

Executive Council Narrative Minutes  
Embassy Suites, Montgomery, Alabama  
October 18 - 21, 2019

**Friday morning, October 18, 2019**

The meeting began with morning prayer designed to support the work in racial justice and reconciliation that will be the focus of this meeting.

Following morning prayer, The Most Rev. Michael Curry, Chair, called the meeting to order and called on the Secretary, the Rev. Canon Michael Barlowe, to call the roll and make announcements.

All present, unless otherwise noted:

Michael Curry, Chair  
Gay Jennings, Vice Chair

Thomas Alexander – arriving late  
Lloyd Allen  
Devon Anderson  
Liza Anderson  
Diane Butler  
Jane Cislucis  
Matthew Cowden - excused  
Lillian Davis-Wilson  
Patricia Downing - excused  
Noreen Duncan  
Cornelia Eaton  
Blanca Echeverry  
Alice Freeman  
Pauline Getz  
Louis Glosson  
Angela Goodhouse-Mauai  
Mark Goodman  
Julia Ayala Harris  
Scott Hayashi

Anne Hodges-Copple - excused  
Anne Kitch  
Edward Konieczny  
Alexizendria Link – arriving late  
Mally Ewing Lloyd  
Frank Logue - excused  
Andrea McKellar  
Steven Nishibayashi  
Aaron Perkins  
Mayra Gonzalez Polanco  
Diane Pollard  
Holli Powell Strum  
Russell Randle  
Rose Sconiers  
Dabney Smith  
Sarah Stonesifer  
George Wing  
Warren Wong

Ex-officio members and those with seat and voice:  
Michael Barlowe, Secretary  
Kurt Barnes, Treasurer  
Byron Rushing, Vice President of the House of Deputies  
Geof Smith, COO

Doug Anning, Acting CLO

Companion Church Partners:

Andrew Asbil, Anglican Church of Canada - excused

Joanne Engquist, ELCA

Pastor Joanne Engquist was introduced as the new liaison from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The other new liaison, The Rt. Rev. Andrew Asbil from the Anglican Church of Canada was unable to attend this meeting due to prior scheduled events. After announcements, Bishop Curry asked for a motion to accept the agenda. The agenda was moved, seconded and approved. The minutes of the June, 2019 meeting were moved, seconded and approved. Actions taken by the Executive Committee were ratified:

**1. Native American Dioceses Sustainability Grants – ECEC 012**

*Resolved*, That \$355,625 of the total \$667,000 Long-term Development Grants (budget line 402) for the four principal dioceses engaged in Native American ministry (Alaska, Navajoland, North Dakota, and South Dakota), be distributed and released as follows:

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1. North Dakota Standing Rock Mission building repairs and completion of Star Lodge    | \$271,625 |
| 2. Navajoland Mission church building repairs in Bluff, Utah                           | \$64,000  |
| 3. Alaska, Building Improvements to St. Thomas, Pt. Hope and St. Stephen's, Ft. Yukon. | \$20,000  |

**EXPLANATION**

In consultation with the Missioner for Indigenous Ministries, the bishops of the four dioceses noted above, are in agreement and are submitting this allocation request. The bishops wish to receive these funds now to enable construction before harsh weather sets in during the autumn months. An earlier request for \$270,000 was approved by Executive Council in February 2019 as FIN-024. This additional request, if approved, leaves a remaining balance of \$ 41,375.

**2. Grant to the Diocese of Taiwan – ECEC 013**

*Resolved*, That the Executive Committee wishes to enable the expansion of ministries to people of Chinese descent; and be it further

*Resolved*, That because certain board directed trust funds have been restricted for ministry to Chinese of the Dispersion (post-Communist takeover), the Executive Committee agrees to grant \$55,000 to the Diocese of Taiwan to assist in an episcopal transition; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the funds will be used specifically to defray costs of election and consecration expenses; participation of the new bishop at the 2020 Lambeth Conference; and year one of the new bishop's participation in the College for Bishops.

**EXPLANATION**

This grant is a request from Bishop David Lai. It is supported by the Presiding Bishop. These trusts, which are restricted for ministry among the Chinese of the Dispersion, have been used for work in the Diocese of Taiwan, and, more recently, to assist with the Li Tim-Oi Center for Chinese Ministry in the Diocese of Los Angeles.

These trust funds totaled approximately \$4.7 million at 06/30/2019, generating annual dividends of approximately \$220K.

### **3. Clergy Housing Allowance – ECEC 015**

*Resolved*, That a portion of the total compensation paid to each clergy employee for calendar year 2019 shall be designated to be a housing allowance; and be it further

*Resolved*, that the Executive Committee designates as a tax-deductible housing allowance for 2019 those allowances requested and presented by clergy employees of the DFMS to the Treasurer as indicated in the attached list; and be it further

*Resolved*, that these allowances will be made pursuant to Internal Revenue Code Section 107 and Internal Revenue Service Regulations S1.107 up to 100% of the annual cash salary of such clergy.

#### **EXPLANATION**

This resolution is required because clergy employees are compensated by the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (DFMS) for the services as ministers of the gospel; and

Clergy Housing Allowances must be approved by the governing body. Requests received will be considered as soon as practicable, either by the Executive Council or by the Executive Committee, on behalf of the Executive Council.

The current request is from one new employee whose work commenced August 1<sup>st</sup>. The requested amount is within the salary limitations. Individual salaries are available for review in the Treasurer's Office.

<b>Employee</b>	<b>2019 Requested Housing Allowance</b>
Crist, Mary Frances	\$14,221

### **4. Request from The Episcopal Church in Liberia: Trust Fund 853 - ECEC 016**

*Resolved*, That upon receiving written request from the Rt. Rev. Jonathan B. Hart and the Standing Committee of the Episcopal Church of Liberia (ECL), the Executive Council authorizes that \$300,000 from Trust Fund 853 be distributed to ECL.

#### **Explanation**

In a letter received August 21, 2019, Bishop Hart explained that ECL is unable to meet payroll in the next two months due to deteriorating economic conditions in the country, which has resulted in delinquent payments from tenants.

As a last resort. ECL wishes to make a special draw of \$300,000.00 to get through the end of the year. The funds will also enable ECL to proceed with bringing on production of palm and other agricultural products. Trust Funds of Class 179 were established as an endowment fund for The Episcopal Church of Liberia in 1982. At 6/30/19 TF853 had undistributed appreciation of \$639,000.

Bishop Curry invited the Chairs of the Joint Standing Committees to give a brief report of their committee's agendas for this meeting.

Canon Jane Cislucyis reported for the Joint Standing Committee on Governance and Operations (GO). Among other things, the committee will receive updates on legal matters

and receive a report from the 815 building manager regarding request for funds to renovate 815 Second Avenue.

The Rev. Mally Lloyd reported for the Joint Standing Committee on Finance (FIN). This committee has 28 resolutions, including three from the Executive Council Committee on Corporate Responsibility. Other resolutions include approving the 2020 Travel Guidelines, approving the audit, fund raising priorities, 2020 budget, and construction of meeting room at 815 Second Avenue.

The Rt. Rev. Dabney Smith reported for the Joint Standing Committee on Mission Beyond The Episcopal Church (MB). This committee will devote a large part of their time discussing covenant and bilateral committees.

The Hon. Rose Sconiers reported for the Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within The Episcopal Church (MW). The committee will be approving grants, care of creation covenant, and will interact and hear reports from many staff members.

Next, Canon Barlowe explained the process for election of a new member of Executive Council. The Executive Committee received 58 applications and presented a slate of five nominees. One nominee had to withdraw due to personal reasons, four names were placed on the ballot. Bishop Curry asked if there were any nominations from the floor. There were no floor nominations. The first ballot was distributed and collected.

Bishop Curry called on Jane Cisluycis to provide an overview of the schedule for Saturday. Jane thanked her planning committee – Diane Butler, Russ Randle, Louis Glosson, Diane Pollard, and Chuck Wynder. Executive Council members and staff have prepared for the pilgrimage by reading “Just Mercy” by Bryan Stevenson, watching a documentary, and participating in webinars facilitated by Dr. Kelly Brown-Douglas and Dr. Catherine Meeks.

Bishop Curry and President Jennings offered opening remarks. Their remarks reflected the theme of the meeting, racial reconciliation. Results of the first ballot were announced. There was no election, and a second ballot was distributed and collected. There was a short break. After the break, Canon Barlowe announced that there no candidate received a majority of votes. A third ballot was distributed and collected.

The Rev. Anne Kitch gave a presentation about the budget visioning process. She asked everyone to write one word or phrase that answered the question “What is the most important consideration in the budget process?” Answers were collected, and the Joint Standing Committee on Finance will use these as they begin the budget process. This discussion will be continued on Monday morning.

The three representatives to the Anglican Consultative Council gave a report of their meeting in Hong Kong in February. Canon Rosalie Ballentine began by describing her impressions of the meeting, especially compared to the previous meeting she attended as

an ACC representative. Canon Ballentine said that the meeting was very scripted, with little or no discussion. Most of the resolutions passed called for reporting back at ACC 18. Intentional discipleship was the goal of the meeting. Canon Barlowe, who was elected to attend as an alternate to replace Rev. Gay Jennings (who was unable to attend), presented on his overall impressions and gave some statistics about provincial asks and contributions. He said that he was shocked by the boldness of exclusion – there were no attention to interpretation/translation needs, and no provision for guests. A new formula for provincial assessments based on active bishops and their compensation, was presented, and the three Episcopal Church representatives were the only members to vote against it. Bishop Ed Konieczny echoed that it was a very controlled environment, and shared some personal experiences with the resolution he proposed and shepherded through the meeting.

Canon Barlowe announced the results of the third ballot, and still no candidate had received a majority of votes. As the Rules of Order dictate, the name of the person receiving the least number of votes will be dropped from the ballot. The fourth ballot will be distributed when Executive Council next meets in plenary session, Monday morning. Bishop Curry offered grace and Council broke for lunch.

#### **Friday afternoon**

The afternoon was spent in committee. Some committees also met in the evening.

#### **Saturday, 10/19**

This day was a pilgrimage. Council met for Morning Prayer, led by members of Diocese of Alabama and Diocese of Central Gulf Coast, the Rev. Carolyn Foster, Mr. Gary Moore and Mr. Joe McDaniel. The group walked to the Legacy Museum: From Enslavement to Mass Incarceration in the morning; walked over to St. John's Episcopal Church for lunch; and then were bused to the National Memorial for Peace and Justice in the afternoon. After visiting the memorial, they continued by bus to Good Shepherd Episcopal Church, where Mr. Bryan Stevenson, Director of the Equal Justice Initiative, spoke to the group. They returned to the hotel for dinner and a short prayer service led again by Deacon Foster, Mr. Moore and Mr. McDaniel.

#### **Sunday morning, 10/20**

Executive Council attended Eucharist at St. John's Episcopal Church, and returned to the hotel for lunch.

#### **Sunday afternoon, 10/20**

The afternoon was spent in committee. Some committees also met in the evening. Consent calendar was posted at 3:00 p.m. Upon request, MW 007 was removed from the consent calendar.

### **Monday morning, 10/21**

After morning prayer, the fourth ballot for election was distributed and collected. The Council members spent an hour debriefing about the pilgrimage experiences of Saturday. Discussion was facilitated by Bishop Curry, who instructed them to first discuss at their tables and then as group. Staff and visitors were invited to join table discussions. Members were given the opportunity to voice their impressions, feelings and hopes for going forward.

Canon Barlowe announced that Charles Graves had received a majority of votes and was elected to Executive Council. Canon Barlowe asked everyone to refrain from sharing that information until he was able to notify all the nominees.

Bishop Curry gave an introduction to budget visioning, going back to 2015 and how the priorities were developed. Gay Jennings added the importance of paying attention to our desire for a participatory government and to remember how the Holy Spirit moves us. Anne Kitch asked a series of questions that members answered on post-it notes that were collected. Questions were:

1. Based on what General Convention asked for, name the 3 most important budget priorities
2. Based on the Presiding Bishop's vision, name the 3 most important budget priorities
3. Where do you see convergence and divergence?
4. Is there anything else the EC Joint Standing Committee on Finance should consider in the budget process?

Anne thanked everyone for their participation, on behalf of the subcommittee of Patty Downing, Andrea McKeller and Anne Kitch. At Bishop Curry's invitation, she offered grace before lunch.

### **Monday afternoon, 10/21**

Council reconvened after lunch and began committee reports with The Hon. Rose Sconiers reporting for Mission Within The Episcopal Church. Justice Sconiers thanked the committee and staff members who assisted the committee in their work. She reported that they had a zoom conference with Edwin Johnson from the Presiding Officers Advisory Group on Beloved Community Implementation, and heard their recommendations. She moved MW 012.

To: Executive Council  
From: Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church (MIN)  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Re: Becoming Beloved Community Grants

*Resolved*, That the following Becoming Beloved Community grants, recommended by the Presiding Officers Advisory Group on Beloved Community Implementation, and having been reviewed and recommended by the Joint Standing Committee on Mission

Within the Episcopal Church, are approved and authorized for payment from Becoming Beloved Community grant funds, budget line item 84, in the total amount of \$350,600, as follows:

1. The Justice Pilgrimage, Diocese of Georgia, Impact Grant, \$15,000.00
2. Diocesan Racial Justice and Healing, Diocese of Kentucky, Seed Grant, \$7,000.00
3. Episcopal Farmworkers Ministry, Diocese of North Carolina, Impact Grant, \$15,000.00
4. The Center for Reconciliation, Diocese of Rhode Island, Impact Grant, Growing the Center for Reconciliation's Mission, \$14,000.00
5. Partnership with Great Lakes Peace Center, Diocese of Northern Michigan, Impact Grant, \$15,000
6. Gethsemane Reconciliation Center, Gethsemane Episcopal Church, Diocese of Indiana, \$9,500.00
7. Charis Community in Charlottesville, Virginia, Grace Church-Red Hill, Diocese of Virginia, \$8,000.00
8. Racial Reconciliation Ministry, St. Anne's Episcopal Church, Diocese of Maryland, Seed Grant, \$5,000.00
9. "My Work to Do," Jubilee Consortium, Diocese of California, Seed Grant, \$8,000.00
10. Antiracism Action Plan, St. John's Episcopal Church, Diocese of Illinois, \$4,000.00
11. Pilgrimage through South and Midwest, St. John's Episcopal Church, Diocese of Michigan, Seed Grant, \$5,000.00 South Carolina, Seed Grant, \$
12. Community-wide Storytelling Events, St. Martin's-in-the-Fields Episcopal Church, Columbia, SC, Diocese of South Carolina, Seed Grant, \$3,900.00
13. Sacred Ground and Communities of Color, Union of Black Episcopalians, Impact Grant, \$14,000.00
14. Triangle of Hope, Diocese of Virginia, Impact Grant, \$13,000.00
15. Ethnic Studies Academy (Becoming Beloved Community), Diocese of Iowa, Seed Grant, \$8,000.00
16. Trail of Souls Video Narratives, Diocese of Maryland, Seed Grant, \$5,000.00
17. The Mission Institute – Capacity Building, Diocese of Massachusetts, Impact Grant, \$15,000.00
18. Community Conversations, Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, Diocese of Minnesota, Seed Grant, \$6,500.00
19. Bravos Valley Common Good, St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Diocese of Texas, Seed Grant, \$6,000.00
20. Beloved Community Commission for Racial Reconciliation, Eastern Diocese of Tennessee, Seed Grant, \$8,000.00
21. Diocesan Racial Reconciliation and Healing Resource Team, Diocese of Georgia, Seed Grant, \$6,000.00
22. Province V Becoming Beloved Community Initiative, Diocese of Southern Ohio, Impact Grant, \$10,000.00
23. The One Human Race Initiative, St. James Episcopal Church, Diocese of Texas, Seed Grant, \$6,000.00
24. Voorhees Scholars Program, Episcopal Diocese of Upper South Carolina, Impact Grant, \$10,000.00
25. "How Do We Talk to Our Children About Race?" Training, All Saints Episcopal Church, Diocese of Illinois, Seed Grant, \$3,000.00
26. Worship with Bravery, Christ Church Cathedral, Diocese of Indianapolis, Impact Grant, \$11,000.00
27. Commission on Racial Justice & Reconciliation, Diocese of the Central Gulf Coast, Impact Grant, \$12,000.00

28. Engaging Racial Justice and Inclusion, Convocation of Episcopal Churches in Europe, Impact Grant, \$11,000.00
  29. Growing Centers of Practice, Diocese of Southern Ohio, Impact Grant, \$11,000.00
  30. Commission for Intercultural Ministries, Diocese of Northern California, Impact Grant, \$5,000.00
  31. Racial Reconciliation Fellowship for Young Adults, Diocese of Western North Carolina, Seed Grant, \$5,700.00
  32. Pilgrimage towards Racial Reconciliation, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Diocese of Pennsylvania, Seed Grant, \$3,000.00
  33. Initiative: "At the Heart of Our Identity: Being Episcopal, Being Inclusive", National Association of Episcopal Schools, Diocese of NY, Seed Grant, \$5,000.00
  34. Dismantle Systemic Racism in the Justice System, Saint Andrew's Episcopal Church, Diocese of California, Impact Grant, \$7,000.00
  35. Courageous Conversations, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Diocese of Ohio, Seed Grant, \$6,000.00
  36. St. Paul's, Tri-Cities, WA Racial Equity & Social Justice Coalition, St. Paul's Episcopal Mission, Diocese of Spokane, Seed Grant, \$4,000.00
  37. Faculty Training in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Diocese of California, Seed Grant, \$3,500.00
  38. Building Bridges to Communities of Justice, PRISM Restorative Justice, Diocese of Los Angeles, Impact Grant, \$7,000.00
  39. European-American/Arabic Church Partnership, Diocese of Michigan, Impact Grant, \$12,000.00
  40. Building Inclusive, Representative and Authentic Communities, Episcopal Camps and Conference Centers (ECCC), Diocese of California, Impact Grant, \$10,000.00
  41. Trail of Souls: Next Phase, Diocese of Easton, Seed Grant, \$2,500.00
  42. Service Never Sleeps Trainings on Privilege, Racism and Justice, Diocese of Southwestern Virginia, Impact Grant, \$12,000.00
- Total of grants to be funded this cycle: \$350,600  
and be it further,

*Resolved*, That in the event of any discrepancy between the above recitation of the grants to be funded and the spreadsheet, "Final BBC Grant Recommendations\_Fall 2019.xlsx," attached hereto, the details set forth in the spreadsheet shall be deemed controlling; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the grantees shall be required to submit the reports ordinarily and customarily required of grant recipients and such other and further reports as the "Presiding Officers Advisory Group on Beloved Community Implementation" may require.

MW 012 was adopted. The committee also heard a report from Janet Waggoner on behalf of the Task Force for Church Planting, and moved MW 010.

To: Executive Council

From: Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church

Date: October 21, 2019

Re: Resolution on Church Planting Grants

*Resolved*, That the following Church Planting and Redevelopment grants, recommended by the Task Force on Church Planting and Congregational Redevelopment, and having been reviewed and recommended by the Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within



the Episcopal Church, are approved and authorized for payment from Church Planting grant funds, budget line item 38, in the total amount of \$689,500.00, as follows:

Ministry Name	Diocese	Type	Amount
Abundant Life Health and Wellness	North Carolina	Seed	\$30,000
All Souls Episcopal Church	Central Florida	Seed	\$20,000
Bethany House and Gardens	Kansas	Discernment	\$2,500
Between the Bridges	Central Gulf Coast	Discernment	\$5,000
Center for Mission and Ministry at St. Paul's	Kansas	Growth	\$30,000
Chaplains on the Harbor	Olympia	Harvest	\$30,000
Christ's Beloved Community	North Carolina	Harvest	\$40,000
The Church at Crossroads	Michigan	Growth	\$30,000
Church of the Beloved	Oregon	Seed	\$30,000
Creche	Massachussetts	Seed	\$30,000
Freeport Way of Love	Central Gulf Coast	Discernment	\$5,000
German Language Communities in Europe	Europe	Discernment	\$5,000
Good Samaritan Church	Indianapolis	Harvest	\$40,000
Holy Hikes of Green Bay	Fon du Lac	Discernment	\$5,000
Iglesia Episcopal de San Pablo	W. Massachussettes	Discernment	\$5,000
Life Together	New York	Discernment	\$5,000
Misa Magdalena	Washington DC	Growth	\$30,000
Mission Walk	New York	Seed	\$30,000
Mother of the Savior	Michigan	Discernment	\$5,000

Plainsong Farm	W. Michigan	Growth	\$30,000
Rathbone Migrant Ministry	Massachusetts	Discernment	\$2,000
Resurrection Church	NW Pennsylvania	Growth	\$30,000
RISE	Pennsylvavnia	Seed	\$30,000
Saint James	Pittsburgh	Discernment	\$5,000
San Cornelio	W. Kansas	Discernment	\$5,000
San Marco	El Camino Real	Seed	\$30,000
St. Luke's, North Park	San Diego	Seed	\$30,000
Saint Nicholas	West Texas	Seed	\$30,000
Stepping Stone	El Camino Real	Growth	\$30,000
Table 229	Minnesota	Harvest	\$20,000
Teens of Santa Cruz County	El Camino Real	Growth	\$15,000
The Gathering	Los Angeles	Seed	\$20,000
The Playground	N. California	Discernment	\$5,000
The Waystation	Iowa	Seed	\$30,000

Total of grants \$689,500

and be it further

*Resolved*, in the event of any discrepancy between the above recitation of the grants to be funded and the spreadsheet, “Church Planting - Executive Council Report, October 2019.Rev1.xlsx,” attached hereto, the details set forth in the spreadsheet shall be deemed controlling; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the grantees shall be required to submit the reports ordinarily and customarily required of grant recipients and such other and further reports as the “Task Force on Church Planting and Congregational Redevelopment” may require.

Ms. Holli Powell abstained from voting due to a conflict of interest. MW 010 was adopted. Next, Justice Sconiers moved MW 007.

To: Executive Council  
From: Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Re: Constable Fund Grants

*Resolved*, That the following Constable Fund grants, recommended by the Constable Fund Grant Review Committee, having been reviewed and recommended by the Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church, are approved and authorized for payment from available Constable Fund grant funds in the total amount of \$209,000.00, as follows:

1. Department of Faith Formation (Staff) – Support for Episcopal Service Corps, \$35,000.00

*[Episcopal Service Corps: For more than 10 years, ESC has been an important formation ministry of The Episcopal Church, offering young adults ages 21-32 with opportunities to live the Way of Love for a full year by serving others in solidarity with the surrounding community, promoting justice for all of God's creation, deepening their spiritual formation, and discerning their vocational call, all while living simply in intentional community. With the passage of B017 at the 2018 General Convention, coordination of the Episcopal Service Corps network was incorporated into the work of the Department of Faith Formation but with no funding allocation from PB&F. Funds requested in this Constable Grant application would be used to more fully incorporate the functions of ESC into the work of the Formation Department and support the ongoing work of the ESC network while continuing to grow and foster this transformative ministry.]*

2. Standing Commission on World Mission – Holy Land Study Program, \$60,000.00

*[The Holy Land Study Program (HLSP) is a video-based religious education program supported by online resources and materials that will address the many General Convention resolutions that call us (1) to deepen our understanding of the significance of the Holy Land to the Abrahamic faiths, (2) to raise awareness of the inspiring and powerful Christian witness demonstrated by a small community of Palestinian Episcopalians in the region, and (3) to show people the conditions on the ground that necessitate the humanitarian response of serving their neighbors. Since 1988, the General Convention of the Episcopal Church has called for dioceses and parishes to take steps to learn about the Holy Land no fewer than seven times, as recently as B003 passed in 2018. To date no religious education curriculum or adaptable study program has been developed for broad use across the church. Nor has funding been provided in the current triennial budget of the DFMS for such work. The Standing Commission on World Mission with its primary partners, the Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem (DoJ) and American Friends of the Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem (AFEDJ), propose to develop a video-based study program and additional resources to provide congregations of all sizes and Episcopalians of all ages with an up-close-and-personal learning experience that connects them to Jesus's life and teaching and to the current-day ministries at work in the Diocese of Jerusalem. The program will educate Episcopalians about the opportunities we have to learn from our brothers and sisters in the Holy Land and join with them in ministry. The HLSP will provide a virtual pilgrimage to transform hearts and minds by offering a window into God's living presence at work in the Holy Land.]*

3. Task Force on Dialogue with South Sudanese Anglican Diaspora (D088) – Pilgrims on the Road to Emmaus (a conference), \$58,000.00

*[Pilgrims on the Road to Emmaus – The Episcopal Church & the South Sudanese Anglican Diaspora in the U.S.A. The task force was appointed to establish an official conversation for the purpose of developing a statement of understanding of the relationship with the South Sudanese Anglican diaspora living in this country and The Episcopal Church, passed by Resolution at the 79<sup>th</sup> General*

*Convention. The task force hopes this project will deepen the relationship between our Church and the South Sudanese Anglican diaspora through prayer, dialogue and the building of trust. Our hope is that through this particular engagement of South Sudanese clergy our task force and DFMS staff, we will begin to overcome the cultural and social obstacles that exist between our two entities. This involves an intentional time of listening to one another, breaking bread together, asking honest questions and being prepared for the challenges and hope that come from deeper engagement. Setting aside time to cultivate friendships in Christ, and offering a ministry of presence with one another, will hopefully lead to a shared sense of familiarity. It is with this hope that we share this project, which in many ways is a shared road to Emmaus.]*

4. Jerusalem Peacebuilders (Province I) – Blessed are the Peacemakers: Empowering youth for interfaith peace and justice ministries, \$20,000.00

*[Jerusalem Peacebuilders requests support from the Constable Fund to underwrite the design and teaching of all Christian instruction and workshops for its 2020 Blessed Are the Peacemakers interfaith initiative for teenage American, Israeli and Palestinian youth. Blessed Are the Peacemakers aims to advance peace, interfaith citizenship, and leadership through four experiential institutes in Connecticut, Texas and Vermont. Including instruction by Episcopalian, Jewish and Muslim clergy, JPB's curricula centers on exploring our universal interpersonal challenges, building the skills to overcome them and fostering the notion that securing a better future is our communal responsibility. JPB's peacebuilding modules of our curricula are framed around models of who our Lord Jesus Christ calls us all to be: resilient healers and peacemakers.]*

5. Office of Ecumenical and Interreligious Relations (Staff) – “Abraham: Out of One, Many,” \$36,000.

*[“ABRAHAM: Out of One, Many.” A timely educational interreligious artistic initiative on living harmoniously, inspired by Abraham, the common ancestor of Jews, Christians and Muslims – a creative response to the rise of prejudice and stereotyping in the United States. This proposal focuses on assisting Episcopalians around the country to most effectively embody the “Way of Love,” as demonstrated to us by Christ, amidst the alarming rise of antisemitism and anti-Muslim sentiment. This educational artistic initiative specifically focuses on the Episcopal “Way of Love” Practices of Learn, Bless, Go and Turn, and on “becoming the beloved community.”]*

*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Today's climate of increasing prejudice and stereotyping, which has resulted in a rise of tribalism, populist nationalism, racist ideologies, hate crimes, including an increase in antisemitism and anti-Muslim sentiment, needs to be counteracted by creative educational initiatives that are based on what we all hold in common. It is in this context that Abraham, a spiritual figure of distinct significance within the three primary monotheistic faith traditions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, has much to teach us about understanding and embracing the “other.” In these three religious traditions, whose followers are referred to as “children of Abraham,” the figure of Abraham is seen as a model of hospitality – of welcoming the “stranger.” Under the umbrella of the Office for Ecumenical and Interreligious Relations, and in partnership with CARAVAN, a peacebuilding ministry affiliated with the Episcopal Church, and with cathedrals around the country, this timely educational exhibition titled “ABRAHAM: Out of One, Many” (playing off of the US' traditional Latin motto, “E pluribus unum” / “Out of many, one”), focuses on what we can learn from Abraham's story about living together more harmoniously in the midst of the increasing diversity of our country. For this exhibition, three globally acclaimed contemporary visual artists from the faith traditions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam have been commissioned to produce artwork that interprets Abraham's life for us today, serving as a guide toward creating cultures of peace, harmony, justice and healing – all as descendants of a shared heritage, regardless of religious, ethnic or cultural backgrounds. The question this strategic contemporary art exhibition answers is, “What can we learn today from Abraham, the common ancestor of Jews, Christians and Muslims, about freeing our world from sectarian or ethnic strife?” This timely educational exhibition comes directly out of an expressed need by Episcopal cathedrals and their communities around the country that have recognized the effectiveness of art as an interreligious educational bridge, and who*

*have requested such an exhibition to benefit their communities to enhance understanding about the “other,” and also to help them build new relationships with local Jewish and Muslim communities. The exhibition will tour around the country for 22 months, between Fall 2019 and mid-2021, to 13 cities in 12 states. Held primarily in Episcopal cathedrals, the exhibition serves as a strategic catalyst for each host venue for the development of a variety of educationally related programs tailored to the specific needs of their community, toward enhancing understanding of Judaism and Islam, and to stimulate dialogue and friendship with our Jewish and Muslim sisters and brothers. In short, it is about how we might most effectively, as Christians, demonstrate the “Way of Love” amidst the alarming rise of antisemitism and anti-Muslim sentiment today. In this regard, we are respectfully submitting a grant proposal to The Constable Fund for this strategic educational interreligious artistic initiative for \$39,000, 28% of the overall exhibition tour budget of \$140,900. The remaining 72% (\$101,900) will be funded by Episcopal cathedrals, foundations and donors. This grant would be a strategic investment from The Constable Fund in the national Episcopal Church, assisting it to be a prophetic well-informed voice and a Christ-like example amidst the rise of prejudice, stereotyping, and what many are calling a Western “tribalism.”]*

Available funds for grants:       \$209,815.57

Total grants recommended:       \$209,000.00

Russ Randle recused himself due to a conflict of interest. MW 007 was adopted. Justice Sconiers reported that the committee received a report from the Task Force on Care of Creation and Environmental Racism. A grant to assist their work is on the consent calendar. They also presented a Care of Creation Covenant, which she moved as MW 011.

To:     Executive Council  
 From:   Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church  
 Date:   October 20, 2019  
 Re:     Care of Creation Covenant

*Resolved*, That Executive Council endorse and commend to the Church the Episcopal Creation Covenant and its three major commitments: Loving Formation, Liberating Advocacy and Life-giving Conservation, as follows:

### **Episcopal Creation Covenant**

In Jesus, God so loved the *whole* world. We follow Jesus, so we love the world God loves. Concerned for the global climate emergency, drawing on diverse approaches for our diverse contexts, we commit to form and restore loving, liberating, life-giving relationships with all of Creation.

**LOVING FORMATION: For God’s sake, we will grow our love for the Earth and all of life through preaching, teaching, storytelling, and prayer.**

As a whole church, we can ...

- Leverage the Care of Creation Grants program to support and connect Creation ministries (A008)
- Use StorySharing strategies, worship resources, and the Asset Map to offer stories of our love for Creation, our concern for the climate emergency, and our grief for climate-related suffering (A008)
- Equip preachers to preach regularly about Creation, spiritual resilience, moral courage, and action (A008)
- Communicate broadly and openly about the ecological crisis and our call to care for Creation, especially connecting across political/ideological divides (A008)

- Craft and communicate a theology of Creation and deepen knowledge of biblical insights into Creation (A008)
- Connect with and support youth movements, in partnership with Youth and Young Adult Ministries
- Illuminate connections between the ecological crisis and the Doctrine of Discovery/Manifest Destiny, in partnership with Indigenous Ministries
- Host pilgrimages in wild or degraded natural places, and encourage hands-on engagement with nature, including gardens, farms, and tree-planting (A010)
- Participate in the World Day of Prayer for the Care of Creation (September 1) and encourage the use of Episcopal liturgical resources for the Season of Creation on the Sundays leading to St. Francis of Assisi Day (October 4)

**LIBERATING ADVOCACY: For God’s sake, standing alongside marginalized, vulnerable peoples, we will advocate and act to repair Creation and seek the liberation and flourishing of all people.**

As a whole church, we can ...

- Stand in solidarity with historically marginalized and vulnerable communities, focusing on 2 or 3 specific groups/eco-justice sites as a whole church, especially ...
  - Communities of color and targets of environmental racism (A011)
  - Indigenous communities like Standing Rock, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Bears Ears, Navajo, Gwich’in/groups related to Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (C064 and B025)
  - Province IX, including Honduras, Ecuador, Dominican Republic and Colombia
  - Pacific Islanders/partners in the Anglican Communion (C063)
  - Women (B027)
- Engage in federal, state and local advocacy, especially around policies outlined by General Convention and with the guidance of the Office of Government Relations and the Episcopal Public Policy Network:
  - Leverage investments to support clean, renewable energy and energy access (A020 and C021)
  - Encourage adoption of the Paris Accord at state and local levels (A018 and A010)
  - Advocate for ocean health and protection (C063) and water as a human right (B025)
  - Affect policy through diverse means such as advocacy, voting, community organizing, and trained civil disobedience
  - Respond to proposed rule changes by U.S. government departments and agencies
- Support a just transition and global climate resilience
  - Partner with groups like Episcopal Relief and Development, ecoAmerica, Green Faith, Interfaith Power and Light, the Anglican Communion Environmental Network, and many others
  - Support Sustainable Development Goals, UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and Conference of Parties (A018)

**LIFE-GIVING CONSERVATION: For God’s sake, we will adopt practical ways of reducing our climate impact and living more humbly and gently on Earth as individuals, households, congregations, institutions, and dioceses.**

As a whole church, we can ...



- Practice joyful, counter-cultural simplicity and gratitude, and move from individualized, wasteful practices to a way of life that celebrates our interdependence and harmony with God's Creation
  - Practice Sabbath and living lightly, unselfishly and intentionally, especially during Lent
  - Speak the truth about sin, evil, falling short, forgiveness, and amendment of life
- Adopt specific conservation strategies in our daily lives as individuals and as a church
  - Encourage use of the Carbon Tracker in households and throughout dioceses ([www.SustainIslandHome.org](http://www.SustainIslandHome.org)) (C008)
  - Reduce energy consumption and waste in church gatherings, including phasing out use of bottled water in church-related facilities (B025)
  - Promote conscious food decisions and local, sustainable agriculture
  - Support use of the carbon tax and carbon offsets (C020 and A014)
  - Work toward regenerative agriculture, biodiversity conservation and habitat restoration, especially on church-owned lands (D053)

and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Task Force on Creation Care and Environmental Racism and the Presiding Bishop's Staff recommend a strategy for the implementation of the three major commitments within the Creation Covenant, reporting to the Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Church at least one month prior to its February, 2020, meeting; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Task Force and Staff research and develop a Future Church-wide Ambition to safeguard creation and steward finances by transitioning to clean, renewable energy, reporting to Mission Within the Church at least one month prior to its February, 2020, meeting.

MW 011 was adopted. The committee heard from various staff members. They discussed a resolution received from the Executive Council Committee on Anti Racism. Canon Noreen Duncan will contact the chair to discuss their mandate. This ended the report of the JSC on Mission Within TEC.

Next, Canon Jane Cislucyis presented for the Joint Standing Committee on Governance and Operations. This committee was joined at times by the Presiding Officers and others. They heard from Mr. Bill Savarese, Facility Manager for 815 Second Avenue, and the committee supports the 815 renovation project which will come as a resolution from Finance. They discussed the visit with Bryan Stevenson, which was inspirational and hopeful. Work on the Executive Council job description is ongoing. The committee received an update from the Task Force to Study the Church's pension system, and reviewed a revised plan from CPG. The committee had some suggestions for CPG, and to address this, moved GO 011.

TO: Executive Council  
 FROM: Joint Standing Committee on Governance and Operations  
 DATE: October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
 RE: Response to Report of CPF on the Revised C029 and D037 Implementation Plan

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church acknowledges receipt of the Revised Implementation Plan from the Church Pension Fund ("CPF"), in its capacity



as the Recorder of Ordinations, in response to Resolutions 2018-C029 and 2018-D037; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council recommend that in requesting information about gender identity, CPF use only an open text box so that clergy can self-identify their own gender rather than being classified as “other” (as specified in the third bullet point under “Implementation Plan”); and be it further

*Resolved*, That, given that gender identity can change over time, CPF develop protocol for how data on gender identity might be revise; and be it further

*Resolved*, That CPG clarify and make explicit how it will solicit data from all deacons and non-stipendiary clergy, who are not beneficiaries of the pension plan.

#### Explanation

The Executive Council Joint Standing Committee on Governance and Operations was grateful to receive the new implantation report from CPF, which addresses the concerns raised by GO009 from our June 2019 meeting. Our conversations about the report identified a few areas of additional concern about which we would like further clarity.

With respect to gender identity, while we understand the importance of being able to compare demographic data over time, we believe that it is important to avoid potentially alienating language such as “other”.

Further, since gender identity can change over a person’s lifetime, we would like to suggest that CPF develop protocol for how such data might be changed, and how those changes would be reflected in their records.

Finally, we would like additional clarity from CPF about how they plan to solicit data from all deacons and non-stipendiary clergy, many of whom do not currently have accounts with CPF.

GO 011 was adopted.

Canon Cislucyis reported that after two years of experimenting with a model of a part time Acting Chief Legal Officer who remained a partner of his firm, the Chair and Vice Chair of Executive Council have decided to end that experiment and go back to the original plan of a full time. On staff Chief Legal Officer. A four person committee will be formed to review the job description. She moved GO 012, which was approved by applause.

#### **Honoring Doug Anning**

The Committee on Governance and Operations recommends adoption of the following resolution honoring the faithful service of Douglas Anning, Acting Chief Legal Officer for The Episcopal Church:

#### **Resolution**

Whereas, Doug Anning, a lifelong Episcopalian and follower of Jesus, has served as Acting Chief Legal Officer beginning in September 2017 and concluding around December 2019; and

Whereas, Doug worked ably and faithfully to assist our officers, Executive Council, and the Church Center staff with legal advice and practical counsel in carrying out the ministry of The Episcopal Church; and

Whereas, Doug built many strong friendships among us during the time of his service;

Be it therefore

*Resolved*, by the Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, from October 18-21, 2019, that:

We recognize with great appreciation the steadfast service of Douglas Anning, as Acting Chief Legal Office for The Episcopal Church;

We extend our hearty thanks to Doug's for his faithful service to our Church and to our Lord Jesus; and

We extend our hearty thanks to Doug for his many professional and personal contributions to our common life and ministry; and

In friendship and gratitude, we pray God's blessings be upon him.

Canon Cislucyis ended by thanking fellow members and staff for entering into the pilgrimage.

Next, The Rev. Mally Lloyd presented on behalf of the Joint Standing Committee on Finance. She reported that the Finance Committee met jointly with JSC on Mission Within TEC and JSC on Mission Beyond TEC. Many of the resolutions, particularly the trust fund resolutions, are on the consent calendar. She moved FIN 039 and spoke to it.

To:	Executive Council
From:	The EC Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility through the Joint Standing Committee on Finance
Date:	October 21, 2019
Subject:	Ethical Investing in Gun Manufacturers: B007 Response

---

*Resolved*, That Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama receives the June 2019 report (the Report) of its Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility (CCSR) responding to the direction in resolution *B007 Ethical Investing in Gun Manufacturers* (GC2018) that "the Executive Council Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility...develop and implement a shareholder engagement plan" for investing in "gun manufacturers and retailers" in order to engage with them on gun safety; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Executive Council acknowledges and approves the plan (summarized below), which calls for the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society to invest in publicly traded securities of gun manufacturers and to work with other investors to engage with such companies to promote gun safety; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Executive Council, in order to enable CCSR to implement the plan, acknowledges and approves the purchase of stock in American Outdoor Brands, Olin Corporation and Sturm, Ruger and Co.

The Report states the plan as follows:

**Shareholder Engagement Plan for Ethical Investing in Gun Manufacturers**

- DFMS will invest in stock of American Outdoor Brands, Olin Corporation and Sturm, Ruger and Co. These publicly traded companies are known to be engaged in the gun manufacturing or ammunition businesses.
- CCSR should work with other investors to engage in shareholder advocacy with these publicly traded companies in order to further gun safety.
- CCSR, as it determines appropriate, should seek to apply the Mosbacher-Bennett Principles for Investors in the Gun Industry developed by Do Not Stand Idly By as commended to the Church by General Convention in B007.
- CCSR should evaluate whether to invest in any other publicly traded U.S. companies in gun-related industries in order to advocate for gun safety, and
- CCSR should conduct advocacy for gun safety with companies in other industries (e.g., financial institutions) which may be in the DFMS portfolio and recommend appropriate shareholder action regarding any such company

(See Attachment A)

FIN 039 was adopted. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 052.

To: Executive Council  
From: The EC Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility through the Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Shareholder Engagement Work for 2019

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, approves the 2020 shareholder engagement work outlined by the Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility (CCSR) in the attached shareholder advocacy plan (Appendix 1); and be it further

*Resolved*, That CCSR and the Treasurer are authorized to take actions necessary to implement the shareholder advocacy plan for 2020; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Treasurer is directed to file shareholder resolutions with companies listed below, substantially in the form attached (Attachment 2) but always subject to appropriate review by the Chief Legal Officer that the language conforms with regulations of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

- Request **Kraft Heinz** and **United Airlines** to report on their efforts to curtail labor trafficking in its supply chain and sex trafficking;
- Refile as lead filer resolutions on human rights with **Motorola** and **Caterpillar**

- File shareholder resolutions with one or more of **Booz Allen** and **Heidelberg Cement** requesting a report on the company’s impact in areas of conflict where violations of international law and human rights have been identified
- File shareholder resolutions with **American Outdoor Brands, Olin and Sturm Ruger** requesting adoption or compliance with the “Sandy Hook Principles” in their business planning and operations and report on their efforts to minimize criminal uses of their products
- File shareholder resolutions with **First Cash** and **World Fuel Services** requesting action regarding board diversity with respect to women and people of color.

FIN 052 was adopted. Next, Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 061 and spoke to it, explaining the steps that need to be taken for global screening requested by the Executive Council Committee on Corporate Responsibility and that the original resolution was split into three resolutions, FIN 061, 062 and 063.

To: Executive Council  
 From: The EC Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility through the Joint  
 Standing Committee on Finance  
 Date: October 21, 2019  
 Subject: Recommend Global Human Rights Investment Screen for TEC  
 Institutions with Criteria for Israel/Palestine Conflict and Adopt Screen  
 and Criteria for DFMS

*Resolved*, That Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, October 18-21, 2019 receives the June 2019 report (the Report) of its Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility (CCSR) on resolution *B016 Adopt ELCA Action on Israel/Palestine* adopted by 2018 General Convention, and hereby adopts the following Global Human Rights Screen with “criteria for the Israel//Palestine conflict” (B016) as directed by General Convention (the TEC Global Screen & Criteria):

#### TEC Global Human Rights Investment Screen with Criteria for Israel/Palestine

The Global Screen – Executive Council hereby recommends that any Episcopal Church institutional investor not invest in any corporation supporting or benefiting from denial of human rights consistent with policy adopted by General Convention or Executive Council.

Criteria for Israel and Palestine – Executive Council hereby recommends that any Episcopal Church institutional investor not invest in any corporation that supports or benefits from denial of human rights in or through the occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem or the Gaza Strip (the Occupied Palestinian Territories or OPT); and recommends these criteria for deciding if a corporation supports or benefits from denial of human rights in the OPT:

- 1) Does a corporation have a record of any of the following: supplying or doing business or providing goods or services in or to illegal settlements (as defined in international law) or contributing to the construction or maintenance of housing or other facilities in such settlements or seeking otherwise to profit from human rights violations in the OPT, or
- 2) Does a corporation have a record of directly or indirectly supplying or doing business with or providing goods or services to, or otherwise contributing to, the Israeli Defense Forces as the IDF operates in the OPT; and be it further

Resolved, that Executive Council hereby adopts the TEC Global Screen & Criteria as investment policy for the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (DFMS) and hereby creates a DFMS Human Rights No Buy List based on the TEC Global Screen & Criteria

Resolved, that Executive Council hereby adopts the TEC Global Screen & Criteria as investment policy for the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (DFMS) and hereby creates a DFMS Human Rights No Buy List based on the TEC Global Screen & Criteria for corporations that resist effective engagement on human rights, and directs CCSR to administer this List, and asks that the TEC Global Screen & Criteria be shared with all TEC institutional investors.

#### Explanation

See the Report which includes the ELCA human rights investment screen – Attachment B.

FIN-061, 062 and 063, taken together, provide a substitute for FIN-040 (withdrawn) . Combined, they are the EC CCSR response to GC2018 B-016 “ Adopt ELCA Action on Israel/Palestine”.

FIN 061 was adopted. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 062.

To: Executive Council  
From: The EC Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility through the Joint  
Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Implement DFMS Human Rights Investment Screen

*Resolved*, That Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, October 18-21, 2019, having noted CCSR’s evaluation in the Report of its efforts over multiple years to engage with six companies in the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society portfolio, and in order to implement FIN-061 Resolution, directs that Caterpillar Inc., Motorola Solutions and the Israel Discount Bank be, and they hereby are, placed on the DFMS Human Rights No Buy List, and Council further hereby directs DFMS’s money managers to sell DFMS’s holdings in these companies as soon as possible and in a fiscally prudent manner; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Executive Council asks CCSR to pursue continued engagement with Facebook, Booking.com, and TripAdvisor, urging them to address human rights violations through complicity in the occupation of the OPT, and seeking to assure that the companies take all necessary steps to end their complicity in the occupation.

#### Explanation

See FIN-061 Resolution and the CCSR Report. The companies chosen for initial consideration to place on the DFMS Human Rights No Buy List were the six companies in the DFMS portfolio with which CCSR has been seeking to carry on engagement. CCSR has attempted to engage with two of these, Motorola Solutions and Caterpillar, for 25 and 15 years, respectively, without any progress. A third company in the DFMS portfolio, Israel Discount Bank, did not respond to a request to meet after initially agreeing to do so. The bank is a major investor in Israeli settlements. Thus, CCSR recommends that the DFMS sell its stock in these three companies while continuing engagement with the remaining three, which have shown willingness to engage and openness to revising their business practices.

FIN-061, 062 and 063, taken together, provide a substitute for FIN-040 (withdrawn) . Combined, they are the EC CCSR response to GC2018 B-016 “ Adopt ELCA Action on Israel/Palestine”.

FIN 062 was adopted. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 063. Mr. Russ Randle proposed an amendment, which was seconded. There was discussion of the amendment, and Mr. Randle clarified that this was in

addition, not in place of any part of the original amendment. The amendment was adopted, and the vote was on the amended resolution.

To: Executive Council  
From: The EC Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility through the Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Fund Future DFMS Human Rights Screening

*Resolved*, That Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, October 18-21, 2019:

- a) directs CCSR to continue monitoring DFMS investments in light of the TEC Screen & Criteria and to determine if they should be noted for engagement or be placed on the DFMS Human Rights No Buy List, and
- b) directs CCSR to monitor the DFMS investment portfolio for other human rights concerns under General Convention and Executive Council policy (not involving the OPT), and directs CCSR to consider recommending action regarding such other human rights concerns, and
- c) *directs CCSR in the next sixty days to review reported plans by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for its state owned oil company, Aramco, to present an initial public offering (IPO) of stock and to make recommendations to Executive Council as to how TEC should engage with the underwriters of that IPO given the Kingdom's atrocious human rights record;*
- d) in order to support CCSR's efforts under (a), (b), and (c), approves the use of up to \$10,000 for additional consulting services during this triennium such expenditure to be treated as an investment management expense per A296, 2018 General Convention.

#### Explanation

See FIN-061 and FIN-062 Resolutions, and the CCSR Report.

FIN-061, 062 and 063, taken together, provide a substitute for FIN-040 (withdrawn) . Combined, they are the EC CCSR response to GC2018 B-016 "Adopt ELCA Action on Israel/Palestine."

FIN 063 was adopted as amended. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 051 and spoke to it.

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: 2020 Dividend Rates for the DFMS Trust Fund Portfolios

*Resolved*, That the dividend rate for 2020 for the DFMS Trust Fund portfolios available to support the operating budget of DFMS be set at \$1.11 per share based on 5.0% of the average yearend market values of the portfolio for the five years ending 2017; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the dividend rate for 2020 for Trust Funds in the DFMS Endowment Portfolio that are not available to support the operating budget of DFMS be set at \$1.11 per share based on 5.0% of the average yearend market values of the portfolio for the five years ending 2017.

#### **EXPLANATION**

This appropriation from the endowment honors the budget adopted by the General Convention for the 2019-2021 triennium which reflects a dividend rate of 5.0%.

The formula is consistent with standards of prudent fiduciary conduct in the management of endowment funds and with general practice among university, foundation and other non-profit endowment funds.

<b>Year Ending 12/31</b>	<b>Endowment Year-End \$ Market Value</b>	<b>Year-End \$ Value per Share</b>	<b>5-year average \$ Value per Share</b>	<b>\$ Payout per Share</b>
2011	284,121,180	17.808	19.877	1.09
2012	311,816,630	19.298	18.876	1.09
2013	364,917,861	22.317	17.919	0.94
2014	374,505,896	22.561	19.346	0.89
2015	355,969,542	21.286	20.654	0.96
2016	365,914,910	21.315	21.355	1.01
2017	448,897,531	\$24.341	22.364	1.03
2018	415,504,874	\$21.537	22.208	1.06
2019				1.11
2020				1.11

In making this appropriation, the following factors were considered in accordance with the New York Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act.

1. FIN noted that the endowment is of perpetual duration and that the current need to support operations must be balanced against the need for funds in the future.
2. FIN notes that the applicable gift instruments allow this endowment to be used for operations.
3. FIN discussed revenue expectations and general economic conditions that led to the recommendation that the funds be appropriated from the endowment. FIN also discussed the current investment market conditions and believes that its policy of using past market values is prudent. In February 2011, it was agreed that future dividends would be calculated based on the market average of the endowment using the five years ending on December 31<sup>st</sup> of the year preceding the adoption of any subsequent budget. This would eliminate the uncertainty of forecasting portfolio values prior to the completion of a year.
4. FIN discussed the effect of inflation and deflation on the purchasing power of the endowment. FIN observed that inflation in the past decade has been very modest and that most forecasts for the next year suggest that economies around the world will continue to show only modest, if any, growth; thus price inflation will remain modest.
5. FIN particularly noted that the trust funds have returned 8.0% annually since 1993; and inflation has averaged 2.3% annually. This relationship confirms that the purchasing power of the portfolio has been maintained while using annual dividends of approximately 5.0%.
6. FIN discussed the Treasurer's report on the performance of the endowment. The endowment has recovered significantly since 2008; and also during 2019. The Investment Committee has not reacted in fear but has maintained its focus on an asset mix that it considers prudent to ensure long-term returns.
7. FIN discussed the possibility of using other sources to fund current operations. The Executive Council made extensive use of the Society's short-term reserves between 2004 and 2012. The Treasurer regularly reports on the limited availability of other funds.
8. FIN discussed how costs have been curtailed during the 2016-2018 triennium.

9. FIN has reviewed and approved an investment statement policy (IPS) at its meeting in October 2018. It will seek to reduce the payout over time but has determined that the proposed appropriation is consistent with recent returns.
10. FIN finally noted that the budget for the 2019-2021 triennium adopted by General Convention reflects a dividend payout rate at 5.0% annually.

FIN 051 was adopted. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 057 and spoke to it, explaining that it is not a deficit budget, but is a best guess of expenses and revenue.

TO: Executive Council  
FROM: Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
DATE: October 21, 2019  
RE: 2020 Budget for The Episcopal Church

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council approves the revised 2020 Budget for The Episcopal Church.

FIN 057 was adopted. Next, Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 065, and explained that the revised Manual is not available yet, but is expected to be complete by early December.

TO: Executive Council  
FROM: Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
DATE: October 21, 2019  
RE: Manual of Business Methods in Church Affairs

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council accepts the updated chapters of the Manual of Business Methods in Church Affairs, subject to formatting, editing and pagination changes to be made by the Treasurer.

#### Explanation

The Manual is an online resource that provides guidance for the increasingly complex work of all treasurers and parish administrators. It is referenced in Title I, Canon 7, "Of Business Methods in Church Affairs," and Resolution D-147 (1979 GC): "Accounting Principles and Practices for Dioceses, Parishes, and Other Congregations".

Individual chapters have been updated periodically. All chapters were read and edited in 2019 with the assistance of external experts and past and present members of Executive Council.

The current Treasurer believes approval by EC would be appropriate since it is cited in the Canons.

FIN 065 was adopted. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 059, which was adopted by applause.

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 18, 2019  
Subject: Bequests (TF #927 and Restricted Purpose)

*Resolved*, That The Executive Council extends its thanks to those who have included The Episcopal Church in their wills.



*Resolved*, That the Executive Council recognizes the generosity of all those who endow the Episcopal Church and thus support its ministries.

#### **EXPLANATION**

Unrestricted gifts or bequests designated for the work of the Society are added to Trust Fund #927 (Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society Endowment Fund). Because no separate trust is created in the name of the donor, the generosity of the donor is not explicitly acknowledged. This resolution seeks to recognize publicly the bequests from the following individuals who have contributed to the endowment of the Society from November 2018 until August 2019, plus a bequest restricted to the Good Friday Offering.

Date	Donor	Amount
11/18	Alfred E. W. Wheeler	\$ 107.00
12/18	Jennie E. Temple	102.00
12/18	IRR TR U/W Harry Cowan	2,015.00
12/18	Edward W. Conklin Trust	9,656.70
8/19	Communities Foundation of Texas	15,215.78
		<b>\$ 27,096.48</b>
9/19	Ardyce B. Welch	<b>\$157,324.01</b>

Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 053 and spoke to it. Bishop Dabney Smith questioned where the funding would come from.

TO: Executive Council  
FROM: The Chief Operating Officer  
DATE: September 20, 2019  
RE: Construction at 815 Second Avenue

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council authorizes the construction of meeting space and a production studio at 815 Second Avenue at an estimated cost of \$750,000; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the project be managed by the Chief Operating Officer; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Treasurer is authorized to fund the construction with operating cash.

#### **EXPLANATION**

##### **The Need**

As a consequence of leasing the ground floor space (formerly the bookstore, and commonly called “the hospitality space” adjacent to the Chapel) and the mezzanine large conference room and kitchen to Midtown Hardware, and the vacant portion of the 7<sup>th</sup> floor to H&D Physical Therapy PLLC, the DFMS has immediate need for new large (>15 seat) conference spaces.

Video and audio (podcasts) are rapidly becoming the primary communications channels for both the Church and for interested media consumers outside the Church. By building our own studio, we will be able to expand the content, both in type and quantity, we produce while reducing overhead expense for 1-2 person interviews and direct-to-camera

style shoots, as well as podcast productions. Additional significant opportunities arise from having a studio on-site.

- 1) It will provide a more appropriate environment for taping interviews requested by external media, Episcopal entities, and individuals bringing their own crew and equipment. Presently, Public Affairs books the chapel for these interviews which otherwise would not have been possible, given the PB's time-constrained schedule.
- 2) Ability to take advantage of short-lived opportunities. If the Presiding Bishop or another DFMS leader is hosting a guest at 815, we can quickly set up to capture a conversation or interview with very short notice. Each opportunity to capture this type of content expands the library of material we can access for future videos, podcasts, written pieces, etc.
- 3) Ability to livestream or host / participate in webinars at any time, with minimal prep or setup needed, and operational with a single control operator.
- 4) The space would enable us to capture audio content for the Presiding Bishop's podcasts, other future podcasts, voiceovers for film pieces, etc., at any time. Equipment would remain in place, and various DFMS staff could be trained to use the gear for content creation.
- 5) As part of our vision for digital evangelism, we envision a studio space becoming a classroom for diocesan and parish communicators, as well as ecumenical partners. ChurchNext, a video subsidiary of the Forward Movement, has expressed interest in renting the space from us for potentially 20-30 video shoots a year.

Executive Leadership has identified construction of a production studio as an appropriate long-term investment for the DFMS.

These needs were anticipated when the spaces above were leased, and Executive Leadership determined there is enough space on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor for the new conference space and studio to be constructed without negatively impacting staff.

### **Cost Estimates**

#### **Conference and Pantry Space**

The project entails i) converting roughly 20% of the 5th floor (the northeast corner of the floor facing 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, from the existing conference room to the north exterior wall) into a large conference room equipped with advanced A/V equipment that can be subdivided into two smaller rooms by using a retractable folding wall, and ii) expanding the 5th floor pantry to handle larger crowds. When the retractable wall is opened, the room will be capable of seating 48 at a large rectangular table configuration, 55-60 at round tables, and approximately 70 in theater-style seating with no chairs (this is the maximum allowable under our current use permits). With the folding wall in place, the rooms would provide seating on one side for 18, and 36 on the other side at round tables; and 14 and 30 respectively at rectangular tables. Each side will be equipped with state-of-the-art audio-visual capability.

The cost associated with this portion of the project is estimated at \$622,000, including \$25,000 for the re-work of the pantry. These figures also include a \$78,000 contingency reserve that, if not needed, will reduce the construction costs to \$544,000. The construction estimates were developed by an outside architect in consultation with the Building Manager. The audio-visual equipment estimates were provided by the Director, Information Technology.

#### **Studio Space**

The Communications staff is seeking to create permanent studio space at 815 for recurring video shoots that already take place at or near 815. The optimal location for this studio is in the northwest corner of the 5th floor.

The Communications staff produces roughly 40 videos per year with the Presiding Bishop, the Office of Government Relations, Canon Spellers and other DFMS offices and departments. This number is increasing. Currently, Communications must rent crew and equipment for these shoots, at a cost of roughly \$47,200 a year. An on-site studio would eliminate much of the additional crew and equipment needed for these shoots, making it possible for our staff to complete most of these requests with DFMS-owned equipment. When not being used for production purposes, this space can be easily configured with existing furniture for use as a conference room and broken down rapidly when needed.

The cost associated with this portion of the project is budgeted at \$129,000. Costs were provided by the architect, and Communications staff for personnel and equipment.

FIN 053 was adopted. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 068 and spoke to it. In addition to the dioceses named in the resolution, the Assessment Review Committee is continuing to work with the Dioceses of Rio Grande, Albany and Florida. Status of Diocese of Alabama is unknown. The Diocese of Dallas was not granted a waiver, the Diocese of Springfield will not apply, and the committee determined that the Convocation of Episcopal Churches in Europe is not a diocese.

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Assessment Review Committee Recommended Waivers

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, October 18-21, 2019, grants waivers of full payment of their assessments for the 2019-2021 triennium to the following dioceses:

Colorado: 2019 - 10%; 2020 – 12%; 2021 – 13.5%

Ecuador Central: Two-year waiver: 2019 - \$2,063; 2020 - \$3,500.  
Discussion continues for 2021.

Fond du Lac: Two-year waiver: 2019 11.9%; 2020 – 12%  
Discussion continues for 2021.  
Diocesan Convention or bishop to commit to moving towards 15%.

Honduras: waiver at \$1,500 for 2019. Keep talking for 2020 and 2021.

Minnesota: waiver of \$33,379 for 2019 due to overpayment of 2018 assessment by that amount.

Venezuela: waiver at \$1,500 for 2019. Keep talking for 2020 and 2021.

And be it further

*Resolved*, That Executive Council grants to the Convocation of Churches in Europe a “waiver” at 12.5% of 80% of income for 2019 and 2020. Discussion continues for 2021.

FIN 068 was adopted. Ms. Lloyd moved FIN 069. Bishop Curry clarified that this is not a churchwide campaign – it authorizes the Development Office to do fundraising.

To: Executive Council  
From: JSC Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Accept Fundraising Campaign for Way of Love Projects

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council authorizes the Office of Development to conduct a fundraising campaign totaling an estimated \$1.3 million to broaden the reach of the Way of Love.

***Explanation Reminder of Council approved fundraising priorities:***

Annual Appeal	Active
Cuba Pensions	Nearing completion
EMM: Refugee Assistance	Active
Historically Black Colleges	Active
Navajoland	Active
Diocese of Ft. Worth	Active
Archives Relocation	Not active
Haiti Rebuilding	Not active

Approval of fundraising projects exceeding \$10,000 must be approved by Executive Council pursuant to resolutions FFM-013 (February 2010) and FFM-067 (October 2014).

More detail of the Sharing the Way of Love campaign is attached – Attachment C.

FIN 069 was adopted. Next Ms. Lloyd reported that the Audit Committee recommended acceptance of the Audit and appointment of the Auditors. She moved FIN 066.

To: Executive Council  
From: Audit Committee  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Accept 2018 Audit and Appoint Independent Auditors for FY2019

*Resolved*, That Executive Council, upon the recommendation of the Audit Committee, hereby accepts, the 2018 audit as reported in the *Report of Independent Certified Public Accountants to the Executive Council of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, dated July 30, 2019* (“Report”); and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council, upon the recommendation of the Audit Committee, hereby approves the appointment of Grant Thornton, LLP, to audit all accounts under the management or control of the Council and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society for the year ending December 31, 2019.

**EXPLANATION**

The full Report is posted at

[https://www.episcopalchurch.org/files/the\\_domestic\\_and\\_foreign\\_missionary\\_society\\_12-31-18\\_17\\_final\\_0.pdf](https://www.episcopalchurch.org/files/the_domestic_and_foreign_missionary_society_12-31-18_17_final_0.pdf)

Pursuant to its By-Laws, Article III, Sec. 4, the Executive Council, upon recommendation from the Audit Committee, approves the appointment of an independent Certified Public Accountant firm to audit annually all accounts under the management or control of the Council and the Society. The Audit Committee approved this appointment at its meeting of September 9, 2019.

FIN 066 was adopted. This concluded the report of from Finance.

There was a short break, and Bishop Dabney Smith reported for the JSC on Mission Beyond TEC. He said that the committee met with great joy and vigor. They were joined by and heard from many staff members, as well as new ELCA liaison Pastor Joanne Engquist. The Directors of Episcopal Migration Ministries and Episcopal Relief & Development gave updates on their work. The committee met jointly with Finance to deal with budgetary issues of covenants and continuing bilateral relationships. Bishop Smith moved MB 014 and spoke to it. He said that historically, these bilateral agreements have been adopted by General Convention, and he recommends that the committee as for General Convention action as well.

TO: Executive Council  
FROM: JSC on Mission Beyond TEC  
DATE: October 20, 2019  
RE: RATIFY BILATERAL AGREEMENT

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council, meeting in Montgomery, Alabama from October 18-21, 2019, ratifies the attached bilateral agreement with the Iglesia Anglicana de Mexico. See Attachment D.

MB 014 was adopted. Bishop Smith reported that all other resolutions were on the consent calendar, and this concluded the report from Mission Beyond TEC.

Bishop Curry moved the consent calendar, which was adopted.

#### **FIN 043**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1203, St. Mary's Church, Kansas City, MO

---

*Resolved*, That Trust Fund # 1203, St. Mary's Church Trust be established as an investment account for St. Mary's Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

#### **EXPLANATION**

**Trust Fund # 1203, St. Mary's Church Trust (2019)**

This fund was established with \$513,544.04 as an investment account by St. Mary's Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (St. Mary's Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion

**FIN 044**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1204, St. Thomas Endowment, Clarkdale, AZ

---

*Resolved*, That Trust Fund # 1204, St. Thomas Episcopal Church Endowment be established as an investment account for St. Thomas Episcopal Church in Clarkdale, AZ, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

**EXPLANATION**

**Trust Fund # 1204, St. Thomas Episcopal Church Endowment (2019)**

This fund was established with \$69,571.00 as an investment account by St. Thomas Episcopal Church in Clarkdale, AZ. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (St. Thomas Episcopal Church in Clarkdale, AZ) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion.

**FIN 045**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1205, Children's Fund STPAAS, Kansas City, MO

---

*Resolved*, That Trust Fund # 1205, Children's Fund-STPAAS be established as an investment account for St. Peter & All Saints Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

**EXPLANATION**

**Trust Fund # 1205 Children's Fund-STPAAS (2019)**

This fund was established with \$10,000.00 as an investment account by St. Peter & All Saints Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (St. Peter & All Saints Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion.

**FIN 046**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance

Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1206, E. Boling & Marilyn K. Robertson Endowment

---

**Resolved,** That Trust Fund # 1206, The E. Boling & Marilyn K. Robertson Endowment for Theological Education in Liberia be established as an investment account for the Diocese of Liberia, which may withdraw income and accumulated appreciation upon request.

#### **EXPLANATION**

**Trust Fund # 1206 The E. Boling & Marilyn K. Robertson Endowment for Theological Education in Liberia (2019)**

This fund was established with \$99,643.69 from the proceeds of a Charitable Gift Annuity of Mr. E. Boling and Marilyn K. Robertson. Income and accumulated appreciation are to be used solely for Theological Education in the Diocese of Liberia.

**FIN 047**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1207, STPAAS Parking Lot, Kansas City, MO

---

**Resolved,** That Trust Fund # 1207, STPAAS Parking Lot be established as an investment account for St. Peter & All Saints Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

#### **EXPLANATION**

**Trust Fund # 1207 STPAAS Parking Lot (2019)**

This fund was established with \$325.95 as an investment account by St. Peter & All Saints Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (St. Peter & All Saints Episcopal Church in Kansas City, MO) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion.

**FIN 048**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: February 24, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1208, All Souls Savings, N. Fort Myers, FL

---

**Resolved,** That Trust Fund # 1208, All Souls Episcopal Church Savings be established as an investment account for All Souls Episcopal Church in North Fort Myers, FL, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

#### **EXPLANATION**

**Trust Fund # 1208 All Souls Episcopal Church Savings (2019)**

This fund was established with \$25,000.00 as an investment account by All Souls Episcopal Church in North Fort Myers, FL. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (All Souls Episcopal Church in North Fort Myers, FL) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion.

**FIN 049**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: February 24, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1209, Grace Preschool, Millbrook, NY

---

*Resolved*, That Trust Fund # 1209, Grace Preschool, be established as an investment account for benefit of Millbrook Community Preschool at Grace Church in Millbrook, NY, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request and may add to the principal at its discretion.

**EXPLANATION****Trust Fund # 1209 Grace Preschool (2019)**

This fund was established with \$5,000.00 as an investment account by Grace Church in Millbrook, NY, for benefit of its Millbrook Community Preschool. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (Grace Church in Millbrook, NY) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion.

**FIN 050**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1210 ECW of Yakima for St. Timothy

---

*Resolved*, That Trust Fund # 1210, ECW of Yakima be established as an investment account for Episcopal Parish of St. Timothy in Yakima, WA, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

**EXPLANATION****Trust Fund # 1210 ECW of Yakima (2019)**

This fund was established with \$53,839.34 as an investment account by the Episcopal Parish of St. Timothy in Yakima, WA. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (Episcopal Parish of St. Timothy in Yakima, WA) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion

**FIN 054**



For: Executive Council  
From: JSC on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Request from The Episcopal Diocese of Haiti

---

*Resolved*, That the Executive Council authorizes that \$145,000 from Trust Fund 407 be distributed to provide payment of past due pension contributions for the Diocese of Haiti.

#### **Explanation**

Trust Fund 407 may be used for emergencies at the request of the bishop of Haiti. At July 31, 2019, the market value was \$1.2 million, including undistributed appreciation of T\$805K.

This request comes from the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Haiti. The total payment due as of the August invoice (minus a CPF waiver established after the 2010 earthquake) is \$142,956.42 (\$174,956.42 total). The \$32,000 waiver will be triggered once 2017 assessments are paid in full.

The Standing Committee has committed to budget and make ongoing monthly assessment payment of approximately \$6,000.

#### **FIN 055**

TO: The Executive Council  
FROM: The JSC on Finance  
DATE: October 21, 2019  
RE: Clergy Housing Allowances

---

*Resolved*, that a portion of the total compensation paid to each clergy employee for calendar year 2020 shall be designated to be a housing allowance; and be it further

*Resolved*, that the Executive Council designates as a tax-deductible housing allowance for 2020 those allowances requested and presented by clergy employees of the DFMS to the Treasurer as indicated in the attached list; and be it further

*Resolved*, that these allowances will be made pursuant to Internal Revenue Code Section 107 and Internal Revenue Service Regulations S1.107 up to 100% of the annual cash salary of such clergy.

#### **EXPLANATION**

This resolution is required because clergy employees are compensated by the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (DFMS) for the services as ministers of the gospel; and

Clergy Housing Allowances must be approved by the governing body. Requests received will be considered as soon as practicable, either by the Executive Council or by the Executive Committee, on behalf of the Executive Council.

The requested amounts are within the salary limitations. Individual salaries are available for review in the Treasurer's Office.

Employee	2019 Housing Allowance Requested
Barlowe, Michael L.	54,400
Borbon, Samuel	27,760
Brackett, Thomas	55,649
Byrd, Ronald C.	41,130
Crist, Mary Frances	42,600
Curry, Michael	30,000
Edington, Mark	53,900
Froelich, Meghan	32,900
Guillen, John A.	70,000
Hauff, Bradley	40,805
James, Molly	37,862
McQueen, Glenda	46,355
Melton, Heather	34,336
Mullen, Melanie	52,651
Ousley, Todd	50,000
Robertson, Charles K.	55,000
Rose, Margaret	52,912
Smith, Geoffrey	33,703
Spellers, Stephanie	57,192
Steffensen, Leslie	42,545
Stevenson, E. Mark	40,000
Vergara, Winfred B.	50,320
Woodcock, Bruce	45,665
Wynder, Charles	53,204

#### FIN 056

TO: Executive Council  
FROM: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
DATE: October 21, 2019  
RE: Updated Travel Guidelines

---

*Resolved*, That the revised official Travel Guidelines for the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society are adopted, effective 1/1/2020.

#### EXPLANATION

The Travel Guidelines and T&E forms work well and reflect one change to conform with IRS guidelines and decisions of the Audit Committee.

IRS rules limit charitable mileage reimbursement at 14 cents per mile even though the business mileage allowance is 58 cents per mile.

The excess 44 cents is considered taxable income and must be reported of a Form 1099 once the excess exceeds \$600

After thorough discussion with tax counsel and the DFMS Audit Committee, effective 1/1/2020 we will

- Reimburse volunteers at the 14 cents per mile rate for personal automobile use
- Reimburse employees at the statutory business rate (currently 58 cents per mile)
- Create one expense report for employees and consultants; and one for volunteers (primarily members of Interim Bodies)

If a volunteer incurs more than 14 cents per mile in costs, the volunteer may document it and claim a deduction on his/her tax return.

This is an unfortunate discrepancy (one of many) in the US Tax Code but one which the DFMS must observe. (The volunteer rate has not changes since the 1980s. Modifications are regularly put forward in Congress but receive no attention.)

### **FIN 058**

For: Executive Council  
From: Finances for Mission Committee  
Date: October 18, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund # 691 Gift of Church of Our Savior, North Platte, NE (1957), A Special Fund – Repurpose

---

*Resolved*, That the language of Trust Fund # 691, Gift of Church of Our Savior, North Platte, NE (1957), A Special Fund, be changed as follows:

*This fund was established with a gift of \$1,700.00 from Church School of the Church of Our Savior (COOS) in North Platte, NE in 1957 for work in former Diocese of Hankow, China. In 2019, the donor changed the designation to “Income for missionary and outreach work in areas where Episcopal Church of Our Savior, the Diocese of Nebraska, and The Episcopal Church are actively engaged in ministry, as from time-to-time recommended by Episcopal Church of Our Savior and as approved by the Treasurer of the DFMS. “*

### **EXPLANATION**

#### **Trust Fund # 691 Gift of Church of Our Savior, North Platte, NE (1957), A Special Fund**

Created by a gift to the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society from Episcopal Church of Our Savior, North Platte, Nebraska, in 1957, with the restriction that 1) the Fund be “designated for work in [the] former Diocese of Hankow, China” and 2) that “income [is] to be added to principal until work in China resumes, this trust fund has never been put to use.

Episcopal Church of Our Savior recognized that the Fund is an “institutional fund” of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society as defined by Section 555 of the New York Nonprofit Code (NYNPC”); Episcopal Church of Our Savior is the “donor” as defined by said code and has the authority pursuant to the NYNPC to modify the restrictions applicable to the Fund. Episcopal Church of Our Savior has sent a formal request to modify the first restriction of the Fund given how unlikely it is that DFMS will be able to use the funds as originally stated.

Accumulated appreciation and annual dividends to be available for missionary and outreach work in areas supported collectively by Episcopal Church of Our Savior, the Diocese of Nebraska, and the Episcopal Church, as from time-to-time recommended by Episcopal Church of Our Savior and as approved by the Treasurer of the DFMS.

DFMS has agreed to the modification.

**FIN 060**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #809 – Theological Education for Latin America and the Caribbean (1977)

---

*Resolved*, That the Canons to the Presiding Bishop for Ministry Within the Episcopal Church and for Ministry Beyond The Episcopal Church be authorized to use income distributed during 2019 from Trust Fund No.809, up to \$381,366.00, for educational and theological programs (including continuing education and individual scholarships), as recommended by the Commission on Theological Education for Latin America and the Caribbean (CETALC) at its meeting in Brazil, July 29 – August 3, 2019; and be it further

*Resolved*, That disbursement of funds will be conditioned upon the receipt of appropriate documentation to secure financial and operational accountability acceptable to the Canons and the Treasurer; and be it further

*Resolved*, That any funds not spent during 2020 be reinvested.

**FIN 064**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1211, Christ Episcopal Church, Albemarle, NC

---

*Resolved*, That Trust Fund # 1211, Christ Episcopal Church - Albemarle be established as an investment account for Christ Episcopal Church in Albemarle, NC, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

**EXPLANATION**

**Trust Fund # 1211 Christ Episcopal Church - Albemarle (2019)**

This fund was established with \$50,000.00 as an investment account by Christ Episcopal Church in Albemarle, NC. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (Christ Episcopal Church in Albemarle, NC.) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion.

**FIN 067**

For: Executive Council  
From: The Joint Standing Committee on Finance  
Date: October 21, 2019  
Subject: Trust Fund #1212, Episcopal Church of the Ridge, Trenton, SC

---

*Resolved*, That Trust Fund # 1212, Our Savior be established as an investment account for Episcopal Church of the Ridge in Trenton, SC, which may withdraw principal and/or income upon request, and may add to the principal at its discretion.

#### **EXPLANATION**

##### **Trust Fund # 1212 Our Savior (2019)**

This fund was established with \$5,000.00 as an investment account by Episcopal Church of the Ridge in Trenton, SC. This is a custodial-type fund, meaning that DFMS is not trustee for these funds but as custodian is providing the owner (Episcopal Church of the Ridge in Trenton, SC.) with access to investment management through DFMS endowment. The owner may add to or withdraw principal funds at its discretion.

##### **MB 012**

TO: Executive Council  
FROM: JSC on Mission Beyond TEC  
DATE: October 20, 2019  
RE: Ratify Election of Board of Episcopal Relief & Development

*Resolved*, That, in accordance with Episcopal Relief & Development's bylaws section 3.02 paragraph (a), after the Episcopal Relief & Development Board elects a director or directors, the election must be ratified by the Executive Council, Episcopal Relief & Development respectfully requests that Executive Council ratify the election below which took place at a board meeting on October 4, 2019; and be it further

*Resolved*, That after being duly re-nominated by The Presiding Bishop and Chair of the Episcopal Relief & Development Board, The Rt. Rev. Mary Gray-Reeves and The Rt. Rev. Wilfrido Ramos Orench are re-elected to serve as members of the Board of Episcopal Relief & Development in the class 2022(b) (term ends on 12/31/22); and be it further

*Resolved*, That after being duly nominated by The Presiding Bishop and Chair of the Episcopal Relief & Development Board, Mr. Miguel Escobar and Dr. David Martin are elected to serve as members of the Board of Episcopal Relief & Development in the class 2022(a) (term ends on 12/31/22).

##### **MB 013**

TO: Executive Council  
FROM: Mission Beyond The Episcopal Church  
DATE: October 18, 2019  
RE: APPOINTMENT TO LUTHERAN EPISCOPAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

*Resolved*, That in accordance with Canon I.4.3(k), the Chair and Vice Chair nominate and Executive Council elects The Rev. Jane M. Johnson to fill the unexpired term of The Rev. David Perry, who resigned. Term ends December 31, 2021.

##### **Brief Bio**

The Rev. Jane M. Johnson is a priest in the Diocese of Fond du Lac. She is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin and the School of Theology at Sewanee. Jane is the Priest/Pastor of the Beloved Community of

Intercession Episcopal and Redeemer Lutheran. She has participated in the Missional Leadership Cohort for Episcopal Clergy, and she engages in many ecumenical and community partnerships. She is chair of the diocesan Commission on Ministry and is a deputy to General Convention where she served on the Legislative Committee on Congregational and Diocesan Vitality.

**MW 008**

To: Executive Council

From: Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church (MIN)

Date: October 21, 2019

Re: Care of Creation Grant

*Resolved*, That the following Care of Creation Grant, recommended by the Task Force on Care of Creation, and having been reviewed and recommended by the Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church, is approved and authorized for payment from Care of Creation grant funds, budget line item 173:

A grant in the amount of \$3,000.00 to assist with and support the expenses of a delegation to be appointed by the Presiding Officers to the Conference of Parties on Climate Change, said event to be held in Chile in December, 2020; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the delegation is to submit a report on the event to the Task Force on Care of Creation and to the Executive Council for review by the Executive Council's at its next meeting following the event.

**MW 009**

To: Executive Council

From: Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Episcopal Church

Date: October 21, 2019

Re: Resolution on Creation Care Grant – “Sustaining Earth, Our Island Home,” Resolution C008

*Resolved*, on the recommendation of the Task Force on Creation Care, having been reviewed and approved by the Joint Standing Committee on Mission Within the Church, a grant to the Diocese of California in the amount of \$30,000.00 to support the carbon tracking program known as “Sustaining Earth, Our Island Home,” [www.sustainislandhome.org](http://www.sustainislandhome.org), is approved and authorized for payment from Care of Creation grant funds, budget line item 173, to be paid at the rate of \$10,000.00 per year, and to be fully paid by June 30, 2021.

*[This is a matching grant to make an existing carbon tracking program, “Sustaining Earth, Our Island Home,” supported by the Diocese of California, available to the entire Church. The Diocese of California will contribute an additional \$60,000 to match this grant, \$30,000 of which will come from its own funds, and \$30,000 of which will be raised. This grant implements Resolution C008]*

**End of Consent Calendar**

Bishop Curry called on President Jennings for closing remarks. President Jennings asked for prayers for our brothers and sisters in places of unrest, and for the bishops of these dioceses.

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and approved. Bishop Curry offered a blessing and the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

**CCSR Report to Executive Council on  
Resolution B007 Ethical Investing in Gun Manufacturers  
June 2019  
as amended September 12, 2019**

**Summary**

In resolution B007 the 79th General Convention directed “the Executive Council Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility [CCSR] *to develop and implement a shareholder engagement plan*” for “*investing* in the publicly traded stock of gun manufacturers and retailers...to effect change in these companies through the practices of shareholder advocacy.” [Emphasis supplied]

Prior to this, CCSR had no role in selecting investments of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. Instead, CCSR has carried on advocacy with companies already in the DFMS portfolio.

B007 directs CCSR to develop a plan that includes investing in shares, but prior to this CCSR has been given no authority to cause DFMS to buy shares, and B007 does not grant CCSR any such authority. Of course, Executive Council has authority to cause DFMS to purchase shares.

CCSR here presents to Executive Council its proposed shareholder engagement plan under B007 – including the element contemplated by B007, investing in publicly traded shares – and requests that Council approve both the plan and the purchase of shares by DFMS to implement the plan.

CCSR’s gun safety shareholder engagement proposals are placed in context and described in detail in the report, below. The proposed shareholder engagement plan (the Plan) is stated here:

**Shareholder Engagement Plan for Ethical Investing in Gun Manufacturers**

- DFMS will invest in stock of American Outdoor Brands, Olin Corporation and Sturm, Ruger and Co. These publicly traded companies are known to be engaged in the gun manufacturing or ammunition businesses.
- CCSR should work with other investors to engage in shareholder advocacy with these publicly traded companies in order to further gun safety.
- CCSR, as it determines appropriate, should seek to apply the Mosbacher-Bennett Principles for Investors in the Gun Industry developed by Do Not Stand Idly By as commended to the Church by General Convention in B007.
- CCSR should evaluate whether to invest in any other publicly traded U.S. companies in gun-related industries in order to advocate for gun safety, and
- CCSR should conduct advocacy for gun safety with companies in other industries (e.g., financial institutions) which may be in the DFMS portfolio and recommend appropriate shareholder action regarding any such company

**Discussion**

**The Task assigned to CCSR:**

In 2018, at Austin, Texas, the 79<sup>th</sup> General Convention adopted Resolution B007 Ethical Investing in Gun Manufacturers. B007 calls on Executive Council’s Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility (CCSR or the Committee) to develop and implement a plan for investing ethically in publicly traded stock of gun manufacturers and retailers and then applying shareholder advocacy to reduce harmful use of guns the companies make or sell. (Faith based investors working with gun companies call this advocacy for *gun safety*, and this report uses that term.) This report,



directed to Executive Council, includes recommendations on advocating for gun safety emerging from CCSR's work to date on B007, with an enabling resolution.

Resolution B007 reads in its entirety as follows:

***B007 Ethical Investing in Gun Manufacturers***

*Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the 79th General Convention **direct the Executive Council Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility to develop and implement a shareholder engagement plan by which dioceses, church organizations, and individual Episcopalians investing in the publicly traded stock of gun manufacturers and retailers could act to effect change in these companies through the practices of shareholder advocacy to do everything in their power to minimize lethal and criminal uses of their products, and be it further***

*Resolved, That the 79th General Convention commend to the church the Mosbacher-Bennett Principles for Investors in the Gun Industry developed by Do Not Stand Idly By.*  
[Emphasis supplied]

Clearly B007 on its own gives both a basis for CCSR to conduct shareholder advocacy for DFMS with gun manufacturers and retailers as well as explicit direction for CCSR to do so. In addition, however, over the years both General Convention and Executive Council have addressed gun violence and gun safety through policy statements. These statements have focused historically on advocacy with government, but these statements also give grounding for shareholder engagement with gun companies. See the Supporting Material, below.

For a half century, through countless responses to the Church's ethical concerns about social and environmental issues, institutional investors related to The Episcopal Church have engaged in *responsible investing* to bring to bear TEC's ethical teachings as those investors have managed the assets of their Church-related institutions.

CCSR dates TEC's formal engagement in responsible investing to 1971, when then Presiding Bishop John E. Hines stood up at the General Motors annual meeting. The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (the national corporate entity of TEC, commonly referred to as DFMS), was a General Motors shareholder. On behalf of DFMS Bishop Hines personally presented the first ever shareholder resolution by an investor of faith. With the support of a wide community of institutional investors, DFMS, through Bishop Hines, called on GM to stop doing business in South Africa.

Shortly before that, in 1970, Executive Council, as the governing board of DFMS, established CCSR, as a committee of Council, to oversee DFMS's shareholder advocacy efforts. CCSR has continued in this role from the 1970s to today. (Later, after General Convention action in 1988 to support community economic development, on recommendation of CCSR and others, Executive Council in 1997 formed the Economic Justice Loan Committee, as a committee of Council, to oversee use of a fraction of DFMS's regular investment assets directly for community investing. Community investing is a form of investing for responsible social and environmental outcomes as well as financial return. EJLC also continues its work to the present.)

In the nearly 50 years since 1970, responsible investing has grown substantially as a movement among both secular and faith based investors, including among TEC institutions. Largely on a case by case basis, TEC related investors, including DFMS, have responded to ethical concerns raised by the Church and taken a variety of actions as investors consistent with their understanding of the Church's faith and mission. Now three elements of responsible investing are practiced across TEC by a variety of Church related institutional investors: (i) applying ethical guidelines in

investment selection and management, (ii) shareholder activism, and (iii) investing for responsible social and environmental outcomes as well as financial return.

From its creation in the 1970s until 2018, CCSR has operated solely with the existing security holdings in the DFMS portfolio. CCSR has had no role in selecting the investments of DFMS. The Investment Committee, another committee of Council (the IC), is responsible for the DFMS portfolio on an ongoing basis, and the IC works with investment managers and consultants on design and management of the portfolio. In shorthand, the IC and DFMS's investment managers have been responsible to choose investments for the portfolio – not CCSR.

Instead of choosing securities for the DFMS portfolio, historically CCSR has reviewed the actual holdings in that portfolio on a regular basis to determine if any companies in the portfolio are engaged in activities that raise ethical concerns for DFMS as a TEC investor. In making these evaluations and in developing responses, CCSR applies the ethical teachings of the Church as embodied in policy statements enacted by General Convention and Executive Council.

CCSR also works closely with other faith based investors through the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR). (DFMS was a founder of ICCR.) For a number of years, on behalf of DFMS, CCSR has worked in the ICCR Gun Safety Group to develop shareholder advocacy on gun safety concerns. In addition, for much of its history, consultants have helped CCSR; Mercy Investment Services, Inc. recently has been CCSR's consultant.

In 2018 General Convention for the first time changed the way CCSR operates with respect to the DFMS portfolio, but with only one issue: guns. Resolution B007 directs CCSR to develop an engagement plan including the *purchase* of shares in gun manufacturer and gun retailer companies to provide an ownership basis for the shareholder advocacy with such companies. *Such shares would be held in the DFMS portfolio whether or not any DFMS investment manager would have chosen them based on IC developed investment policies or the manager's own criteria or analysis.*

Following the passage of B007, CCSR and DFMS staff have taken steps to assure that DFMS holds shares of publicly traded gun manufacturers. Today DFMS holds shares of Sturm, Ruger & Co. and American Outdoor Brands (which operates through its subsidiary Smith & Wesson), as well as shares of Olin Corporation, a publicly traded company that manufactures ammunition through its subsidiary Winchester. These shares are held in DFMS's Advocacy Account, a subaccount of DFMS's investment account used to keep track of securities of companies with which DFMS, through CCSR, is engaging in shareholder advocacy.

Although DFMS continues to hold shares in Dick's Sporting Goods (DSG), a retailer that sells guns, currently the ICCR Gun Safety Group is only monitoring DSG, because the company has been positively responsive to shareholder advocacy, including by DFMS and other members of ICCR. The engagement with DSG is discussed in the Supporting Material, below.

Resolution B007 does not address DFMS shareholder advocacy with industries other than the gun industry. The Committee believes that, under its historic mandate, CCSR is empowered to review the existing DFMS portfolio for companies in industries other than the gun industry to determine if gun safety advocacy may be appropriate with such companies under the ethical teachings of the Church (see the discussion of TEC teachings in the Supporting Material). The ICCR Gun Safety Group has begun to review whether such advocacy may be appropriate with companies in other industries, and the Group has focused on financial institutions that provide financing to the gun industry. CCSR intends to undertake such a review and includes in the proposed enabling resolution support for CCSR to consider whether it should conduct gun safety advocacy with companies in other industries. (The current DFMS portfolio includes thirteen financial institutions that the Gun Safety Group has under review for possible action.)

The Committee notes that the text of B007 may be read to suggest that CCSR should develop and implement a plan *for others than DFMS* to purchase gun company shares for the purpose of engaging in shareholder advocacy with such companies. The Committee respects the scope of General Convention's concern, but the Committee recognizes its own limitations. The Committee asks that it not be tasked with assisting others than DFMS in their shareholder advocacy. The following considerations lead to this conclusion:

- The Committee is a creature of Executive Council, the governing board of DFMS. For nearly 50 years the Committee has developed experience and competence in assisting Council and the officers and staff of DFMS in shareholder advocacy with respect to shares owned by DFMS. The Committee has no experience assisting investors other than DFMS in their shareholder advocacy.
- The Committee is in the early stages of assisting DFMS to respond to B007.
- The Committee is a group of volunteers. The Committee has limited resources available to perform its regular duties. No additional resources have been provided for any work under B007.
- Any effort by the Committee to assist others across the Church in their own shareholder advocacy would involve identifying and resolving organizational and legal issues that the Committee and the Church have never addressed.
- The Committee historically has provided general information on shareholder advocacy to organizations and individuals in TEC. Once it has more experience with B007, the Committee believes it may be able to provide general information derived from that experience to investors across the Church.

### **Recommendations:**

CCSR recommends that Executive Council confirm the course of action CCSR has taken to implement B007. CCSR also asks that Council recognize that shareholder advocacy on gun safety is a dynamic field, and there may be developments that are not addressed directly by B007. For example, CCSR recommends that Council authorize CCSR to continue to evaluate whether gun safety advocacy may be appropriate with companies not in the gun industry.

The second resolved of B007 commends to the Church the *Mosbacher-Bennett Principles for Investors in the Gun Industry developed by Do Not Stand Idly By*. The Principles are discussed in the Supporting Material. CCSR believes Convention intended CCSR to consider these principles in its work, and CCSR has included in the proposed enabling resolution language to affirm that.

The work begun here also provides a stepping stone to developing a more comprehensive responsible investment policy as called for in 2018 General Convention resolution D068 Criteria and Procedures for Deciding to Engage with or Establish a No Buy List of Companies. CCSR believes this report and CCSR's work to prepare it will assist Executive Council and CCSR in their continuing efforts to align the Church's investments with its values across the board, including through implementing D068.

### **Supporting Material on The Episcopal Church and Gun Safety**

The Episcopal Church has addressed gun safety broadly defined for over four decades, beginning in 1976 at the 65<sup>th</sup> General Convention. Most actions associated with the Church have been taken by General Convention and Executive Council, but Presiding Bishop Edmond Browning worked individually, publicly and privately, to support gun safety. Recently, Bishops United Against Gun Violence has provided leadership across the Church on these issues. On behalf of DFMS as a shareholder, CCSR has advocated and continues to advocate for gun safety.

These several actions have been taken by the Church over the years in a changing context of continuing gun violence. As we all know, since the April 1999 shootings at Columbine High School, reported incidents of mass gun violence have grown. School children and people of faith in their places of worship have been targeted repeatedly. The shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School in December 2012, in Newtown, Connecticut, and at Margery Stoneman Douglas High School on Valentine's Day in 2018, in Parkland, Texas, may have shifted efforts to deal with gun violence away from federal legislation to the state and local level, to the courts, and to shareholder activism.

Long ago, in 1994, the Congress was considering a federal ban on assault weapons to be included in what became enacted as the *Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act*. Bishop Browning wrote an op-ed piece for the *Los Angeles Times* supporting the ban. He also personally contacted three United States Senators who were Episcopalians to urge them to vote for the measure. One he contacted was John Danforth, of Missouri, an Episcopal priest. The provision passed the Senate by a vote of 52-48. The three Episcopalians voted for it. The ban expired after ten years, in accordance with the sunset provision in the law.

TEC policy statements frequently have focused on the role of individual Church members and parishes and dioceses in promoting an end to gun violence and in developing safe communities. But the Church has made many strong statements emphasizing a need for action for gun safety by those outside the Church. Until recently, TEC policy statements have addressed gun safety by calling for action at the federal, state and local levels, with an emphasis on federal legislation and regulation. TEC repeatedly has supported legislative proposals in Congress to regulate hand guns and ban assault weapons, to regulate the import and export of such weapons, to initiate and improve background checks, and to end gun trafficking. The Church also has supported legislation and other efforts to improve the quality and availability of mental health care. See the following General Convention resolutions: 1976-C052, 1991-B042, 1994-D019, 1997-C035, 1997-D033, 2000-A006, 2000-B007, 2000-D004, 2012-D003, 2015-B008, 2015-C005. For the first time, in 2018, with resolution 2018-B007, the subject of this report, General Convention addressed shareholder action with companies in the gun industry.

Executive Council has acted three times to address gun safety. In 1999, before the Columbine shootings, Executive Council urged Congress to pass comprehensive gun control and safety legislation (EXC061999-19). Following the Sandy Hook shootings, in February 2013 Executive Council issued a comprehensive policy statement both reaffirming past General Convention actions and extending them (EXC022013.20).

In June 2017, on recommendation of CCSR, Executive Council adopted the Sandy Hook Principles. The Principles were promulgated "to influence the corporate behavior of gun and ammunition manufacturers, distributors and retailers by establishing a baseline standard for responsible conduct." They were developed by the Mayor of Philadelphia and have gained wide support. See <http://media.philly.com/documents/Sandy+Hook+Principles.pdf>

In the fall of 2017, Executive Council, on CCSR's recommendation, approved having DFMS co-file a shareholder resolution based on the Sandy Hook Principles with Dick's Sporting Goods, a retailer in which DFMS owned shares. Mercy Investment Services was lead filer, and the co-filers included two hospital systems historically connected with Roman Catholic orders, two Roman Catholic religious orders of women, and DFMS. The resolution asked DSG to respond to the Principles.

Within a month after receiving the resolution in January 2018, DSG had entered into dialogue with the investors of faith. DSG indicated it was willing to discuss a positive response. The filers decided to withdraw the resolution and proceed with dialogue with DSG.

Then, on February 14, 2018, 17 students and adults were shot dead at Parkland. On February 28, without any further contact with the investor filers, the chief executive officer of DSG announced publicly through national media that DSG would stop selling assault weapons and high capacity magazines in its stores and voluntarily raise the age for all gun sales in its stores to 21. DSG also called on public officials to adopt a comprehensive set of gun safety measures. The chief executive said that DSG had determined that it had sold a gun to the suspect in the Parkland shooting. While that gun had not been used in that shooting, the chief executive said that knowledge moved DSG to act. Subsequently, abiding by public safety standards for weapons disposal, DSG destroyed the assault weapons in its inventory that it would no longer sell, rather than return them to the manufacturers.

The Sandy Hook Principles played a role in this decision by DSG. The filing of the shareholder resolution and subsequent dialogue, led by Mercy Investment Services and including DFMS, also played a role. The fact that DSG was founded by the father of its chief executive officer also probably played a role – in helping to induce a human response by DSG to a mass shooting peripherally touching the company.

Separately, earlier in 2017, Roman Catholic religious orders and health care systems had purchased shares in two publicly traded gun manufacturers, Sturm, Ruger & Co. and American Outdoor Brands (AOB). They did so in order to open dialogue with the companies on gun violence. [http://www.iccr.org/sites/default/files/blog\\_attachments/finalpr\\_gun\\_safety\\_2018.pdf](http://www.iccr.org/sites/default/files/blog_attachments/finalpr_gun_safety_2018.pdf)

DFMS did not own shares in these gun manufacturers. And, in accordance with longstanding policy, CCSR did not seek to cause DFMS to buy any such shares. As explained above, for the four decades CCSR has been engaged in shareholder advocacy for DFMS, the companies held in the portfolio have been chosen by investment managers in accordance with policies adopted by Executive Council's Investment Committee. CCSR has done its advocacy solely based on the securities chosen by such managers as from time to time held in the DFMS portfolio.

When Sturm, Ruger and AOB refused to enter into dialogue with the shareholders of faith, the shareholders filed a resolution with each, asking each company to report to its shareholders on use of the company's products in violent incidents, on the impact of such incidents on its business, and its plans for dealing with such matters. Each management strongly opposed the resolution applicable to its company. For each company, the resolution was scheduled to come to a vote at its 2018 annual meeting.

Since it owned no shares in either company, DFMS could play no role in either campaign or vote. However, the actions of the shareholders of faith with Sturm, Ruger and AOB did play a role in the approval of B007, as did, more generally, DFMS's earlier experience with DSG.

Probably the most important factor in the passage of B007 was the support of Bishops United Against Gun Violence (BUAGV or Bishops United). Bishops United is a network 80 bishops within TEC organized after Sandy Hook. BUAGV views gun violence as a public health crisis and advocates for gun safety at multiple levels. The network has organized large public witness prayer events in Washington D.C., Chicago, Salt Lake City and Austin. In 2018, inspired by the work of investors of faith on Sturm, Ruger and AOB, Bishops United began to advocate within TEC for shareholder engagement based on "ethical investing in gun manufacturers." The network asked Bishop Doug Fisher to sponsor a resolution at General Convention. In July that resolution passed in the form now known as B007.

BUAGV works from time to time with Do Not Stand Idly By, a national campaign to "encourage a greater commitment to safety in the gun industry." The Metro Industrial Areas Foundation launched the effort. Rabbi Joel Mosbacher and the Rev. Anthony Bennett are co-chairpersons and developed the principles bearing their names. See <http://www.donotstandidlyby.org/wp->

[content/uploads/2018/05/Mosbacher-Bennett-Principles-for-Gun-Industry-Investors.pdf](#) Like the Sandy Hook Principles, the Mosbacher-Bennett Principles are intended to provide a comprehensive set of guidelines for companies in the gun industry and their shareholders. B007 commends the Mosbacher-Bennett Principles to TEC.

As noted above, in 2018 at their respective annual meetings, the shareholder resolutions filed with Sturm, Ruger and AOB came to a vote. Based on years of experience, shareholder advocates do not expect to win such votes outright. Instead, an affirmative vote of a fraction of shareholders, such as 10%, normally is good enough to get the company to undertake dialogue. In these gun manufacturer votes, due to highly uncommon support for the resolutions by large institutional investors, the results astonished almost everyone: 53% of AOB's shareholders voted for the shareholder resolution, and 69% of Sturm, Ruger's shareholders did that. One of these votes took place before General Convention met in Austin in July 2018, while the other took place after Convention. Thus, the votes provided an emphatic frame for the B007 decision.

Since the shareholders of each company had voted for management to produce a report, each management did so, but exceedingly grudgingly. Both managements dismissed and attacked the resolution proponents as enemies of gun owners and Second Amendment rights. In public statements, both managements tried to marginalize the proponents, ignoring the fact that, in each company, shareholders had voted overwhelmingly for the resolutions. Not surprisingly, the shareholders found the reports unresponsive to the questions raised. See the report of AOB at: <http://ir.aob.com/static-files/52fdcb73-60a9-400a-a5b7-c4c201632a3a> See the Ruger report at: <https://ruger.com/corporate/PDF/8K-2019-02-08.pdf>

Since each of the companies produced a report, albeit a rather inadequate one, the two resolutions cannot be filed again. More pertinent, the responses of the two companies demonstrate that their managements continue to be opposed to any discussions with shareholder advocates for gun safety. Therefore, dialogue on the reports is not likely to occur or, if it does, to be constructive.

ICCR's Gun Safety Group is working on additional approaches to gun companies, such as asking them to develop human rights policies and/or to amend their bylaws to allow shareholders to nominate candidates to serve on the company's board of directors. As noted above, the Gun Safety Group also is assessing entering into advocacy on gun safety with companies in other industries, such as financial institutions.



## **MOSBACHER-BENNETT PRINCIPLES FOR INVESTORS IN THE GUN INDUSTRY**

The United States has by far the highest levels of gun-related deaths and crime of any developed nation; approximately 90 Americans lose their lives each day to gunshot wounds. Investing in companies that make or sell guns in the U.S. market carries extraordinary ethical responsibilities. Every institutional or individual shareholder, lender, equity partner or other investor in gun-related companies is obligated to engage with these companies to encourage actions and practices that will minimize lethal and criminal uses of their products. Specifically, every investor has an obligation to:

- 1) Require, as a condition of investment, that companies make significant and measurable improvements over time in the following areas:

### **FOR GUN MANUFACTURERS:**

- Maintaining networks of secure, responsible sales outlets
- Developing and marketing safer, less lethal guns, ammunition and accessories
- Cooperating fully with law enforcement in reducing gun-related crime
- Minimizing the resale of guns on the secondary market

### **FOR GUN RETAILERS:**

- Conducting background checks for all purchases
- Minimizing theft and straw purchases
- Educating and training consumers on gun storage and safety
- Maintaining accurate records and cooperating fully with law enforcement

Responsible conduct in these areas may require manufacturers and retailers to go beyond what is required by federal state law.

- 2) Conduct regular, ongoing evaluation of gun-related companies' progress and performance in these areas using objective data.
- 3) Establish viable timetables, deadlines, and performance expectations for gun manufacturers and retailers.
- 4) Terminate investments in companies that fail to meet these expectations after a period of extended engagement.
- 5) Work strategically with other sectors to isolate bad actors in the gun industry and limit their ability to harm the profitability of responsible companies.
- 6) Sustain these efforts for the life of each gun-related investment, independent of the ebbs and flows of public and media attention to these matters.

***Rabbi Joel Mosbacher and Reverend Anthony Bennett are co-chairpersons of Do Not Stand Idly By, a nationwide campaign launched by Metro Industrial Areas Foundation to encourage a greater commitment to safety in the gun industry.***



**CCSR Report to Executive Council on  
Resolution B016 Human Rights Investment Screen  
June 2019**

**The Task assigned to CCSR:**

In 2018, at Austin, Texas, the 79<sup>th</sup> General Convention adopted Resolution B016 Adopt ELCA Action on Israel/Palestine. B016 calls on the Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility (CCSR or the Committee) to prepare a human rights investment screen for Israel and Palestine to be applied in Episcopal Church investing. This report, directed to Executive Council, includes recommendations emerging from CCSR's work to date on B016, with an enabling resolution.

Resolution B016, in its first resolved, reads as follows:

***B016 Adopt ELCA Action on Israel/Palestine***

*Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That General Convention join with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of [sic] America's action, CA 16.06.31, "Justice for the Holy Land Through Responsible Investment," and direct our Executive Council's Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility to develop criteria for Israel and Palestine based on a human rights' investment screen and the actions of General Convention and Executive Council over the past seventy years. [Emphasis supplied]*

An *investment screen* is a policy statement adopted by an investor, whether an individual or an institution, to guide decisions regarding the investor's portfolio. Investment screens may be based on a variety of policy positions and may be affirmative or negative. In 2015 the 78<sup>th</sup> General Convention adopted resolution C045 incorporating both a negative and an affirmative screen: divest from fossil fuels (negative) and invest in alternative energy (affirmative).

When an investor develops a negative screen, the investor analyzes its current portfolio to assess which, if any, investments do not comply with the screen. If any do not, the investor divests from those investments. Also when an investor develops a negative screen, the investor establishes a "No Buy List" by applying the screen to the relevant universe of potential investments. If an investor has investment managers, once a screen is decided, from that point the investor's managers are directed to choose investments in line with the affirmative screen and to avoid those on the No Buy List, or, if already in the portfolio, to divest from those companies.

In the 1970s Executive Council, as the governing board of The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (the national corporate entity of TEC, commonly referred to as DFMS), established CCSR, as a committee of Council, to guide DFMS's shareholder advocacy efforts. CCSR has nearly 50 years' experience in this role, applying the Church's ethical teachings in policy statements of General Convention and Executive Council, including through investment screens.

In 2018, calling on the Episcopal Church to "adopt ELCA action on Israel/Palestine," Convention assigned CCSR "*to develop criteria for Israel and Palestine based on a human rights' investment screen and the actions of General Convention and Executive Council over the past seventy years.*" As Convention knew, CCSR has decades of shareholder advocacy experience with companies involved in Israel/Palestine.

CCSR reviewed seventy years' of Convention and Council policy actions and found clear support for a human rights investment screen. CCSR also reviewed the human rights investment



screen adopted by the ELCA Church Council and found the TEC policy statements and ELCA screen are broadly consistent. Accordingly, taking guidance from Convention's words in B016, CCSR recommends that Executive Council adopt the same investment screen as the ELCA, restated with minimal wording adjustments to make a new enabling resolution for TEC.

### **Recommendations:**

CCSR makes two broad recommendations. First CCSR recommends that Executive Council adopt the same investment screen as the ELCA Church Council adopted as a recommendation to ELCA institutional investors. Accordingly, CCSR recommends that Executive Council make a similar recommendation to Episcopal Church institutional investors: that the investors consider adopting the human rights screen set out in the enabling resolution proposed for Executive Council by CCSR. (That resolution restates the ELCA screen for the Episcopal Church and calls the recommended screen the "TEC Screen" to avoid confusion with the ELCA original.)

Second, CCSR recommends that Executive Council, as the DFMS governing board, adopt this human rights screen (the TEC Screen) for application by DFMS. CCSR does so because Executive Council has a dual role in TEC, as a denominational body with policy responsibilities and also as the governing board of an investor, DFMS. In the case of the ELCA, its Church Council has policy responsibilities but is not an investor governing board, so the Church Council could recommend the ELCA screen but could not itself adopt the screen. In the TEC case, it makes sense for Executive Council to adopt for itself the recommendation it makes to others.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church human rights screen adopted by its Church Council states:

*"The ELCA recommends not investing in corporations benefiting from the most egregious denial of the rights of humans as political and civic beings to have equal access and participation in legal and political decisions affecting them.*

*Definition of problem: Equal access and participation in legal and political decisions cannot happen when they occur in conflict-affected countries, especially disputed or occupied territories. Recognizing that various investors will implement this along a continuum, for the purpose of this screen investments might include screening companies supporting and benefiting from occupation. It could also include investments that promote positive economic development in such regions."*

CCSR believes this policy statement is consistent with seventy years of Episcopal Church policy actions by General Convention and Executive Council, is reasonably succinct, and may be applied without undue difficulty across the Episcopal Church, and, specifically, by CCSR.

The fact that B016 explicitly references following ELCA policy action indicates that General Convention would accept this recommendation to adopt the actual ELCA screen. The title of B016 is "Adopt ELCA Action on Israel/Palestine" [emphasis supplied]. In its text, B016 says the Episcopal Church is to "join with" ELCA action [emphasis supplied]. CCSR here recommends the very screen ELCA adopted, with wording changes to make a fresh enabling resolution for action by Council. If Council adopts the resolution set out below, Executive Council would affirm a policy that General Convention seems effectively to have approved in principle in B016.

In addition CCSR recommends that, if Executive Council adopts for DFMS the investment screen recommended in this report, Council need not wait to apply that screen to the current DFMS portfolio but can adopt CCSR's company by company recommendations based on CCSR's actual experience. CCSR also recommends that TEC devote additional resources to monitoring human rights and investment policy going forward.

### Process and Considerations:

- **ELCA policy** As indicated above, guided by B016, the Committee reviewed the human rights screen of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
- **Ecumenical positions:** In addition to ELCA policy, CCSR reviewed actions taken by its other major denominational partners: the United Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church and United Church of Christ. See the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).
- **Episcopal Church in Jerusalem:** The Archbishop of Jerusalem attended General Convention and was invited but declined to give testimony on any of the resolutions under consideration related to Israel/Palestine, including B016. CCSR respects the Archbishop's decision to refrain from commenting. See FAQ.
- **Legislative history of B016** More than 50 witnesses testified at a large and well-publicized joint committee hearing on Israel and Palestine at General Convention. These included Muslim and Christian Palestinians and Palestinian Americans, Jewish citizens of Israel, Jewish Americans, and members of several Christian traditions including dozens of Episcopalians. B016 passed both houses and is an act of General Convention. CCSR has a specific assignment under B016: to assist in defining and applying a human rights screen for Israel/Palestine going forward.
- **TEC Policy on Israel/Palestine** CCSR reviewed with care an extremely helpful report from the Episcopal Archives on the history of Episcopal Church policy on Israel/Palestine. The recommended human rights screen developed originally by the Evangelical Lutheran Church is consistent with those policies. The Episcopal Church's policy actions repeatedly affirm the right of Israel to exist in peace with secure borders and the right of Palestinians to have their own sovereign state with Jerusalem to be the shared capital of both peoples. TEC also affirms that the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) are illegal under international law. Thus TEC policy is consistent with the ELCA human rights policy statement, which affirms that preventing people from acting "as political and civic beings to have equal access and participation in legal and political decisions affecting them" is a denial of their human rights and that such access and participation "cannot happen ... in conflict-affected countries, especially disputed or occupied territories." See Archives Report link in FAQ for summary up to but not including the 79<sup>th</sup> General Convention.
- **Other TEC Screens:** CCSR notes this is not the first time a screen has been applied so that the Episcopal Church has divested from certain companies in its portfolio. Nor is this the first time the Church has created a No Buy List. Past actions by the Church include divesting from oil companies doing business in the Sudan (in 2000) and companies involved in South African Apartheid (in 1985). The Episcopal Church also has negative screens (No Buy Lists) for tobacco, military contracting, and private prisons.
- **Human Rights Reports:** The Committee reviewed human rights reports of three non-government organizations: Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International and B'tselem, an Israeli non governmental organization (NGO) based in Jerusalem. The Committee carefully reviewed the policies of the Church with the various categories of violations reported by these organizations. Particularly noted were Church policies which spoke to the following areas of human rights concern: Freedom of Movement, Arbitrary Arrests and Detention, including children, Torture and other ill treatment, Unlawful Killings, Excessive Use of Force, Freedom of expression, associations and assembly, Impunity and collective punishment, Right to Housing – forced evictions and demolitions, Violence Against Women and Girls, and Refugees and Asylum Seekers. See specific TEC policy references in Amnesty International Report in FAQ.
- **Concerns expressed by organizations in the American Jewish community:** CCSR reviewed and considered stated positions of a number of organizations in the Jewish community, particularly positions on the OPT and on the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions ("BDS") movement. The Committee reviewed policy positions of the American Jewish Committee, Jewish Voice for Peace, the Anti-Defamation League,

Americans for Peace Now and J Street. It appears that the views of the Episcopal Church are largely consistent with those of J Street and Americans for Peace Now, and CCSR believes the policy recommended in this report also is largely consistent with the positions of those organizations. See FAQ.

- **Scope of current work:** With respect to human rights issues regarding Israel/Palestine, Resolution B016 does not limit the Episcopal Church to focusing solely on the occupied territories. B016 calls for consideration of “human rights in Israel and the Occupied Territories.” But historically TEC’s primary focus has been on issues related to the occupation. See the Archives report. The ELCA policy also has a focus on the occupied territories. Thus this report has focused on human rights issues related to the OPT.
- **Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement:** The global BDS movement has developed from 2005, beginning within Palestinian civil society. Critics of BDS say that BDS denies the right of Israel to exist. The Episcopal Church has opposed BDS (in 2013) and for many years has affirmed, and continues to affirm, the right of Israel to exist, and has called, and continues to call, for a two-state solution or, as of General Convention 2018, a one state solution with equal rights for all as an alternative. About boycotts/divestment J Street says: “We do not oppose boycott, divestment, or sanctions initiatives that explicitly support a two-state solution, recognize Israel’s right to exist, and focus only on occupied territory beyond the Green Line. ...It is critical to maintain the distinction between boycott and divestment efforts which work against the interests of Israel, and initiatives which are limited to opposing the occupation.” See FAQ.
- **First Amendment:** Proposals for legislation to punish BDS participation have been made at federal, state and local levels and have been widely recognized to pose serious questions under the First Amendment guarantee of freedom of speech. Not as widely noted, but as serious, would be questions the proposals would raise, with respect to religious bodies, under the First Amendment free exercise clause. Any such legislation likely would be challenged in the courts on constitutional grounds, and the resolution would require time. There is no need to forebear adopting the screen because a legislature may, at some time, adopt an anti-BDS statute. For half a century investors of faith have carried on shareholder advocacy in support of human rights. See FAQ.

**Company Recommendations:** With TEC policies and the ELCA screen in mind, CCSR looked at six DFMS portfolio companies it has engaged. (The American Friends Service Committee Investigate website assembles extensive information on companies doing business in the OPT, and CCSR is appreciative of this work.) Based on CCSR’s engagement with each and the company’s OPT activities, CCSR recommends creating a Human Rights No Buy List and placing the first three companies on this List, while continuing engagement with the other three:

**Caterpillar, Inc.** – multinational heavy engineering equipment manufacturer

*CCSR Engagement: 15 years: letters, dialogue, shareholder resolutions, no progress*

*Complicity in the Occupation – equipment used for demolition of homes, separation barrier construction on confiscated land, settlement building, Israel Defense Force (IDF) work in the OPT. From Investigate: Caterpillar equipment customized for IDF use. [investigate.afsc.org](http://investigate.afsc.org)*

*Recommendation – Divest and Place on Human Rights No Buy List*

**Motorola Solutions** – multinational data & telecommunications equipment manufacturer

*CCSR Engagement: 25 years: letters, dialogue, shareholder resolutions unresponsive*

*Complicity in the Occupation – sale of tech products to IDF for occupation infrastructure including check points, curbing freedom of movement, and providing security to illegal settlements From Investigate: Motorola’s equipment is installed in settlements (illegal under*

*international law) and the separation wall in the occupied West Bank, and used by the Israeli military, police, and prison service. [investigate.afsc.org](http://investigate.afsc.org)*

**Recommendation:** *Divest and Place on Human Rights No Buy List*

**Israel Discount Bank** – one of Israel's largest banks

**CCSR Engagement** – *two years of correspondence; CCSR requested dialogue and company appeared to agree, but, when CCSR requested date, bank was unresponsive*

**Complicity in the Occupation** – *IDB has financed construction of settlements and provides financial services in them. From Investigate: IDB financed construction of housing projects in multiple settlements in the OPT and has branches in the settlements. [investigate.afsc.org](http://investigate.afsc.org)*

**Recommendation** – *Divest and Place on Human Rights No Buy List*

**Facebook** – multinational social media platform company

**CCSR Engagement** – *For two years CCSR has monitored sister organizations' efforts at dialogue with Facebook over allegations it bends to pressure from the Israeli government and removes Palestinian posts on its platform. CCSR has had no direct engagement*

**Complicity in the Occupation** – *removing Palestinian posts critical of Israeli policy*

**Recommendation** – *List in Advocacy Account for continued engagement*

**Trip Advisor** – multinational web based travel company

**CCSR Engagement** – *two years correspondence (no response in year one) followed by shareholder resolution that generated TA willingness to dialogue, withdrawal of resolution and discussions between TA and shareholders about resolving issue of doing business in settlements*

**Complicity in the Occupation** – *offering accommodations in Israeli settlements in the OPT*

**Recommendation** – *List in Advocacy Account for continued engagement*

**Booking.com** – multinational web based travel company

**CCSR Engagement:** *Shareholder resolution filed in 2018, dialogue begun and ongoing*

**Complicity in the Occupation** – *offering accommodations in Israeli settlements in the OPT*

**Recommendation** – *List in Advocacy Account for continued engagement*

Other companies not yet engaged but in the DFMS portfolio would be also evaluated for the corporate engagement list or placement on the Human Rights No Buy List. CCSR recommends that companies not in the portfolio but doing business in the Occupied Palestinian Territories also be evaluated for placement on the Human Rights No Buy List or shareholder engagement.

### **Additional Conclusions and Recommendations for Implementation of B016**

In working on B016, CCSR was aware that the principles developed from B016 and applied in reference to the Occupied Palestinian Territories are applicable to other areas of conflict and occupation. Human rights standards are universal, but circumstances vary. Therefore, CCSR believes it should seek to apply the screen recommended in this report to additional areas of conflict or occupation on which the Episcopal Church has or develops policy positions. See the eleven military occupations identified at <http://www.rulac.org/browse/conflicts>

To make it possible to carry through on B016, CCSR recommends Executive Council consider funding a consultancy to assist CCSR in the important work of monitoring human rights issues in DFMS's investments, by means of the mechanism approved in 2018 by General Convention resolution A296, Resources for Responsible Investing.

The work begun here also provides a stepping stone to developing a more comprehensive social investment policy as called for in 2018 GC D068 (Criteria and Procedures for Deciding to Engage with or Establish a No Buy List of Companies). CCSR believes this report and CCSR's work to prepare it will assist Executive Council and CCSR in their continuing efforts to align the Church's investments with its values across the board, including through implementing D068.

## **Addendum**

### **Supporting Material**

#### **Human Rights Reports as Reviewed by CCSR for B016**

**As the CCSR Report says, three non-government Human Rights organizations were studied by CCSR.**

**First is the legal framework offered by B'tselem, an Israeli human rights organization based in Jerusalem. For full report visit this link. [https://www.btselem.org/international\\_law](https://www.btselem.org/international_law)**

“International law establishes the normative framework binding on Israel in its conduct in the Occupied Territories. The relevant provisions are enshrined in two branches of law: international humanitarian law (IHL) and international human rights law. It was once the agreed convention that the two branches do not apply concurrently, namely that IHL applies during armed conflict and occupation, while human rights law applies during peacetime.

Over the years, however, legal conventions have undergone changes, and this distinction has been blurred. Current convention holds that human rights law continues to apply during armed conflict and occupation, concurrently with IHL. Since the protection IHL provides civilians and victims of war is more limited than the protection afforded under human rights law, this view significantly broadens protection afforded civilians during armed conflict. In the rare instances when IHL and human rights are not in agreement in a situation of armed conflict, the convention is for the provisions of IHL to take precedence....

Israel argues it is not bound by international human rights law in the Occupied Territories, as they are not officially sovereign Israeli territory. While it is true that Israel is not the sovereign in the Occupied Territories, this fact does nothing to detract from its duty to uphold the international provisions regarding human rights. International jurists disagree with Israel's position on the matter, and it has also been repeatedly rejected by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and all UN committees overseeing the implementation of the various human rights conventions. These international bodies have asserted time and time again that states must uphold human rights provisions wherever they are in effective control.

When it comes to IHL, Israel has invoked various arguments over the years in a bid to avoid upholding its provisions. In the early years of the occupation, the state argued the territories were not at all occupied, as before Israel seized control of them, they had not been recognized as the sovereign territory of any other country. Therefore, goes Israel's argument, it is exempt from upholding the rules governing occupation. Israel declared that, nonetheless, though not required to do so by law, it would uphold the “humanitarian provisions” of the Fourth Geneva Convention which addresses the protection of civilians. Israel has never stated which provisions it considers humanitarian.

Regardless, this argument has no basis in IHL, the applicability of which is not predicated on previously recognized sovereignty. Who declared war, who won it or which party is in the right are also irrelevant for this branch of law. All it sets forth is that the country that wields effective control over the territory must afford protection to the individuals - defined as “protected persons” - who live in the area are not its nationals.

Over the years Israel has also argued that its actions in the Occupied Territories are, in any event, “lawful” and in compliance with the provisions of international law: The building of scores of settlements in the West Bank, and the theft of thousands of hectares of land are lawful because they are pursued under the narrow exception that allows the destruction of private property in case of a “military necessity”; the administrative detention of thousands of Palestinians is lawful because preventing future crimes and security reasons underpinned putting them behind bars; and more than anything – the killing of thousands of Palestinians during the recurrent spells of fighting in the Gaza Strip is lawful because they were always killed in keeping with the fundamental principles of IHL – the principle of distinction and the principle of proportionality. These arguments have nearly always been accepted by Israel’s High Court of Justice.

The provisions of international law are not mere legal theory. They were formulated in order to provide a modicum of protection even in a state of war or occupation to people who are otherwise defenseless. The various interpretations Israel gives these rules to justify the serious harm it causes the civilian population of the Occupied Territories are completely divorced from this objective, and instead serve the very opposite purpose: to provide a guise of legality for unjustifiable actions and to deny the minimal protection afforded to the defenseless. Given all this, Israel’s interpretation has been rejected by most international law jurists, both in Israel and abroad. While the rules of international law are open to interpretation, as are all legal rules, the reading given by Israel is unreasonable, legally wrong and renders the provisions hollow.

Instead of adopting international law – both IHL and human rights law – as its moral compass, Israel cynically uses it as a manual for the systematic abuse of human rights. The provisions of international law lie before Supreme Court justices, lawyers of the State Attorney’s Office and officers of the MAG (Military Advocate General) Corps. Yet they all manage to interpret them and work around them with one sole objective of lending a guise of legality to the violation of international law. Israel’s policies throughout the Occupied Territories over the past half a century have been veering farther and farther away from protecting the population to verging on actual neglect. This is not an abstract issue. It has tangible repercussions: dispossession, oppression, abuse and killings are the outcome of a formalistic interpretation of rules designed to prevent exactly that.”

**From Human Rights Watch 2017-18 report - <https://www.hrw.org/middle-east/n-africa/israel/palestine>**

*(A brief summary of an HRW report follows. CCSR notes its breadth of areas where human rights abuses occur by Israel, the occupying force. Also noted are the restrictions on human rights by The Palestinian Authority and Hamas. For the full report visit the link above.)*

“Israel maintains entrenched discriminatory systems that treat Palestinians unequally. Its 50-year occupation of the West Bank and Gaza involves systematic rights abuses, including collective punishment, routine use of excessive lethal force, and prolonged administrative detention without charge or trial for hundreds. It builds and supports illegal settlements in the occupied



West Bank, expropriating Palestinian land and imposing burdens on Palestinians but not on settlers, restricting their access to basic services and making it nearly impossible for them to build in much of the West Bank without risking demolition. Israel's decade-long closure of Gaza, supported by Egypt, severely restricts the movement of people and goods, with devastating humanitarian impact. The Palestinian Authority in the West Bank and Hamas in Gaza both sharply restrict dissent, arbitrarily arresting critics and abusing those in their custody."

**Amnesty International** <https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/middle-east-and-north-africa/israel-and-occupied-palestinian-territories/>

*(A substantial section of AI's report is included because of the relevant parts to Church policy which have been addressed over decades by General Convention and Executive Council. Each section in bold and in parentheses cite relevant Church policy. Full texts can be found at [episcopalarchives.org](http://episcopalarchives.org))*

#### **"ISRAEL AND OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORIES 2017/2018**

##### **Freedom of movement – Gaza blockade and West Bank restrictions (2018 General Convention D027 Crisis in Gaza) (Ex Co February 2010 – reaffirmations and call for end of the blockade of Gaza)**

Israel's illegal air, land and sea blockade of the Gaza Strip entered its 11th year, continuing the long-standing restrictions on the movement of people and goods into and from the area, collectively punishing Gaza's entire population. Combined with Egypt's almost total closure of the Rafah border crossing, and the West Bank authorities' punitive measures, Israel's blockade triggered a humanitarian crisis with electricity cuts reducing access to electricity from an average of eight hours per day down to as little as two to four hours, affecting clean water and sanitation and diminishing health service access, and rendering Gaza increasingly "unlivable" according to the UN. Gaza's economy deteriorated further and post-conflict reconstruction of civilian infrastructure remained severely hindered; some 23,500 Palestinians remained displaced since the 2014 conflict. Many patients with life-threatening illnesses were unable to access treatment outside Gaza due to Israeli restrictions and delays by West Bank authorities in processing referrals. Israeli forces maintained a "buffer zone" inside Gaza's border with Israel and used live ammunition against Palestinians who entered or approached it, wounding farmers working in the area. Israeli forces also fired at Palestinian fishermen in or near the "exclusion zone" along Gaza's coastline, killing at least one and injuring others.

In the West Bank, Israel maintained an array of military checkpoints, bypass roads and military and firing zones, restricting Palestinian access and travel. Israel established new checkpoints and barriers, especially in East Jerusalem. In response to Palestinian attacks on Israelis, the military authorities imposed collective punishment; they revoked the work permits of attackers' family members and closed off villages and entire areas including Silwad, Deir Abu Mishal and Beit Surik.

In Hebron, long-standing prohibitions limiting Palestinian presence, tightened in October 2015, remained in force. In Hebron's Tel Rumeida neighbourhood, a "closed military zone", Israeli

forces subjected Palestinian residents to oppressive searches and prevented the entry of other Palestinians while allowing free movement for Israeli settlers. In May, Israel erected a new checkpoint and a new fence barrier within Hebron's H2 area, arbitrarily confining the Palestinian Gheith neighbourhood and segregating a street alongside the area.

### **Arbitrary arrests and detentions**

**(1994 General Convention D015 “this 71st General Convention encourage the President and the Secretary of State to take the initiative internationally in promoting the cause of human rights and in restoring the primary focus of human rights effort[s] to the civil rights and political freedoms that are the building blocks of decent and humane societies”)**  
**(2018 General Convention on the Detention of Children)**

Israel detained or continued to imprison thousands of Palestinians from the OPT, mostly in prisons in Israel, in violation of international law. Many detainees' families, particularly those in Gaza, were not permitted entry to Israel to visit their relatives.

The authorities continued to substitute administrative detention for criminal prosecution, holding hundreds of Palestinians, including children, civil society leaders and NGO workers, without charge or trial under renewable orders, based on information withheld from detainees and their lawyers. More than 6,100 Palestinians, including 441 administrative detainees, were held in Israeli prisons at the end of the year. Israeli authorities also placed six Palestinian citizens of Israel under administrative detention.

In April around 1,500 Palestinian prisoners and detainees launched a 41-day hunger-strike to demand better conditions, family visits, an end to solitary confinement and administrative detention, and access to education. The Israeli Prison Service punished hunger-striking detainees, using solitary confinement, fines, and denial of family visits.

### **Torture and other ill-treatment**

**(2009 General Convention C020 Condemn Torture)**  
**(2018 General Convention C038 Safeguarding the Rights of Palestinian Children)**

Israeli soldiers and police and Israel Security Agency officers subjected Palestinian detainees, including children, to torture and other ill-treatment with impunity, particularly during arrest and interrogation. Reported methods included beatings, slapping, painful shackling, sleep deprivation, use of stress positions and threats. No criminal investigations were opened into more than 1,000 complaints filed since 2001. Complaints of torture and other ill-treatment by the Israeli police against asylum-seekers and members of the Ethiopian community remained common.

### **Unlawful killings**

**(2015 March Executive Council “the Executive Council condemn serious violations of international humanitarian law and gross human rights violations and abuses, including: attacks directly targeting civilians and civilian infrastructure, executions and other targeted killings of civilians, abductions, rape and other forms of sexual and gender-based violence perpetrated against women and children...” )**



Israeli soldiers, police and security guards killed at least 75 Palestinians from the OPT, including East Jerusalem, and five Palestinians with Israeli citizenship. Some of those killed were shot while attacking Israelis or suspected of intending an attack. Many, including children, were shot and unlawfully killed while posing no immediate threat to life. Some killings, such as that of Yacoub Abu al-Qi'an, shot in his car by police in Umm al-Hiran in January, appeared to have been extrajudicial executions.

#### **Excessive use of force**

**(2010 February Executive Council “the Executive Council recognizes that the use of force, violence or arbitrary power by Israelis or Palestinians to determine the outcome of this conflict must be condemned absolutely...”)**

Israeli forces, including undercover units, used excessive and sometimes lethal force when they used rubber-coated metal bullets and live ammunition against Palestinian protesters in the OPT, killing at least 20, and injuring thousands. Many protesters threw rocks or other projectiles but were posing no threat to the lives of well-protected Israeli soldiers when they were shot. In July, in response to the tensions over Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif, the authorities killed 10 Palestinians and injured more than 1,000 during the dispersal of demonstrations, and conducted at least two violent raids on al-Makassed hospital in East Jerusalem. In December, wheelchair user Ibrahim Abu Thuraya was shot in the head by an Israeli soldier as he was sitting with a group of protesters near the fence separating Gaza from Israel.

#### **Freedoms of expression, association and assembly**

**(1994 General Convention D015 “That this 71st General Convention reaffirm its support for human rights throughout the world and states its conviction that civil rights and political freedom are the universal bedrock of any meaningful scheme of human rights”)**

The authorities used a range of measures, both in Israel and the OPT, to target human rights defenders who criticized Israel's continuing occupation.

In March the Knesset (parliament) passed an amendment to the Entry into Israel Law banning entry into Israel or the OPT to anyone supporting or working for an organization that has issued or promoted a call to boycott Israel or Israeli entities, including settlements. The authorities continued to obstruct human rights workers' attempts to document the situation by denying them entry into the OPT, including the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in the OPT. An Amnesty International staff member was denied entry after he was questioned about the organization's work on settlements.

Using public order laws in East Jerusalem, and military orders in the rest of the West Bank, Israeli authorities prohibited and suppressed protests by Palestinians, and arrested and prosecuted protesters and human rights defenders. In July, the military trials of Palestinian human rights defenders Issa Amro and Farid al-Atrash began on charges related to their role in organizing peaceful protests against Israel's settlement policies. Israeli authorities continued to harass other Hebron-based human rights activists, including Badi Dweik and Imad Abu Shamsiya, and failed to protect them from settler attacks.

Israeli authorities initiated tax investigations against Omar Barghouti, a prominent advocate of the boycott, divestment and sanctions campaign, in what appeared to be an effort to silence his work.

Several Israeli human rights organizations, including Breaking the Silence, Gisha, B'tselem and Amnesty International Israel were also targeted by government campaigns to undermine their work, and faced smears, stigmatization and threats.

### **Right to Housing – forced evictions and demolitions**

**(General Convention 2003 D008 “The 74<sup>th</sup> General Convention call upon the President and the U.S. Government to urge Israel to end its policy of the demolition of the Palestinian homes.”)**

In the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, the Israeli authorities carried out a large number of demolitions of Palestinian property, including 423 homes and structures built without Israeli permits that remained virtually impossible for Palestinians to obtain, forcibly evicting more than 660 people. Many of these demolitions were in Bedouin and herding communities that the Israeli authorities planned to forcibly transfer. The authorities also collectively punished the families of Palestinians who had carried out attacks on Israelis, by demolishing or making uninhabitable their family homes, forcibly evicting approximately 50 people.

### **Impunity**

**(2018 General Convention D027 on investigating use of lethal force)**

More than three years after the end of the 2014 Gaza-Israel conflict, in which some 1,460 Palestinian civilians were killed, many in evidently unlawful attacks including war crimes, the authorities had previously indicted only three soldiers for looting and obstructing an investigation.

### **Violence against women and girls**

**(Executive Council February 2011- The Episcopal Church abhors gender based violence against women and girls and has a longstanding commitment to the human rights of women and girls throughout the world)**

There were new reports of violence against women; Palestinian communities in Israel were particularly affected. In June, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women issued recommendations urging Israeli authorities to carry out law and policy reforms by integrating CEDAW standards; to combat and prevent violence against women in Israel and the OPT; and to investigate reported abuses.

### **Refugees and asylum-seekers**

**(2018 General Convention D009 Christian Principles for Responding to Human Migration “We insist that the United States of America and other powerful, wealthy nations, and all nations to the best of their ability, contribute to resettlement, establish and maintain safe and orderly humanitarian protection for refugees, internally displaced persons, and other migrants seeking long-term solutions and safety”)**

The authorities continued to deny asylum-seekers, more than 90% of whom were from Eritrea or Sudan, access to a fair or prompt refugee status determination process. More than 1,200 asylum-seekers were held at the Holot detention facility and at Saharonim Prison in the Negev/Naqab desert at the end of the year. According to activists, there were more than 35,000 asylum-seekers in Israel; 8,588 asylum claims remained pending. In December, the Knesset passed an amendment to the anti-infiltration law that would force asylum-seekers and refugees to accept relocation to countries in Africa or face imprisonment. Tens of thousands were at risk of deportation.”

*CCSR also calls attention to a significant report by Human Rights Watch called “[Occupation Inc.](#) How Settlement Businesses Contribute to Israel’s Violations of Palestinian Rights.” This substantial report from 2016 describes the infrastructure of the settlement enterprise, and describes, among many things, how Palestinian resources are extracted by international companies which pay taxes to the Israeli government and the settlements, while Palestinians wishing to establish such companies are denied permission by Israel. Palestinians receive no benefits from tax collections.*

*There is also a report from the United Nations Human Rights Office listing Israeli and international companies in a database which details the involvement of those companies in supporting the infrastructure of the occupation. However, that report has not been released due to political pressure from Israel and the United States which oppose its publication. CCSR awaits that eventual report which is expected to be helpful in evaluating some of the companies in its investment portfolio.*

## Frequently Asked Questions

### *1. What is the legislative history of the Episcopal Church on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict?*

The Archives report on Episcopal policies on Israel and Palestine Conflict can be found here:

[https://www.episcopalarchives.org/sites/default/files/gc\\_resolutions\\_2018/Israel-Palestine\\_AECResearchReport\\_09-05-2017.pdf](https://www.episcopalarchives.org/sites/default/files/gc_resolutions_2018/Israel-Palestine_AECResearchReport_09-05-2017.pdf)

### *2. What is the background on the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America human rights screen on Israel and Palestine? See also FAQ number 14*

See ELCA's [Human Rights social criteria investment screen](#)

### *3. What and when was the first CCSR shareholder resolution on Israel and Palestine?*

In 1994, breaking ground again as in 1971 when it called on General Motors to withdraw from apartheid South Africa, the Episcopal Church was the first religious institution to file a resolution on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. The resolved clause follows here:

“Executive Council Minutes, Oct. 30-Nov. 3, 1994, New York, p. 27.

Resolved, That the Executive Council, meeting in New York City, November 1-3, 1994, adopt the be filed by the Treasurer on or before the appropriate filing date: Motorola ...

Resolved, That the shareholders request the Board of Directors to establish a policy to prohibit the sale of products or provision of services to any settlement, including persons residing in those settlements, located in the Occupied Territories.” Visit Episcopal Archives for full text.

No other denomination or religious order joined in this filing, and the resolution did not receive the required votes to refile in subsequent years. (Footnote: The author of the first shareholder resolution in 1971 to GM and the author of this resolution to Motorola was Attorney Paul Neuhauser, who has served on CCSR for all of its 48 years as a member or consultant.)

### *4. What was the 2005 Report by CCSR on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict about?*

In 2004 Executive Council directed CCSR (then called SRI) to undertake a review of companies in its portfolio that were contributing to the infrastructure of the ongoing occupation, then in its 37<sup>th</sup> year. That resulted in a one year study involving numerous interviews and travel to Jerusalem and the OPT. The outcome of that report was to continue the policy of corporate engagement based on existing Church policy. It recommended against divestment. See the report here.

[https://www.episcopalchurch.org/files/sri\\_report\\_october\\_3\\_20051.pdf](https://www.episcopalchurch.org/files/sri_report_october_3_20051.pdf)

### *5. What did the 2018 General Convention say about the Israeli/Palestinian conflict?*

The 2018 General Convention adopted six resolutions on Israel/Palestine, as follows (full texts at [generalconvention.org](http://generalconvention.org) on the virtual binder):

- B021 restoration of aid to Palestinian refugees, especially those living in Gaza
- C038 safeguarding the rights of Palestinian children being held and tried in Israeli military courts
- D027 pursuing peace in Gaza, including investigating Israeli and Palestinian use of lethal force against civilians
- D018 negotiate an end to the conflict through a one or two state solution based on one person one vote
- B003 affirmation of Jerusalem as the shared capital of Israel and Palestine with free and secure access to the holy sites for Muslims, Jews and Christians
- B016 prepare a human rights screen for the Church's financial investments

The latter resolution is the mandate for The Report.

*6. In what ways does TEC use economic leverage in the Israeli/Palestinian conflict?*

In addition to CCSR's work of corporate engagement (and the B016 call for a human rights screen), the Episcopal Church also supports positive investment through a loan of \$500,000 to the Bank of Palestine for microenterprise projects. The loan is managed through the Executive Council's Economic Justice Loan Committee. And many Episcopalians contribute generously to the American Friends of the Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem in support of the diocese's 30+ institutions.

*7. Does criticism of the state of Israel and its government policies equate to anti-Semitism?*

CCSR notes the Church's long held position that affirms the right of Israel to exist in secure borders. In addition, General Convention said in 1991 "That the 70th General Convention of the Episcopal Church recognize that a distinction exists between the propriety of legitimate criticism of Israeli governmental policy and action and the impropriety of anti-Jewish prejudice." CCSR is guided by this distinction.

*8. Is Israel singled out and held to a higher standard than other nations?*

This is asked today and was an issue in 2005. In its 2005 report CCSR noted that it addresses human rights concerns in many places around the world. "The Church, on recommendation of the SRI (now CCSR) Committee, has filed and voted in favor of resolutions focusing on a variety of topics as diverse as human rights in Iran, China, Uganda, and Myanmar (Burma)." In doing its work, the SRI Committee applies the same standard to the Israeli/Palestinian conflict that it would to any other region or country." While this report is focused on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict as directed in B016, CCSR is concerned for its investments anywhere that human rights violations occur. Rather than arguing that Israel is being singled out, it should more accurately be said that Israel is not exempted from legitimate criticism, just as every nation is not exempted, including the United States of America.

*9. Should CCSR and Executive Council consult with the Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem as it creates this investment screen?*

As stated in the report, the Archbishop of Jerusalem was in attendance at General Convention and was invited but declined to give testimony on any of the resolutions under consideration related to Israel/Palestine, including B016. CCSR members are respectful of the Bishop's choice to abstain from commenting on this resolution. CCSR believes Convention's concern was with whether investment funds of the Episcopal Church are complicit in supporting the infrastructure of the occupation and thus

contribute to human rights violations. The money is a stewardship issue for the U.S. based Episcopal Church, and does not involve funds from the Diocese of Jerusalem.

*10. Economic pressure on Israel is a contentious issue. Were all voices heard in the process for deciding on this screen?*

In the year leading up to General Convention, a task force appointed by the presiding officers, and comprising a range of views, met and eventually made recommendations to the presiding officers about how to approach this topic at Convention. Following that recommendation, the presiding officers sent Israel/Palestine resolutions to two separate legislative committees to address. More than 50 witnesses testified at a large and well-publicized joint committee hearing on Israel and Palestine at General Convention, including Muslim and Christian Palestinians and Palestinian Americans, Jewish citizens of Israel, Jewish Americans, and members of several Christian traditions including dozens of Episcopalians. Both legislative committees responsible for Israel and Palestine resolutions were present at that hearing and heard all of the testimony from a wide range of perspectives. Following the public testimony, the committees discussed and amended their resolutions before moving adoption of a number of resolutions by the Convention.

Now that B016 has passed both Houses and been adopted as a resolution of General Convention, CCSR is tasked with its implementation, not with continuing debate on the resolution itself.

*11. Will anti-BDS legislation at federal, state and local levels in the US restrict the work of creating a human rights screen?*

This concern is addressed in the report. There is debate over whether these bills violate the First Amendment protection for freedom of speech. The American Civil Liberties Union and other civil rights groups have indicated their opposition to these bills on those grounds; these cases will certainly be challenged in the courts and that process could be protracted. Meanwhile, the work of CCSR is unaffected.

*12. Is B016 or the creation of this human rights screen an endorsement of BDS?*

This concern is also addressed in the report. The Episcopal Church in an Executive Council resolution opposed BDS in 2013 and is not part of the BDS international coalition. B016 is not an endorsement of BDS (defined by its threefold objectives and call for economic and cultural boycott of Israel as well as those doing business in the OPT). The Episcopal Church has long advocated for human rights with corporations in its investment portfolio, starting decades before the launch of BDS in 2005, including in the OPT as well as other parts of the world, and has applied economic pressure on corporations involved in the occupation. This human rights screen would focus on companies whose investment in activities and technologies related to the occupation is significant, salient, and persistent. As directed in B016, the Church would also continue its strategies of shareholder advocacy in cases where it hopes will lead to positive corporate action, and continue to encourage positive investment in Palestine by the Church's institutions at all levels.

*13. Has there been any change to the political context in Israel and Palestine since General Convention?*

Unfortunately, the prospects for a two-state solution have receded since the General Convention. CCSR notes with alarm the recent actions taken by the U.S. and Israeli governments, including the Trump administration's move to recognize Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel; U.S. official recognition

of Israel’s sovereignty over the contested Golan Heights; the Nation-State bill passed by Israel in July 2018, which is widely seen as enshrining the rights of Jewish citizens and immigrants above all others within Israel; and very recent statements by members of the governing coalition, including the prime minister himself, openly committing to “legal” annexation of settlement areas in the West Bank and Jerusalem that have been understood to be land for a future Palestinian state.

*14. What do American Jewish voices say about boycott, divestment and sanctions and the movement to outlaw them in Congress and other legislative bodies?*

Jewish voices vary among Jewish organizations. Here are statements from five groups that offer a wide spectrum of opinion on BDS as well as other calls for economic pressure. The position of Americans for Peace Now and J Street most closely resembles the approach of the Episcopal Church—to support economic pressure on companies doing business in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, but not the broader BDS campaign.

**a. Jewish Voice for Peace:**

“Jewish Voice for Peace endorses the call from Palestinian civil society for Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) as part of our work for freedom, justice and equality for all people. We believe that the time-honored, non-violent tools proposed by the BDS call provide powerful opportunities to make that vision real.

We join with communities of conscience around the world in supporting Palestinians, who call for BDS until the Israeli government:

Ends its occupation and colonization of all Arab lands occupied in June 1967 and dismantles the Wall; recognizes the fundamental rights of the Arab-Palestinian citizens of Israel to full equality; and respects, protects and promotes the rights of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and properties as stipulated in UN Resolution 194.”

Visit <https://jewishvoiceforpeace.org/>

**b. Americans for Peace Now**

“Some BDS supporters are certainly motivated by anti-Semitic or anti-Israel agendas. Many more are motivated by legitimate frustration over Israeli policies and actions. Legislative initiatives that treat all BDS supporters as members of the first category are just as misguided and counterproductive as BDS efforts that target all Israelis for the pro-settlement policies of their government. At the same time, efforts to outlaw BDS, even if well-intentioned, represent an unacceptable effort to limit free speech and peaceful political protest—violating our own Constitution as well as the spirit of the American ideal of the free exchange of ideas.

.... There is a smarter approach to the challenge of BDS against Israel. This is one that does not conflict with constitutionally-protected rights, will not fuel a pro-BDS narrative, has a real chance of convincing a lot of people—those who are frustrated with Israeli policies but are neither anti-Israel nor anti-Semitic—to adopt a better kind of activism. APN supports such an approach, which includes:

- Recognizing and rejecting pro-settlement, anti-peace policies that feed the growing support for BDS today, and working publicly and concretely to oppose and change them.

- Rejecting efforts to conflate Israel and the settlements and instead recognizing the legitimacy and potential value of activism and boycotts that squarely target settlements and the occupation.
- Ceasing efforts to limit free speech. BDS supporters, regardless of their motivations, are entitled to their views and to their legal, non-violent forms of protest, just as opponents of BDS are entitled to challenge and criticize them in ways that do not trample on the First Amendment rights of any party.
- Engaging the public and challenging BDS on its merits—through statements and other public messaging—in order to demonstrate why BDS against Israel is a misguided, counterproductive tactic in the fight to end the occupation, and to illustrate how activism focused on settlements and the occupied territories is a better way to achieve that goal.”

Visit <https://peacenow.org/>

**c. American Jewish Committee**

“AJC exposes the sinister reality of the BDS movement. We spearhead anti-BDS legislation at all levels of government and rally elected officials to reject the boycott movement. And through AJC Project Interchange, we foster truth and counter anti-Israel rhetoric by giving influential figures the opportunity to experience the reality of Israel firsthand.

AJC combats the efforts of BDS extremists by engaging thought leaders in every segment of society that BDS targets. Aware that BDS activists may someday seek to promote legislation at the state level to facilitate a boycott, we convinced the governors of all 50 states to declare their opposition to BDS. We were also a driving force behind anti-BDS legislation in California and Illinois.

As the BDS movement has surged on campus, we have brought dozens of university presidents to Israel and trained hundreds of students as advocates for Israel. And with BDS proponents pushing for Christian denominations to join a boycott of Israel, we have marshalled our allies in the Christian world to oppose such efforts.

AJC advocacy has cut off BDS at every turn, ensuring that the anti-Israel forces behind the movement will never achieve their goals.”

Visit <https://ajc.org>

**d. Anti-Defamation League**

Anti-Defamation League former head Abraham Foxman has said the following:

“Legislation that bars BDS activity by private groups, whether corporations or universities, strikes at the heart of First Amendment-protected free speech, will be challenged in the courts and is likely to be struck down. A decision by a private body to boycott Israel, as despicable as it may be, is protected by our Constitution.” (2015)

Visit <https://www.adl.org/>



**e. J Street**

**“1) We do not advocate for or support any boycott, divestment or sanctions initiative whatsoever**

**2) J Street has always been and remains opposed to the Global BDS Movement**

J Street advocates for a two-state solution and a secure, Jewish and democratic future for Israel. The Global BDS Movement does not support the two-state solution, recognize the right of the Jewish people to a state or distinguish between opposition to the existence of Israel itself and opposition to the occupation of the territory beyond the Green Line. Further, some of the Movement’s supporters and leaders have trafficked in unacceptable anti-Semitic rhetoric. The Movement is not a friend to Israel, nor does its agenda, in our opinion, advance the long-term interests of either the Israeli or Palestinian people.

**3) We do not oppose boycott, divestment, or sanctions initiatives that explicitly support a two-state solution, recognize Israel’s right to exist, and focus only on occupied territory beyond the Green Line**

These kinds of initiatives are different than those advocated and initiated by the Global BDS Movement.

It is critical to maintain the distinction between boycott and divestment efforts which work against the interests of Israel, and initiatives which are limited to opposing the occupation.

While we do not oppose these initiatives, we do not support them either.”

Visit <https://jstreet.org/policy/boycott-divestment-and-sanctions-bds/#.XNCC-JNKjUI>

***15. What is the current position of our ecumenical mainline denominational partners on economic pressure?***

CCSR works in coalition with many ecumenical partners through the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility. We highlight four of our mainline denominational partners.

**a. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA)**

Note: Portico is the entity that manages the investment assets of ELCA.

“In April of 2018, the ELCA Church Council approved a [Human Rights social criteria investment screen](#).

Wording of screen: The ELCA recommends not investing in corporations benefiting from the most egregious denial of the rights of humans as political and civic beings to have equal access and participation in legal and political decisions affecting them.

Definition of problem: Equal access and participation in legal and political decisions cannot happen when they occur in conflict-affected countries, especially disputed or occupied territories. Recognizing that various investors will implement this along a continuum, for the purpose of this

screen investments might include screening companies supporting and benefiting from occupation. It could also include investments that promote positive economic development in such regions.”

### **“Portico Implements New ELCA Human Rights Screen**

April 14, 2019

This month, the ELCA’s largest institutional investor, Portico Benefit Services, announced two recent actions supporting the 2016 Churchwide Assembly resolution, Justice for the Holy Land Through Responsible Investment.

**First, on April 1, Portico implemented within the ELCA social purpose funds the ELCA’s new Political and Civil Human Rights social criteria investment screen approved last year by the ELCA Church Council.** This screen provides guidance to Portico and other ELCA investors wanting to take investment action relative to the ELCA’s human rights position.

Since approval of the screen, Portico has established a comprehensive process for identifying and screening companies from the ELCA social purpose funds, and began applying it April 1. Now, companies will be screened out if they’re identified as involved with a controversy in an occupied or disputed territory where the denial of legal and political human rights measures “severe” or “very severe.”

For 2019, the screen added one company to the list of those excluded from ELCA social purpose funds. While Portico can report the number of companies identified by a specific screen, it isn’t able to name specific companies by screen as this information is considered proprietary research by Portico’s screening consultant.

“Because the risk of doing business in occupied and disputed territories can be significant,” says Erin Ripperger, Portico’s senior socially responsible investment analyst, “we didn’t expect many companies to meet the requirements. Screening may identify additional companies as we refine our process over time. We also expect to create significant impact through our advocacy work as shareholders and by making investments that promote positive economic development in select occupied and disputed territories.”

<https://www.porticobenefits.org/Overview/ReponsibleInvesting/InvestingForSocialImpact/PorticoImplementsHumanRightsScreen>

### **b. Presbyterian Church, USA**

Note: a proscription list is the same as a No Buy List.

“As human rights issues arise, as in the case of apartheid in South Africa, the military violence against civilians in Sudan, or human rights violations that obstruct a just peace in Israel-Palestine, the General Assembly may place a company on the divestment and/or proscription list. Currently, three companies are on the list as a result of General Assembly action. The 2014 General Assembly added Caterpillar, Hewlett Packard and Motorola Solutions to its divestment and/or proscription list due to concerns about continuing involvement in human rights violations in the Occupied Palestinian Territories such as the illegal military occupation including checkpoints, the illegal Israeli settlements and restricted roads being built in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, destruction of Palestinian homes and agricultural lands, and construction of the separation barrier in so far as it extends beyond the 1967 “Green Line” boundary. The General Assembly has identified such activities as non-peaceful roadblocks to a just peace based on a two-state solution,

and called upon all corporations to confine their business operations solely to peaceful pursuits. Note: As of December 31, 2016 due to corporate actions, there are now four companies including Hewlett Packard Enterprise and HP Inc. on the proscription list.”

<https://www.presbyterianmission.org/wp-content/uploads/APPROVED-MRTI-2019-GA-Divestment-Proscription-List.pdf>

### **c. United Methodist Church**

The UMC pension board (Wespath), with a value of \$20 billion, divested of 5 Israeli banks and 2 other corporations in 2016.

“Wespath’s Human Rights guideline reflects The United Methodist Church’s call for all general boards and agencies to “...make a conscious effort to invest in institutions, companies, corporations, or funds whose practices are consistent with the goals outlined in the Social Principles.” (§ 717) We are a global investor, and we actively influence the promotion and protection of human rights through constructive engagement by using our voice as shareholders to change company practices. We believe that engagement is the most effective strategy for us, and like-minded investors, to effect corporate change and improve human rights protections.

There are specific times, however, when we must recognize that a company is very unlikely—or unable—to discontinue activities in certain parts of the world that we have classified as “**high-risk**.” When activities in high-risk countries or areas represent a significant or integral part of a company’s business, we will avoid investing until the company changes its business practices or until there is a change in its operating environment. Avoiding such investments supports our commitment to sustainable investing, which we believe ultimately improves the performance of our investment funds.

We implement our Human Rights guideline by:

#### **1. Identifying “high-risk” countries and areas where there is a prolonged and systematic pattern of human rights abuses, where conflict exists and where human rights abuses have been widely documented and/or significant breaches of international law occur**

High-risk countries and areas are identified based on an assessment of:

— [Freedom House](#)’s annual “worst of the worst” list of countries with the lowest-possible ratings for both political rights and civil liberties. We selected Freedom House—an organization focused on expanding freedom and democracy through analysis, advocacy and action—after conducting a thorough due diligence process evaluating reputable organizations that provide thoughtful, objective analysis on countries’ human rights performance. [Here is the full list of countries.](#)

— Conflict-affected areas where significant human rights violations are widely documented. These include countries and/or regions where a specific economic sector is recognized as prolonging conflict and areas where a United Nations Security Council resolution or an advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice has identified significant breaches of international law. [Areas currently identified as “conflict-affected” are listed here.](#)

These definitions of international justice align with the United Methodist Church’s Social Principles, which state “...we endorse the United Nations, its related bodies, the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court as the best instruments now in existence to achieve a world of justice and law.” (§ 165.D)

## **2. Relying on an objective and respected external environmental, social and governance (ESG) research provider to help us identify companies at risk**

In 2015, Wespeth Investment Management, Wespeth’s investments division, contracted [Sustainalytics](#) (a global ESG research provider) to identify and assess the management policies and practices of companies with significant exposure to the countries and areas identified as high-risk.

We chose Sustainalytics after conducting a search for an ESG research provider that could help us implement our Human Rights and Climate Change guidelines. The firm works with more than 300 clients worldwide, including pension funds, mutual funds and asset managers.

## **3. Evaluating companies in our investment funds that pose excessive human rights risks**

We have identified companies with significant operations in “high-risk” countries and the three specific “conflict-affected” areas. These companies are ineligible for investment under the Human Rights guideline.

Factors we considered include:

- percentage of revenue linked to the high-risk area
- nature of the company’s relationship to the conflict/region
- mitigating factors relating to the company’s management of human rights risk found in publicly available documents

We will continue to regularly monitor and update the list of high-risk countries and areas, as well as companies affected by the guideline, as warranted.”

<https://www.wespeth.org/investments/human-rights-guideline-implementation/>

### **d. United Church of Christ**

“Part of United Church Funds’ SRI work involves promoting peace in the Middle East through every outlet available. Most recently, staff joined in a delegation to the region along with national leaders of the United Church of Christ. More information on that trip, including a **blog post** written by the UCF’s director of Social Responsibility, can be found [here](#). In 2005, the General Synod of the United Church of Christ called on its members and ministries to use economic leverage to promote peace in the Middle East. Since that Synod, **United Church Funds has worked actively** within the UCC and with an ecumenical task force — comprising at least 20 different denominations, communions and Roman Catholic orders — to achieve the goals reflected in the Synod resolution.”

<https://ucfunds.org/social-responsibility/corporate-engagement/economic-leverage/promoting-peace/>

United Church Funds notes that the UCC strives to “restrict companies [from its investment portfolio] whose involvement in international conflict zones, including the Occupied Palestinian Territories, leads to direct violations of human rights.” UCC has excluded 5 international companies from its portfolio based on this position.



## SHARING THE WAY OF LOVE

*A Bold Campaign to Engage Millions of New People with the Loving Way of Jesus*

*“You will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria, to the ends of the earth.” - Acts 1:8*

### Why Share the Way of Love Now?

The Episcopal Church has an unprecedented opportunity to transform the American Christian landscape and welcome neighbors near and far to discover the loving, liberating, life-giving way of Jesus – a way that has the power to change lives and change the world.

With the wise, prophetic and charismatic leadership of Presiding Michael Bishop Curry, we are uniquely positioned to go public and broaden our reach. It is time to engage the millions of people who yearn to discover communities that are centered on Jesus of Nazareth and practice his gospel of freedom and hope.

### How Will We Share the Way of Love?

From now to June 2021, we will pursue a strategic series of public-directed initiatives, including ...

- New York City revival
- iTunes-charting podcast
- boundary-crossing video series
- streaming TV series exploring faith with major public figures
- resources to equip and form local followers of Jesus

All of these initiatives should be backed by a top-tier marketing effort that connects the truly good news of Jesus with people who long to discover it. These efforts will leverage the latest technologies and media platforms to shine a brighter light on the Presiding Bishop's vision and intentionally engage new people with practices and communities that shape us to live as Jesus' loving body in the world.

### What Will Grow or Change as a Result?

Sharing the Way of Love will increase The Episcopal Church's capacity to communicate the loving, liberating, and life-giving Way of Jesus Christ with the broadest population we have ever attempted to engage. Through this campaign, The Episcopal Church will...

- increase the number of people who hear about and engage with the Jesus Movement and Way of Love
- build partnerships with positive, news-making individuals who can continue to raise Episcopal visibility
- develop the Church's capacity for large scale, effective communication with non-church audiences
- revitalize and embolden church members to publicly proclaim love for God and neighbor
- create a high-quality body of materials and resources (videos, podcasts, curricula) to support evangelism, formation and outreach efforts
- build stronger collaborations with other branches of the Jesus Movement, especially The Evangelical Lutheran Church of America

# SHARING THE WAY OF LOVE

A Bold Campaign to Engage Millions of New People with the Loving Way of Jesus



Initiatives	Overview	Progress and Vision	Cost
<b>New York City Revival, October 25, 2020 (\$335K)</b>	<p>8 days before Election Day, in partnership with the ELCA, we will host 10,000+ Episcopalians, Lutherans and spiritually hungry people at a major NYC venue (eg. Barclay's or Madison Sq. Garden).</p> <p>PB Michael Curry, ELCA PB Elizabeth Eaton, and other compelling influencers of faith and culture will call Americans to pray, live, and publicly engage the Way of Love.</p>	<p><b>Prior progress:</b> Over the last three years, the Presiding Bishop's Evangelism Team has partnered to organize a dozen <u>Episcopal Revivals</u> and engaged 30,000 people along the way.</p> <p><b>Next Steps/Vision:</b> This revival will connect with thousands of people who attend in person, and potentially hundreds of thousands who link virtually, either individually or in satellite events across the land.</p>	<p>New York event professionals have provided the following preliminary cost estimates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$280,000: venue rental (non-profit rate), security, lights, sound, production, catering, etc.</li> <li>\$45,000: event management</li> <li>\$20,000: musicians and artists</li> <li>\$40,000: promotion (inc. film crew)</li> </ul>
<b>The Way of Love with Presiding Bishop Michael Curry Podcast (\$195,000 through 2021)</b>	<p>In his new <u>Way of Love Podcast</u>, Presiding Bishop Curry welcomes Episcopalians, people of faith and people with no faith at all to a generous, open conversation about how to live and love in the world today. Each episode features reflections from Bishop Curry, conversations with leaders and thinkers, music and prayer.</p>	<p><b>Prior Progress:</b> Within two months of launch on June 9, 2019, Season 1 reached 42,090 downloads.</p> <p><b>Next Steps/Vision:</b> With an expanded budget, we aim to ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>become a Top 10 religious podcast in America by the end of 2020</li> <li>produce 3 additional seasons</li> <li>build a new Episcopal Podcast Network (inc. podcasts on Creation Care, Latinos Episcopales, Evangelism, and more)</li> <li>successfully advertise and grow audience</li> </ul>	<p>Program development and Season 1 costs have been covered by Evangelism and Digital Evangelism budgets, and total about \$70,000 in 2018 and 2019. \$195,000 of additional funding will ensure continuation into 2021 and robust, industry-standard promotion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$135,000 for 3 seasons (\$45,000/season for production, inc. hosts/producers <b>Kyle Oliver and Sandy Milien</b>)</li> <li>\$24,000 for promotion (roughly \$8,000/season)</li> <li>\$25,000 for partnerships and development of podcast network</li> </ul>
<b>"Traveling the Way of Love" Video Series (\$210,000 for triennium)</b>	<p>This <u>periodic video series</u> features seven short films a year, each focused on a practice in the Way of Love. Host Chris Sikkema and a film crew travel the church, gathering inspirational stories of how God is working in an Episcopal context, insights from one engaging guest per episode, and suggestions on how the average person can take up the particular practice.</p>	<p><b>Prior progress:</b> The popular series is 2<sup>nd</sup> only to the Presiding Bishop's holiday greetings in ratings. Cinematic video content is supplemented with reflection guides, small group guides, and other resources, making it not only an entertaining series, but also a resource for congregations and dioceses.</p> <p><b>Next steps/Vision:</b> The series has strong crossover appeal with other Christian groups, the de-churched/ formerly churched and seekers, and could be distributed on services like Amazon and Netflix.</p>	<p>Program development and Season 1 costs for 7 episodes have been covered by Multimedia and Digital Evangelism budgets, totaling ~\$105,000. Additional funding would allow the series to run through 2021, including highly professional film and production, graphic design and curriculum development.</p> <p>Estimated costs for 2 seasons (2020-21):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$195,000 for film crew, travel, production</li> <li>\$5,000 for graphic design</li> <li>\$7,000 for Spanish translation</li> <li>\$3,000 for curriculum development</li> </ul>



# SHARING THE WAY OF LOVE

A Bold Campaign to Engage Millions of New People with the Loving Way of Jesus



Initiatives#	Overview#	Progress and Vision	Estimate
<b>Web-streaming (Netflix) Limited Series with Presiding Bishop Michael Curry (\$190,000)</b>	This limited series for a streaming service like Netflix would feature the Presiding Bishop visiting spiritually vital places in conversation with major, individual public figures (one guest per episode).	<p><b>Prior progress:</b> Streaming services are producing and distributing some of the most compelling content anywhere, much of it geared toward spiritual, values-based viewers. There is a natural audience for a limited series featuring Presiding Bishop Curry engaging public figures in a rich, meaningful, long-form conversation about life in the Spirit. Netflix has already indicated initial interest.</p> <p><b>Next steps/vision:</b> Funding for an additional 3 episodes would be provided either by 1) the content distributor (Netflix, HBO, Amazon, etc.), based on delivery of the completed pilot episode or 2) select backers passionate about this unique form of public engagement and evangelism.</p>	<p>Initial funding of \$195,000 would allow for creation of an industry-standard “pilot” episode, to be filmed on-location with the interview guest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$40,000: Pre-production (inc. story generation, location scout and all necessary personnel)</li> <li>• \$90,000: Production (inc. all necessary equipment, location, acquisition fees, permits, insurance)</li> <li>• \$30,000: Post-production (inc. necessary personnel and equipment, on-site/off-site digital storage)</li> <li>• \$35,000: Travel (inc. airfare, lodging and meals for pre-production and production)</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Initiatives</b>			
<b>Further Way of Love development (\$115,000 for triennium)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Way of Love Working Group (\$35,000)</i>: Funds cover four gatherings of the mostly volunteer team that guides and advances the movement.</li> <li>• <i>Resource Development and Creation (\$25,000)</i>: Modest fees to compensate curriculum developers and outside graphic designers doing significant work beyond the volunteer level, plus printing and distribution of new materials for church gatherings, including General Convention 2021.</li> <li>• <i>Resource Translation and Distribution (\$20,000)</i>: Minimum necessary to engage growing Spanish- and French-speaking audience.</li> <li>• <i>Video Teaching Series (\$20,000)</i>: A teaching series introducing how to practice the 7 disciplines of the Way of Love.</li> <li>• <i>Way of Love Spiritual Life App (\$15,000)</i>: The Newbigin Centre-San Francisco has offered a platform and funding for a spiritual life app based on the Way of Love, designed to reach church and non-church audiences. Episcopal monastic communities could produce content.</li> </ul>		
<b>Marketing Support (\$170,000 for triennium)</b>	<p>Go Public with the Way of Love can only truly reach millions of new people with the assistance of an expert external marketing team that shares our passion for spreading a loving, life-changing, world-changing message. The Office of Communications is eager to partner with such a marketing team, not in order to replace staff efforts but to complement and deepen them in these ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acquire new data and information about the public square</li> <li>• Reveal audience behavior, especially identifying trends and patterns to more effectively reach our target audiences</li> <li>• Provide additional direction to the Communications Department, with measurable goals and tasks</li> <li>• Design and execute a social media strategy that will reach the public sphere beyond the Church’s “usual suspects”</li> </ul>		

## Finance and Governance Note:

All efforts to raise external dollars for Episcopal Church programming must be approved by the General Convention or the Executive Council. At its meeting in October 2019, the Executive Council will have the opportunity to specifically designate both the permission to fundraise and the purpose and spending policies governing how the funds are to be spent.

## **Bilateral Relationship Between The Anglican Church of Mexico and The Episcopal Church**

### **Historical background**

As a result of the concerns and work of a group of priests with renewal ideas and with the desire to spread the Christian faith from new perspectives, “The Church of Jesus” was formed in Mexico, which later came into contact with PECUSA in 1875, where it was received as a part of the IX province as the Mexican Episcopal Church, thus initiating a stage of growth as a missionary district that would later give rise to 3 dioceses (North, West, and Central and Southern Mexico), already with the visionary idea of forming a Province of the Anglican Communion. While the Mexican bishops worked on this idea, the Constitutional Reform to article 130 allowed that, in February 1993, the Mexican Episcopal Church could be constituted as a Religious Association obtaining the registration as Anglican Church of Mexico.

After a sustained growth of the mission, the Diocese of Central and Southern Mexico gave rise to two others: Cuernavaca and Southeast, so having 5 dioceses in the country, which covered another requirement to obtain autonomy.

It was in the 71st General Convention of The Episcopal Church (1994) where it was approved to grant autonomy to the Mexican Episcopal Church, in order to form a new province in the Anglican Communion. As part of this resolution, The Episcopal Church proposed the drawing up of an agreement for 25 years with the purpose of coming along with our Church through strategies, programs and financial assistance. The Agreement came into effect on January 1, 1995, with Bishop Edmond L. Browning as Primate of The Episcopal Church and Bishop José G. Saucedo as Main Bishop of the Anglican Church of Mexico.

In our walking as an Autonomous Province, we have faced different challenges; lived enriching experiences and responded to our mission with actions such as the following:

- ❖ The demands of the challenges have produced in the Anglican Church of Mexico (IAM for its acronym in Spanish) a maturity in the faith and a greater sense of responsibility and commitment.
- ❖ In the search for new strategies and as part of the Anglican Communion we have established relationships of fellowship with the Diocese in TEC, with which the exchange has been very strengthening.
- ❖ We have had to look more inward and develop our own programs for the learning and continuing education of the clergy and the training of lay leaders.



- ❖ As a result of sharing experiences with other dioceses regarding strategic planning, we are committed to the development of economic sustainability projects.
- ❖ At the IAM we have established our own program of the United Thanks Offering and continue to contribute to the UTO of The Episcopal Church
- ❖ Another of the significant achievements has been the acceptance of the ordination of women, an acceptance that enjoys greater recognition and approval in our Church.

Following the example of The Episcopal Church and other provinces, but above all, the example of Our Lord Jesus Christ, we have placed special interest in the Social Pastoral, attending to different vulnerable groups with the intention of making them feel the love of Christ as a way of evangelization.

### **Preamble**

Accepting the command of Our Lord Jesus Christ to establish the Kingdom of God here on earth and despite the political difficulties that Mexico and the United States are going through. We believe that the Anglican Church of Mexico (IAM) and The Episcopal Church (TEC) are called to share a ministry of prayer and collaboration through the gifts and talents we have to help us in mutual growth where we reflect the kingdom with our actions of justice, peace and love through service, education and the expansion of ministry.

### **Resolutions**

- ❖ Maintain and increase the relationships of fellowship at the level of dioceses, congregations and programs that allow mutual learning, strengthening of fellowship, and the growth and development of the Church.
- ❖ Support collaboration and exchange of resources and expertise in ministerial aspects related to:
  - ❖ Pensions for the Clergy
  - ❖ Financial reorganization and sustainability
  - ❖ Theological Education
  - ❖ Access to materials from the Hispanic / Latino Ministry of TEC and IAM
  - ❖ United Thanks Offering (UTO)
  - ❖ Missionaries Exchange
- ❖ We resolve to remain in prayer, for each other, as a testimony of brotherhood in Christ.

### **Structure**

The IAM and TEC will have a bilateral relationship with two priorities: (1) mutual ministry, shared collaboration, Christian relationship and Christian communion and (2) focus on sustainability and projects that promote self-reliance. With these two priorities in mind, a bilateral committee between TEC and the IAM will have the following structure:

- ❖ 10 people from the IAM, 2 people from each diocese;
- ❖ 6 people from TEC, elected by the Primate and President of the Chamber of Deputies or a committee of the Executive Council related to supporting relations within the Anglican Communion;
- ❖ Each member serves a term of 6 years;
- ❖ The bilateral committee will meet at least once in the triennium;
- ❖ The meetings will focus on developing relationships between the two churches for shared collaboration and Christian communion and projects that support sustainability through the five dioceses of Mexico;

### **Effectiveness**

This bilateral relationship will take effect on January 1, 2020 and will continue for a period of six years after being approved by the Executive Council of the Anglican Church of Mexico and the Executive Council of The Episcopal Church, date on which it may be reviewed. and/or reconsidered

Proposed by the Mexico Convention Committee on \_\_\_\_\_ (date).

(All names of the current agreement committee here) ...

Date of action of the Anglican Church of Mexico \_\_\_\_\_ (date).

Date of action of The Episcopal Church \_\_\_\_\_ (date).

Signed on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) of \_\_\_\_\_ (year), in \_\_\_\_\_ (place).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bishop and Primate  
Episcopal Church

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bishop and Primate  
Anglican Church of México