



DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

March 3, 2016

James E. Parsons
Exxon Mobil Corporation
james.e.parsons@exxonmobil.com

Re: Exxon Mobil Corporation
Incoming letter dated January 20, 2016

Dear Mr. Parsons:

This is in response to your letter dated January 20, 2016 concerning the shareholder proposal submitted to ExxonMobil by Kenneth Steiner. We also have received a letter on the proponent's behalf dated February 24, 2016. Copies of all of the correspondence on which this response is based will be made available on our website at <http://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8.shtml>. For your reference, a brief discussion of the Division's informal procedures regarding shareholder proposals is also available at the same website address.

Sincerely,

Matt S. McNair
Senior Special Counsel

Enclosure

cc: John Chevedden

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

March 3, 2016

Response of the Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance

Re: Exxon Mobil Corporation
Incoming letter dated January 20, 2016

The proposal recommends that the company hire an investment bank to explore the sale of the company. This would include a sale by dividing the company into major pieces to facilitate such a sale.

We are unable to concur in your view that ExxonMobil may exclude the proposal under rule 14a-8(i)(3). We are unable to conclude that the proposal is so inherently vague or indefinite that neither the shareholders voting on the proposal, nor the company in implementing the proposal, would be able to determine with any reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires. Accordingly, we do not believe that ExxonMobil may omit the proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on rule 14a-8(i)(3).

We are unable to concur in your view that ExxonMobil may exclude the proposal under rule 14a-8(i)(10). Based on the information you have presented, it appears that the company's policies, practices and procedures do not compare favorably with the guidelines of the proposal and that ExxonMobil has not, therefore, substantially implemented the proposal. Accordingly, we do not believe that ExxonMobil may omit the proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on rule 14a-8(i)(10).

Sincerely,

Adam F. Turk
Special Counsel

**DIVISION OF CORPORATION FINANCE
INFORMAL PROCEDURES REGARDING SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS**

The Division of Corporation Finance believes that its responsibility with respect to matters arising under Rule 14a-8 [17 CFR 240.14a-8], as with other matter under the proxy rules, is to aid those who must comply with the rule by offering informal advice and suggestions and to determine, initially, whether or not it may be appropriate in a particular matter to recommend enforcement action to the Commission. In connection with a shareholder proposal under Rule 14a-8, the Division's staff considers the information furnished to it by the Company in support of its intention to exclude the proposals from the Company's proxy materials, as well as any information furnished by the proponent or the proponent's representative.

Although Rule 14a-8(k) does not require any communications from shareholders to the Commission's staff, the staff will always consider information concerning alleged violations of the statutes administered by the Commission, including argument as to whether or not activities proposed to be taken would be violative of the statute or rule involved. The receipt by the staff of such information, however, should not be construed as changing the staff's informal procedures and proxy review into a formal or adversary procedure.

It is important to note that the staff's and Commission's no-action responses to Rule 14a-8(j) submissions reflect only informal views. The determinations reached in these no-action letters do not and cannot adjudicate the merits of a company's position with respect to the proposal. Only a court such as a U.S. District Court can decide whether a company is obligated to include shareholders proposals in its proxy materials. Accordingly a discretionary determination not to recommend or take Commission enforcement action, does not preclude a proponent, or any shareholder of a company, from pursuing any rights he or she may have against the company in court, should the management omit the proposal from the company's proxy material.

JOHN CHEVEDDEN

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

February 24, 2016

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington, DC 20549

1 Rule 14a-8 Proposal
Exxon Mobil Corporation (XOM)
Hire an Investment Bank
Kenneth Steiner


Ladies and Gentlemen:

This is in regard to the January 20, 2016 no-action request.

The company must believe the rule 14a-8 proposal is clear because the company claims to know that it has done enough to implement the proposal.

This is to request that the Securities and Exchange Commission allow this resolution to stand and be voted upon in the 2016 proxy.

Sincerely,



John Chevedden

cc: James Parsons <james.e.parsons@exxonmobil.com>

XOM: Rule 14a-8 Proposal, December 30, 2015]

Proposal [4] – Hire an investment bank

Shareholders recommend our company hire an investment bank to explore the sale of our company. This would include a sale by dividing the company into major pieces to facilitate such a sale.

I believe the sale of XOM would release significantly more value to the shareholders than the current share price. Our stock was trading above \$100 in 2014 and it went below \$75 in 2015.

Hire an investment bank – Proposal [4]

Exxon Mobil Corporation
5959 Las Colinas Boulevard
Irving, Texas 75039-2298
972 444 1478 Telephone
972 444 1488 Facsimile

James E. Parsons
Coordinator
Corporate Securities & Finance



January 20, 2016

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20549
via email: shareholderproposals@sec.gov

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of ExxonMobil, a New Jersey corporation (the "**Company**"), and in accordance with Rule 14a-8(j) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "**Exchange Act**"), we are filing this letter with respect to the shareholder proposal dated December 30, 2015 (the "**Proposal**") submitted by Kenneth Steiner (the "**Proponent**") through his representative John Chevedden via email on December 16, 2015 for inclusion in the proxy materials the Company intends to distribute in connection with its 2016 Annual Meeting of Shareholders (the "**2016 Proxy Materials**"). Copies of all correspondence between the Company and the Proponent as well as the Proponent's representative are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

We hereby request confirmation that the Staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "**Staff**") will not recommend any enforcement action if, in reliance on Rule 14a-8, the Company omits the Proposal from the 2016 Proxy Materials. In accordance with Rule 14a-8(j), this letter is being filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "**Commission**") not less than 80 days before the Company plans to file its definitive proxy statement. To the extent this letter represents matters of law it is my opinion as counsel for the Company.

Pursuant to Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (CF), Shareholder Proposals (November 7, 2008), question C, we have submitted this letter and any related correspondence via email to shareholderproposals@sec.gov. Also, in accordance with Rule 14a-8(j), a copy of this submission is being sent simultaneously to the Proponent's representative as notification of the Company's intention to omit the Proposal from the 2016 Proxy Materials. This letter constitutes the Company's statement of the reasons it deems the omission of the Proposal to be proper.

THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal asks that the shareholders of the Company adopt the following resolution:

Hire an investment bank. Shareholders recommend our company hire an investment bank to explore the sale of our company. This would include a sale by dividing the company into major pieces to facilitate such a sale.

The full text of the Proposal is included in Exhibit A.

REASONS FOR EXCLUSION OF PROPOSAL

The Company believes that the Proposal may be properly omitted from the 2015 Proxy Materials pursuant to:

- Rule 14a-8(i)(3), because the Proposal is so inherently vague and indefinite as to be materially misleading in violation of Rule 14a-9; and
- Rule 14a-8(i)(10), because the Company has already substantially implemented the Proposal.

1. The Company may omit the Proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(3) because the Proposal is so inherently vague and indefinite as to be materially misleading under Rule 14a-9.

Under Rule 14a-8(i)(3), a proposal may be excluded if the resolution or supporting statement is contrary to any of the Commission's proxy rules or regulations. The Staff has consistently taken the view that shareholder proposals that are "so inherently vague or indefinite that neither the stockholders voting on the proposal, nor the company in implementing the proposal (if adopted), would be able to determine with any reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires" are materially false and misleading. Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14B (CF) (September 15, 2004). *See also Dyer v. SEC*, 287 F.2d 773, 781 (8th Cir. 1961) ("[I]t appears to us that the proposal, as drafted and submitted to the company, is so vague and indefinite as to make it impossible for either the board of directors or the stockholders at large to comprehend precisely what the proposal would entail.").

Consistent with this guidance, the Proposal is properly excludable. The Proposal fails to define key terms relevant to its own implementation and, as a result, the Proposal is so broad and indefinite that neither shareholders nor the board would be able to determine with reasonable certainty what the resolution requires.

The Proposal fails to define key terms relevant to its own implementation.

The Staff has consistently concurred in the exclusion of proposals that fail to define key terms. *See e.g., Wendy's International Inc.* (February 24, 2006) (permitting exclusion of a proposal where the term "accelerating development" was found to be unclear); *Peoples Energy Corporation* (November 23, 2004) (permitting exclusion of a proposal where the term "reckless neglect" was found to be unclear); and *Exxon Corporation* (January 29, 1992) (permitting exclusion of a proposal regarding board member criteria because vague terms were subject to differing interpretations).

A proposal may also be vague, and thus materially misleading, when it fails to address essential aspects of its own implementation. For example, the Staff has allowed the exclusion of several executive compensation proposals where a crucial term relevant to implementing the proposal was insufficiently clear. *See The Boeing Company* (March 2, 2011) (concurring with the exclusion of a proposal requesting, among other things, that senior executives relinquish certain "executive pay rights" because the proposal did not sufficiently explain the meaning of the phrase); *General Electric Company* (January 21, 2011) (proposal requesting that the compensation committee make specified changes was vague because, when applied to the company, neither the stockholders nor the company would be able to determine exactly what actions or measures the proposal required); and *General Electric Company* (January 23, 2003) (proposal seeking an individual cap on salaries and benefits of one million dollars failed to define the critical term

"benefits" or otherwise provide guidance on how benefits should be measured for purposes of implementing the proposal).

A key element of the Proposal is the concept of "dividing the company into major pieces." However neither the Proposal itself nor the very brief supporting statement give any indication as to what is meant by the term "major pieces". Nor is "major pieces" a term of recognized meaning in the investment or financial community (or among investment bankers) such that even a shareholder familiar with corporate M&A or restructuring transactions would have any reasonable idea of the meaning of the term. In fact, it is likely that different shareholders would interpret the term in significantly different ways, which could range from:

- Dividing the company into an upstream company and a downstream/chemical company;
- Dividing the company into three parts according to its financial reporting segments (Upstream, Downstream, and Chemical);
- Retaining the integrated nature of the company's upstream and downstream/chemical businesses but dividing the company along geographic lines;
- A more granular division of the company into "major pieces" consisting of existing incorporated subsidiaries and/or major assets or groups of assets.

Because an essential term of the Proposal is not defined within the Proposal and has no clear generally understood meaning, neither shareholders voting on the Proposal nor the Company in implementing the Proposal would know with any degree of certainty what actions are being proposed or should be taken. We believe the term "major pieces" as used in the Proposal is far more vague and misleading than the reference to "non-core banking operations" defined as "operations other than what the corporation calls Consumer & Business Banking, Consumer Real Estate Services, and Global Banking" used in the divestiture proposal at issue in *Bank of America Corporation* (avail. March 6, 2014), in which the Staff concurred in the exclusion of the proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(3).

Accordingly, the Company believes that the Proposal is properly excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(3).

- 2. If the Proposal is taken to mean the Company should explore options to enhance shareholder value including with use of investment bankers and including divestments, the Company may omit the Proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(10) because the Company has already substantially implemented the Proposal.**

Rule 14a-8(i)(10) permits a company to exclude a shareholder proposal if the company has already substantially implemented the proposal. The Commission has stated that "substantial" implementation under the rule does not require implementation in full or exactly as presented by the proponent. See *SEC Release No. 34-40018* (May 21, 1998, n. 30). The Staff has provided no-action relief under Rule 14a-8(i)(10) when a company has substantially implemented and therefore satisfied the "essential objective" of a proposal, even if the company did not take the exact action requested by the proponent, did not implement the proposal in every detail, or exercised discretion in determining how to implement the proposal. See *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* (March 25, 2015) (permitting exclusion of a shareholder proposal requesting an employee engagement metric for executive compensation where a "diversity and inclusion metric related to employee engagement" was already included in the Company's Management Incentive Plan); *Entergy Corp.* (February 14, 2014)

(permitting exclusion of a shareholder proposal requesting a report “on policies the company could adopt. . . to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the national goal of 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050” where the requested information was already available in its sustainability and carbon disclosure reports); *Duke Energy Corp.* (February 21, 2012) (permitting exclusion of a shareholder proposal requesting the assessment of potential “comprehensive energy efficiency and renewable energy programs” where the company disclosed its current steps and future plans related to energy efficiency and renewable energy in the Form 10-K and its annual sustainability report). The Staff has stated that whether “a company has substantially implemented the proposal depends upon whether its particular policies, practices, and procedures *compare favorably* with the guidelines of the proposal.” *Texaco, Inc.* (March 28, 1991) (emphasis added) (permitting exclusion on substantial implementation grounds of a proposal requesting that the company adopt the Valdez Principles where the company had already adopted policies, practices, and procedures regarding the environment).

The core of the Proposal, or its “essential objective,” appears to be that the Company “hire an investment bank” to explore strategic alternatives for maximizing shareholder value. This is in fact an activity the Company engages in on a regular basis. In 2015 alone, the Company estimates it has met with major investment banks on approximately 68 separate occasions, including discussions of strategic alternatives for enhancing shareholder value (in addition to extensively analyzing such options on an internal basis). This approach of receiving frequent input from investment banks is consistent with the Company’s long-standing core policy of continually reviewing opportunities both for acquisitions and divestments that could be accretive to shareholder value. In the course of these frequent and open-ended strategic discussions with investment banks, we note that none of the banks proposed a de-integration or sale of the Company as a means to enhance shareholder value.

That said, under the Company’s long-standing asset management program the Company continuously reviews its portfolio to ensure that all assets are contributing to the Company’s strategic objectives and divests assets that no longer meet these objectives or are worth considerably more to others than to the Company.¹ This program has resulted in dispositions over the past 10 years totaling over \$45 billion. These divestments include:

- Sale of natural gas transportation business in Germany
- Divestment of downstream businesses in numerous countries and regions around the world including Argentina, Caribbean, Central America, Malaysia and Switzerland
- Sale of 25% interest in Angola Block 31
- Transitioning of US Retail Network from direct-served (i.e. dealer, company-operated) to branded wholesaler model
- Sale of Hong Kong Power generation business

The ongoing nature of this program is shown by recently announced but not yet completed transactions to divest the Company’s Torrance Refinery in California and its interest in the Chalmette Refinery in Louisiana.

We believe the substantial transactions noted above – in some cases including the engagement of investment banks – constitute sales of “major pieces” of the Company under any reasonable interpretation of the term.

¹ See *Cash Flow From Operations and Asset Sales* on page 37 of ExxonMobil’s 2014 Annual Report on Form 10-K

In addition to the ongoing sale of major pieces of the Company under our asset management program, we also believe we have substantially implemented the apparent core objective of the Proposal to “release” value to shareholders. The Company’s capital allocation strategy consists of three core elements:

- Pay a reliable and growing cash dividend, which we have done consecutively for over 33 years
- Meet the company’s capital investment needs with respect to those projects we believe will be accretive to long-term shareholder value
- Return remaining available cash resources in excess of business needs to shareholders through a flexible share repurchase program.

Our commitment to a stable and growing cash dividend together with share repurchases to return additional cash to shareholders has resulted in total cash distributions to shareholders of almost \$360 billion since the Exxon-Mobil merger in 1999 — an amount which exceeds the market capitalization of at least 496 of the companies in the S&P 500. In 2015, while crude prices dropped by nearly 40%, dividends were increased by 5.8%, capital investments were decreased by over 12%, and share buybacks continued, albeit at a lower rate, demonstrating the resiliency of the Company’s integrated business model underpinned by an attractive investment portfolio. ExxonMobil’s increase in dividend payments and continuation of its buyback program in 2015 were clearly differentiating within the energy sector. In short, we believe our existing capital allocation approach and the large and ongoing shareholder distributions resulting from it already prudently implement the essential objective of the Proposal to “release” value “to the shareholders.”


Lastly, we attach as Exhibit B to this letter a selection of quotes from recent reports issued by a number of sell-side analysts, many of which are associated with investment banks with which we hold regular strategic discussions. As shown by these quotes, a number of analysts hold the view that the Company’s integrated business model – including both upstream, downstream, and chemical operations – in fact provides additional synergies and value to shareholders (including allowing the Company to perform better than its less integrated and diversified peers during the recent decline in oil and gas prices) than would otherwise be the case. Put differently, several major investment banks have already effectively assessed the issue raised by the Proposal and concluded a transaction such as that suggested by the Proposal – if taken to mean a de-integration of our upstream business from our downstream and chemicals businesses – would be harmful rather than beneficial to shareholder value.

Thus, because we already regularly consult with and hire investment banks to assist the Company in maximizing shareholder value; have long maintained an asset management program including the disposal of major assets in order to optimize value for shareholders; have already distributed substantial cash value to shareholders and continue to do so; and are recognized by a number of investment banks as creating positive shareholder value through our integrated business model, we believe we have substantially implemented the essential objective of the Proposal and the Proposal is therefore properly excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(10).

CONCLUSION

The Company requests confirmation that the Staff will not recommend any enforcement action if, in reliance on the foregoing, the Company omits the Proposal from its 2015 Proxy Materials. If you should have any questions or need additional information, please contact the undersigned at (972) 444-1478 or by email at james.e.parsons@exxonmobil.com. We would be happy to answer any questions or provide additional information that would be useful to the Staff in considering this request.

Respectfully yours

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James E. Parsons". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

James E. Parsons

Attachment

cc w/ att: John Chevedden, as representative of the
Proponent Kenneth Steiner

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

Exhibit A

Gilbert, Jeanine

From: ***FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16***
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2015 2:17 PM
To: Woodbury, Jeffrey J
Cc: Tinsley, Brian D; Gilbert, Jeanine
Subject: Rule 14a-8 Proposal (XOM)``
Attachments: CCE16122015_4.pdf

Categories: External Sender

Dear Mr. Woodbury,
Please see the attached rule 14a-8 proposal to enhance long-term shareholder value.
Sincerely,
John Chevedden

Kenneth Steiner

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

RECEIVED

DEC 16 2015

B. D. TINSLEY

Mr. Jeff Woodbury
Corporate Secretary
Exxon Mobil Corporation (XOM)
5959 Las Colinas Blvd.
Irving TX 75039
PH: 972 444-1000
FX: 972-444-1433
FX: 972-444-1505*
FX: 972 444-1199

Dear Mr. Woodbury,

I purchased stock in our company because I believed our company had greater potential. My attached Rule 14a-8 proposal is submitted in support of the long-term performance of our company. This Rule 14a-8 proposal is submitted as a low-cost method to improve company performance.

My proposal is for the next annual shareholder meeting. I will meet Rule 14a-8 requirements including the continuous ownership of the required stock value until after the date of the respective shareholder meeting. My submitted format, with the shareholder-supplied emphasis, is intended to be used for definitive proxy publication. This is my proxy for John Chevedden and/or his designee to forward this Rule 14a-8 proposal to the company and to act on my behalf regarding this Rule 14a-8 proposal, and/or modification of it, for the forthcoming shareholder meeting before, during and after the forthcoming shareholder meeting. Please direct all future communications regarding my rule 14a-8 proposal to John Chevedden


FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

to facilitate prompt and verifiable communications. Please identify this proposal as my proposal exclusively.

This letter does not cover proposals that are not rule 14a-8 proposals. This letter does not grant the power to vote. Your consideration and the consideration of the Board of Directors is appreciated in support of the long-term performance of our company. Please acknowledge receipt of my proposal promptly by email to

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

Sincerely


Kenneth Steiner

10/25/15
Date

cc: Brian D. Tinsley <brian.d.tinsley@exxonmobil.com>
Jeanine Gilbert <jeanine.gilbert@exxonmobil.com>

XOM: Rule 14a-8 Proposal, December 30, 2015]

Proposal [4] – Hire an investment bank

Shareholders recommend our company hire an investment bank to explore the sale of our company. This would include a sale by dividing the company into major pieces to facilitate such a sale.

I believe the sale of XOM would release significantly more value to the shareholders than the current share price. Our stock was trading above \$100 in 2014 and it went below \$75 in 2015.

Hire an investment bank – Proposal [4]



December 22, 2015

VIA UPS – OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

John Chevedden

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

Dear Mr. Chevedden:

This will acknowledge receipt of the proposal to Hire an Investment Bank (the "Proposal"), which you have submitted on behalf of Kenneth Steiner (the "Proponent") in connection with ExxonMobil's 2016 annual meeting of shareholders. However, proof of share ownership was not included in your December 16, 2015 submission.

In order to be eligible to submit a shareholder proposal, Rule 14a-8 (copy enclosed) requires a proponent to submit sufficient proof that he or she has continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to vote on the Proposal for at least one year as of the date the shareholder proposal was submitted. For this Proposal, the date of submission is December 16, 2015, which is the date the Proposal was received electronically by eMail.

The Proponent does not appear on our records as a registered shareholder. Moreover, to date we have not received proof that the Proponent has satisfied these ownership requirements. To remedy this defect, the Proponent must submit sufficient proof verifying its continuous ownership of the requisite number of ExxonMobil shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 16, 2015.

As explained in Rule 14a-8(b), sufficient proof must be in the form of:

- a written statement from the "record" holder of the Proponent's shares (usually a broker or a bank) verifying that the Proponent continuously held the requisite number of ExxonMobil shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 16, 2015; or

- if the Proponent has filed with the SEC a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting the Proponent's ownership of the requisite number of ExxonMobil shares as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins, a copy of the schedule and/or form, and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in the ownership level and a written statement that the Proponent continuously held the requisite number of ExxonMobil shares for the one-year period.

If the Proponent intends to demonstrate ownership by submitting a written statement from the "record" holder of their shares as set forth in the first bullet point above, please note that most large U.S. brokers and banks deposit their customers' securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), a registered clearing agency that acts as a securities depository (DTC is also known through the account name of Cede & Co.). Such brokers and banks are often referred to as "participants" in DTC. In Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (October 18, 2011) (copy enclosed), the SEC staff has taken the view that only DTC participants should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited with DTC.

The Proponent can confirm whether its broker or bank is a DTC participant by asking its broker or bank or by checking the listing of current DTC participants, which is available on the internet at: <http://www.dtcc.com/~media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx>. In these situations, shareholders need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held, as follows:

- If the Proponent's broker or bank is a DTC participant, then the Proponent needs to submit a written statement from its broker or bank verifying that the Proponent continuously held the requisite number of ExxonMobil shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 16, 2015.
- If the Proponent's broker or bank is not a DTC participant, then the Proponent needs to submit proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held verifying that the Proponent continuously held the requisite number of ExxonMobil shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 16, 2015. The Proponent should be able to find out who this DTC participant is by asking the Proponent's broker or bank. If the Proponent's broker is an introducing broker, the Proponent may also be able to learn the identity and telephone number of the DTC participant through the Proponent's account statements, because the clearing broker identified on the Proponent's account statements will generally be a DTC participant. If the DTC participant that holds the Proponent's shares knows the Proponent's broker's or bank's holdings, but does not know the Proponent's holdings, the Proponent needs to satisfy the proof of ownership requirement by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, for the one-year period preceding and including December 16, 2015, the required amount of securities were continuously held – one from the Proponent's broker or bank confirming the Proponent's ownership, and the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership.

Mr. John Chevedden
Page 3

The SEC's rules require that any response to this letter must be postmarked or transmitted electronically to us no later than 14 calendar days from the date this letter is received. Please mail any response to me at ExxonMobil at the address shown above. Alternatively, you may send your response to me via facsimile at 972-444-1233, or by email to jeanine.gilbert@exxonmobil.com.

You should note that, if the Proposal is not withdrawn or excluded, the Proponent or the Proponent's representative, who is qualified under New Jersey law to present the Proposal on the Proponent's behalf, must attend the annual meeting in person to present the Proposal. Under New Jersey law, only shareholders or their duly constituted proxies are entitled as a matter of right to attend the meeting.

If the Proponent intends for a representative to present the Proposal, the Proponent must provide documentation that specifically identifies their intended representative by name and specifically authorizes the representative to act as your proxy at the annual meeting. To be a valid proxy entitled to attend the annual meeting, your representative must have the authority to vote your shares at the meeting. A copy of this authorization meeting state law requirements should be sent to my attention in advance of the meeting. Your authorized representative should also bring an original signed copy of the proxy documentation to the meeting and present it at the admissions desk, together with photo identification if requested, so that our counsel may verify the representative's authority to act on your behalf prior to the start of the meeting.

In the event there are co-filers for this Proposal and in light of the guidance in SEC staff legal bulletin No. 14F dealing with co-filers of shareholder proposals, it is important to ensure that the lead filer has clear authority to act on behalf of all co-filers, including with respect to any potential negotiated withdrawal of the Proposal. Unless the lead filer can represent that it holds such authority on behalf of all co-filers, and considering SEC staff guidance, it will be difficult for us to engage in productive dialogue concerning this Proposal.

Note that under Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F, the SEC will distribute no-action responses under Rule 14a-8 by email to companies and proponents. We encourage all proponents and any co-filers to include an email contact address on any additional correspondence, to ensure timely communication in the event the Proposal is subject to a no-action request.

We are interested in discussing this Proposal and will contact you in the near future.

Sincerely,



JJW/ljg

Enclosures

Rule 14a-8 – Shareholder Proposals

This section addresses when a company must include a shareholder's proposal in its proxy statement and identify the proposal in its form of proxy when the company holds an annual or special meeting of shareholders. In summary, in order to have your shareholder proposal included on a company's proxy card, and included along with any supporting statement in its proxy statement, you must be eligible and follow certain procedures. Under a few specific circumstances, the company is permitted to exclude your proposal, but only after submitting its reasons to the Commission. We structured this section in a question-and-answer format so that it is easier to understand. The references to "you" are to a shareholder seeking to submit the proposal.

(a) *Question 1: What is a proposal?* A shareholder proposal is your recommendation or requirement that the company and/or its board of directors take action, which you intend to present at a meeting of the company's shareholders. Your proposal should state as clearly as possible the course of action that you believe the company should follow. If your proposal is placed on the company's proxy card, the company must also provide in the form of proxy means for shareholders to specify by boxes a choice between approval or disapproval, or abstention. Unless otherwise indicated, the word "proposal" as used in this section refers both to your proposal, and to your corresponding statement in support of your proposal (if any).

(b) *Question 2: Who is eligible to submit a proposal, and how do I demonstrate to the company that I am eligible?*

(1) In order to be eligible to submit a proposal, you must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal. You must continue to hold those securities through the date of the meeting.

(2) If you are the registered holder of your securities, which means that your name appears in the company's records as a shareholder, the company can verify your eligibility on its own, although you will still have to provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders. However, if like many shareholders you are not a registered holder, the company likely does not know that you are a shareholder, or how many shares you own. In this case, at the time you submit your proposal, you must prove your eligibility to the company in one of two ways:

(i) The first way is to submit to the company a written statement from the "record" holder of your securities (usually a broker or bank) verifying that, at the time you submitted your proposal, you continuously held the securities for at least one year. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders; or

(ii) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you have filed a Schedule 13D (§240.13d-101), Schedule 13G (§240.13d-102), Form 3 (§249.103 of this chapter), Form 4 (§249.104 of this chapter) and/or Form 5 (§249.105 of this chapter), or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting your ownership of the shares as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins. If you have filed one of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility by submitting to the company:

(A) A copy of the schedule and/or form, and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in your ownership level;

(B) Your written statement that you continuously held the required number of shares for the one-year period as of the date of the statement; and

(C) Your written statement that you intend to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

(c) *Question 3:* How many proposals may I submit? Each shareholder may submit no more than one proposal to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting.

(d) *Question 4:* How long can my proposal be? The proposal, including any accompanying supporting statement, may not exceed 500 words.

(e) *Question 5:* What is the deadline for submitting a proposal?

(1) If you are submitting your proposal for the company's annual meeting, you can in most cases find the deadline in last year's proxy statement. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting last year, or has changed the date of its meeting for this year more than 30 days from last year's meeting, you can usually find the deadline in one of the company's quarterly reports on Form 10-Q (§249.308a of this chapter), or in shareholder reports of investment companies under §270.30d-1 of this chapter of the Investment Company Act of 1940. In order to avoid controversy, shareholders should submit their proposals by means, including electronic means, that permit them to prove the date of delivery.

(2) The deadline is calculated in the following manner if the proposal is submitted for a regularly scheduled annual meeting. The proposal must be received at the company's principal executive offices not less than 120 calendar days before the date of the company's proxy statement released to shareholders in connection with the previous year's annual meeting. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting the previous year, or if the date of this year's annual meeting has been changed by more than 30 days from the date of the previous year's meeting, then the deadline is a reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

(3) If you are submitting your proposal for a meeting of shareholders other than a regularly scheduled annual meeting, the deadline is a reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

(f) *Question 6:* What if I fail to follow one of the eligibility or procedural requirements explained in answers to Questions 1 through 4 of this section?

(1) The company may exclude your proposal, but only after it has notified you of the problem, and you have failed adequately to correct it. Within 14 calendar days of receiving your proposal, the company must notify you in writing of any procedural or eligibility deficiencies, as well as of the time frame for your response. Your response must be postmarked, or transmitted electronically, no later than 14 days from the date you received the company's notification. A company need not provide you such notice of a deficiency if the deficiency cannot be remedied, such as if you fail to submit a proposal by the company's properly determined deadline. If the company intends to exclude the proposal, it will later have to make a submission under §240.14a-8 and provide you with a copy under Question 10 below, §240.14a-8(j).

(2) If you fail in your promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years.

(g) *Question 7: Who has the burden of persuading the Commission or its staff that my proposal can be excluded? Except as otherwise noted, the burden is on the company to demonstrate that it is entitled to exclude a proposal.*

(h) *Question 8: Must I appear personally at the shareholders' meeting to present the proposal?*

(1) Either you, or your representative who is qualified under state law to present the proposal on your behalf, must attend the meeting to present the proposal. Whether you attend the meeting yourself or send a qualified representative to the meeting in your place, you should make sure that you, or your representative, follow the proper state law procedures for attending the meeting and/or presenting your proposal.

(2) If the company holds its shareholder meeting in whole or in part via electronic media, and the company permits you or your representative to present your proposal via such media, then you may appear through electronic media rather than traveling to the meeting to appear in person.

(3) If you or your qualified representative fail to appear and present the proposal, without good cause, the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meetings held in the following two calendar years.

(i) *Question 9: If I have complied with the procedural requirements, on what other bases may a company rely to exclude my proposal?*

(1) *Improper under state law:* If the proposal is not a proper subject for action by shareholders under the laws of the jurisdiction of the company's organization;

Note to paragraph (i)(1): Depending on the subject matter, some proposals are not considered proper under state law if they would be binding on the company if approved by shareholders. In our experience, most proposals that are cast as recommendations or requests that the board of directors take specified action are proper under state law. Accordingly, we will assume that a proposal drafted as a recommendation or suggestion is proper unless the company demonstrates otherwise.

(2) *Violation of law:* If the proposal would, if implemented, cause the company to violate any state, federal, or foreign law to which it is subject;

Note to paragraph (i)(2): We will not apply this basis for exclusion to permit exclusion of a proposal on grounds that it would violate foreign law if compliance with the foreign law would result in a violation of any state or federal law.

(3) *Violation of proxy rules:* If the proposal or supporting statement is contrary to any of the Commission's proxy rules, including §240.14a-9, which prohibits materially false or misleading statements in proxy soliciting materials;

(4) *Personal grievance; special interest:* If the proposal relates to the redress of a personal claim or grievance against the company or any other person, or if it is designed to result in a benefit to you, or to further a personal interest, which is not shared by the other shareholders at large;

(5) *Relevance:* If the proposal relates to operations which account for less than 5 percent of the company's total assets at the end of its most recent fiscal year, and for less than 5 percent of its net earnings and gross sales for its most recent fiscal year, and is not otherwise significantly related to the company's business;

(6) *Absence of power/authority:* If the company would lack the power or authority to implement the proposal;

(7) *Management functions*: If the proposal deals with a matter relating to the company's ordinary business operations;

(8) *Director elections*: If the proposal:

(i) Would disqualify a nominee who is standing for election;

(ii) Would remove a director from office before his or her term expired;

(iii) Questions the competence, business judgment, or character of one or more nominees or directors;

(iv) Seeks to include a specific individual in the company's proxy materials for election to the board of directors; or

(v) Otherwise could affect the outcome of the upcoming election of directors.

(9) *Conflicts with company's proposal*: If the proposal directly conflicts with one of the company's own proposals to be submitted to shareholders at the same meeting;

Note to paragraph (i)(9): A company's submission to the Commission under this section should specify the points of conflict with the company's proposal.

(10) *Substantially implemented*: If the company has already substantially implemented the proposal;

Note to paragraph (i)(10): A company may exclude a shareholder proposal that would provide an advisory vote or seek future advisory votes to approve the compensation of executives as disclosed pursuant to Item 402 of Regulation S-K (§229.402 of this chapter) or any successor to Item 402 (a "say-on-pay vote") or that relates to the frequency of say-on-pay votes, provided that in the most recent shareholder vote required by §240.14a-21(b) of this chapter a single year (i.e., one, two, or three years) received approval of a majority of votes cast on the matter and the company has adopted a policy on the frequency of say-on-pay votes that is consistent with the choice of the majority of votes cast in the most recent shareholder vote required by §240.14a-21(b) of this chapter.

(11) *Duplication*: If the proposal substantially duplicates another proposal previously submitted to the company by another proponent that will be included in the company's proxy materials for the same meeting;

(12) *Resubmissions*: If the proposal deals with substantially the same subject matter as another proposal or proposals that has or have been previously included in the company's proxy materials within the preceding 5 calendar years, a company may exclude it from its proxy materials for any meeting held within 3 calendar years of the last time it was included if the proposal received:

(i) Less than 3% of the vote if proposed once within the preceding 5 calendar years;

(ii) Less than 6% of the vote on its last submission to shareholders if proposed twice previously within the preceding 5 calendar years; or

(iii) Less than 10% of the vote on its last submission to shareholders if proposed three times or more previously within the preceding 5 calendar years; and

(13) *Specific amount of dividends:* If the proposal relates to specific amounts of cash or stock dividends.

(j) *Question 10:* What procedures must the company follow if it intends to exclude my proposal?

(1) If the company intends to exclude a proposal from its proxy materials, it must file its reasons with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy with the Commission. The company must simultaneously provide you with a copy of its submission. The Commission staff may permit the company to make its submission later than 80 days before the company files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy, if the company demonstrates good cause for missing the deadline.

(2) The company must file six paper copies of the following:

(i) The proposal;

(ii) An explanation of why the company believes that it may exclude the proposal, which should, if possible, refer to the most recent applicable authority, such as prior Division letters issued under the rule; and

(iii) A supporting opinion of counsel when such reasons are based on matters of state or foreign law.

(k) *Question 11:* May I submit my own statement to the Commission responding to the company's arguments? Yes, you may submit a response, but it is not required. You should try to submit any response to us, with a copy to the company, as soon as possible after the company makes its submission. This way, the Commission staff will have time to consider fully your submission before it issues its response. You should submit six paper copies of your response.

(l) *Question 12:* If the company includes my shareholder proposal in its proxy materials, what information about me must it include along with the proposal itself?

(1) The company's proxy statement must include your name and address, as well as the number of the company's voting securities that you hold. However, instead of providing that information, the company may instead include a statement that it will provide the information to shareholders promptly upon receiving an oral or written request.

(2) The company is not responsible for the contents of your proposal or supporting statement.

(m) *Question 13:* What can I do if the company includes in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should not vote in favor of my proposal, and I disagree with some of its statements?

(1) The company may elect to include in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should vote against your proposal. The company is allowed to make arguments reflecting its own point of view, just as you may express your own point of view in your proposal's supporting statement.

(2) However, if you believe that the company's opposition to your proposal contains materially false or misleading statements that may violate our anti-fraud rule, §240.14a-9, you should promptly send to the Commission staff and the company a letter explaining the reasons for your view, along with a copy of the company's statements opposing your proposal. To the extent possible, your letter should include specific factual information demonstrating the inaccuracy of the company's claims. Time permitting, you may wish to try to work out your differences with the company by yourself before contacting the Commission staff.

(3) We require the company to send you a copy of its statements opposing your proposal before it sends its proxy materials, so that you may bring to our attention any materially false or misleading statements, under the following timeframes:

(i) If our no-action response requires that you make revisions to your proposal or supporting statement as a condition to requiring the company to include it in its proxy materials, then the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 5 calendar days after the company receives a copy of your revised proposal; or

(ii) In all other cases, the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 30 calendar days before its files definitive copies of its proxy statement and form of proxy under §240.14a-6.



**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 18, 2011

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division"). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division's Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://tts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

A. The purpose of this bulletin

This bulletin is part of a continuing effort by the Division to provide guidance on important issues arising under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8. Specifically, this bulletin contains information regarding:

- Brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8 (b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8;
- Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies;
- The submission of revised proposals;
- Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests regarding proposals submitted by multiple proponents; and
- The Division's new process for transmitting Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email.

You can find additional guidance regarding Rule 14a-8 in the following bulletins that are available on the Commission's website: [SLB No. 14](#), [SLB](#)

No. 14A, SLB No. 14B, SLB No. 14C, SLB No. 14D and SLB No. 14E.

B. The types of brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

1. Eligibility to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

To be eligible to submit a shareholder proposal, a shareholder must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the shareholder meeting for at least one year as of the date the shareholder submits the proposal. The shareholder must also continue to hold the required amount of securities through the date of the meeting and must provide the company with a written statement of intent to do so.¹

The steps that a shareholder must take to verify his or her eligibility to submit a proposal depend on how the shareholder owns the securities. There are two types of security holders in the U.S.: registered owners and beneficial owners.² Registered owners have a direct relationship with the issuer because their ownership of shares is listed on the records maintained by the issuer or its transfer agent. If a shareholder is a registered owner, the company can independently confirm that the shareholder's holdings satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)'s eligibility requirement.

The vast majority of investors in shares issued by U.S. companies, however, are beneficial owners, which means that they hold their securities in book-entry form through a securities intermediary, such as a broker or a bank. Beneficial owners are sometimes referred to as "street name" holders. Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) provides that a beneficial owner can provide proof of ownership to support his or her eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting a written statement "from the 'record' holder of [the] securities (usually a broker or bank)," verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the shareholder held the required amount of securities continuously for at least one year.³

2. The role of the Depository Trust Company

Most large U.S. brokers and banks deposit their customers' securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), a registered clearing agency acting as a securities depository. Such brokers and banks are often referred to as "participants" in DTC.⁴ The names of these DTC participants, however, do not appear as the registered owners of the securities deposited with DTC on the list of shareholders maintained by the company or, more typically, by its transfer agent. Rather, DTC's nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants. A company can request from DTC a "securities position listing" as of a specified date, which identifies the DTC participants having a position in the company's securities and the number of securities held by each DTC participant on that date.⁵

3. Brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

In *The Hain Celestial Group, Inc.* (Oct. 1, 2008), we took the position that an introducing broker could be considered a "record" holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). An introducing broker is a broker that engages in sales and other activities involving customer contact, such as opening customer accounts and accepting customer orders, but is not permitted to maintain custody of customer funds and securities.⁶ Instead, an introducing broker engages another broker, known as a "clearing broker," to hold custody of client funds and securities, to clear and execute customer trades, and to handle other functions such as issuing confirmations of customer trades and customer account statements. Clearing brokers generally are DTC participants; introducing brokers generally are not. As introducing brokers generally are not DTC participants, and therefore typically do not appear on DTC's securities position listing, *Hain Celestial* has required companies to accept proof of ownership letters from brokers in cases where, unlike the positions of registered owners and brokers and banks that are DTC participants, the company is unable to verify the positions against its own or its transfer agent's records or against DTC's securities position listing.

In light of questions we have received following two recent court cases relating to proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8⁷ and in light of the Commission's discussion of registered and beneficial owners in the Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, we have reconsidered our views as to what types of brokers and banks should be considered "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). Because of the transparency of DTC participants' positions in a company's securities, we will take the view going forward that, for Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) purposes, only DTC participants should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. As a result, we will no longer follow *Hain Celestial*.

We believe that taking this approach as to who constitutes a "record" holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) will provide greater certainty to beneficial owners and companies. We also note that this approach is consistent with Exchange Act Rule 12g5-1 and a 1988 staff no-action letter addressing that rule,⁸ under which brokers and banks that are DTC participants are considered to be the record holders of securities on deposit with DTC when calculating the number of record holders for purposes of Sections 12(g) and 15(d) of the Exchange Act.

Companies have occasionally expressed the view that, because DTC's nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants, only DTC or Cede & Co. should be viewed as the "record" holder of the securities held on deposit at DTC for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). We have never interpreted the rule to require a shareholder to obtain a proof of ownership letter from DTC or Cede & Co., and nothing in this guidance should be construed as changing that view.

How can a shareholder determine whether his or her broker or bank is a DTC participant?

Shareholders and companies can confirm whether a particular broker or bank is a DTC participant by checking DTC's participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at <http://www.dtcc.com/downloads/membership/directories/dtc/alpha.pdf>.

What if a shareholder's broker or bank is not on DTC's participant list?

The shareholder will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held. The shareholder should be able to find out who this DTC participant is by asking the shareholder's broker or bank.²

If the DTC participant knows the shareholder's broker or bank's holdings, but does not know the shareholder's holdings, a shareholder could satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the required amount of securities were continuously held for at least one year – one from the shareholder's broker or bank confirming the shareholder's ownership, and the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership.

How will the staff process no-action requests that argue for exclusion on the basis that the shareholder's proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant?

The staff will grant no-action relief to a company on the basis that the shareholder's proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant only if the company's notice of defect describes the required proof of ownership in a manner that is consistent with the guidance contained in this bulletin. Under Rule 14a-8(f)(1), the shareholder will have an opportunity to obtain the requisite proof of ownership after receiving the notice of defect.

C. Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies

In this section, we describe two common errors shareholders make when submitting proof of ownership for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2), and we provide guidance on how to avoid these errors.

First, Rule 14a-8(b) requires a shareholder to provide proof of ownership that he or she has "continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal" (emphasis added).¹⁰ We note that many proof of ownership letters do not satisfy this requirement because they do not verify the shareholder's beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted. In some cases, the letter speaks as of a date *before* the date the proposal is submitted, thereby leaving a gap between the date of the verification and the date the proposal is submitted. In other cases, the letter speaks as of a date *after* the date the proposal was submitted but covers a period of only one year, thus failing to verify the shareholder's beneficial ownership over the required full one-year period preceding the date of the proposal's submission.

Second, many letters fail to confirm continuous ownership of the securities. This can occur when a broker or bank submits a letter that confirms the shareholder's beneficial ownership only as of a specified date but omits any

reference to continuous ownership for a one-year period.

We recognize that the requirements of Rule 14a-8(b) are highly prescriptive and can cause inconvenience for shareholders when submitting proposals. Although our administration of Rule 14a-8(b) is constrained by the terms of the rule, we believe that shareholders can avoid the two errors highlighted above by arranging to have their broker or bank provide the required verification of ownership as of the date they plan to submit the proposal using the following format:

"As of [date the proposal is submitted], [name of shareholder] held, and has held continuously for at least one year, [number of securities] shares of [company name] [class of securities]."¹¹

As discussed above, a shareholder may also need to provide a separate written statement from the DTC participant through which the shareholder's securities are held if the shareholder's broker or bank is not a DTC participant.

D. The submission of revised proposals

On occasion, a shareholder will revise a proposal after submitting it to a company. This section addresses questions we have received regarding revisions to a proposal or supporting statement.

1. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. The shareholder then submits a revised proposal before the company's deadline for receiving proposals. Must the company accept the revisions?

Yes. In this situation, we believe the revised proposal serves as a replacement of the initial proposal. By submitting a revised proposal, the shareholder has effectively withdrawn the initial proposal. Therefore, the shareholder is not in violation of the one-proposal limitation in Rule 14a-8(c).¹² If the company intends to submit a no-action request, it must do so with respect to the revised proposal.

We recognize that in Question and Answer E.2 of SLB No. 14, we indicated that if a shareholder makes revisions to a proposal before the company submits its no-action request, the company can choose whether to accept the revisions. However, this guidance has led some companies to believe that, in cases where shareholders attempt to make changes to an initial proposal, the company is free to ignore such revisions even if the revised proposal is submitted before the company's deadline for receiving shareholder proposals. We are revising our guidance on this issue to make clear that a company may not ignore a revised proposal in this situation.¹³

2. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. After the deadline for receiving proposals, the shareholder submits a revised proposal. Must the company accept the revisions?

No. If a shareholder submits revisions to a proposal after the deadline for receiving proposals under Rule 14a-8(e), the company is not required to accept the revisions. However, if the company does not accept the revisions, it must treat the revised proposal as a second proposal and

submit a notice stating its intention to exclude the revised proposal, as required by Rule 14a-8(j). The company's notice may cite Rule 14a-8(e) as the reason for excluding the revised proposal. If the company does not accept the revisions and intends to exclude the initial proposal, it would also need to submit its reasons for excluding the initial proposal.

3. If a shareholder submits a revised proposal, as of which date must the shareholder prove his or her share ownership?

A shareholder must prove ownership as of the date the original proposal is submitted. When the Commission has discussed revisions to proposals,¹⁴ it has not suggested that a revision triggers a requirement to provide proof of ownership a second time. As outlined in Rule 14a-8(b), proving ownership includes providing a written statement that the shareholder intends to continue to hold the securities through the date of the shareholder meeting. Rule 14a-8(f)(2) provides that if the shareholder "fails in [his or her] promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of [the same shareholder's] proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years." With these provisions in mind, we do not interpret Rule 14a-8 as requiring additional proof of ownership when a shareholder submits a revised proposal.¹⁵

E. Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests for proposals submitted by multiple proponents

We have previously addressed the requirements for withdrawing a Rule 14a-8 no-action request in SLB Nos. 14 and 14C. SLB No. 14 notes that a company should include with a withdrawal letter documentation demonstrating that a shareholder has withdrawn the proposal. In cases where a proposal submitted by multiple shareholders is withdrawn, SLB No. 14C states that, if each shareholder has designated a lead individual to act on its behalf and the company is able to demonstrate that the individual is authorized to act on behalf of all of the proponents, the company need only provide a letter from that lead individual indicating that the lead individual is withdrawing the proposal on behalf of all of the proponents.

Because there is no relief granted by the staff in cases where a no-action request is withdrawn following the withdrawal of the related proposal, we recognize that the threshold for withdrawing a no-action request need not be overly burdensome. Going forward, we will process a withdrawal request if the company provides a letter from the lead filer that includes a representation that the lead filer is authorized to withdraw the proposal on behalf of each proponent identified in the company's no-action request.¹⁶

F. Use of email to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses to companies and proponents

To date, the Division has transmitted copies of our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses, including copies of the correspondence we have received in connection with such requests, by U.S. mail to companies and proponents. We also post our response and the related correspondence to the Commission's website shortly after issuance of our response.

In order to accelerate delivery of staff responses to companies and

proponents, and to reduce our copying and postage costs, going forward, we intend to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email to companies and proponents. We therefore encourage both companies and proponents to include email contact information in any correspondence to each other and to us. We will use U.S. mail to transmit our no-action response to any company or proponent for which we do not have email contact information.

Given the availability of our responses and the related correspondence on the Commission's website and the requirement under Rule 14a-8 for companies and proponents to copy each other on correspondence submitted to the Commission, we believe it is unnecessary to transmit copies of the related correspondence along with our no-action response. Therefore, we intend to transmit only our staff response and not the correspondence we receive from the parties. We will continue to post to the Commission's website copies of this correspondence at the same time that we post our staff no-action response.

¹ See Rule 14a-8(b).

² For an explanation of the types of share ownership in the U.S., see Concept Release on U.S. Proxy System, Release No. 34-62495 (July 14, 2010) [75 FR 42982] ("Proxy Mechanics Concept Release"), at Section II.A. The term "beneficial owner" does not have a uniform meaning under the federal securities laws. It has a different meaning in this bulletin as compared to "beneficial owner" and "beneficial ownership" in Sections 13 and 16 of the Exchange Act. Our use of the term in this bulletin is not intended to suggest that registered owners are not beneficial owners for purposes of those Exchange Act provisions. See Proposed Amendments to Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12598 (July 7, 1976) [41 FR 29982], at n.2 ("The term 'beneficial owner' when used in the context of the proxy rules, and in light of the purposes of those rules, may be interpreted to have a broader meaning than it would for certain other purpose[s] under the federal securities laws, such as reporting pursuant to the Williams Act.").

³ If a shareholder has filed a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 reflecting ownership of the required amount of shares, the shareholder may instead prove ownership by submitting a copy of such filings and providing the additional information that is described in Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(ii).

⁴ DTC holds the deposited securities in "fungible bulk," meaning that there are no specifically identifiable shares directly owned by the DTC participants. Rather, each DTC participant holds a pro rata interest or position in the aggregate number of shares of a particular issuer held at DTC. Correspondingly, each customer of a DTC participant – such as an individual investor – owns a pro rata interest in the shares in which the DTC participant has a pro rata interest. See Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, at Section II.B.2.a.

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

⁶ See Net Capital Rule, Release No. 34-31511 (Nov. 24, 1992) [57 FR 56973] ("Net Capital Rule Release"), at Section II.C.

⁷ See *KBR Inc. v. Chevedden*, Civil Action No. H-11-0196, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36431, 2011 WL 1463611 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2011); *Apache Corp. v. Chevedden*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 723 (S.D. Tex. 2010). In both cases, the court concluded that a securities intermediary was not a record holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b) because it did not appear on a list of the company's non-objecting beneficial owners or on any DTC securities position listing, nor was the intermediary a DTC participant.

⁸ *Techne Corp.* (Sept. 20, 1988).

⁹ In addition, if the shareholder's broker is an introducing broker, the shareholder's account statements should include the clearing broker's identity and telephone number. See Net Capital Rule Release, at Section II.C.(iii). The clearing broker will generally be a DTC participant.

¹⁰ For purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), the submission date of a proposal will generally precede the company's receipt date of the proposal, absent the use of electronic or other means of same-day delivery.

¹¹ This format is acceptable for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), but it is not mandatory or exclusive.

¹² As such, it is not appropriate for a company to send a notice of defect for multiple proposals under Rule 14a-8(c) upon receiving a revised proposal.

¹³ This position will apply to all proposals submitted after an initial proposal but before the company's deadline for receiving proposals, regardless of whether they are explicitly labeled as "revisions" to an initial proposal, unless the shareholder affirmatively indicates an intent to submit a second, *additional* proposal for inclusion in the company's proxy materials. In that case, the company must send the shareholder a notice of defect pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f)(1) if it intends to exclude either proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on Rule 14a-8(c). In light of this guidance, with respect to proposals or revisions received before a company's deadline for submission, we will no longer follow *Layne Christensen Co.* (Mar. 21, 2011) and other prior staff no-action letters in which we took the view that a proposal would violate the Rule 14a-8(c) one-proposal limitation if such proposal is submitted to a company after the company has either submitted a Rule 14a-8 no-action request to exclude an earlier proposal submitted by the same proponent or notified the proponent that the earlier proposal was excludable under the rule.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Adoption of Amendments Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12999 (Nov. 22, 1976) [41 FR 52994].

¹⁵ Because the relevant date for proving ownership under Rule 14a-8(b) is the date the proposal is submitted, a proponent who does not adequately prove ownership in connection with a proposal is not permitted to submit another proposal for the same meeting on a later date.

¹⁶ Nothing in this staff position has any effect on the status of any

shareholder proposal that is not withdrawn by the proponent or its authorized representative.

<http://www.sec.gov/interps/legal/cfslb14f.htm>

[Home](#) | [Previous Page](#)

Modified: 10/18/2011

Pages 34 through 35 redacted for the following reasons:

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

ExxonMobil SHAREHOLDER RELATIONS ▶ PROXY... HIRE AN INVESTMENT BANK ACK-LTR VIEW
PROXY

<input type="checkbox"/>	Type	Name	Check In Comment	Checked Out To	Modified	Modified By	Created
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2016_Hire an Investment Bank_John Chevedden_ACK-LTR			12/29/2015 12:12 PM	Dutchover, Alyssa	12/29/2015 12:12 PM
		2016_Hire an Investment Bank_John Chevedden_Original Submission_no Proof			12/16/2015 2:30 PM	Gilbert, Jeanine	12/16/2015 2:29 PM
		2016_Hire an Investment Bank_John Chevedden_Proposal Summary			12/30/2015 9:32 PM	Gilbert, Jeanine	12/30/2015 9:32 PM
		2016_Hire an Investment Bank_John Chevedden_Proposal			12/30/2015 9:32 PM	Gilbert, Jeanine	12/30/2015 9:32 PM
		2016_Hire an Investment Bank_John Chevedden_Share Proof			12/30/2015 9:16 PM	Gilbert, Jeanine	12/30/2015 9:16 PM
		2016_Hire an Investment Bank_John Chevedden_UPS Receipt			12/29/2015 12:13 PM	Dutchover, Alyssa	12/29/2015 12:13 PM

Add document

Server: DALSP533

Corporate Separateness Notice
 Ownership & MPI Guidelines
 Privacy guidelines including Survey requirements
 SharePoint Solution Center

Gilbert, Jeanine

From: ***FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16***
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2015 9:01 PM
To: Woodbury, Jeffrey J
Cc: Tinsley, Brian D; Gilbert, Jeanine
Subject: Rule 14a-8 Proposal (XOM) bib
Attachments: CCE30122015_7.pdf

Categories: External Sender

RECEIVED

DEC 30 2015

B. D. TINSLEY

Dear Mr. Woodbury,
Please see the attached broker letter.
Sincerely,
John Chevedden



RECEIVED

DEC 30 2015

B. D. TINSLEY

XOM

Post-It® Fax Note	7671	Date	12-30-15	# of pages
To	Jeff Woodbury	From	John Chevalier	
Co./Dept.		Co.		
Phone #		Phone	***FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16***	
Fax #	972-444-1505	Fax #		

December 30, 2015

Kenneth Steiner

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

Re: Your TD Ameritrade account ending in Memorandum M-07-16 and TD Ameritrade Clearing Inc. DTC #0188

Dear Kenneth Steiner,

Thank you for allowing me to assist you today. As you requested, this letter confirms that, as of the date of this letter, you have continuously held no less than 500 shares of each of the following stocks in the above referenced account since July 1, 2014.

1. Exxon Mobil Corporation (XOM)
2. Vertex Pharmaceuticals Incorporated (VRTX)
3. Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)
4. TheStreet, Inc. (TST)
5. Time Warner Inc. (TWX)
6. Everi Holdings Inc. (EVRI)

If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know. Just log in to your account and go to Client Services > Message Center to write us. You can also call Client Services at 800-889-3900. We're available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Sincerely,

Chris Blue
Resource Specialist
TD Ameritrade

This information is furnished as part of a general information service and TD Ameritrade shall not be liable for any damages arising out of any inaccuracy in the information. Because this information may differ from your TD Ameritrade monthly statement, you should rely only on the TD Ameritrade monthly statement as the official record of your TD Ameritrade account.

Market volatility, volume, and system availability may delay account access and trade executions.

TD Ameritrade, Inc., member FINRA/SIPC (www.finra.org, www.sipc.org). TD Ameritrade is a trademark jointly owned by TD Ameritrade IP Company, Inc. and The Toronto-Dominion Bank. © 2015 TD Ameritrade IP Company, Inc. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

Exhibit B

Selected recent quotes from investment bank analyst reports

John Herrlin (Soc Gen, Buy):

- XOM remains a clear beneficiary from its IOC model
- We think that size and a diversified asset base for an IOC can be a plus in an uncertain world.
- The mere fact that XOM hasn't had to "right size" their workforce, or take large asset impairments, we believe, speaks to the success of their integrated business model, which seeks to generate returns through product price and economic cycles. Many on the Street forgot about Oil & Gas cyclical until 2015, but when companies report in 2015, especially the E&Ps, it will be another quarter of "extraordinary reporting," with more impairments.
- Over the last 5 years, many IOCs have vivisected (split into E&Ps and independent downstream refiners). Some of those companies may now wish that they still had those downstream (refining and chemicals) cash flows.
- By taking the long term view, XOM's management's business model has proven robust during commodity price cycles.

Doug Leggate (BofA, Buy):

- With ample support from downstream operations, prefunded growth from upstream mega projects, and a healthy balance sheet, we believe XOM is well positioned to weather the downturn. With the advantage of an integrated business mix that has benefited from an usually strong year for refining in particular, XOM is in the rare position in the third quarter of covering capex, dividends and share buybacks from operating cash flow and modest disposals of about \$500M.

Neil Mehta (Goldman Sachs, Conviction List Buy)

- We believe the integrated business model has advantages for XOM, including: a hedge against upstream volatility, reducing the company's cost of capital; higher return and lower capital intensity businesses in chemicals and refining with lower crude prices; the long-term potential to monetize midstream and marketing assets.

Phil Gresh (JPM, Hold):

- ExxonMobil's integrated business model that should allow it to maintain its organic growth/mix shift strategy over the next several years.

Additional quotes from key analysts

Moody's (Aaa, Stable):

- ExxonMobil is the only integrated oil company rated Aaa among a group of highly rated peers, and one of three industrial Aaa companies. The rating reflects its differentially large scale in oil and gas reserves and production, coupled with conservative financial leverage. ExxonMobil is also one of the world's largest petroleum refiners and petrochemical producers, providing the countercyclical benefits of integrated operations.

Allen Good (Morningstar):

- We continue to view the downstream segment as a source of competitive advantage for Exxon.
- Exxon earns a wide economic moat by integrating a low-cost upstream and downstream business to capture economic rents along the oil and gas value chain. While its peers operate a similar business model with the same goal, they fail to do so as successfully, as evidenced in the lower margins and returns compared with Exxon. Exxon generates its superior returns from the integration of low-cost assets (an intangible asset that we consider to be part of its moat source) combined with low cost of capital; this combination produces excess returns greater than peers.
- With coordination between upstream and downstream operations, as well as integrated refining and chemical facilities, Exxon actually achieves a high level of integration that creates value, as opposed to simply owning assets like peers.