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Introduction

Protecting the Protectors: Aligning Investment Strategies for Native American Communities is a step-by-step resource guide designed to help mission-driven asset owners better manage investments in publicly held companies and funds that impact Native American communities. This guide focuses on communities within the geographic boundaries of the United States, and on those Indigenous Peoples broadly defined as Native American; however, many of the principles and methodologies shared in this guidebook can be applied to investments that impact Indigenous communities around the world.

Investors, grantmaking organizations, and other types of asset owners interested in using the power of their capital to positively effect change within Native American (or Tribal) communities\(^1\)\(^2\) have a variety of tools available to them. Several strategies commonly used in impact investing or mission-related investing offer investors a path to positively impact Native communities.

Two commonly used tools—screening and shareholder engagement—can be applied with a lens benefiting Tribal communities. This guide presents these methodologies, along with examples of how they have been used by both Native and non-Native organizations active in the field. Protecting the Protectors: Aligning Investment Strategies for Native American Communities also has a how-to section laying out steps for implementation.

Native Americans represent only two percent of the population of the United States.\(^3\) However, the positive impacts of investing (and grantmaking) with a Tribal-focused lens can have exponential reach beyond Native American communities, yielding broadly positive social and environmental benefits. Adopting this Tribal-focused lens supports traditional lifeways of Native American peoples and empowers self-determination and tribal sovereignty.

Impact Investing Tools and Native American Communities

While impact investing in Native communities can be accomplished using a variety of tools, investors often use these two easily implemented strategies:

- Apply an investment screen or lens;
- Participate in or initiate shareholder engagement, either directly or in partnership with shareholder networks, non-profit advocacy organizations, and/or asset managers.

As a third strategy, investors may also choose to invest directly in Native Community Development Financial Institutions (Native CDFIs)\(^4\).

---

1 For selected background information about Native communities in the United States, see Appendix A
2 For the purposes of this paper, Native American, American Indian, Native Peoples, and Indigenous People(s) (IP) will be used interchangeably (unless otherwise noted).
4 A copy of Doubling Philanthropic Impact: Below Market Rate Investments in Native American Community Financial Institutions (Confluence Philanthropy) is available upon request.
Screens and Lenses

Applying an investment screen as part of an Environmental Social Governance (ESG) strategy allows investors to specifically exclude or include companies in an investment portfolio based on the company’s ESG performance. Screening adds an additional layer of research to traditional investment research.

1. Negative Screens

Applying a negative screen to a portfolio excludes companies and securities from investment consideration based on their negative impact or corporate activities. Negative screens can be fairly straightforward and simple to apply because the process of avoiding stocks can be easier than deciding which companies to include.

In the past, commonly applied negative screens focused on excluding companies participating in the production of alcohol, tobacco, or firearms. More recently, however, negative screens have expanded to encompass many harmful industries, including fossil fuel companies driving climate change. Within Native communities, negative screens have been used to exclude coal, uranium, and other natural resource extraction companies; companies with human rights violations; and those known for disregarding tribal rights, such as meaningful consultation and “free, prior and informed consent” (also known as FPIC\(^5\), described in more detail below).

2. Positive Screens

Positive screening is the proactive process of investing in companies with business practices that align with the values or mission of the asset owner. These include environmentally conscious business practices, demonstrated diversity in staff and executive leadership, or advocacy on social issues. Investors can also use positive screens to identify companies whose good ESG performance or socially beneficial products may lead to improved financial returns.

As described in more detail below, the Swift Foundation uses multiple types of positive screens, including one for companies demonstrating support of local farmers and Indigenous communities by building and sustaining viable food systems. For those interested in applying a positive Native community screen to their portfolio, this report provides additional examples in Section C below; also see Appendix D: Additional Resources.

---

\(^5\) 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
The Evolution of Tribally Focused Screens

Over the past 30 years, investing vanguards have worked to institutionalize the adoption of Native community focused screens as part of standard ESG protocols, but progress has been slow. While many institutional investors use ESG protocols of some sort, very few explicitly include Indigenous Peoples in their investment policy statements. Among those that do, a limited number have adopted language from the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP or UN Declaration), including the importance of “free, prior and informed consent.” Even fewer mention Native Americans/Alaska Natives by name in their investment or social responsibility policies.

In 1999, First Peoples Worldwide and Calvert Social Investment Fund co-created one of the first investment screens for Native community impacts. The statement was crafted to provide standard engagement practices for governments, investors, and corporations interested in incorporating Indigenous community rights into investment choices. Although developed with a global lens, the principles focused specifically on Native American communities within the geographic United States.6 Investors aligned with these principles commit to seek out companies that:

- Respect the right of self-determination;
- Respect land and natural resource rights and traditional homelands of Indigenous communities;
- Respect cultural heritage, ceremonial, and sacred Indigenous sites;
- Obtain free and informed prior consent to operate or explore on Indigenous lands;
- Avoid relocation of Indigenous communities, except in cases where there is free and informed prior consent, agreement on fair compensation, and an option to return to homelands;
- Negotiate agreements with Indigenous communities fairly and transparently with independent observers present;
- Avoid exacerbating any tensions between Indigenous communities and local or national governments;
- Protect and respect customary knowledge and use of natural resources;
- Provide restitution and fair compensation to Indigenous People when any property, including intellectual property, has been taken from them;
- Establish a mechanism for monitoring company compliance with codes of conduct and principles.

These general principles served as the framing of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN Declaration), which was adopted in 2007 by the United Nations General Assembly.

---

Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC)

The UN Declaration formally outlines the terms of free and prior informed consent with regard to responsibilities of national states. It can also be applied to corporate, investor, and institutional responsibilities. The terms include respect of basic rights, self-determined, freely given decision-making without coercion, and full disclosure of consequences.

Although commitment by governments and corporations to UNDRIP are aspirational and nonbinding, Indigenous peoples have successfully used UNDRIP—and specifically, FPIC—to change laws and court rulings, and to stop unwanted projects from moving forward. For more about the legal strategies in use, see Appendix B.
Own What You Own: Shareholder Engagement/Advocacy

Shareholder Engagement, or Shareholder Advocacy, is the practice whereby shareholders in publicly-traded companies work to change corporate behavior related to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices. Investors may also work to change or support public policy. There are two primary strategies used by shareholders to exercise their ownership voice: filing shareholder resolutions and proxy voting.

1. Resolutions

Shareholders can submit resolutions—formally known as shareholder proposals—for inclusion in a company’s proxy statement, to be voted on at its annual shareholders meeting. To propose a resolution in the U.S., a shareholder must own a minimum $2,000 market value of shares continuously for at least one year. Canada has similar rules for their federally chartered corporations. Elsewhere in the world, securities laws make it difficult to file shareholder proposals. Prior to being included in the proxy statement and sent to all shareholders for vote, the corporation’s management can challenge resolutions via legal filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. If the resolution survives this challenge, it will then be voted on by all of the corporation’s shareholders. Although an important tool for raising management’s awareness of an issue, shareholder resolutions are nonbinding.

A number of shareholder resolutions regarding Indigenous Peoples have been filed, and some have been successful in changing corporate behavior. For example, in 2009, shareholders successfully steered one of the world’s largest gold producers toward improved Indigenous rights policies. That year, shareholders representing 92% of Newmont Mining’s stock voted in favor of the resolution, and the company’s Community Relations Review is now a critical part of Newmont’s operations planning worldwide. In the past two decades investors have proposed a number of resolutions specific to Native Americans. These have focused mainly on eliminating offensive images, protecting sacred spaces, and addressing negative impacts of natural resource extraction. These resolutions have been met with corporate resistance and produced only limited change.

---

Boston Common Asset Management

Using comprehensive ESG Sustainability Criteria, Boston Common has adopted the following statement:

“Under the human rights lens, we are also committed to helping defend the rights of Indigenous Peoples. We seek companies that respect the lands and cultures of Indigenous Peoples, and operate in line with the international standards of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, ILO Convention 169, and Free Prior and Informed Consent.”

– Steven Heim, Boston Common Asset Management

---

2. Proxy Voting

Shareholders may grant their voting rights via proxy to expert advocates at specialized proxy voting firms; this is a commonly used practice when investors do not have time to attend annual meetings or do the research needed to make informed decisions about resolutions. Some philanthropic investors grant proxy rights to their grantees or to others with experience and knowledge of the issue at hand.

Be forewarned! Proxy voting is considered by some to be minimally effective. It is an arms-length approach to changing corporate behavior, and one that requires a critical mass of shareholder support to be seriously considered by a corporate board, while at the same time offering little guarantee of substantive impact. Even when a resolution receives over 50% of the vote, a board of directors can disregard the resolution.

That said, proxy voting should not be viewed as a quixotic endeavor. Increasingly, proxy voting and shareholder engagement drive change in corporate practices as investors become more savvy and better organized through the efforts of powerful global networks such as the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, the UN-supported Principles for Responsible Investment, US SIF, CDP, Ceres, and others.

Use of Pro-Native Community Investment Strategies

The following two example investment strategies are excerpted from the Swift Foundation’s Investment Policy. Additional examples from both the Swift Foundation and Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation are provided in Appendix F.

1. Negative Screens: “Do Not Buy” Guidelines

Investments shall not knowingly be made in any company receiving 10% or more in gross revenues from the development, manufacture, sale, or distribution of any of the following items:

- Coal or nuclear power (including the mining, storing, or transportation of such fuels);
- Genetically modified organisms (seeds, fish, or animals);
- Synthetic agrochemicals;
- Old-growth timber;
- Antipersonnel weapons, armaments, ammunition, or weapons-related systems;
- Nuclear weapons contract awards from the U.S. Department of Defense or comparable agency or department of any foreign government.

Companies that do not fall into any of the above categories may still be ineligible for purchase, or eligible for immediate liquidation, if Swift determines their business practices to be a gross violation of generally accepted social principles (such as human rights violations; the violation of free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples; discriminatory or abusive labor practices, including the exploitation of child labor; flagrant or egregious damage to the environment; and unethical business practices).

Swift Foundation: Leaders in the field

The Swift Foundation has embraced the use of both positive and negative screens as a way of addressing concerns about Indigenous communities. They invest in local stewards and their allies who are dedicated to protecting biological and cultural diversity, building resilience to adapt to climate change, and restoring the health and dignity of Native communities.

How did Swift begin including the concerns of Native Peoples in their investment strategy? Executive Director Jen Astone says it started when a question arose at the foundation’s Board of Directors about ways to align grantmaking (which included Indigenous communities) with investment decisions. The discussion began a proactive effort to better align their grantmaking impact with their investment impact. The board continues to review investment policy to mindfully, proactively, and specifically include Indigenous Peoples.
2. Positive Screens

The Swift Foundation focuses part of its programmatic investing efforts in agroecology, based on its longstanding interest in agriculture, people, and sustainable food systems. The Foundation works to develop expertise and to network with other grantmakers, collaboratives, and companies also working in this space. Agroecology brings ecological principles to agricultural production systems resulting in innovative management approaches that aim to support local farmers and Indigenous communities by building and sustaining viable food systems; promote communities’ economic well-being and food security; and protect the environment from the effects of industry and climate change.

3. Shareholder Engagement

As with screens, few shareholder resolutions with U.S.-domiciled assets have explicitly identified Native American Peoples. Of the 370 resolutions in the 2016 Proxy Preview Report published by As You Sow, only three explicitly identify Indigenous Peoples (Netflix, Kinder Morgan, and SPX), and only two name Native Americans (Netflix and Apple). In the same year, 18% of resolutions related to human rights/labor and 33% centered around environmental issues. Of these human rights and environmental resolutions, 51% directly related to issues impacting Native communities; thus, it may be a natural progression for future resolutions to explicitly name and include Indigenous Peoples as part of a broader investment strategy.

Trillium Asset Management has advocated for Native American communities through various actions. In 2013, the firm had success with the mining company Anglo American, part of a partnership in the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska,\(^{10}\) resulting in the withdrawal of the project. By partnering with the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Trillium put forward shareholder proposals directed at FedEx and their sponsorship of the Washington, D.C. NFL team. The firm co-authored resolutions calling for the company to cease using the deeply offensive and racist term “Redskins.”\(^{11}\)

In 2016, the New York Common Retirement Fund (NYCRF) submitted a resolution calling on Kinder Morgan (owner and operator of pipelines transporting gas, crude, chemicals, and more) to consider ESG factors, including the long- and short-term implications of the nonrecognition of human rights of Indigenous communities.\(^{12}\) NYCRF also submitted a resolution to Marathon Petroleum regarding its ownership stake in the Dakota Access Pipeline.\(^{13}\)

---


\(^{11}\) Ibid


\(^{13}\) Bloomberg Sustainable Finance. Investors Take Stand on Dakota Access Pipeline by Amanda Albright, December 1, 2016. https://newsletters.briefs.bloomberg.com/document/Q8OSxAYD1rDm1-8SeDvUQ--_4azz20fg2gc3zrl3rb/front
In 2016, Calvert filed three resolutions related to human rights and Indigenous Peoples. The resolution at Netflix focused on offensive and inaccurate portrayals of Native Americans; the resolution at FedEx Corporation focused on degrading sports team names; and at Kroger Calvert co-filed a proposal addressing human rights in the company’s supply chain.\textsuperscript{14}

In 2016, Boston Common Asset Management, working with First Peoples Worldwide and other investors, helped write resolutions and file them with minority partners of the Dakota Access Pipeline (Marathon Petroleum, Phillips 66, and Enbridge). Boston Common held meetings with three of the four major banks financing the pipeline (Citibank, TD, and Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi UFJ). Furthermore, to educate and empower investors, Boston Common helped organize webinars and meetings with the Chairman of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and other tribal representatives.\textsuperscript{15} Boston Common has successfully engaged energy companies to adopt Indigenous Peoples policies or statements, including Burlington Resources (2004), Repsol (2009), ConocoPhillips (2011), Spectra Energy (2013), and Apache (2014).

The Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation includes proxy voting guidelines in their investment policy.\textsuperscript{16} While these guidelines do not explicitly identify Native Americans, the policy supports the foundation’s grantmaking, and grantees include Native Americans working on traditional growing practices, food sovereignty, and environmental justice.

\section*{Proxy Voting Statement Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation (excerpt)}

We believe that passive holding of corporate stocks without assessment of the social and environmental, as well as the financial performance of a corporation does not fulfill our obligation as a shareholder.

With its separately managed accounts, the Foundation votes its proxies as follows:

- When program interests are directly involved, proxies shall be voted in a manner consistent with them.
- When a shareholder resolution deals with a social or environmental issue that is not directly related to the Foundation’s program interests, the proxy shall be voted in a manner consistent with this Policy Statement. The Foundation will review each individual case and consult with our grantees, managers and others, as appropriate.
- On issues of corporate governance the Foundation will vote according to the following general guidelines:
  - Vote for proposals recognizing the standing of stakeholders other than shareholders in governance and control.

\textsuperscript{15} https://fccdl.in/2ASk8mcZG
How and Where to Get Started

Factors that impact Indigenous communities are far reaching and interconnected with other complex issues, such as gender, human rights, health, economic development, and the environment. Investors concerned about how their investments impact tribal communities can use these issues as surrogate screens while an investment strategy and accompanying screening policy is being adopted. A good source for screening criteria focusing more broadly can be found in the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) 2010 Resolution ABQ-10-018, Socially Responsible Investing for Indian Country,\textsuperscript{17} which encourages tribal Governments to adopt a SRI policy with regards to their investable assets. This can include using positive screens to identify and invest in corporations that support human rights and the environment.

Education and Information Gathering: Know What You Own

The first step is to analyze the investments that you and your foundation own. There are a number of ways to gather information about the publicly held companies in your portfolio:

- Investor Networks. Leverage your membership at Confluence and in other networks. Inquire with the staff or post a query to the listserv.
- Internet searches. Conduct an Internet search using the company’s name and keywords such as good/bad corporate behavior, Native Americans, human rights violations, or environmental violations.
- Investor Relations. Review the investor relations’ reports and social responsibility statement and follow up directly with the company.
- Investment Advisors. Work with an advisor to review your portfolio regarding your impact in Native communities.

\textsuperscript{17} National Congress of American Indians, Resolution #ABQ-10-018 Socially Responsible Investing for Indian Country. October 2010. http://www.ncai.org/resources/resolutions/socially-responsible-investing-for-indian-country
The Process

The process presented below is meant to serve as a general framing for moving forward in expanding your ESG investment strategy to include Indigenous communities.

1. Start with Questions.

- What questions or concerns do you have about your current investments?
- What are the current investments in your portfolio and the impacts on Native Peoples?
- Do you need an outside expert to address questions about the intersection of your mission, your portfolio, and Indigenous issues?
- Who will lead the effort to continue? Subcommittee? Investment committee? It’s recommended that there be representation from senior leadership, board, trustee, and investment committees.
- What are the risks (financial, mission related, etc.)? What impact will the adoption of Native community focused screens have on current investments?
- How will the updated policy be implemented and when?
- What asset classes will be considered for screens?

2. Write or Update Your Investment Policy

A simple policy can expand as the organization learns, grows, and evolves. Many policies define which assets Indigenous screens will be applied to and to what extent they will be applied.

3. Keep the Policy Current

As with most investment policies, periodic reviews are useful to ensure effectiveness, relevance, and to adjust course.
Conclusion: Achieving Increased Impact

Using these tools, investors can leverage their capital and influence—without sacrificing profit—to increase impact across publicly held assets in the investment corpus. The practices outlined here can drive powerful change that advances mission, investments, and positive impact in Native American communities.

A. Mission Related

The more traditional positive outcomes for adopting a Native community focused screen include: promoting good will; aligning mission, grantmaking and investment portfolio impact; positioning the organization’s image as socially and environmentally conscious; serving as an example for the field; and rewarding positive corporate behavior.

B. Financial

In 2005, the United Nations Environment Program’s (UNEP) Finance Initiative determined that there is a direct and positive link between adopting ESG-based policies and financial performance. Therefore, the addition of a Native lens will prioritize, enhance, and focus the investment impact.

“Integrating ESG considerations into an investment analysis so as to more reliably predict financial performance is clearly permissible and is arguably required in all jurisdictions.”

Appendix A. Selected Background Information: Native American Communities

This information is intended to provide context and background to assist better understanding of whether creation and adoption of investing strategies related to Native communities is relevant to your portfolio and priorities.

There are approximately 370 million Indigenous Peoples worldwide, in over 90 countries; they own, occupy or use a quarter of the world's surface area which contain approximately 80% of the world's remaining biodiversity.20

Indigenous traditional knowledge and lifeway systems play a pivotal role in the conservation and sustainable management of the earth's riches. One of the root causes of marginalization and poverty in Native communities is the loss of control over traditional lands, territories, and natural resources.21

Within the United States, approximately 56.2 million acres are held in trust by the federal government for tribes (44 million acres) and individuals (11 million acres).22 A large percentage of the total natural resources in the U.S. are found on or near tribal reservations.

Definition

For the purposes of this paper, Native American, American Indian, Native Peoples, and Indigenous People(s) (IP) will be used interchangeably (unless otherwise noted). The characteristics outlined by the United Nations and the International Labor Organization describe Indigenous groups as:

- Descended from the pre-colonial/pre-invasion inhabitants of our region;
- Maintaining a close tie to their land in both cultural and economic practices;
- Suffering from economic and political marginalization as a minority group;
- Considered Indigenous if self-defined that way.

Approximately 6.4 million individuals identify themselves as American Indian (AI), Alaska Native (AN), or Native Hawaiian (NH), in full or in part. However, not all individuals who self-identify as Native American are members of federally recognized tribes.

Geographic Classification

There are three geographic contexts for Native communities: urban, rural, and tribal, each distinct in ways that can affect the impact, accuracy, relevance, and success of applying a Native lens to an investment strategy. Below is a geographic snapshot of American Indian communities.

1. Urban

Native Americans living in metropolitan or urban communities represent three-fourths of the American Indian population;²⁴ despite movement to urban areas, these populations maintain strong physical and cultural ties to their tribal communities. Experts consider this number incorrect due to census misclassification. This leads to underreporting and results in misleading data about the need for services and economic support in urban populations.

2. Rural

Rural communities include both Native and non-Native American Indians. In general, rural communities are under-resourced and offer opportunities for investment and economic development.

3. Tribal Lands

Tribal communities have different legal designations (described below), which may have an effect on investment strategy. Designations include federally recognized, state recognized, and unrecognized. Native Hawaiians do not have tribal “nations,” but are recognized by the state as Indigenous Peoples.

Tribal Recognition

Federal recognition is typically granted by treaty acknowledgement, presidential proclamation, or executive order. Tribes with federal recognition are treated as sovereigns by the U.S. Federal government (and other nations). As sovereign nations, they have the same liberties as foreign nations with their own governance, obligations, limitations, commerce, judiciary, and infrastructure.²⁵ To date, there are 567 Federally recognized tribes.²⁶

Tribes can have state recognition, granted by the state in which they are geographically located. It is common for a tribe to have state recognition but not federal recognition.

A third common tribal entity type is unrecognized, meaning the tribe has no federal or state recognition, but has a critical mass of citizenry and an historical—as well as cultural kinship—tie to a geographic location. According to the U.S. Government Accountability Office, there are about 400 non-federally recognized tribes.²⁷

²⁶ Ibid
Appendix B. Native Communities Rights: Legal Strategies

On the international level, FPIC was used successfully for Indigenous communities in the case of the Saramaka People v. Suriname. Saramaka lands had been distributed to logging and mining companies with no process for recognizing their rights, including the right to free, prior and informed consent. The court sided with the Saramaka, stating that they had the right to choose their own representatives and make choices aligned with their traditional practices, and that restitution may be due for lands taken without consent.28

Recognition of and success for Indigenous People fighting against companies violating FPIC in the global arena may discourage future actors from violations29 and encourage companies to change their policies and activities to be in accordance with FPIC.

In the United States, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and six other confederated Sioux tribes continue to work to prevent the construction and operation of the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) by Energy Transfer, noting violations of an 1868 U. S. treaty and a lack of free, prior and informed consent. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe is suing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) through a federal court action to invalidate the project permits, stating that the DAPL Environmental Assessment failed to include a highly sensitive factor—the inclusion of two endangered butterfly species. The DAPL project’s Environmental Impact Statement stated: “the Project would have no effect on any of the listed species within the affected environment. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts to the listed species within the affected environment.” Failing to consider these factors is grounds for terminating the project.30

On December 4, 2016, the USACE declined to grant the necessary easement for construction of the DAPL on the current route. The halted construction and forced the company to develop an alternative pipeline route. However, on February 7th, 2017, Army Corps officials approved the final permit necessary for the pipeline’s completion without a full environmental review. As of the writing of this report, the Standing Rock Sioux are planning on challenging that decision in court.

Appendix C. Additional Resources


Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework


Indigenous Peoples Investment Criteria

Indigenous Peoples and Engagement Timeline for Sustainable and Responsible Investing (1971–2005)


Indigenous Rights Risk Report

Proxy Guide: Resources
http://businessjournalism.org/2013/03/proxy-guide-resources/

The 21st Century Corporation: The Ceres Roadmap for Sustainability
http://www.ceres.org/resources/reports/ceres-roadmap-to-sustainability-2010

The Calvert Principles for Responsible Investment
http://www.calvert.com/approach/how-we-invest/the-calvert-principles
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2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples


Appendix E. Sample Native Community Screening Criteria

The Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation lists the screens on their website; these are a selection of those which directly address Native communities, both implicitly and explicitly. For more information, please see http://www.noyes.org/impact-investing/investment-policy.

Positive:

- Companies that have a demonstrated record of women and people of color serving on their boards of directors and in the top two levels of management;
- Companies with hiring practices and supportive environments that foster diversity and inclusiveness and/or are included on lists like Fortune magazine’s 50 Best Companies for Minorities and Working Mother magazine’s 100 Best Companies for Working Mothers;
- Companies that support the construction of and/or provide financing and mortgages for affordable and low-income housing;
- Companies with demonstrated leadership on charitable giving, innovative approaches to community development, environmentally friendly building designs, and excellence in the public education system;
- Companies that purchase goods and services from minority and women-owned businesses and actively promote contract opportunities for minority and women-owned suppliers and service providers.

Negative:

- Companies that consistently target Indigenous lands in the United States and globally for:
  - mining and extraction of coal, oil, natural gas or other minerals;
  - storage and disposal of nuclear wastes;
  - dumping and disposal of hazardous and toxic wastes.
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