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A. The Purpose of This Bulletin

The Division is rescinding Staff Legal Bulletin Nos. 14I, 14J and 14K (the “rescinded SLBs”) after a review of staff experience applying the guidance in them. In addition, to the extent the views expressed in any other prior Division staff legal bulletin could be viewed as contrary to those expressed herein, this staff legal bulletin controls.

This bulletin outlines the Division’s views on Rule 14a-8(i)(7), the ordinary business exception, and Rule 14a-8(i)(5), the economic relevance exception. We are also republishing, with primarily technical, conforming changes, the guidance contained in SLB Nos. 14I and 14K relating to the use of graphics and images, and proof of ownership letters. In addition, we are providing new guidance on the use of e-mail for submission of proposals, delivery of notice of defects, and responses to those notices.

In Rule 14a-8, the Commission has provided a means by which shareholders can present proposals for the shareholders’ consideration in the company’s proxy statement. This process has become a cornerstone of shareholder engagement on important matters. Rule 14a-8 sets forth several bases for exclusion of such proposals. Companies often request assurance that the staff will not recommend enforcement action if they omit a proposal based on one of these exclusions (“no-action relief”). The Division is issuing this bulletin to streamline and simplify our process for reviewing no-action requests, and to clarify the standards staff will apply when evaluating these requests.
B. Rule 14a-8(i)(7)

1. Background

Rule 14a-8(i)(7), the ordinary business exception, is one of the substantive bases for exclusion of a shareholder proposal in Rule 14a-8. It permits a company to exclude a proposal that “deals with a matter relating to the company’s ordinary business operations.” The purpose of the exception is “to confine the resolution of ordinary business problems to management and the board of directors, since it is impracticable for shareholders to decide how to solve such problems at an annual shareholders meeting.”

2. Significant Social Policy Exception

Based on a review of the rescinded SLBs and staff experience applying the guidance in them, we recognize that an undue emphasis was placed on evaluating the significance of a policy issue to a particular company at the expense of whether the proposal focuses on a significant social policy, complicating the application of Commission policy to proposals. In particular, we have found that focusing on the significance of a policy issue to a particular company has drawn the staff into factual considerations that do not advance the policy objectives behind the ordinary business exception. We have also concluded that such analysis did not yield consistent, predictable results.

Going forward, the staff will realign its approach for determining whether a proposal relates to “ordinary business” with the standard the Commission initially articulated in 1976, which provided an exception for certain proposals that raise significant social policy issues, and which the Commission subsequently reaffirmed in the 1998 Release. This exception is essential for preserving shareholders’ right to bring important issues before other shareholders by means of the company’s proxy statement, while also recognizing the board’s authority over most day-to-day business matters. For these reasons, staff will no longer focus on determining the nexus between a policy issue and the company, but will instead focus on the social policy significance of the issue that is the subject of the shareholder proposal. In making this determination, the

---

1 Release No. 34-40018 (May 21, 1998) (the “1998 Release”). Stated a bit differently, the Commission has explained that “[t]he ‘ordinary business’ exclusion is based in part on state corporate law establishing spheres of authority for the board of directors on one hand, and the company’s shareholders on the other.” Release No. 34-39093 (Sept. 18, 1997).

2 For example, SLB No. 14K explained that the staff “takes a company-specific approach in evaluating significance, rather than recognizing particular issues or categories of issues as universally ‘significant.’” Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14K (Oct. 16, 2019).

3 Release No. 34-12999 (Nov. 22, 1976) (the “1976 Release”) (stating, in part, “proposals of that nature [relating to the economic and safety considerations of a nuclear power plant], as well as others that have major implications, will in the future be considered beyond the realm of an issuer’s ordinary business operations”).
staff will consider whether the proposal raises issues with a broad societal impact, such that they transcend the ordinary business of the company.\textsuperscript{4}

Under this realigned approach, proposals that the staff previously viewed as excludable because they did not appear to raise a policy issue of significance for the company may no longer be viewed as excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7). For example, proposals squarely raising human capital management issues with a broad societal impact would not be subject to exclusion solely because the proponent did not demonstrate that the human capital management issue was significant to the company.\textsuperscript{5}

Because the staff is no longer taking a company-specific approach to evaluating the significance of a policy issue under Rule 14a-8(i)(7), it will no longer expect a board analysis as described in the rescinded SLBs as part of demonstrating that the proposal is excludable under the ordinary business exclusion. Based on our experience, we believe that board analysis may distract the company and the staff from the proper application of the exclusion. Additionally, the “delta” component of board analysis – demonstrating that the difference between the company’s existing actions addressing the policy issue and the proposal’s request is insignificant – sometimes confounded the application of Rule 14a-8(i)(10)’s substantial implementation standard.

3. Micromanagement

Upon further consideration, the staff has determined that its recent application of the micromanagement concept, as outlined in SLB Nos. 14J and 14K, expanded the concept of micromanagement beyond the Commission’s policy directives. Specifically, we believe that the rescinded guidance may have been taken to mean that any limit on company or board discretion constitutes micromanagement.

The Commission has stated that the policy underlying the ordinary business exception rests on two central considerations. The first relates to the proposal’s subject matter; the second relates to the degree to which the proposal “micromanages” the company “by probing too deeply into matters of a complex nature upon which shareholders, as a group, would not be in a position to

\textsuperscript{4} 1998 Release (“[P]roposals… focusing on sufficiently significant social policy issues… generally would not be considered to be excludable, because the proposals would transcend the day-to-day business matters and raise policy issues so significant that it would be appropriate for a shareholder vote”).

\textsuperscript{5} See, e.g., Dollar General Corporation (Mar. 6, 2020) (granting no-action relief for exclusion of a proposal requesting the board to issue a report on the use of contractual provisions requiring employees to arbitrate employment-related claims because the proposal did not focus on specific policy implications of the use of arbitration at the company). We note that in the 1998 Release the Commission stated: “[P]roposals relating to [workforce management] but focusing on sufficiently significant social policy issues (e.g., significant discrimination matters) generally would not be considered to be excludable, because the proposals would transcend the day-to-day business matters and raise policy issues so significant that it would be appropriate for a shareholder vote.” Matters related to employment discrimination are but one example of the workforce management proposals that may rise to the level of transcending the company’s ordinary business operations.
make an informed judgment."6 The Commission clarified in the 1998 Release that specific methods, timelines, or detail do not necessarily amount to micromanagement and are not dispositive of excludability.

Consistent with Commission guidance, the staff will take a measured approach to evaluating companies’ micromanagement arguments – recognizing that proposals seeking detail or seeking to promote timeframes or methods do not per se constitute micromanagement. Instead, we will focus on the level of granularity sought in the proposal and whether and to what extent it inappropriately limits discretion of the board or management. We would expect the level of detail included in a shareholder proposal to be consistent with that needed to enable investors to assess an issuer’s impacts, progress towards goals, risks or other strategic matters appropriate for shareholder input.

Our recent letter to ConocoPhillips Company7 provides an example of our current approach to micromanagement. In that letter the staff denied no-action relief for a proposal requesting that the company set targets covering the greenhouse gas emissions of the company’s operations and products. The proposal requested that the company set emission reduction targets and it did not impose a specific method for doing so. The staff concluded this proposal did not micromanage to such a degree to justify exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(7).

Additionally, in order to assess whether a proposal probes matters “too complex” for shareholders, as a group, to make an informed judgment,8 we may consider the sophistication of investors generally on the matter, the availability of data, and the robustness of public discussion and analysis on the topic. The staff may also consider references to well-established national or international frameworks when assessing proposals related to disclosure, target setting, and timeframes as indicative of topics that shareholders are well-equipped to evaluate.

This approach is consistent with the Commission’s views on the ordinary business exclusion, which is designed to preserve management’s discretion on ordinary business matters but not prevent shareholders from providing high-level direction on large strategic corporate matters. As the Commission stated in its 1998 Release:

[In] the Proposing Release we explained that one of the considerations in making the ordinary business determination was the degree to which the proposal seeks to micromanage the company. We cited examples such as where the proposal seeks intricate detail, or seeks to impose specific time-frames or to impose specific methods for implementing complex policies. Some commenters thought that the examples cited seemed to imply that all proposals seeking detail, or seeking to promote time-frames or methods, necessarily amount to “ordinary business.” We did not intend such an

---

implication. Timing questions, for instance, could involve significant policy where large differences are at stake, and proposals may seek a reasonable level of detail without running afoul of these considerations.

While the analysis in this bulletin may apply to any subject matter, many of the proposals addressed in the rescinded SLBs requested companies adopt timeframes or targets to address climate change that the staff concurred were excludable on micromanagement grounds.\(^9\) Going forward we would not concur in the exclusion of similar proposals that suggest targets or timelines so long as the proposals afford discretion to management as to how to achieve such goals.\(^10\) We believe our current approach to micromanagement will help to avoid the dilemma many proponents faced when seeking to craft proposals with sufficient specificity and direction to avoid being excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(10), substantial implementation, while being general enough to avoid exclusion for “micromanagement.”\(^11\)

C. Rule 14a-8(i)(5)

Rule 14a-8(i)(5), the “economic relevance” exception, permits a company to exclude a proposal that “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.”

Based on a review of the rescinded SLBs and staff experience applying the guidance in them, we are returning to our longstanding approach, prior to SLB No. 14I, of analyzing Rule 14a-8(i)(5) in a manner we believe is consistent with *Lovemheim v. Iroquois Brands, Ltd.*\(^12\) As a result, and consistent with our pre-SLB No. 14I approach and *Lovemheim*, proposals that raise issues of broad social or ethical concern related to the company’s business may not be excluded, even if the relevant business falls below the economic thresholds of Rule 14a-8(i)(5). In light of this approach, the staff will no longer expect a board analysis for its consideration of a no-action request under Rule 14a-8(i)(5).

---

\(^9\) See, e.g., *PayPal Holdings, Inc.* (Mar. 6, 2018) (granting no-action relief for exclusion of a proposal asking the company to prepare a report on the feasibility of achieving net-zero emissions by 2030 because the staff concluded it micromanaged the company); *Devon Energy Corporation* (Mar. 4, 2019) (granting no-action relief for exclusion of a proposal requesting that the board in annual reporting include disclosure of short-, medium- and long-term greenhouse gas targets aligned with the Paris Climate Agreement because the staff viewed the proposal as requiring the adoption of time-bound targets).


\(^11\) To be more specific, shareholder proponents have expressed concerns that a proposal that was broadly worded might face exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(10). Conversely, if a proposal was too specific it risked exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) for micromanagement.

\(^12\) 618 F. Supp. 554 (D.D.C. 1985).
D. Rule 14a-8(d)13

1. Background

Rule 14a-8(d) is one of the procedural bases for exclusion of a shareholder proposal in Rule 14a-8. It provides that a “proposal, including any accompanying supporting statement, may not exceed 500 words.”

2. The Use of Images in Shareholder Proposals

Questions have arisen concerning the application of Rule 14a-8(d) to proposals that include graphs and/or images.14 The staff has expressed the view that the use of “500 words” and absence of express reference to graphics or images in Rule 14a-8(d) do not prohibit the inclusion of graphics and/or images in proposals.15 Just as companies include graphics that are not expressly permitted under the disclosure rules, the Division is of the view that Rule 14a-8(d) does not preclude shareholders from using graphics to convey information about their proposals.16

The Division recognizes the potential for abuse in this area. The Division believes, however, that these potential abuses can be addressed through other provisions of Rule 14a-8. For example, exclusion of graphs and/or images would be appropriate under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) where they:

- make the proposal materially false or misleading;

- render the proposal so inherently vague or indefinite that neither the stockholders voting on the proposal, nor the company in implementing it, would be able to determine with any reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires;

- directly or indirectly impugn character, integrity or personal reputation, or directly or indirectly make charges concerning improper, illegal, or immoral conduct or association, without factual foundation; or

---

13 This section previously appeared in SLB No. 14I (Nov. 1, 2017) and is republished here with only minor, conforming changes.

14 Rule 14a-8(d) is intended to limit the amount of space a shareholder proposal may occupy in a company’s proxy statement. See 1976 Release.

15 See General Electric Co. (Feb. 3, 2017, recon. granted Feb. 23, 2017); General Electric Co. (Feb. 23, 2016). These decisions were consistent with a longstanding Division position. See Ferrofluidics Corp. (Sept. 18, 1992).

16 Companies should not minimize or otherwise diminish the appearance of a shareholder’s graphic. For example, if the company includes its own graphics in its proxy statement, it should give similar prominence to a shareholder’s graphics. If a company’s proxy statement appears in black and white, however, the shareholder proposal and accompanying graphics may also appear in black and white.
• are irrelevant to a consideration of the subject matter of the proposal, such that there is a strong likelihood that a reasonable shareholder would be uncertain as to the matter on which he or she is being asked to vote.  

Exclusion would also be appropriate under Rule 14a-8(d) if the total number of words in a proposal, including words in the graphics, exceeds 500.

E. Proof of Ownership Letters

In relevant part, Rule 14a-8(b) provides that a proponent must prove eligibility to submit a proposal by offering proof that it “continuously held” the required amount of securities for the required amount of time.

In Section C of SLB No. 14F, we identified two common errors shareholders make when submitting proof of ownership for purposes of satisfying Rule 14a-8(b)(2). In an effort to reduce such errors, we provided a suggested format for shareholders and their brokers or banks to follow when supplying the required verification of ownership. Below, we have updated the suggested format to reflect recent changes to the ownership thresholds due to the Commission’s 2020 rulemaking. We note that brokers and banks are not required to follow this format.

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

Some companies apply an overly technical reading of proof of ownership letters as a means to exclude a proposal. We generally do not find arguments along these lines to be persuasive. For example, we did not concur with the excludability of a proposal based on Rule 14a-8(b) where the proof of ownership letter deviated from the format set forth in SLB No. 14F. In those cases, we concluded that the proponent nonetheless had supplied documentary support.


18 This section previously appeared in SLB No. 14K (Oct. 16, 2019) and is republished here with minor, conforming changes. Additional discussion is provided in the final paragraph.

19 Rule 14a-8(b) requires proponents to have 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.


21 The Division suggested the following formulation: “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].”


23 See Amazon.com, Inc. (Apr. 3, 2019); Gilead Sciences, Inc. (Mar. 7, 2019).
sufficiently evidencing the requisite minimum ownership requirements, as required by Rule 14a-8(b). We took a plain meaning approach to interpreting the text of the proof of ownership letter, and we expect companies to apply a similar approach in their review of such letters.

While we encourage shareholders and their brokers or banks to use the sample language provided above to avoid this issue, such formulation is neither mandatory nor the exclusive means of demonstrating the ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b). We recognize that the requirements of Rule 14a-8(b) can be quite technical. Accordingly, companies should not seek to exclude a shareholder proposal based on drafting variances in the proof of ownership letter if the language used in such letter is clear and sufficiently evidences the requisite minimum ownership requirements.

We also do not interpret the recent amendments to Rule 14a-8(b) to contemplate a change in how brokers or banks fulfill their role. In our view, they may continue to provide confirmation as to how many shares the proponent held continuously and need not separately calculate the share valuation, which may instead be done by the proponent and presented to the receiving issuer consistent with the Commission’s 2020 rulemaking. Finally, we believe that companies should identify any specific defects in the proof of ownership letter, even if the company previously sent a deficiency notice prior to receiving the proponent’s proof of ownership if such deficiency notice did not identify the specific defect(s).

F. Use of E-mail

Over the past few years, and particularly during the pandemic, both proponents and companies have increasingly relied on the use of emails to submit proposals and make other communications. Some companies and proponents have expressed a preference for emails, particularly in cases where offices are closed. Unlike the use of third-party mail delivery that provides the sender with a proof of delivery, parties should keep in mind that methods for the confirmation of email delivery may differ. Email delivery confirmations and company server logs may not be sufficient to prove receipt of emails as they only serve to prove that emails were sent. In addition, spam filters or incorrect email addresses can prevent an email from being delivered to the appropriate recipient. The staff therefore suggests that to prove delivery of an

24 See Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F, n. 11.


26 2020 Release at n. 55 ("Due to market fluctuations, the value of a shareholder’s investment in a company may vary throughout the applicable holding period before the shareholder submits the proposal. In order to determine whether the shareholder satisfies the relevant ownership threshold, the shareholder should look at whether, on any date within the 60 calendar days before the date the shareholder submits the proposal, the shareholder’s investment is valued at the relevant threshold or greater. For these purposes, companies and shareholders should determine the market value by multiplying the number of securities the shareholder continuously held for the relevant period by the highest selling price during the 60 calendar days before the shareholder submitted the proposal. For purposes of this calculation, it is important to note that a security’s highest selling price is not necessarily the same as its highest closing price.") (citations omitted).
email for purposes of Rule 14a-8, the sender should seek a reply e-mail from the recipient in which the recipient acknowledges receipt of the e-mail. The staff also encourages both companies and shareholder proponents to acknowledge receipt of emails when requested. Email read receipts, if received by the sender, may also help to establish that emails were received.

1. Submission of Proposals

Rule 14a-8(c)(1) provides that in order to avoid controversy, shareholders should submit their proposals by means, including electronic means, that permit them to prove the date of delivery. Therefore, where a dispute arises regarding a proposal’s timely delivery, shareholder proponents risk exclusion of their proposals if they do not receive a confirmation of receipt from the company in order to prove timely delivery with email submissions. Additionally, in those instances where the company does not disclose in its proxy statement an email address for submitting proposals, we encourage shareholder proponents to contact the company to obtain the correct email address for submitting proposals before doing so and we encourage companies to provide such email addresses upon request.

2. Delivery of Notices of Defects

Similarly, if companies use email to deliver deficiency notices to proponents, we encourage them to seek a confirmation of receipt from the proponent or the representative in order to prove timely delivery. Rule 14a-8(f)(1) provides that the company must notify the shareholder of any defects within 14 calendar days of receipt of the proposal, and accordingly, the company has the burden to prove timely delivery of the notice.

3. Submitting Responses to Notices of Defects

Rule 14a-8(f)(1) also provides that a shareholder’s response to a deficiency notice must be postmarked, or transmitted electronically, no later than 14 days from the date of receipt of the company’s notification. If a shareholder uses email to respond to a company’s deficiency notice, the burden is on the shareholder or representative to use an appropriate email address (e.g., an email address provided by the company, or the email address of the counsel who sent the deficiency notice), and we encourage them to seek confirmation of receipt.