Making Justice Our Business
A Faithful Voice for Justice

ABOUT ICCR

Currently celebrating our 42nd year, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility has been a leader of the corporate responsibility movement for four decades. Beginning with our calls for divestment from South Africa in opposition to apartheid, ICCR members have been actively engaging the world’s largest companies in an effort to transform corporate practices on a host of issues from rooting out human trafficking and supply chain abuses to ensuring safe food and water, to calling for financial and health care reform to protect the world’s most vulnerable. Today our membership is comprised of 300 institutional investors with over $100 billion in invested capital. Representing faith-based communities with congregations all over the world, SRI asset management companies, unions, pension funds and a global network of allies, ICCR members are not only shareholders, but trusted partners in corporate responsibility initiatives that promote a more just and sustainable world.

We do this in a variety of ways:

- **CORPORATE DIALOGUES:** As active shareowners who have built productive and long-term relationships with management, ICCR members conduct hundreds of dialogues every year to advance a wide range of issues. Because we have a vested interest in a company’s success and propose realistic solutions as opposed to making demands, these dialogues often bear fruit in the form of meaningful reform and have a positive impact on long-term profitability.

- **SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS:** When dialogues are unproductive, ICCR may issue shareholder resolutions to engage management and other investors’ attention around a specific issue.

- **CSR TOOLS:** ICCR’s database offers members a historical record of shareholder actions with hundreds of companies. Known for our insightful reports on emerging trends such as our 2011 Social Sustainability Resource Guide, Extracting the Facts (an investor guide to hydraulic fracturing operations) and Effective Supply Chain Accountability, offering investor guidance on the new California supply chain legislation, along with our ability to convene key stakeholders from the business, NGO, community and investor sectors, ICCR is a resource for all those working in corporate responsibility.

OUR MISSION

ICCR seeks a global community built on justice and sustainability through transformation of the corporate world by integrating social values into corporate and investor actions.

We invite you to join us. We are inspired by faith and committed to action.
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Is justice “truth in action” as Benjamin Disraeli said over 200 years ago? Or as Albert Einstein said, must we accept that “In matters of truth and justice, there is no difference between large and small problems, for the issues concerning the treatment of people are all the same,”? Perhaps justice can be best measured by the absence of life-threatening disparities. Helen Keller may have provided the most sweeping definition when she said, “Until the great mass of people shall be filled with the sense of responsibility for each other’s welfare, social justice can never be attained.”. Even in the absence of a clear definition that allows us to measure justice, we know that our work helps light the path to a more just and sustainable world.

In this issue of the Corporate Examiner, we look at a broad spectrum of areas where ICCR members have made justice our business. When we explore the roots of our faith traditions, we see justice is an ever-present concept. In the earliest days of the Christian Church, St. Augustine said, “Charity is no substitute for justice withheld”. This quote reminds me of a challenge that is fundamental to everyone engaged in the business of justice. We are ready and able to recognize injustice when we see it, but how do we define “justice”? Can we measure it, as we are so frequently asked to do? How do we know we are making progress when we know that so much injustice is present in our world?

In the pages that follow, you will read about our work with the financial services industry to promote equitable and affordable access to credit. In the five years since the financial crisis began, we have learned a lot about lending practices and how a vicious cycle of injustice led to catastrophic consequences. We know that responsible lending practices can be both profitable and just. Through our work, members are challenging mainstream banks to develop appropriate access channels for all borrowers. Meanwhile, another piece looks at how faith institutions view their community investing strategies as an expression of their faith, sowing seeds of justice to foster sustainable prosperity while addressing the needs of vulnerable communities. These approaches have been used for decades by ICCR members and have resulted in high-impact programs like The Isaiah Fund.

Focusing on our continuing work to illuminate nutritional disparities exacerbated by global food production, another piece highlights our work to reverse trends that lead to unjust outcomes. We know that while hunger continues to plague vulnerable communities around the globe, our children and families grow sicker as obesity trends higher. Another article reflects on the disproportionate impact of climate change—a crisis that ICCR members have addressed with increasing urgency for a quarter of a century—and share our thoughts on practical steps investors can take.

As you read about our work in the pages that follow, we hope you will share our abiding faith that justice will ultimately prevail. We invite you to join us in encouraging companies to ensure that justice is their business, too.
Working Together for Change:
ICCR Members Gather in St. Louis for AGM

“We at ICCR draw tremendous strength from the many communities in which our members operate, including the city of St. Louis. There is no question that our allies and members both here in the U.S. and abroad inform our work, expand our horizons, and challenge us to be our best.”

– ICCR Executive Director Laura Berry
A Call for Justice from Planet Earth

“Convince those in power to reduce our carbon pollution. Push your own communities to adopt smarter practices. Invest. Divest. Remind folks there’s no contradiction between a sound environment and strong economic growth. And remind everyone who represents you at every level of government that sheltering future generations against the ravages of climate change is a prerequisite for your vote. Make yourself heard on this issue.” – President Barack Obama, Georgetown University, June 25

The President’s call to action at the Georgetown commencement this June could not have been more urgent: the time for procrastination on the multiple threats facing our planet as a result of man-made global warming is now over. The question is no longer whether to act, but how, and he was clear that everyone must employ the best strategies at our disposal if we are to avert a global climate crisis. In June, 2013 ICCR issued the following position paper outlining how we, in the role of active investors, could employ our best strategies through our engagements with fossil fuel and other energy-intensive companies and do our part to help reduce global warming and promote a more sustainable energy future.

INSIGHTS FOR INVESTORS WORKING FOR BOLDER INTERVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Background
In October of 2012, Superstorm Sandy roared up the east coast leaving 110 people dead, more than 8 million households without power and wreaking economic havoc in excess of $60 billion. Weather events in the form of droughts, floods and tornadoes occur with ever-increasing regularity and impact across the globe. And ominously, in May of this year, the Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii recorded a first-ever carbon dioxide concentration of 400 parts per million (PPM), exceeding the threshold of 350 PPM that scientists deem safe for humanity.

Decades before Al Gore’s “An Inconvenient Truth” sparked an international debate that pitted climate scientists against global warming skeptics, members of the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility and shareholders in global energy companies began sounding the alarm on climate risk. For over 40 years, faith-based and socially responsible investors have been using their voices to advocate for the corporate responsibility to properly care for and manage the earth’s resources. The concept of environmental stewardship is embedded in all faith traditions, as is the concept of “environmental justice” which acknowledges that environmental impacts are felt most keenly by those least able to mitigate against them. This social justice dimension has been at the center of all ICCR members’ advocacy and a driving force behind our members’ engagements on climate change.

While the primary responsibility for controlling greenhouse gas emissions clearly lies with global policymakers, as early as 1992 ICCR members began to use their leverage as shareholders to forcefully engage the fossil fuel industry and other GHG-heavy sectors in an effort to curb emissions and forge new paths towards a green economy. While the shareholder engagement approach championed by ICCR and its members has proven successful in promoting increased corporate responsibility in a wide variety of industries, progress in the fossil fuel industry has been too modest and now, in light of accelerated global warming trends, much too slow.
Specifically, fossil fuel companies:

- Have not factored the full impacts of climate change into their business plans, and are instead continuing to invest heavily to preserve a business model that is unsustainable. In fact, they have increased production, extracting millions of barrels of oil more a week and are developing more environmentally degrading sources, such as tar sands;

- Often use their vast resources to influence politicians and to lobby against legislation that attempts to put a price on and/or cap carbon extraction and burning and;

- Fight environmental regulations (directly or through industry associations) that seek to reduce GHG emissions and mitigate climate change impacts.

As a sign of both the dire nature of our planet’s climate crisis and the growing public frustration with government and industry intransigence, grassroots movements are beginning to surface and gain some traction in the public discourse. One such movement is a campaign launched by 350.org which calls for wholesale divestment from the top 200 fossil fuel companies. While the campaign organizers concede that a divestment movement is a largely symbolic strategy meant to mobilize the public and marginalize the industry, the campaign has helped to focus public attention on the need for more aggressive policy measures that will serve as a wake-up call to propel meaningful climate policy.

ICCR is a leader in shareholder advocacy and a strong proponent of corporate engagement as a powerful tool to generate positive corporate change. For that reason, we have been asked to provide guidance to concerned investors who are evaluating fossil fuel divestment and/or looking for bolder, more aggressive strategies for advocacy.

Questions and Considerations

What are the implications of divestment vs. engagement as a strategy to encourage improved corporate social responsibility?

The ICCR model of active ownership maintains that shareholders have an obligation to use their voices to positively influence corporate decision-making. Even if this voice is only used to vote their proxies in favor of others’ resolutions, for the purposes of engagement, shareholder advocates may choose to hold problematic companies in their portfolios in order to retain a “seat at the table”. To divest is to relinquish those shares to another owner who may not be practicing active ownership. This approach, in effect, serves to strengthen management control. ICCR members advocate for amplifying our collective voice by bringing more shareholder advocates to the table – that is, we support engagement.

However, divestment may be appropriate when a company with egregious practices has failed to respond to a long-term engagement or when an organization has exhausted its available resources to continue to engage a company effectively. What we strongly discourage is passive ownership. If investors determine to divest as a last resort, we urge them to raise the public visibility of their decision and the reasons for it.

What investment approaches are available to concerned investors?

Most faith-based and responsible investors have established criteria and guidelines that inform their investment and engagement strategies. The following is a list of the most common investment approaches employed by concerned investors from the lowest to the highest level of engagement. By applying guidelines and evaluating resources, investors can find an appropriate engagement level with one, or a combination of several, of the following approaches:

- Traditional Avoidance and Screening: Organization gives guidance to fund managers to avoid certain activities above defined thresholds (e.g., alcohol, firearms, tobacco);

To divest is to relinquish those shares to another owner who may not be practicing active ownership. This approach, in effect, serves to strengthen management control. ICCR members advocate for amplifying our collective voice by bringing more shareholder advocates to the table – that is, we support engagement.
- Modified “Buy” List to Avoid “Worst in Class”: Organization avoids companies identified by third parties as most problematic;
- Modified “Buy” List to Accentuate “Best in Class”: Organization seeks out companies making strides toward goals through their business models, processes and products;
- Ownership with Active Engagement: Organization promotes change via corporate engagement through dialogue and shareholder action, redefining “best practices”, encouraging transparency and reporting, influencing research and valuation models, and developing new approaches to alternative investments.

**Why remain invested in fossil fuel companies given that the industry faces questions about its sustainability over the long term?**

No one disagrees that the continued burning of fossil fuels at current levels will have deleterious environmental, economic and social impacts, but the argument that the fossil fuel industry alone is responsible for global warming is misleading. To the degree that we participate in a global economy powered mainly by fossil fuels we are all complicit. Transitioning to a greener economy will require full participation and begins with reducing demand and deliberately shifting capital towards renewables.

Importantly, the energy industry should not be seen as sole creators of the problem as long as global markets remain inextricably linked to fossil fuels to propel growth. It is, however, in a unique position to help find (and fund) the solutions through product lines and operations. Holding fossil fuel companies to account on this need is the role of shareholder advocates who continuously press for more ambitious emission reduction targets and more robust investments in research, and development of sustainable energy alternatives. However, without strong and enforceable global regulations that put a price on carbon emissions, there is small hope for meaningful progress in an industry that has little incentive to self-regulate.

**What engagement strategies are currently being used to counter global warming?**

Over the past 20 years, investors have used multiple and creative strategies to exert pressure on fossil fuel companies, including resolutions and dialogues calling for:

- GHG emissions disclosure (Shareholder pressure is credited with helping to found the Carbon Disclosure Project, currently tracking the emissions of over 5,000 companies around the world.);
- Sustainability reporting, including extensive reporting on environmental performance;
- Lobbying and political spending reporting (Citing potential conflicts of interest with publicly-stated environmental policies, shareholder resolutions request disclosure of lobbying and political activities that seek to undermine stronger regulation of GHG emissions. The number of these resolutions and investor support of them continues to grow each year.);
- Setting of quantitative GHG reduction goals;
- Reporting on the risks of hydraulic fracturing to water and communities as well as reporting on fugitive methane emissions and flaring;
- Engagements with the financial services sector regarding the carbon impact of their investment portfolios.
What new and expanded strategies for future engagement are being pursued?

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the world’s leading scientific authority on climate change estimates that a 50% reduction in GHG emissions globally is needed by 2050 to stabilize global temperatures - this translates into an 80% reduction in the U.S. alone. New and more effective strategies must be employed. New shareholder approaches (some recently tested) are being considered, including:

• Phase in a request to any and all companies to address the IPCC reality to reduce carbon emissions by 80% by 2050 and their plans to accomplish this goal;
• Call for companies to publicly support stronger national legislation and EPA regulatory initiatives to reduce GHG emissions;
• Intensify direct appeals to legislators and facilitate public appeals through web campaigns and online petitions.

Where can we have the greatest leverage and impact?

After evaluating its resources and relationships, each individual/institutional investor should ask where it might have the most influence and impact, including,

• What are they doing as individuals and institutions to directly reduce their carbon footprints and to promote green energy solutions through advocacy, purchasing decisions and capital investment?
• Is there a “best in class” company that could be encouraged to step out more publicly on the need to reduce GHG emissions and to adopt new public policy approaches as a challenge to industry laggards?
• Are there relationships with trade associations, policymakers or regulators that can be leveraged?

Shareholders are putting the human rights impacts of climate change on the agendas of both companies and governments, with consideration for the global public health implications of global warming as well as the serious climate justice issues it raises.

In Conclusion

The severity and urgency of the climate crisis has been underestimated by too many for far too long. Strong global policy and regulation that drastically reduce carbon emissions are needed if we are to avoid irreversible impacts on the environment, economies and the health and well-being of our planet’s inhabitants; fossil fuels have significant geo-political importance and impact. There are many companies across a variety of sectors that are moving to advance sustainable solutions and are setting standards that exceed government regulations. But the majority of the energy sector remains mired in its old model and demonstrates through its actions that it is in apparent denial of the terrible price future generations will pay for its resistance to reform and/or to conforming to measures that can produce change.

In the absence of a more stringent GHG policy to enforce reductions, it is our responsibility as concerned investors to use our leverage to intervene wherever and whenever we can. There is no doubt that bolder, more creative strategies are required. There is no doubt that increased energy, persistence and resourcefulness will be needed. Many innovative strategies will and should be implemented because we face dire circumstances and a range of tactics will be required to achieve the needed solutions.

As advocates - with many ICCR members representing faith institutions - we understand that where there is disagreement, we must be in discussion to hope for resolution. For that reason, as shareholders, we remain engaged with the companies we hope to change.
Building Sustainable Justice: The Future of Faith-Based Community Development Investing

“In order to increase peace (shalom), you must increase justice.”
– From Ethics of the Ancestors (Pirke Avot)

Socially responsible investing is a three-pronged approach, encompassing shareholder advocacy, positive and negative screening of investments, and community investing. Religious institutions — many of whom are ICCR members — have a long history of empowering underserved communities via community investing.

Faith-based investors believe that limited access to and unequal distribution of capital for poor and marginal communities perpetuate existing cycles of poverty over multiple generations. Community development investment is a deliberate financial strategy that aims to break those cycles by using low-cost financial resources to establish more sustainable prosperity for those communities. “For faith-based investors, it is a genuinely materialized form of spiritual service intended to bring about both economic and social justice,” said Jeffrey Dekro of the Isaiah Fund.

Mark Regier of Everence Financial spoke of the origins of the movement: “In the 1980s, faith communities in the U.S. seized on the opportunity presented by the passage of the 1977 Community Reinvestment Act, which sought to address discrimination in bank loans made to individuals and businesses in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods. They channeled a portion of their own investments — often at concessionary rates — into organizations seeking to bring economic opportunity to these communities.” Since that time, community development funds have been used to drive affordable housing construction, small business development, and support cooperatively-owned businesses, women-centered endeavors and rural development.

Today, the range of options for community investors is much greater. “Lending in communities of need can meet several important investment objectives that are difficult to find in traditional markets, namely long duration fixed-income securities with favorable prepayment provisions, all while allowing institutions to do good for people, communities, and society,” observed Michael Lohmeier of Wespath Investment Management.

Much progress has been achieved over the past decades. Observed Dekro, “Through our faith-based investing, we have achieved tremendous financial

“What started as a risky experiment – if you loan money to poor people, will you be able to pay back your investors, faith-based and others – has proven that well-placed credit that is responsible and affordable is good for communities.”
In the drive to address the root causes of poverty and injustice, faith-based community development investors are constantly refining how they measure and quantify the impact of their initiatives. According to Donna Katzin of

“We must continue to ask what contribution an investment promising ‘impact’ is making to addressing the underlying systems and institutions that keep people poor and powerless.”

Shared Interest, an organization that pioneered the use of partial loan guarantees to encourage commercial banks to lend to low-income black communities in South Africa, “We must continue to ask what contribution an investment promising ‘impact’ is making to addressing the underlying systems and institutions that keep people poor and powerless, and then prioritize investments that provide the answers and help to build more prosperous, sustainable and empowered communities.”

Two questions guiding investors’ work are:

• How do people benefit from our investment? and;
• How do we know if our community development initiatives are working?

It is critical to know whether or not programs and initiatives designed to address specific social issues are meeting their goals and having a measurable impact. It is easier to measure, for example, the number of housing units built or number of jobs created (“outputs”) than it is to measure the “outcomes” or impacts of those constructions: did they result in improved health or poverty alleviation for the community?

In the area of impact measurement, faith-based investors – with their long-term experience, particularly in the international arena – have an edge over newer impact investors. Continued Katzin: “Faith-based institutions are often ideally suited to understand international contexts and monitor outcomes of international investments as a result of their ‘boots on the ground’ and roots in overseas communities. Whether these relationships spring from missionary work, sister denominations and communions or congregational relationships, they are powerful tools for discerning international priorities and forging partnerships. They have a great deal to contribute to international community investing.”

One challenge faith-based community development investors face in trying to grow and manage their portfolios is the continued tension between the mission focus and the financial return needs of investors – that is, their fiduciary duty, their legal obligation to act in the financial best interests of their congregations. In the lingering economic downturn, weak returns continue to present a problem. Looking ahead, faith-based investors must be creative in seeking new ways to manage risk while adhering to social investment criteria in a down market.

Investors remain optimistic. “What started as a risky experiment – if you loan money to poor people, will you be able to pay back your investors, faith-based and others?” said Mark Pinsky of Opportunity Finance Network, “has proven that well-placed credit that is responsible and affordable is good for communities. Faith-based investors will be critical in ensuring that justice, not capital comes first.”

“Going forward,” said Sister Corinne Florek, O.P. of the Mercy Partnership Fund, “the challenge before us is to continue to be prophetic, patient and visionary, advocating for better partnerships and collaboration, as well as subsidy where needed in order to create sustainable communities based on economic justice.”
Access to an adequate supply of healthy food is a basic human right, yet as a result of unfair trade, production and distribution, today’s food system fails to provide equitable access to nutrition for nearly one in seven people. While the scourge of global hunger has many causes beyond our control, there are several structural inequities in the food system that ICCR addresses through its shareholder advocacy.

We see evidence of food injustice in land grabbing by institutions that rob small farmers of their livelihoods and their surrounding communities of sustenance. We witness the millions living in food insecure countries and exposed to famine as a result of the food bubbles created by commodities markets distorted by speculation. And here in the United States we see the injustice of a food and beverage industry that often tailors its product offerings and marketing messages to maximize profit at the expense of the health of our citizens.

The industrialization of our global food system has led to a host of unintended consequences, including the overuse of fertilizers, pesticides and antibiotics that poison our environment and compromise our health. It has also led to the mistreatment of animals and human rights violations in the food and agriculture sectors, and a rise in obesity and undernutrition and their associated diseases.

Together with our allies, ICCR staff and members are developing corporate engagement strategies that seek to reform and correct some of the structural injustices at the heart of our contemporary global food system, so that access to safe and healthy food is expanded and protected as both a human and a civil right.

**Farm Worker Prayer of Praise**

Bless the hands of the people of the earth,
The hands that plant the seed,
The hands that bind the harvest,
The hands that carry the burden of life.
Soften the hands of the oppressor and Strengthen the hands of the oppressed.
Bless the hands of the workers,
Bless the hands of those in power above them
That the measure they deal will be tempered
With justice and compassion. Amen.
—United Farm Workers

**INCREASING ACCESS TO HEALTHY FOOD**

While many of us live in areas where grocery stores, supermarkets and even farmers’ markets abound, and a rainbow assortment of fresh produce and safely produced meat and dairy products is available year-round, others live in neighborhoods where the food most readily available comes out of cans, packages or from fast food restaurants. Clearly, all food is not created equal and where you live has a whole lot to do with what you get to eat.

Said Lauren Compere of Boston Common Asset Management, “One of the ways ICCR is seeking ‘food justice’ is by questioning companies’ identification of low-income communities and communities of color as areas of revenue growth potential in developed markets. We want to make sure companies are integrating their growth goals with their stated goals of being responsive to the nutritional needs of their consumers.”

In dialogues with food and beverage companies, ICCR asks whether they are making their healthier options uniformly available, not just in different communities domestically, but wherever they operate internationally, and in emerging markets in particular.

In their engagements with food and beverage retailers, members are asking companies to set specific goals for increasing access to healthy food by using the federal Healthy Food Financing Initiative to open stores in underserved communities, report on their progress, and consult with groups such as The Food Trust, Policylink, and the Partnership for a Healthier America (PHA).

Said Ava Alkon, ICCR’s Associate Program Director for Food, “We want to ensure that retailers make their healthier offerings as, or more, affordable...”

Said Makani Themba of the Praxis Project, “When it comes to healthy food and safe, green places to play, many families have few options. Too many communities are inundated by corner stores and junk food outlets, where it’s easier to get malt liquor and a pack of cigarettes than an apple. And as my grandmother would say, ‘that’s just too wrong to be right’.”
than their less healthy products. We’re also calling on companies to participate in new collaborative initiatives that unite business leaders and public health professionals behind the goal of marketing healthy products.”

Said Makani Themba of the Praxis Project, “When it comes to healthy food and safe, green places to play, many families have few options. There are thousands of neighborhoods across this country without any parks or public green spaces and too many communities with parks that are not adequately resourced. Access to healthy food is not much better. Too many communities are inundated by corner stores and junk food outlets. In thousands of neighborhoods nationwide, it’s easier to get malt liquor and a pack of cigarettes than an apple. And as my grandmother would say, ‘that’s just too wrong to be right’.”

PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS (PPPS) ADVANCING FOOD JUSTICE

Another strategy companies can deploy in countries suffering from high rates of under-nutrition is participation in public-private partnerships (PPPs) such as the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) and Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN). These “nutrition-specific” initiatives, including fortification of foods with micronutrients, can be extremely effective in reducing malnutrition and in promoting greater food justice, particularly when carried out in close consultation with local and national policymakers, health authorities, and representatives of affected populations.

But these initiatives aren’t without controversy. “We do not support the addition of nutrients to unhealthy products,” said Alkon. “Instead, we ask that companies which participate in public-private partnerships such as GAIN and SUN support efforts to institute safeguards against conflicts of interest, and integrate the human rights principles of accountability, participation, and non-discrimination in these PPPs’ governance, planning, and operations.”

THE SOCIAL IMPACT OF LAND INVESTMENT

ICCR members have been among the first institutions to recognize the potential injustice of large-scale acquisition of land in developing countries for the purposes of food production and export. The current global food system pits large multinational food companies, seeking cheaper land to grow crops for their products, against small communities, already food and water insecure, in developing nations. Further exacerbating matters, institutional investors, lured by rising food and land prices, are also buying up huge tracts of land for purely speculative purposes. This is what is more commonly known as “land grabbing” and it’s not hard to figure out who comes out on top.

In a survey of top food and beverage companies, Oxfam’s Behind the Brand Scorecard (profiled on page 13) shows that few companies have clear supply chain policies to mitigate against the potential negative social impacts of their land investments. On a scale of 1-10, the best rating achieved by a company on land use was a 3 (poor). In our engagements with food companies, ICCR includes questions regarding land investments and our Recommended Guidelines for Responsible Land Investments outlines best practices that aim to ensure these investments remain just and nutrition-sensitive.

JUSTICE FOR THE HANDS THAT FEED US

The food system is the nation’s largest employer, accounting for roughly 20 million U.S. workers, or one-sixth of the nation’s workforce. Despite the importance of the sector to the American economy, food workers are among the lowest paid and overworked employees, due to the “race to the bottom” created by an industry that is focused on cheaper, faster food at the expense of human rights.

In their corporate dialogues, ICCR members ask companies to adopt policies on human rights and labor that are in accordance with the United Nations’ Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the International Labor Organization’s Declaration on the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, and, importantly, include confidential grievance mechanisms for workers.

For investors looking for new tools to help drive corporate progress towards a sustainable, humane food system, The Equitable Food Initiative Standard (profiled on page 12) includes many benchmarks on improved working conditions, pesticide management, and food safety that companies committed to ethical labor practices will want to formally integrate into their policies.

For more information on how ICCR is helping to create justice in the global food system visit our website www.iccr.org. To learn more about Oxfam’s Behind the Brand Scorecard and the Equitable Food Initiative Standard, see pages 12 and 13.
The Equitable Food Initiative Standard

The Equitable Food Initiative (EFI) is a multi-stakeholder partnership to help workers, growers and major food buyers collaborate to grow safer food. As farms comply with the EFI Standard for improved working conditions, pesticide management and food safety, the initiative creates additional value throughout the food system, with benefits extending all the way to consumers. Below, we present highlights from the EFI’s topline criteria. For the full list of criteria (including EFI standards pertaining to harvest risk; accountability and record keeping; animal activity; and pest and soil management) and detailed underlying benchmarks, visit: http://www.equitablefood.net.

**LABOR MANAGEMENT COOPERATION (LMC)**
Leadership Team has been established for workers and management to share responsibility for compliance with the EFI Standard and contribute to the overall success of the farm, under which farmworkers are knowledgeable, trained and empowered to ensure compliance with the EFI Standard.

**NON-RETALIATION (NR)**
There is no retaliation against farmworkers or management representatives for participating in the monitoring, assessment and enforcement practices required under the EFI Standard.

**COMPLIANCE WITH LAW (CL)**
Employer complies with national, state and local laws regarding labor, food safety and pesticides.

**WORKER HEALTH AND SAFETY (WHS)**
Systems have been established and implemented that provide farmworkers with a safe and healthy work environment and minimize occupational injuries, illnesses and fatalities.

**FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION (FOA)**
Employers recognize farmworkers’ freedom of association and right to organize.

**FAIR COMPENSATION (FC)**
The EFI creates opportunity to generate value for all stakeholders in the food production system (supply chain), including farmworkers, growers and retailers/buyers, and creates opportunity to improve compensation and conditions of employment for farmworkers.

**FAIR WORKING CONDITIONS (FWC)**
A transparent and clear policy and system for disciplinary measures exists and is communicated to farmworkers. The system includes fair warning principles and disciplinary actions that are proportionate to the conduct in question.

**NON-DISCRIMINATION (ND)**
There is no discrimination against any farmworker on the basis of age, race, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, ethnicity, trade union membership, disability, pregnancy, family status or any other legally protected status.

**DISPUTE SETTLEMENT (DS)**
There is a clear and effective dispute settlement mechanism in place to ensure transparent resolution of workplace disputes between farmworkers and owners or management when they occur.

**WORKER INVOLVEMENT – LABOR (WI-LABOR)**
Farmworkers have been trained and understand their rights and responsibilities guaranteed in accordance with the EFI Standard.

**WATER (WA)**
Water sources, water distribution systems and water used in crop production are assessed for risk and held to appropriate quality and safety standards.

**WORKER INVOLVEMENT – FOOD SAFETY (WI-FOOD SAFETY)**
Farmworkers are knowledgeable, trained and empowered to ensure compliance with food safety stewardship standards.

**WATER MANAGEMENT (WM)**
Irrigation and other water management practices support the conservation of resources and do not contaminate water.

**WORKER INVOLVEMENT – ENVIRONMENT (WI-ENVIRONMENT)**
Farmworkers are knowledgeable, trained and empowered to ensure compliance with environmental stewardship standards.
Oxfam’s Behind the Brands

The corporations below are 10 of the world’s most powerful food and beverage companies. According to Oxfam’s rankings, Nestlé is currently performing better than its peers. Even so, none of the 10 is performing at its best - all fall short in tackling social and environmental risks in their respective supply chains.

**The Issues**

The Scorecard looks at seven themes, weighing each theme equally. The seven themes are:

1. Transparency at a corporate level
2. Women farm workers and small-scale producers in the supply chain
3. Workers on farms in the supply chain
4. Farmers (small-scale) growing the commodities
5. Land, both rights and access to land and sustainable use of it
6. Water, both rights and access to water resources and sustainable use of it
7. Climate, both relating to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and helping farmers adapt to climate change

**The Indicators**

The Scorecard approaches six of the seven themes (all except transparency) in a similar way. Within these six themes, the indicators are grouped into four indicator categories (each worth one quarter of the score available for that theme): (i) awareness; (ii) knowledge; (iii) commitments; and (iv) supply chain management. These indicator categories rely on publicly available documents to address the following questions:

1. **Awareness:** Does the company demonstrate general awareness of key issues relating to that theme and does it conduct projects to understand and address these key issues?
2. **Knowledge:** Does the company demonstrate it measures, assesses and reports key issues and facts specifically in its supply chains that relate to that theme?
3. **Commitments:** Does the company commit to addressing the key issues relating to that theme in its supply chains?
4. **Supply chain management:** Does the company require its suppliers to meet relevant standards related to that theme?

The transparency theme is structured differently. It has a broader focus and rewards companies for disclosure on cross-cutting and corporate level issues.

---

### Behind the Brands: Food Companies Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nestlé</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unilever</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PepsiCo</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mondelēz</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Danone</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>General Mills</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kellogg’s</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Associated British Foods plc</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13/50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scorecard was made on 21 June 2013. The latest version is available at http://oxfam.org/behindthebrands
Banks at the Crossroads: How to Create Economic Justice for the Under-Banked

“We are encouraging the banks we engage to use their vast resources to come up with better, safer products that can help these people, most of them hard-working, access affordable credit that won’t entrap them in long-term debt.”

CCR’s engagement with the financial services sector stretches back nearly four decades. At the heart of our advocacy is the goal of bringing greater stability to global financial systems in order to promote sustainable development that serves the needs of the common good. In dialogues with banks and other lending institutions, regulators and credit agencies, ICCR members have focused on reducing the risks inherent in certain transactions, for both the financial institutions and their customers, while increasing the access and affordability of capital for those who need it most.

Federal deregulation in the 80s led many mainstream U.S. banks to abandon small consumer loans, which generated only a marginal profit and replaced them with high interest rate credit cards with insufficient underwriting, leading to high defaults, bankruptcy, and the growth of an “under-banked” population without access to traditional credit products. To meet the needs of the under-banked, a “fringe” financial services industry emerged in the 90s with offerings such as payday loans, pawn loans, direct deposit advance loans, auto title loans, and non-bank installment loans which all carry high interest rates and fees. While marketed as emergency credit for under-banked customers to help bridge them across paychecks when unexpected expenses surface, the interest rates and fees associated with these loans can easily trap borrowers in a dangerous cycle of perpetual debt.

Both payday and deposit advance loans carry hefty fees and interest rates in the range of $10-$20 per $100 borrowed, translating to annual percentage rates (APRs) of roughly 300%. Typically, borrowers must repay the full amount of these loans within two weeks or face additional fees. In the case of direct deposit loans, lenders have direct repayment from a direct deposit.

Of the two products, payday loans are viewed as more dangerous for economically vulnerable customers and have been branded as “predatory” by state and federal regulators. Fifteen states and the District of Columbia have passed laws that effectively make payday loans illegal. These products are used by (and marketed to) individuals who are more often than not: a) less educated; b) living in larger and lower income households; c) more likely to be African-American and living in the South.

Recently, a handful of mainstream banks have moved into this quick and small-loan market with “deposit advance” products that have disturbing similarities to payday loans. The 2008 financial crisis and ongoing bleak U.S. economic outlook have only increased the pool of desperate borrowers in need of affordable credit solutions.
“Most of the individuals resorting to direct deposit loans don’t qualify for credit cards or traditional lending products and have trouble getting the money they need to cover emergencies, such as a health care crisis or a car in need of major repair,” said St. Nora Nash of the Sisters of St. Frances of Philadelphia. “We are encouraging the banks we engage to use their vast resources to come up with better, safer products that can help these people, most of them hard-working, access affordable credit that won’t entrap them in long-term debt.”

Four banks currently offer direct deposit advances. Wells Fargo offers its “Direct Deposit Advance”, US Bank a “Checking Account Advance”, Fifth Third Bank offers an “Early Access Now” advance, and Regions Bank a “Ready Advance”. These banks are at a clear crossroads: how do they service the need for quick and reliable credit in ways that will preserve the financial health of these high risk customers without sacrificing their own financial health? “Banks offering deposit advances frequently justify the high fees and interest rates they charge as the fair cost of supplying unsecured loans to customers with no other credit alternatives,” said Jeff Perkins of Friends Fiduciary, “But these rates aren’t practical or sustainable. We are asking the banks to fully disclose and justify these rates to their customers and to us as their investors. We are convinced there are ways to service the needs of this community that will improve and not exacerbate their situations.”

Anita Green, of Wespath Asset Management, spoke to the changes ICCR members are seeking. “As a sensible first step, we’re asking that the banks we hold adhere to the new leveraged lending guidelines developed by the FDIC (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) and the OCC (Office of the Comptroller of the Currency) which are intended to ensure safe & sound lending activities.”

Released in May of this year, the Interagency Guidance on Leveraged Lending has two key parts. The first calls on banks to do more thorough underwriting of deposit advanced loans, based on a borrower’s ability to repay a loan without re-borrowing. The second major provision calls for a “cooling off period” – in essence a cap on the number of times a borrower can take out a loan during a 12 month period – of one loan every 2 months to reduce the risk of repeat borrowing.

Said St. Susan Mika of the Socially Responsible Investment Coalition, “While the guidelines are a clear improvement, we still have a ways to go to achieve a fair product; the guidelines fail to address the issue of sky-high interest rates, and that’s where customers are really being hurt.”

Improved tracking of customers using these products, perhaps through a common database, and financial literacy programs designed to prevent borrowers from falling into the “debt trap” are other programs banks could explore to help put customers on the path to financial independence.

Frank Rauscher of Aquinas Investments, who has been engaging most of the four banks on responsible lending issues for 6 years points out, “One model the banks may want to consult is the 36% APR cap on payday loans that protects members of the military and their families. At roughly twice the APR charged for credit cards, this cap would still provide banks with a very reasonable profit. What is clear is that we need a better understanding of their formulas for risk-based pricing.”

Shareholders also point to the short-term loans offered by credit unions as a “best practice” model that banks could follow. The Federal Credit Union Act and the NCUA Rules and Regulations set the maximum interest rate federal credit unions can charge on loans and lines of credit at 15% per year, a fee which also includes all finance charges.

“At bottom it becomes a question of economic justice,” said Nash. “As faith-based investors we want to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to improve their lives and the lives of their children. We know there is a way to make fair and affordable credit available to these people that will benefit them, and by extension, the greater economy. We are asking the banks we own to help make it happen.”

According to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), “payday borrowers are indebted a median of 55% (or 199 days) of the year. For the majority of payday borrowers, new loans are most frequently taken on the same day a previous loan is closed, or shortly thereafter.” 65% of direct deposit customers also accrue overdraft fees. The typical payday customer with more than $3,000 in advances goes a scant 12 days or less between paying an old balance and taking out a new advance.
The world is still reeling in the wake of a series of recent calamities in Bangladesh apparel manufacturing plants that resulted in an overwhelming loss of life. First came the deadly fire last November in the Tazreen garment factory, followed by the collapse in April of Rana Plaza, and then a second deadly fire on May 8th in a sweater factory in Dhaka; together, these disasters have resulted in the death of over 1,500 garment workers. While these individual incidents have different root causes, collectively, they are a grave indictment of the human rights record of Bangladesh, and an illustration of the failure of the global companies that manufacture and source their products there to ensure humane working conditions.

The current model, which assures global customers will have a ready supply of inexpensive and up-to-the-minute fashions, incentivizes corruption and lax oversight as low-cost producing nations compete in a race to the bottom for garment manufacturing contracts. Local governments can turn a blind eye to audit irregularities in an attempt to attract investment to their struggling economies. Global companies have seen their valuable brands put at risk by a shell game that makes oversight near-impossible, as local suppliers move manufacturing to unsafe factories without their clients’ knowledge. Caught in the middle are poor and largely unskilled factory workers with no recourse but to risk their lives by continuing to report for work every day in factories they know to be hazardous, only to earn a wage considered indecent by any international standard. Clearly, the current model is broken.

ICCR has formed a coalition of 200 investors and stakeholders representing over $3.1 trillion in assets under management, who together are calling on industry leaders to implement systemic reforms that will ensure worker safety and welfare, and to adopt zero tolerance policies on global supply chain abuses. ICCR supports the Bangladesh Accord on Fire and Building Safety, an initiative of over 70 companies, trade unions and non-governmental organizations to inspect and remediate any safety issues found in garment factories through a legally binding, transparent process. Said Adam Kanzer of Domini Social Investments, “We call on all apparel brands and retailers to join the Accord and quickly find solutions that will prevent catastrophes such as Rana Plaza from ever happening again.”

On July 10th 17 US companies announced a new initiative, The Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety. ICCR was disappointed that these companies chose not to sign the Accord, which includes other North American companies and represents a meaningful path forward for Bangladeshi garment workers through a multi-stakeholder process.

Said Lauren Compere, of Boston Common Asset Management, “We are pushing for more accountability down the supply chain, from the retailers to buyers and their agents, and right to the factory floor. More transparency on who is in the supply chain and how they are managing safety issues is needed.”

Companies can and do bring about meaningful and positive changes in human rights in the countries where they source and manufacture, and we encourage companies to be part of the solution to ensure better working conditions in Bangladesh. But when faced with intransigence of the type we have historically seen in Bangladesh on worker safety issues, members of ICCR are convinced that system change will only occur when companies take action together. They must use the full force of their commercial power to press for reforms.

ICCR is appealing to companies to:

- **Join the Accord on Fire and Building Safety**—a multi-stakeholder initiative that includes the International Labor Organization, non-governmental organizations, trade unions and companies — to implement plans with measurable goals to address all aspects of fire and building safety.
- **Commit to strengthening local trade unions** and to ensuring a living wage for all workers.
- **Publicly disclose all their suppliers**, including those from Bangladesh, the programs they have in place to ensure the safety and health of all their workers, and their performance against these goals, including any corrective actions.
- **Ensure that appropriate grievance mechanisms** and effective remedies for affected workers and families, including compensation, are in place.

ICCR’s David Schilling observed, “The horrific loss of life in Bangladesh highlights the complexities and failures of the current low-cost sourcing model. Consumers, investors, company representatives, unions, trade associations and government officials all have a role to play in reforming that broken model and in helping to eradicate the threat of future Rana Plazas.”
In 2010, ICCR first asked Delta to consider signing the ECPAT tourism code of conduct, which seeks to protect children from sexual exploitation. Within a year, it had agreed to do so - can you tell us what factors led to this swift decision, and how signing has impacted Delta’s day-to-day operations?

**LETTY:** After being asked to support ECPAT, Delta Air Lines CEO Richard Anderson quickly concluded that as a global carrier, using Delta’s people, infrastructure, and other resources to help combat human and child trafficking, was “the morally right thing to do”. As part of this commitment, Mr. Anderson signed the ECPAT Code of Conduct, Delta adopted a policy against human rights abuses that condemns all forms of human rights abuses, and the company began taking steps to raise awareness among employees and business partners about the harms of human and child trafficking.

*As the first major airline to sign the code, Delta had to develop a human trafficking awareness training program which would teach its employees how to identify and report trafficking activities. Can you talk a bit about how you designed and manage it - where you looked for models, who conducts it, how often the program is updated, and the metrics you use to measure success?*

**LETTY:** Shortly after Delta began working on creating its own corporate Human Trafficking Awareness Training, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) announced the creation of the Blue Lightning Initiative, through which CBP would make training available to commercial airlines, to help airline employees identify and report potential trafficking activity. Earlier
this year, Delta became a Blue Lightning member, and has worked with CBP to finalize computer based Blue Lightning Training that is customized for Delta’s customer-facing airport employees.

**How difficult is it to manage trafficking and other human rights risks throughout your supply chain and what are your plans for addressing them?**

**Letty:** Delta Air Lines currently has in place a Supplier Code of Conduct. This Code of Conduct has been updated to include specific language condemning the sexual exploitation of children. Certain of Delta’s supplier contracts now also include provisions requiring the common repudiation of child and human trafficking abuses. Delta will continue to its efforts to include similar provisions in new contracts, or contracts that are being renewed, with appropriate suppliers.

**What awareness raising programs does Delta have in place to educate its employees and its customers about the risks of human trafficking? Are there any obstacles?**

**Letty:** As part of Delta’s ongoing commitment to educate its employees about the need to combat child and human trafficking, Delta has widely communicated its role as the first major airline to sign the ECPAT tourism code of conduct. Delta also plans to create a dedicated portal on the company’s intranet, to update employees about these efforts.

**What advice might you offer other companies in the travel industry that are considering - or have been asked - to sign the ECPAT code?**

**Letty:** Companies who are considering signing on the ECPAT should consider the important impact their company and employees can have in helping to raise awareness about the harms of child and human trafficking.

---

**ECPAT’S CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM SEXUAL EXPLOITATION IN TRAVEL AND TOURISM**

Child sex tourism is the practice of foreigners sexually exploiting children in another country. Each year more than two million children are exploited in the global commercial sex trade, some as young as five years old. The ECPAT Tourism Child-Protection Code of Conduct is a voluntary set of business principles that travel and tourism companies can implement to prevent the trafficking of children and child sex tourism.

This tool consists of the following six criteria, which members of the tourism industry must adhere to once they join The Code:

1. Establish a policy and procedures against sexual exploitation of children;
2. Train employees in children’s rights, the prevention of sexual exploitation and how to report suspected cases;
3. Include a clause in contracts through the value chain stating a common repudiation and zero tolerance policy of sexual exploitation of children;
4. Provide information to travelers on children’s rights, the prevention of sexual exploitation of children and how to report suspected cases;
5. Support, collaborate and engage stakeholders in the prevention of sexual exploitation of children; and
6. Report annually on their implementation of Code-related activities.
Beginning in late 2011, Oxfam began its “Behind the Brands” scorecard initiative, measuring the social and environmental impacts of the world’s largest food companies. How is the scorecard different from other sustainability ranking tools currently in use, and what led to the inclusion of women as a key theme?

Oxfam: The Behind the Brands Scorecard measures the publicly available policies of the top 10 food and beverage companies in the world that Oxfam identified as being crucial to having positive social and environmental impacts in sourcing countries. The Scorecard looks at seven themes that include transparency, workers, women, small farmers, climate, land and water. While there are many indices that measure company performance and policies, Oxfam’s Scorecard does so from the perspective of the most vulnerable people impacted in the supply chains of the food and beverage industry. This is why the inclusion of women as a theme was crucial. Women disproportionately represent workers in low-wage and precarious work in the food system. In most countries they are also responsible for growing food crops. Finally, while women often work in commodity crops like coffee, cocoa and tea, they are too often invisible in the system, working as casual or family labor, thus companies are not taking them into account when creating projects and programs to improve their supply chain management.

Oxfam filed its first-ever shareholder resolution at Chevron in 2009, and its second in the fall of 2012. As a relative newcomer to the work, how does engaging in shareholder advocacy help Oxfam to advocate for justice around food and nutrition issues? Do you envision corporate engagement becoming more of a focus in the future?

Oxfam: Oxfam is a campaign and advocacy organization. Shareholder resolutions are one of the tools in the campaign toolbox. Prior to releasing our Behind the Brands Scorecard, we engaged all 10 companies in the scorecard over a course of several months on developing the indicators and the policies they had that corresponded to them. In 2012, we filed a shareholder resolution with Mondelez as part of our campaign to improve the livelihoods of women cocoa farmers in the supply chains of three chocolate companies.

Prior to launching the campaign, Oxfam engaged Mondelez (as well as Mars and Nestlé) on the issue of gender in its cocoa supply chains. Our cocoa campaign targeted the three chocolate companies in the Scorecard because they source 40% of the world’s cocoa. Oxfam filed a resolution with Mondelez only because Mars is a private company, and Nestlé is incorporated in Switzerland. The resolution helped keep Mondelez engaged in dialogue, while the company’s looming annual meeting in May provided the perfect pressure point to get Mondelez to implement new policies which will mean better conditions for women cocoa farmers.

Our Scorecard revealed that most companies have little to no policies or understanding of land as a resource in their supply chains, or on women and the unique challenges they face in their supply chains. Following our cocoa campaign, all
three chocolate companies signed on to the UN Women’s Empowerment Principles, and committed to undertaking impact assessments in their sourcing countries, focusing on gender. They further agreed to publish their data and action plans, and to advocate with their industry associations, suppliers and certifications schemes to raise up gender as in priority in programming and standards. Our Behind the Brands campaign will target more companies on different issues in our Scorecard. Where appropriate, shareholder advocacy will be considered and will likely be used again as a tactic to get the companies to implement policies affecting their social and environmental impacts in sourcing countries.

**Oxfam has historically tried to influence corporate policies and practices from the outside via campaigns, petitions and research; how is working with other ICCR members on the “inside” as a shareholder strategically different?**

**Oxfam:** For Oxfam, a good campaign strategy will include external along with internal pressure on a given company. ICCR is the perfect forum for Oxfam to learn more about a company’s values, its internal champions, and its future direction. ICCR members have tremendous experience in engaging hundreds of companies. We have benefited from that experience through ICCR meetings and in conversations with members. We will continue to strategize with ICCR members on how best to influence a company’s practices. Our Behind the Brands campaign has used the insider strategy more than any other corporate campaign we have conducted. Our collaboration with ICCR is an integral part of that campaign.

**While most people not closely involved with agriculture assume that food is grown in the U.S. under fair and safe conditions, that’s not always the case. How is Oxfam working with the Equitable Food Initiative to seek worker justice and safety?**

**Oxfam:** The produce industry relies on manual labor to plant and harvest fruits and vegetables. The work is necessarily arduous—many hours in a day, done in sunny, humid, hot conditions, and involving exposure to chemicals. At the same time, farm workers are treated differently from almost all other workers in the country; they are excluded from many of the federal and state laws and regulations that provide basic labor protections. This lack of protection weakens their bargaining power and causes high turnover in the industry. Farm workers’ wages are low, often based on piece work. The vast majority of farmworkers are immigrants, which can leave them more susceptible to exploitation.

At the same time, produce retailers and consumers share important concerns. Produce is the leading source of foodborne illness, and recalls cost the industry millions in loss and liability. Retailers are also aware that public concern about labor conditions in their supply chains can negatively impact their brands. And those companies are also attentive to consumer concerns about pesticide use and its impact on safety and worker health.

The Equitable Food Initiative (EFI) is taking a fresh approach by simultaneously addressing the concerns of all stakeholders – workers, growers, retailers, and consumers. EFI trains and empowers farm workers and growers to collaborate in reducing food safety risks, pesticide use and health hazards in the fields. Informed, motivated, and respected farm workers play a key role in assisting farm owners and other partners in implementing and monitoring EFI standards. Much like quality improvement teams in an industrial setting, farm workers who understand and embrace food safety and environmental stewardship can help improve productivity, safety and quality.

EFI thus presents an opportunity for the produce industry to offer increased assurance to retailers and consumers that their fruit and vegetables have been grown and harvested in ways that respect workers and reduce the potential for transmission of food-borne illness.

**How do Oxfam’s programs and root-cause analysis promote a more equitable food system?**

**Oxfam:** Oxfam works across the spectrum of actors and methods within the food system. In order to create a more equitable food system for all, it will take collaborations with the willing, to campaigns targeting the laggards. It will also require a multi-stakeholder approach, one that involves government, civil society, consumers, buyers, producers and workers to effectively change a system that will feed everyone, enough, always. EFI represents one of our collaborations with stakeholders in the food system and Behind the Brands represents one of our campaigns.

**How will a company scorecard help to promote corporate progress?**

**Oxfam:** The Behind the Brands campaign is spurring a race to the top among the 10 food and beverage companies, which we believe will have a cascading impact on the traders and producers throughout their supply chains. Companies have already shared with us that the Scorecard has created dialogue within their companies. In some cases, new dialogue has broken barriers between corporate social responsibility departments and procurement departments. There are many individuals in companies who understand they need to change how they do business moving forward; the Scorecard gives those individuals, along with consumers, investors, and most importantly, impacted communities, a tool to push for better policies and practices.
Founded in 1971, ICCR members first gained international attention for their campaign to bring down the oppressive system of apartheid through their collective power as shareowners of corporations with investments in South Africa. Today, with 300 institutional investors as members, ICCR's growing coalition is at the center of the Corporate Social Responsibility Movement they began nearly forty years ago. Actively engaging global corporations on social justice issues that impact the health of our planet and all its inhabitants, we invite you to join us in our mission to build a more just and sustainable world.

As pioneers in socially responsible investing (SRI), ICCR members form coalitions both within the membership and with external allies that work with corporations on a wide range of issues from supply-chain accountability and corporate governance to a host of human rights and environmental concerns. ICCR provides our members with critical resources such as research and staff support, as well as access to our growing membership with which to partner, for more effective corporate engagement. Through shareholder proposals, in corporate dialogues and in participation with other CSR organizations, every day ICCR members are helping to change the conscience of the world's most influential corporations and keep them mindful of the human and environmental costs of doing business.

As we look towards the future, our growing coalition seeks new members who bring with them new visions and fresh ideas. The Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility is committed to broadening our membership by actively reaching out to all who support our mission.

In short, ICCR members are inspired by faith and committed to action, as we work together to bridge the divide between morality and markets.

For more information or to become a member of ICCR please contact ICCR's Member Relations Associate Allison Lander at alander@iccr.org or 212-870-2984.