US / SIF

August 24, 2026

Submitted electronically via regulations.gov

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Executive Secretariat
131 M Street NE
Washington, DC 20507

Re: Removal of Reporting Requirements, RIN 3046-AB37

Dear Commissioners,

The US Sustainable Investment Forum[1] and the undersigned investors and investment firms representing $32.2 billion in assets under management or advisement welcome the opportunity to express our opposition to the proposed rule eliminating mandatory EEO-1 reporting.

The Commission should withdraw the proposal and retain EEO-1 as a uniform national reporting framework. Standardized workforce data supports effective enforcement of Title VII, improves market transparency, and allows employers, investors, researchers, and the public to identify labor-market patterns without directing any employer to make decisions based on protected characteristics.

EEO-1 Reporting Supports Effective Enforcement and Market Efficiency

Title VII reflects Congress's judgment that employment discrimination is not merely a private injury; it also burdens interstate commerce and distorts the national labor market. Discrimination prevents workers from being allocated to their highest and best use, imposes costs on families, communities, taxpayers, and investors, and can conceal human-capital risks that affect corporate performance.

Researchers from the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco found the persistence of systemic disparities is costly, and eliminating them has the potential to produce large economic gains, measured in the trillions of dollars of GDP from 1990-2019.[2]

---

[1] US SIF is a membership organization representing 180 investor firms and trillions of dollars of assets under management. Our members represent investors throughout the capital markets value chain - from asset managers, managing billions in retirement dollars for average Americans, to data providers, financial advisors, and community development financial institutions, supporting local economies. www.ussif.org

[2] Buckman, Shelby R., Laura Y. Choi, Mary C. Daly¸ and Lily M. Seitelman. 2021. "The Economic Gains from Equity." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, Fall. 71-111. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/15985-BPEA-BPEA-FA21_WEB_Buckman-et-al.pdf

EEO-1 reporting gives the Commission a consistent factual baseline for understanding broad workforce patterns, allocating enforcement resources, and evaluating information developed in particular investigations. Eliminating that baseline would make systemic patterns harder and more expensive to detect.

The collection of aggregate workforce data does not require unlawful preferences or employment decisions based on race or sex. Reporting and decision-making are distinct activities. The Commission can preserve the informational value of EEO-1 while continuing to make clear that employers must comply with Title VII's prohibition on discrimination against every individual.

The proposal's burden analysis should also account for the costs of rescission. Without a federal baseline, employers may face duplicative state requirements, company-specific investor questionnaires, private data-vendor requests, and inconsistent methodologies. Those fragmented demands could shift rather than eliminate compliance costs while producing data that are less reliable and less comparable. A uniform federal form is a more efficient solution.

Standardized EEO-1 Data Is Important to Investors and Other Market Participants

EEO-1 is uniquely valuable because covered employers use common job categories, demographic classifications, and reporting periods. That consistency permits meaningful comparison across companies, industries, geographies, and job levels, and the long history of the collection helps users distinguish sustained trends from temporary fluctuations. Researchers use the data to study occupational segregation; employers use it for benchmarking; and investors use it to assess workforce disclosures and determine whether corporate statements are supported by comparable evidence.

The collection's central strength is not simply the information measured, but the fact that covered employers measure it in the same way. Voluntary disclosure cannot replicate that function because companies may choose different definitions, methodologies, scopes, and reporting dates. The federal requirement creates a common floor that makes any voluntary public disclosure more legible and useful.

For investors, this information is financially relevant. A recent study by As You Sow found management with higher diversity is associated with positive financial relationships across several core performance metrics, including income after tax, revenue growth, ROE, ROIC, long-term growth mean, free cash flow per share, and share price change.[3] Further, diverse management is associated with stronger long-term returns and is positively linked to five-year and 10-year share price appreciation.[4]

Rescission would not eliminate demand for workforce information. Instead, it would transfer the cost of obtaining that information to individual companies, investors, researchers, and other stakeholders, one request at a time, with no assurance that the resulting answers would be comparable. For diversified, long-term investors, labor-market inefficiency and underutilization of talent can create portfolio-wide risks that are difficult to diversify away. Comparable EEO-1 data is therefore relevant to market integrity as well as civil-rights enforcement.

Conclusion

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Commission to withdraw the proposed rule and retain the EEO-1 reporting and related recordkeeping requirements. Preserving a uniform, and administratively workable reporting system will better advance effective enforcement, efficient markets, and the purposes of Title VII than eliminating the collection altogether.

Sincerely,

The US Sustainable Investment Forum
Washington, DC

Adasina Social Capital
San Francisco, CA

Clean Yield Asset Management
Norwich VT

Freedom Economy Business Association
Winston-Salem, NC

Green America
Washington, DC

Natural Investments
San Francisco CA

Newground Social Investment
Seattle, WA

NorthFork Advisors
Bozeman, Montana

Stance Capital
Boston, MA

Terra Alpha Investments
Washington, DC

Transformative Wealth Management
Berkeley, California

Veris Wealth Partners
Oakland, CA

[3] "Capturing the Diversity Benefit: Workforce Diversity Linked to Financial Benefit," As You Sow (July 2026). https://www.asyousow.org/report-page/2026-capturing-the-diversity-benefit
[4] Ibid.