the Fund’s Director Election Resignation Bylaw shareholder proposal, the Fund held, and has held continuously for at least one year, at least 15,900 shares of Discover Financial Services common stock.

If there are any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (412) 234-4991 or at robert.porco@bnymellon.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert D. Porco", written in black ink.

Robert D. Porco
Vice President
BNY Mellon Relationship Manager

cc. Joseph A. Geiger, Fund Trustee
Michael Piccirillo
Edward J. Durkin

Correspondence

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 5:38 PM
To: Michael Piccirillo
Subject: RE: Verification Letter re Discover

Dear Mr. Piccirillo:

We are writing with respect to the shareholder proposal we received on November 30, 2023. We sent you a letter requesting proof of ownership. We received the broker letter on December 14, 2023 that contained a procedural deficiency, and we notified you of that deficiency on December 15, 2023 via email.

We are in receipt of your response dated December 18, 2023, which is the same broker letter dated December 14, 2023 that contained the procedural deficiency.

We ask that you withdraw the shareholder proposal to avoid the need for Discover to expend the resources to submit a no-action letter to the SEC. Please respond by this Friday, January 5, 2024. Otherwise, we plan to proceed with the no-action request to the SEC.

Thank you.

Kevin M. Coleman | Discover Financial Services
Director & Assistant General Counsel

Email: [REDACTED]

Executive Assistant: Elaine Wexler
[REDACTED]

From: Michael Piccirillo <mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 9:32 AM
To: Kevin Coleman <[REDACTED]>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Verification Letter re Discover

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL
DO NOT open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Mr. Coleman,

BNY Mellon is the Custodian for all stock holdings for the NYCDCC Pension Fund.

Michael Piccirillo
NYC District Council Of Carpenters
Area Standards Manager
917-376-5549
mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org

From: Porco, Robert D <robert.porco@bnymellon.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 9:13 AM
To: Kristin O'Brien <kobrien@nyccbf.org>
Cc: Michael Piccirillo <mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org>; Jeffrey Covell <Jeffrey_Covell@ajg.com>
Subject: RE: Verification Letter re Discover

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the District Council organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Kristin,

I hope you are doing well.

Please see the attached verification letter.

Best Regards,
Rob

Robert D Porco

Vice President

Client Service Delivery

Securities Services - BNY Mellon

Relationship Manager

T 412-234-4991

E robert.porco@bnymellon.com | www.bnymellon.com

The information contained in this e-mail is provided to you in response to an inquiry or for your information. BNY Mellon is not responsible or liable for the contents of this e-mail if you should include any portion of this e-mail in a direction letter to BNY Mellon. BNY Mellon's responsibility is to execute your instructions as set forth in any letter you provide. This e-mail is intended to bring you promotional information regarding services offered by BNY Mellon Asset Servicing. The Federal CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 requires us to note that if you do not want to receive promotional e-mails from Asset Servicing at this e-mail address, you may reply to this e-mail with "NO E-MAIL" noted within the subject line.

From: Kristin O'Brien <KOBrien@nyccbf.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 6:53 AM
To: Porco, Robert D <robert.porco@bnymellon.com>
Cc: Michael Piccirillo <mpiccirillo@nycdistrictcouncil.org>; Jeffrey Covell <Jeffrey_Covell@ajg.com>
Subject: Verification Letter re Discover

Good morning Robert,

Please see the attached verification letter for Discover Financial.

Thank you,
KOB

Kristin O'Brien Fowlkes, LMSW, CEBS
Executive Director - New York City District Council of Carpenters Benefit Funds
395 Hudson Street

New York, NY 10014
Phone: 212-366-7322
Fax: 212-366-7457
Cell: 646-737-2419
kobrien@nyccbf.org



New York City District Council of Carpenters
BENEFIT FUNDS

This email and any attached files are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which this mail is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any use, disclosure, copying or distribution of this email or the attached files by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete this email and attached files from your system. Thank you.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

Notice: The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment, is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Access, copying, or re-use of the e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, please return the e-mail to the sender and delete it from your computer. Emails may be interfered with and may contain viruses or other defects. We provide no warranties in relation to these matters. For information on how to help protect yourself from fraud, including cyberfraud and other fraudulent activity, please visit our [Information Security and Protection Page](#). Please refer to <https://disclaimer.bnymellon.com/eu.htm> for certain disclosures relating to European legal entities. Please note that we may use tracking pixels to monitor your interaction with reports and data delivered via this email. To learn how BNY Mellon uses personal information, please read our [Data Privacy Notice](#).

February 29, 2024

Re: Withdrawal of No-Action Request Dated January 8, 2024 Regarding Shareholder Proposal of New York City Carpenters Pension Fund

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

Dear Sir or Madam:

We are writing on behalf of Discover Financial Services, a Delaware corporation (the "**Company**"), and in reference to our letter dated January 8, 2024 (the "**No-Action Request**"), pursuant to which we requested that the staff of the Office of Chief Counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission concur with our view that the Company may exclude the shareholder proposal (the "**Proposal**") submitted by Joseph A. Greiger on behalf of the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund (the "**Proponent**") from the proxy materials it intends to distribute in connection with its 2024 Annual Meeting of Shareholders.

Attached as Exhibit A is a letter dated February 28, 2024 (the "**Withdrawal Communication**"), signed by the Proponent, in which the Proponent voluntarily agrees to withdraw the Proposal. In reliance on the Withdrawal Communication, we hereby withdraw the No-Action Request.

Please contact the undersigned at (212) 450-4908 or ning.chiu@davispolk.com if you should have any questions or need additional information. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully yours,



Ning Chiu

Attachment: Exhibit A

cc: Joseph A. Greiger, New York City Carpenters Pension Fund
Kevin Coleman, Director & Assistant General Counsel Discover Financial Services

Withdrawal Communication

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA
NEW YORK CITY & VICINITY DISTRICT COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS

JOSEPH A. GEIGER
Executive Secretary - Treasurer

PAUL CAPURSO
President /Asst EST

DAVID CARABALLOSO
Vice President /Asst EST



395 HUDSON STREET - 9TH FLOOR

NEW YORK, N.Y. 10014

PHONE: (212) 366-7500

FAX: (212) 675-3118

www.nycdistrictcouncil.com

SENT VIA EMAIL (kevincoleman1@discover.com)


February 28, 2024

Kevin M. Coleman
Director & Assistant General Counsel
Discover Financial Services
2500 Lake Cook Road
Riverwoods, IL 60015

Dear Mr. Coleman,

On behalf of the New York Carpenters Pension Fund, I hereby withdraw the Director Election Bylaw shareholder proposal submitted to Discover Financial Services by the Fund on November 29, 2023. As a long-term shareholder in Discover Financial Services, the Fund looks forward to further engagement with the Company on important governance issues.

Sincerely,


Joseph A. Geiger
Fund Co-Chair - Trustee

cc. Michael Piccirillo
Edward J. Durkin