



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

DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

February 21, 2019

Lori Zyskowski
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
shareholderproposals@gibsondunn.com

Re: Mondelēz International, Inc.

Dear Ms. Zyskowski:

This letter is in regard to your correspondence dated February 20, 2019 concerning the shareholder proposal (the "Proposal") submitted to Mondelēz International, Inc. (the "Company") by the New York State Common Retirement Fund (the "Proponent") for inclusion in the Company's proxy materials for its upcoming annual meeting of security holders. Your letter indicates that the Proponent has withdrawn the Proposal and that the Company therefore withdraws its January 8, 2019 request for a no-action letter from the Division. Because the matter is now moot, we will have no further comment.

Copies of all of the correspondence related to this matter 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,

Jacqueline Kaufman
Attorney-Adviser

cc: George Wong
State of New York
Office of the State Comptroller
gwong@osc.ny.gov

February 20, 2019

VIA E-MAIL

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

Re: *Mondelēz International, Inc.*
Shareholder Proposal of New York State Common Retirement Fund
Exchange Act of 1934—Rule 14a-8

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In a letter dated January 8, 2019, we requested that the staff of the Division of Corporation Finance concur that our client, Mondelēz International, Inc. (the “Company”), could exclude from its proxy statement and form of proxy for its 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders a shareholder proposal (the “Proposal”) and statements in support thereof received from the New York State Common Retirement Fund (the “Proponent”).

Enclosed as Exhibit A is a letter from George Wong of the Office of the State Comptroller, dated February 19, 2019, withdrawing the Proposal on behalf of the Proponent. In reliance on this letter, we hereby withdraw the January 8, 2019 no-action request relating to the Company’s ability to exclude the Proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (212) 351-2309 or Jeff Srulovitz, the Company’s Vice President & Chief of Global Governance and Corporate Secretary, at (847) 943-4354 regarding this matter.

Sincerely,



Lori Zyskowski

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 8, 2019
Page 2

Enclosures

cc: Jeff Srulovitz, Vice President & Chief of Global Governance and Corporate
Secretary, Mondelēz International, Inc.
George Wong, Office of the New York State Comptroller
Thomas DiNapoli, New York State Common Retirement Fund

EXHIBIT A

**THOMAS P. DINAPOLI
STATE COMPTROLLER**



**DIVISION OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE
59 Maiden Lane-30th Floor
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 383-3931
Fax: (212) 681-4468**

**STATE OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE STATE COMPTROLLER**

February 19, 2019

Mr. Jeff Srulovitz
Vice President and Chief of Global Governance and Corporate Secretary
Mondelēz International, Inc.
Three Parkway North
Deerfield, IL 60015

Dear Mr. Srulovitz:

I hereby withdraw the resolution filed with your company November 27, 2018 by the Office of the State Comptroller on behalf of the New York State Common Retirement Fund.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Wong".

George Wong
ESG Integration Manager

January 8, 2019

VIA E-MAIL

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

Re: *Mondelēz International, Inc.*
Shareholder Proposal of New York State Common Retirement Fund
Exchange Act of 1934—Rule 14a-8

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This letter is to inform you that our client, Mondelēz International, Inc. (the “Company”), intends to omit from its proxy statement and form of proxy for its 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders (collectively, the “2019 Proxy Materials”) a shareholder proposal (the “Proposal”) and statements in support thereof (the “Supporting Statement”) received from the New York State Common Retirement Fund (the “Proponent”).¹

Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j), we have:

- filed this letter with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) no later than eighty (80) calendar days before the Company intends to file its definitive 2019 Proxy Materials with the Commission; and
- concurrently sent copies of this correspondence to the Proponent.

Rule 14a-8(k) and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (Nov. 7, 2008) (“SLB 14D”) provide that shareholder proponents are required to send companies a copy of any correspondence that the proponents elect to submit to the Commission or the staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the “Staff”). Accordingly, we are taking this opportunity to inform the Proponent that if the Proponent elects to submit additional correspondence to the Commission or the Staff with respect to this Proposal, a copy of that correspondence should be furnished

¹ The Proposal was also submitted by the Nathan Cummings Foundation. As reflected by the correspondence in Exhibit A, this proponent did not timely cure its procedural deficiency by providing proof of ownership for the one-year period required under Rule 14a-8(b)(1) after the Company notified the proponent of the proposal’s procedural deficiencies as required by Rule 14a-8(f).

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 8, 2019
Page 2

concurrently to the undersigned on behalf of the Company pursuant to Rule 14a-8(k) and SLB 14D.

THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal states:

Resolved: Shareholders of Mondelēz International, Inc. (the “Company”) urge the Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors to adopt a policy that financial performance metrics shall be adjusted, to the extent practicable, to exclude the impact of share repurchases when determining the amount or vesting of any senior executive incentive compensation grant or award. The policy should be implemented in a way that does not violate existing contractual obligations or the terms of any plan.

The Supporting Statement states:

Stock buybacks affect many of the financial ratios used as performance metrics for incentive pay of senior executives, such as earnings per share, return on assets, and return on equity. While stock buybacks may also boost stock prices in the short term, we are concerned that they can deprive companies of capital necessary for creating long-term growth.

The Company uses earnings per share as a metric for its short-term bonus plans, a financial ratio that is impacted by share repurchases. In our view, senior executives are responsible for improving our Company’s operational performance, whereas the Board of Directors is responsible for determining when stock buybacks are appropriate. For this reason, we believe that senior executives should not receive larger pay packages simply because the number of shares outstanding is reduced. Executive pay should be aligned with operational results, not financial engineering. We note, too, that shareholders voted against the advisory vote on executive compensation in 2018.

A copy of the Proposal, as well as related correspondence with the Proponent, is attached to this letter as Exhibit B.

BASES FOR EXCLUSION

The Proposal may properly be excluded from the 2019 Proxy Materials pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because the Proposal relates to the Company’s general employee compensation and addresses aspects of senior executive compensation that are also applicable to the Company’s general workforce.

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 8, 2019
Page 3

ANALYSIS

The Proposal May Be Excluded Under Rule 14-8(i)(7) Because The Proposal Addresses Matters Related To The Company’s Senior Executive Compensation That Also Apply To The General Workforce.

A. Background.

According to the Commission’s release accompanying the 1998 amendments to Rule 14a-8, the term “ordinary business” “refers to matters that are not necessarily ‘ordinary’ in the common meaning of the word,” but instead the term “is rooted in the corporate law concept providing management with flexibility in directing certain core matters involving the company’s business and operations.” Exchange Act Release No. 40018 (May 21, 1998) (the “1998 Release”). In the 1998 Release, the Commission stated that the underlying policy of the ordinary business exclusion is “to confine the resolution of ordinary business problems to management and the board of directors, since it is impracticable for shareholders to decide how to solve such problems at an annual shareholders meeting,” and identified two central considerations that underlie this policy. As relevant here, one of these considerations is that certain tasks are “so fundamental to management’s ability to run a company on a day-to-day basis” that they cannot be subject to direct shareholder oversight. The Commission added that “[e]xamples include the management of the workforce, such as the hiring, promotion, and termination of employees, decisions on production quality and quantity, and the retention of suppliers.” Although the Commission has stated that “proposals relating to such [ordinary business] matters but focusing on sufficiently significant social policy issues (*e.g.*, significant discrimination matters) generally would not be considered to be excludable,” the Staff has indicated that proposals relating to both ordinary business matters and significant social policy issues may be excludable in their entirety in reliance on Rule 14-8(i)(7) if they do not “transcend the day-to-day business matters” discussed in the proposals. 1998 Release.

In Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14J (Oct. 23, 2018) (“SLB 14J”), the Staff addresses how it evaluates proposals relating to general employee compensation:

[P]roposals that relate to general employee compensation and benefits are excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7). On the other hand, proposals that focus on significant aspects of senior executive . . . compensation generally are not excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7). In determining whether the focus of a proposal is senior executive . . . compensation or, instead, an ordinary business matter, we consider both the resolved clause and the supporting statement as a whole.

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 8, 2019
Page 4

The Staff explains that “[p]roposals that address aspects of senior executive . . . compensation that are also available or applicable to the general workforce” may be excludable “if a primary aspect of the targeted compensation is broadly available or applicable to a company’s general workforce and the company demonstrates that the executives’ . . . eligibility to receive the compensation does not implicate significant compensation matters.” *See* SLB 14J. The Staff further explains that this standard is likely to be met when the proposal addresses “the availability of certain forms of compensation to senior executives and/or directors that are also broadly available or applicable to the general workforce” as they typically do not “raise significant compensation issues that transcend ordinary business matters.” *Id.*

B. The Proposal Would Impact Employees Well Below The Senior Executive Level.

The Proposal requests the adoption of a policy excluding the impact of share repurchases from incentive compensation metrics. Because any such policy would necessarily apply to a broad group of employees that extends well below the senior executive level, it is properly excludable as ordinary business under SLB 14J.

Each year, the Human Resources and Compensation Committee (the “Committee”) of the Company’s Board of Directors establishes the performance metrics to be used in the Company’s annual cash incentive programs (the “Annual Incentive Program”) and long-term equity incentive programs. Historically (as well as for the current year), and as noted in the Supporting Statement, the Annual Incentive Program has included at least one metric—earnings per share (“EPS”)—that is impacted by the amount of the Company’s share repurchases and, therefore, would be impacted by the type of policy contemplated by the Proposal. In this regard, in setting the targets for EPS (and any other metrics impacted by the amount of share repurchases), the Committee specifically takes into account the Company’s planned level of share repurchases as that is an important element of the Company’s capital allocation strategy that the Board (which establishes the Company’s capital allocation framework) believes enhances shareholder value. In addition, the impact of EPS on employee bonuses can reach as high as 16%. As a result, the adoption of the type of policy contemplated by the Proposal would impact and constrain the Committee’s exercise of its fiduciary duties in establishing, defining and setting targets for the performance metrics used in the Company’s Annual Incentive Program.

Moreover, the adoption of the type of policy contemplated by the Proposal would primarily impact employees below the senior executive level. In this regard, the Annual Incentive Program is a broad-based program that covers approximately 17,500 employees worldwide. This represents roughly 20% of the Company’s total workforce as of December 31, 2017, which is a significant portion of the Company’s general workforce. The vast majority of

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 8, 2019
Page 5

these employees are below the senior executive level. Specifically, of these 17,500 employees, fewer than 100 (approximately 1%) are senior executives of the Company. The vast majority of the impacted employees, although critical to the Company's business, are not even executives, much less members of the Company's senior management team.

C. *The Proposal Being Framed In Terms Of Senior Executive Compensation Does Not Change The Fact That It Is Properly Excludable Under The Staff's Guidance.*

The Company recognizes that, on its face, the Proposal is framed in terms of senior executive compensation rather than employee compensation generally. However, because the Committee does not establish separate financial performance metrics for senior executives as compared to employees below the senior executive level (e.g., the Committee establishes and defines a single EPS metric that applies to all employees within specified functions who participate in the Annual Incentive Program, regardless of their level within the Company), the type of policy requested by the Proposal would necessarily impact a broad group of employees below the senior executive level. Any attempt to establish separately defined financial metrics or targets for senior executives compared to other employees would add unnecessary complication and confusion that, in the Company's view, would dilute the transparency of the compensation program to employees and the incentive and retentive effects of the Annual Incentive Program. In addition, the Company strives to maintain an egalitarian employee culture, for which a unified compensation program is the backbone. The compensation program is designed to encourage the Company's employees to work together towards the same company-wide goals. Creating separate financial metrics for senior executives would undermine this defining cultural principle for the Company and could undermine the unified goals and objectives of the Company.

Furthermore, the Staff has acknowledged that a proposal does not need to be framed in terms of general employee compensation in order to be excludable as ordinary business. As the Staff explained in SLB 14J, "it is difficult to conclude that a proposal does not relate to a company's ordinary business when it addresses aspects of compensation that are broadly available or applicable to a company's general workforce, *even when the proposal is framed in terms of the senior executives and/or directors*" (emphasis added). In this regard, as an example, the Staff noted that "a proposal that seeks to limit when *senior executive officers* will receive golden parachutes may be excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) if the company's golden parachute provision broadly applies to a significant portion of its general workforce". SLB 14J (emphasis added). Importantly, the example that the Staff provided referred solely to senior executive compensation, but related to compensation that was applicable to a broader group of employees. As a result, similar to the golden parachute proposal example provided by the Staff, the Proposal is properly excludable—notwithstanding that the Proposal is framed only in terms of senior executive compensation—because it focuses on

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 8, 2019
Page 6

“aspects of compensation that are available or apply to senior executive officers . . . *and the general workforce . . .*” *Id.* (emphasis added).

Even prior to SLB 14J, the Staff consistently has recognized that decisions relating to compensation programs in which both senior executives and other employees participate are part of a company’s ordinary business operations and has concurred in the exclusion of these types of proposals. Notably, the Staff has concurred in the exclusion of a number of proposals where the impact of the proposal was not even as broad-based as the impact of the Proposal, noting that the proposal “relates to compensation that may be paid to employees generally and is not limited to compensation that may be paid to senior executive officers and directors.” *See, e.g., 3M Co.* (avail. Jan. 8, 2018) (proposal impacted compensation for 25 “Corporate Officers”); *Bank of America Corp.* (avail. Jan. 31, 2012) (proposal impacted compensation for the “100 top earning executives”); *Wells Fargo & Co.* (avail. Mar. 14, 2011, *recon. denied* Apr. 5, 2011) (proposal impacted compensation for the “100 highest paid employees”); *The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.* (avail. Mar. 8, 2010) (proposal impacted compensation for the “100 most highly-compensated employees”); *Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co.* (avail. Mar. 4, 1999) (proposal impacted compensation for the “top 40 executives”).

For the foregoing reasons, and consistent with the Staff’s guidance in SLB 14J and precedents, the Proposal is excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) as ordinary business because it focuses on aspects of senior executive compensation that are also applicable to the Company’s general workforce.

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 8, 2019
Page 7

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing analysis, we respectfully request that the Staff concur that it will take no action if the Company excludes the Proposal from its 2019 Proxy Materials.

We would be happy to provide you with any additional information and answer any questions that you may have regarding this subject. Correspondence regarding this letter should be sent to shareholderproposals@gibsondunn.com. If we can be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call me at (212) 351-2309 or Jeff Srulovitz, the Company's Vice President & Chief of Global Governance and Corporate Secretary, at (847) 943-4354.

Sincerely,



Lori Zyskowski

Enclosures

cc: Jeff Srulovitz, Vice President & Chief of Global Governance and Corporate Secretary, Mondelēz International, Inc.
George Wong, Office of the New York State Comptroller
Thomas D. Napoli, New York State Common Retirement Fund

EXHIBIT A

THE · NATHAN · CUMMINGS · FOUNDATION

November 30, 2018

Carol J. Ward
Vice President and Corporate Secretary
Mondelēz International, Inc.
Three Parkway North
Deerfield, Illinois 60015

Dear Ms. Ward,

It has come to our attention that the New York State Common Retirement Fund has filed a shareholder resolution which makes substantially the same request as the shareholder resolution that the Nathan Cummings Foundation submitted to your office on November 28, 2018.

We therefore withdraw the shareholder resolution submitted through our November 28, 2018 letter and submit the enclosed shareholder resolution, as filed by the New York State Common Retirement Fund. The New York State Common Retirement Fund should be considered the lead filer of this resolution and has permission to withdraw this resolution on our behalf.

As before, we submit this resolution for inclusion in Mondelēz International, Inc.'s proxy statement under Rule 14a-8 of the general rules and regulations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The Nathan Cummings Foundation remains the beneficial owner of over \$2,000 worth of shares of Mondelēz International, Inc., stock. Verification of this ownership has been provided by our custodian, Amalgamated Bank in a separate letter. We have continuously held over \$2,000 worth of these shares of Mondelēz International, Inc., stock for more than one year and will continue to hold these shares through the shareholder meeting.

If you have any questions or concerns about the Foundation's withdrawal and resubmission, please contact me at (212) 787-7300. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,



Laura Campos

Director, Corporate & Political Accountability

Resolved: Shareholders of Mondelēz International, Inc. (the "Company") urge the Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors to adopt a policy that financial performance metrics shall be adjusted, to the extent practicable, to exclude the impact of share repurchases when determining the amount or vesting of any senior executive incentive compensation grant or award. The policy should be implemented in a way that does not violate existing contractual obligations or the terms of any plan.

Supporting Statement

Stock buybacks affect many of the financial ratios used as performance metrics for incentive pay of senior executives, such as earnings per share, return on assets, and return on equity. While stock buybacks may also boost stock prices in the short term, we are concerned that they can deprive companies of capital necessary for creating long-term growth.

The Company uses earnings per share as a metric for its short-term bonus plans, a financial ratio that is impacted by share repurchases. In our view, senior executives are responsible for improving our Company's operational performance, whereas the Board of Directors is responsible for determining when stock buybacks are appropriate. For this reason, we believe that senior executives should not receive larger pay packages simply because the number of shares outstanding is reduced. Executive pay should be aligned with operational results, not financial engineering. We note, too, that shareholders voted against the advisory vote on executive compensation in 2018.

For these reasons, we urge you to vote FOR this proposal.



November 28, 2018

Carol J. Ward
Vice President and Corporate Secretary
Mondelēz International, Inc.
Three Parkway North
Deerfield, Illinois 60015

Dear Ms. Ward,

This letter will verify that as of November 20 2018, the Nathan Cummings Foundation held 1344 shares of Mondelēz International, Inc. common stock. It has continuously held more than \$2,000 worth of these shares for at least one year and intends to continue to hold at least \$2,000 worth of these shares at the time of your next annual meeting.

The Amalgamated Bank serves as custodian and record holder for the Nathan Cummings Foundation. The above-mentioned shares are registered in a nominee name of the Amalgamated Bank. The shares are held by the Bank through DTC Account #2352

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Chuck Hutton'.

Chuck Hutton
First Vice President
Investment Management Division, Client Service

December 10, 2018

VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL AND EMAIL

Laura Campos

Director, Corporate & Political Accountability

The Nathan Cummings Foundation

475 Tenth Avenue, 14th Floor

New York, NY 10018

laura.campos@nathancummings.org

Dear Ms. Campos:

I am writing on behalf of Mondelēz International, Inc. (the “Company”), which received on December 3, 2018, the shareholder proposal you submitted on behalf of the Nathan Cummings Foundation (the “Proponent”) regarding the adoption of a policy to exclude the impact of share repurchases when determining the amount or vesting of senior executive incentive compensation grants or awards pursuant to Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) Rule 14a-8 for inclusion in the proxy statement for the Company’s 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders (the “Proposal”).

The Proposal contains certain procedural deficiencies, which SEC regulations require us to bring to your attention. Rule 14a-8(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, provides that shareholder proponents must submit sufficient proof of their continuous ownership of at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of a company’s shares entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of the date the shareholder proposal was submitted. The Company’s stock records do not indicate that the Proponent is the record owner of sufficient shares to satisfy this requirement. In addition, to date we have not received adequate proof that the Proponent has satisfied Rule 14a-8’s ownership requirements as of the date that the Proposal was submitted to the Company. The November 28, 2018 letter from Amalgamated Bank that you provided is insufficient because it verifies the number of shares the Proponent held as of November 20, 2018 instead of December 3, 2018, and does not verify ownership for the one-year period preceding and including December 3, 2018.

To remedy this defect, the Proponent must obtain a new proof of ownership letter verifying the Proponent’s continuous ownership of the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 3, 2018, the date the Proposal was submitted to the Company. As explained in Rule 14a-8(b) and in SEC staff guidance, sufficient proof must be in the form of:

- (1) 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 required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 3, 2018; or
- (2) 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 required number or amount of Company 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 required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period.

If the Proponent intends to demonstrate ownership by submitting a written statement from the “record” holder of the Proponent’s shares as set forth in (1) 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.). Under SEC Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F, only DTC participants are viewed as record holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. You can confirm whether the Proponent’s broker or bank is a DTC participant by asking the Proponent’s broker or bank or by checking DTC’s participant list, which is available 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:

- (1) If the Proponent’s broker or bank is a DTC participant, then the Proponent needs to submit a written statement from the Proponent’s broker or bank verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 3, 2018.
- (2) 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 shares are held verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 3, 2018. You should be able to find out the identity of the DTC participant by asking the Proponent’s broker or bank. If the Proponent’s broker is an introducing broker, you 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 account statements will generally be a DTC participant. If the DTC participant that holds the Proponent’s shares is not able to confirm the Proponent’s individual holdings but is able to confirm the holdings of the Proponent’s broker or bank, then the Proponent needs to satisfy the proof of ownership requirements by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, for the one-year period

Laura Campos
December 10, 2018
Page 3

preceding and including December 3, 2018, the required number or amount of Company shares were continuously held: (i) one from the Proponent's broker or bank confirming the Proponent's ownership, and (ii) the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership.

The SEC's rules require that any response to this letter be postmarked or transmitted electronically no later than 14 calendar days from the date you receive this letter. Please address any response to Carol J. Ward, Vice President and Corporate Secretary of the Company, at Three Parkway North, Deerfield, Illinois 60015. Alternatively, you may transmit any response by email to Carol J. Ward at carol.ward@mdlz.com.

If you have any questions with respect to the foregoing, please contact me at 212-351-2309. For your reference, I enclose a copy of Rule 14a-8 and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F.

Sincerely,



Lori Zyskowski

cc: Carol J. Ward, Mondelēz International, Inc.
The Nathan Cummings Foundation

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/~media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx>.

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.⁹

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/interp/leg/cfslb14f.htm>

EXHIBIT B

THOMAS P. DiNAPOLI
STATE COMPTROLLER



STATE OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE STATE COMPTROLLER

DIVISION OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE
59 Maiden Lane-30th Floor
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 383-3931
Fax: (212) 681-4468

November 27, 2018

Ms. Carol J. Ward
Vice President and Corporate Secretary
Mondelēz International, Inc.
3 Parkway North
Deerfield, IL 60015

Dear Ms. Ward:

The Comptroller of the State of New York, Thomas P. DiNapoli, is the trustee of the New York State Common Retirement Fund (the "Fund") and the administrative head of the New York State and Local Retirement System. The Comptroller has authorized me to inform of his intention to offer the enclosed shareholder proposal for consideration of stockholders at the next annual meeting.

I submit the enclosed proposal to you in accordance with rule 14a-8 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and ask that it be included in your proxy statement.

A letter from J.P. Morgan Chase, the Fund's custodial bank verifying the Fund's ownership of Mondelēz International, Inc. shares, continually for over one year, is enclosed. The Fund intends to continue to hold at least \$2,000 worth of these securities through the date of the annual meeting.

We would be happy to discuss this initiative with you. Should the Mondelēz International, Inc. board decide to endorse its provisions as company policy, the Comptroller will ask that the proposal be withdrawn from consideration at the annual meeting. Please feel free to contact me at (212) 383-3931 and/or email at gwong@osc.ny.gov should you have any further questions on this matter.

Very truly yours,

George Wong
ESG Integration Manager

Enclosures

Resolved: Shareholders of Mondelēz International, Inc. (the "Company") urge the Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors to adopt a policy that financial performance metrics shall be adjusted, to the extent practicable, to exclude the impact of share repurchases when determining the amount or vesting of any senior executive incentive compensation grant or award. The policy should be implemented in a way that does not violate existing contractual obligations or the terms of any plan.

Supporting Statement

Stock buybacks affect many of the financial ratios used as performance metrics for incentive pay of senior executives, such as earnings per share, return on assets, and return on equity. While stock buybacks may also boost stock prices in the short term, we are concerned that they can deprive companies of capital necessary for creating long-term growth.

The Company uses earnings per share as a metric for its short-term bonus plans, a financial ratio that is impacted by share repurchases. In our view, senior executives are responsible for improving our Company's operational performance, whereas the Board of Directors is responsible for determining when stock buybacks are appropriate. For this reason, we believe that senior executives should not receive larger pay packages simply because the number of shares outstanding is reduced. Executive pay should be aligned with operational results, not financial engineering. We note, too, that shareholders voted against the advisory vote on executive compensation in 2018.

For these reasons, we urge you to vote FOR this proposal.

J.P.Morgan

Miriam G. Awad
Vice President
CIB Client Service Americas

November 27, 2018

Ms. Carol J. Ward
Vice President and Corporate Secretary
Mondelēz International, Inc.
3 Parkway North
Deerfield, IL 60015

Dear Ms. Ward,

This letter is in response to a request by The Honorable Thomas P. DiNapoli, New York State Comptroller, regarding confirmation from JP Morgan Chase that the New York State Common Retirement Fund has been a beneficial owner of Mondelez International, Inc continuously for at least one year as of and including November 27, 2018.

Please note that J.P. Morgan Chase, as custodian for the New York State Common Retirement Fund, held a total of 3,613,465 shares of common stock as of November 27, 2018 and continues to hold shares in the company. The value of the ownership stake continuously held by the New York State Common Retirement Fund had a market value of at least \$2,000.00 for at least twelve months prior to, and including, said date.

If there are any questions, please contact me at (212) 623-8481.

Regards,


Miriam Awad

cc: Patrick Doherty – NYSCRF
Tana Goldsmith – NYSCRF
Kyle Seeley - NYSCRF