



**WHEREAS:** AT&T’s Public Policy and Corporate Reputation Committee “is responsible for oversight of AT&T’s public policy activities and corporate political disbursements.” It annually [reviews](#) AT&T’s “policies, practices and expenditures related to political contributions, as well as contributions to trade associations and other tax-exempt and similar organizations that may engage in public policy initiatives.”

AT&T sponsors a federal employee political action committee (PAC) and numerous state PACs to “to collectively support public policy positions that are important to AT&T.... The employee PAC committees’ decisions are based on AT&T’s [public policy positions](#) and the best interests of the business and our employees.”

However, AT&T’s politically focused expenditures appear to be misaligned with its public statements on its views and operational practices. For example, AT&T has committed to achieving carbon neutrality by 2035, yet is a member of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which has consistently lobbied to roll back specific US climate regulations and promote regulatory frameworks that would slow the transition towards a low GHG emissions energy mix.

AT&T has publicized a strong commitment to gender diversity, stating in its 2019 AT&T Diversity & Inclusion Annual Report that it is “a leader in the #SeeHer movement” and detailing its “commitment to gender equality.” AT&T subsidiary WarnerMedia has “Feminist Fridays”, hosts breakfasts, speaker events, and mentoring programs. Yet based on public data, the proponent estimates that in the last three election cycles, AT&T and its employee PACs have made political donations totaling at least \$16.4 million to politicians and political organizations working to weaken women’s access to reproductive health care (Research conducted by the Sustainable Investments Institute)

If the company’s public policy actions appear to conflict with its expressions of social and environmental intention, stakeholders may become concerned that its statements are “corporate puffery,” language described by the United States Federal Trade Commission as marketing exaggerations intended to “puff up” products and not able to be relied upon by consumers and investors.

Proponents believe AT&T should establish policies and reporting systems that minimize risk to the firm's reputation and brand by addressing possible missteps in corporate electioneering and political spending that are in contrast to its stated diversity and environmental policies.



**BE IT RESOLVED:** AT&T publish a report, at reasonable expense, analyzing the congruency of political and electioneering expenditures during the preceding year against publicly stated company values and policies.

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT:** Proponents recommend that such report also contain management's analysis of risks to our company's brand, reputation, or shareholder value of expenditures in conflict with publicly stated company values. "Expenditures for electioneering communications" means spending, from the corporate treasury and from the PACs, directly or through a third party, at any time during the year, on printed, internet or broadcast communications, which are reasonably susceptible to interpretation as in support of or opposition to a specific candidate.