



DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

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

January 23, 2023

Michael Kaplan
Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

Re: Meta Platforms, Inc. (the "Company")
Incoming letter dated January 20, 2023

Dear Michael Kaplan:

This letter is in regard to your correspondence concerning the shareholder proposal (the "Proposal") submitted to the Company by Sarah Wynn-Williams (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 Your letter indicates that the Proponent has withdrawn the Proposal and that the Company therefore withdraws its January 12, 2023 request for a no-action letter from the Division.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 <https://www.sec.gov/corpfin/2022-2023-shareholder-proposals-no-action>.

Sincerely,

Rule 14a-8 Review Team

cc: Sarah Wynn-Williams
Minderoo Foundation

January 12, 2023

Re: Shareholder Proposal of Minderoo Foundation on behalf of Sarah Wynn-Williams
Pursuant to Rule 14a-8 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
100 F. Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20549

Dear Sir or Madam:

On behalf of Meta Platforms, Inc., a Delaware corporation (the “**Company**” or “**Meta**”), and in accordance with Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, we are filing this letter with respect to the shareholder proposal (the “**Proposal**”) submitted by Sarah Wynn-Williams (the “**Proponent**”), with the Minderoo Foundation acting as the representative (the “**Representative**”) for inclusion in the proxy materials that the Company intends to distribute in connection with its 2023 Annual Meeting of Shareholders (the “**2023 Proxy Materials**”). We hereby request confirmation that the staff of the Office of Chief Counsel (the “**Staff**”) will not recommend any enforcement action if, in reliance on Rule 14a-8, the Company omits the Proposal from its 2023 Proxy Materials.

Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j), this letter is being filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “**Commission**”) no later than 80 days before the Company files its definitive 2023 Proxy Materials. Pursuant to Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (CF), *Shareholder Proposals* (Nov. 7, 2008), question C, we have submitted this letter to the Commission via email to shareholderproposals@sec.gov.

Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j), a copy of this submission is being sent simultaneously to the Proponent as notification of the Company’s intention to omit the Proposal from its 2023 Proxy Materials. This letter constitutes the Company’s statement of the reasons that it deems the omission of the Proposal to be proper. We have been advised by the Company as to the factual matters set forth herein.

A copy of the Proposal is attached to this letter as Exhibit A.

Background

On December 9, 2022, the Company received the Proposal via e-mail from the Proponent and the Representative, which included certain procedural deficiencies. Accordingly, and in compliance with the timing set forth in Rule 14a-8, the Company sent a notice of deficiency to the Proponent and the Representative via email on December 20, 2022,¹ which is attached as Exhibit B to this letter (the “**Notice of Deficiency**”). The Notice of Deficiency specifically identified the failure to provide documentation regarding (1) proof of ownership as required by Rule 14a-8(b) and (2) authorization for the representative to submit the Proposal as required by Rule 14a-8(b)(1)(iv). The Notice of Deficiency also specifically described how to

¹ A courtesy hard copy of the Notice of Deficiency was sent to the Proponent and the Representative via FedEx on December 20, 2022, as well.

remedy each deficiency and requested that the deficiencies be remedied within 14 calendar days, January 3, 2023, after receiving the Company's request.

On January 4, 2023, which was one day after the last day of the 14 calendar day timeline afforded to the Proponent to respond to the Notice of Deficiency, the Proponent responded via e-mail to the Company providing a broker letter relating to the Proponent's proof of ownership and a revised letter authorizing the Representative to submit the Proposal on the Proponent's behalf.

Bases for Exclusion

As discussed more fully below, the Proposal may be excluded under Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f) because the Proponent failed to supply, within 14 calendar days of the Company's request, (i) timely proof of the requisite amount of continuously held Company securities entitled to be voted on the Proposal at the Company's 2023 Annual Meeting of Shareholders as required by Rule 14a-8(b)(1)(i) and Rule 14a-8(b)(2); and (ii) sufficient written documentation showing the Representative was authorized to submit the Proposal on the Proponent's behalf as required by Rule 14a-8(b)(1)(iv).

Under Rule 14a-8(b)(2), if a proponent is not a registered shareholder of a company and has not made a filing with the Commission detailing the proponent's beneficial ownership of shares in the company (as described in Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(ii)(B)), such proponent has the burden to prove that she meets the beneficial ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b)(1). If the proponent fails to provide such proof of ownership, the company may exclude the proposal, but only if the company notifies the proponent in writing of such deficiency within 14 calendar days of receiving the proposal and the proponent fails to adequately correct it. A proponent's response to such notice of deficiency must be postmarked or transmitted electronically to the company no later than 14 days from the date the proponent receives the notice of deficiency.

As shown in [Exhibit C](#), the cover letter accompanying the Proposal states that the Proponent has continuously beneficially owned, for at least three years as of the date of the Proposal, at least \$2,000 of the Company's common stock. However, the Proponent did not include with the Proposal written proof of her holdings from the record holder, and the Proponent does not appear on the records of the Company as a shareholder.

Accordingly, because the Company was unable to verify the Proponent's eligibility to submit the Proposal, and in compliance with the timing set forth in Rule 14a-8, the Company sent the Notice of Deficiency to the Proponent via email on December 20, 2022, within 11 days after the Proposal was submitted, also via email to the same email address, requesting that the Proponent provide the necessary proof required by Rule 14a-8(b)(2) within 14 calendar days of receiving the Company's request.

The Notice of Deficiency clearly set out what documentation would be sufficient to prove the requisite ownership. The Proponent did not respond to the Notice of Deficiency or send any documentary proof of her holdings from the record holder by January 3, 2023, within 14 calendar days of the Notice of Deficiency. The Proponent did not respond until January 4, 2023 and therefore failed to timely provide proof that she held the requisite amount of Company securities entitled to be voted on the Proposal at the 2023 Annual Meeting of Shareholders.


The Staff has previously concurred in the exclusion of proposals when proponents have failed to timely furnish evidence of eligibility to submit the shareholder proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b), even if the delay is by only a day or two. *See, e.g., FedEx Corp.* (June 5, 2019) (concurring with exclusion pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f) where the proponent did not provide any documentary support regarding proof of ownership of the company's shares until 15 days following receipt of the company's deficiency notice—i.e., just one day late); *see also Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc.* (Nov. 8, 2022) (concurring with exclusion of a shareholder proposal where the proponent supplied adequate proof of ownership 16 days after receiving the

company's timely deficiency notice—i.e., two days late); *AT&T Inc.* (Jan. 29, 2019) (concurring with exclusion where proof of ownership was provided 17 days after receiving the company's timely deficiency notice—i.e., three days late); and *Mondelēz International, Inc.* (Feb. 27, 2015) (concurring in exclusion of a shareholder proposal where the proponent supplied proof of ownership 16 days after receiving the company's timely deficiency notice—i.e., two days late).

* * *

The Company respectfully requests the Staff's concurrence with its decision to omit the Proposal from the 2023 Proxy Materials and further requests confirmation that the Staff will not recommend any enforcement action if it so omits the Proposal. Please call the undersigned at (212) 450-4111 if you should have any questions or need additional information or as soon as a Staff response is available.

Respectfully yours,



Michael Kaplan

Attachment: Exhibit A; Exhibit B; Exhibit C

cc: Sarah Wynn-Williams, Minderoo Foundation
Katherine R. Kelly, Vice President, Deputy General Counsel and Secretary, Meta Platforms, Inc.

Email: shareholderproposals@sec.gov

Davis Polk

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
davispolk.com

EXHIBIT A

The Proposal

Resolved: Shareholders request that Meta Inc (“Meta”) Board issue a report, at reasonable cost and omitting any proprietary or personal information, describing Meta’s engagement with the Chinese Communist Party over the last decade including board oversight, and discussing if, and how, Meta might mitigate geopolitical risk related to its operations in China and the extent of Board oversight of such risk in the future

Whereas:

Current tensions between the United States and China present significant revenue, legal, regulatory, reputational, and supply chain risks for Meta. There is a meaningful risk of regulation for technology companies with operations in both the United States and China.

China has enacted increasingly sweeping and restrictive regulations of technology. This includes regulations to oversee technology companies’ algorithms, antitrust rules for internet platform companies, regulations on data protection, and reductions of the amount of time children can play online games.

In June, 2021, the Biden Administration issued Executive Order 14034, "Protecting Americans' Sensitive Data from Foreign Adversaries." This Executive Order called on federal agencies to review foreign owned applications for the risk that their use pose to personal data privacy and national security.

China remains Meta’s second largest market by annual revenue, after the United States. According to industry analysts¹, Meta generates approximately five billion dollars a year in revenue from China.

In Meta’s February 2022 10K filing, it stated “we **generate meaningful revenue** from a limited number of resellers representing advertisers based in China, and it is possible that the Chinese government could take action that reduces or eliminates our China-based advertising revenue, whether as a result of the trade dispute with the United States, in response to content issues or information requests in Hong Kong or elsewhere, or for other reasons, or take other action against us, such as imposing taxes or other penalties, which could adversely affect our financial results.”²

Beyond its significant revenue dependency, Meta continues its multi-billiondollar investments in the Metaverse. The success of this initiative is predicated on hardware, such as the Oculus virtual reality headsets, that are manufactured in China. As coronavirus-related supply chain disruptions in China have shown, supply chain disruptions can significantly impact Meta’s ability to deliver on its Metaverse strategy.³

Despite Meta’s dependence on China, both as a supplier and a key revenue source, the company has provided insufficient transparency about its China-based business or operations now or at any point over the last decade. Investors need meaningful information about Meta’s relationship with the Chinese government; given the government’s extensive regulation of technology and licensing requirements to operate in China. This relationship underpins Meta’s ability to successfully operate within the country.

This is important following Meta’s attempted pivot to the Metaverse and fundamental to the future of the company given the revenue China operations represent. We believe that the

¹ <https://www.mediapost.com/publications/article/327443/analyst-estimates-10-of-facebook-ad-revenue-comes.html>

² <https://investor.fb.com/financials/sec-filings-details/default.aspx?FilingId=15526422>

³ <https://uploadvr.com/facebook-coronavirus-quest/>

information sought in this proposal would allow shareholders to assess the robustness of board oversight of this strategically essential relationship and Meta's management of geopolitical risk related to China.

Davis Polk

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
davispolk.com

EXHIBIT B

Notice of Deficiency




VIA EMAIL AND OVERNIGHT MAIL

December 20, 2022

Re: Notice of Deficiency Related to Shareholder Proposal

Sarah Wynn-Williams
Minderoo Foundation



Dear Ms. Wynn-Williams:

I am writing on behalf of Meta Platforms, Inc. (the “Company”), which received on December 9, 2022 a shareholder proposal submitted on December 9, 2022 (the “Submission Date”) by Minderoo Foundation as the representative on behalf of Sarah Wynn-Williams (the “Proponent”), for inclusion in the Company’s proxy statement for its 2023 annual meeting of shareholders. The proposal contains certain procedural deficiencies, which Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) regulations require us to bring to your attention.

Ownership Eligibility. Rule 14a-8(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, requires that in order to be eligible to submit a proposal for inclusion in the Company’s proxy statement for an annual meeting, each proponent must have continuously held as of the Submission Date, at least (i) \$2,000 in market value of the Company’s securities entitled to vote on the proposal at the meeting for at least three years, (ii) \$15,000 in market value of the Company’s securities entitled to vote on the proposal at the meeting for at least two years or (iii) \$25,000 in market value of the Company’s securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least a year.

Note that SEC rules do not permit a proponent to aggregate the proponent’s share holdings with those of another shareholder or group of shareholders to meet the ownership eligibility requirement.

The Company’s stock records do not indicate that the Proponent is currently the registered holder on the Company’s books and records of any shares of the Company’s common stock, and the Proponent has not provided proof of ownership with the proposal.

Method for Demonstrating Proof of Ownership. As explained in Rule 14a-8 and SEC staff guidance, a proponent must provide sufficient proof of its continuous ownership of the requisite number of shares during the applicable time period preceding and including the Submission Date, by providing any of:

- **A written statement from the “record” holder of the securities.** To demonstrate ownership, you must submit to us a written statement from the “record” holder of the shares (usually a bank or broker) verifying that the Proponent continuously held at least \$2,000, \$15,000 or \$25,000 in market value of the Company’s securities entitled to vote on the proposal at the meeting for at least the three-year, two-year, or one-year period, respectively, prior to and including the Submission Date; or

- **SEC filings.** You can alternatively provide (i) a copy of a filed Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4, Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting the Proponent's ownership of shares as of or before the date on which the required holding period begins and (ii) a written statement that the Proponent continuously held the required number of shares for the required time period through the Submission Date.

To help shareholders comply with the requirements when submitting proof of ownership to companies, the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance published Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F ("SLB 14F"), dated October 18, 2011, and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G ("SLB 14G"), dated October 16, 2012. We have attached copies of both for your reference. As the SEC adopted amendments to Rule 14a-8 that became effective in 2021, please note that SLB 14F and SLB 14G do not reflect those amendments and to the extent any provisions are inconsistent, Rule 14a-8 governs in all respects. A copy of Rule 14a-8 is also enclosed for your reference.

Please note that most large U.S. banks and brokers 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.). SLB 14F and SLB 14G provide that for securities held through the DTC, only DTC participants should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. The Proponent can confirm whether the Proponent's bank or broker is a DTC participant by checking DTC's participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at <http://www.dtcc.com/client-center/dtc-directories>.

If the Proponent holds shares through a bank or broker that is not a DTC participant, the Proponent will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the bank or broker holds the Proponent's shares. The Proponent should be able to find out the name of the DTC participant by asking the Proponent's bank or broker. If the DTC participant that holds the Proponent's shares knows the Proponent's bank or broker's holdings, but does not know the Proponent's holdings, the Proponent may satisfy the proof of ownership requirements by submitting two proof of ownership statements—one from the Proponent's bank or broker confirming the Proponent's ownership and the other from the DTC participant confirming the bank or broker's ownership. Both should verify the Proponent's ownership for the required time period prior to and including the Submission Date.

Authorization of Representative to Submit Proposal. SEC rules require that if a shareholder elects to use a representative for the purpose of submitting a proposal and the representative's authority to act on the shareholder's behalf is not apparent and self-evident such that a reasonable person would understand that the agent has authority to submit the proposal and otherwise act on the shareholder's behalf, such shareholder must provide written documentation that must:

- identify the company to which the proposal is directed;
- identify the annual or special meeting for which the proposal is submitted;
- identify the shareholder as the proponent and identify the person acting on his or her behalf as his or her representative;
- include the shareholder's statement authorizing the designated representative to submit the proposal and otherwise act on his or her behalf;
- identify the specific topic of the proposal to be submitted;
- include the shareholder's statement supporting the proposal; and

- be signed and dated by the shareholder.

The proposal lacks proper documentation of authority to the representative to submit the proposal. The letter from Minderoo Foundation accompanying the proposal does not make it clear who is purporting to speak on behalf of the Minderoo Foundation. The affiliation between the Proponent and the Minderoo Foundation is not apparent and self-evident and there is no indication that the Minderoo Foundation has the authority to submit the proposal and otherwise act on the Proponent's behalf. To remedy the deficiency, you must provide documentation that meets the requirements described above.

SEC rules require that these defects that we have identified be remedied, and your response to this letter must be postmarked or transmitted electronically to us no later than 14 calendar days from the date you receive this letter. Please send such documentation (1) via email only delivered to our Corporate Secretary at [REDACTED] or (2) via mail directed to: Meta Platforms, Inc., [REDACTED], Attention: Corporate Secretary, with a copy via email to [REDACTED]. The failure to correct the deficiencies within this time period will provide the Company with a basis to exclude the proposal from the Company's proxy statement for its 2023 annual meeting of shareholders.

Sincerely,

/s/ Yuu Hopkins

Yuu Hopkins

Associate General Counsel

Enclosure

§ 240.14a-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) To be eligible to submit a proposal, you must satisfy the following requirements:

(i) You must have continuously held:

(A) At least \$2,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years; or

(B) At least \$15,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least two years; or

(C) At least \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year; or

(D) The amounts specified in paragraph (b)(3) of this section. This paragraph (b)(1)(i)(D) will expire on the same date that § 240.14a-8(b)(3) expires; and

(ii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; and

(iii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you are able to meet with the company in person or via teleconference no less than 10 calendar days, nor more than 30 calendar days, after submission of the shareholder proposal. You must include your contact information as well as business days and specific times that you are available to discuss the proposal with the company. You must identify times that are within the regular business hours of the company's principal executive offices. If these hours are not disclosed in the company's proxy statement for the prior year's annual meeting, you must identify times that are between

9 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. in the time zone of the company's principal executive offices. If you elect to co-file a proposal, all co-filers must either:

(A) Agree to the same dates and times of availability, or

(B) Identify a single lead filer who will provide dates and times of the lead filer's availability to engage on behalf of all co-filers; and

(iv) If you use a representative to submit a shareholder proposal on your behalf, you must provide the company with written documentation that:

(A) Identifies the company to which the proposal is directed;

(B) Identifies the annual or special meeting for which the proposal is submitted;

(C) Identifies you as the proponent and identifies the person acting on your behalf as your representative;

(D) Includes your statement authorizing the designated representative to submit the proposal and otherwise act on your behalf;

(E) Identifies the specific topic of the proposal to be submitted;

(F) Includes your statement supporting the proposal; and

(G) Is signed and dated by you.

(v) The requirements of paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section shall not apply to shareholders that are entities so long as the representative's authority to act on the shareholder's behalf is apparent and self-evident such that a reasonable person would understand that the agent has authority to submit the proposal and otherwise act on the shareholder's behalf.

(vi) For purposes of paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, you may not aggregate your holdings with those of another shareholder or group of shareholders to meet the requisite amount of securities necessary to be eligible to submit a proposal.

(2) One of the following methods must be used to demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal:

(i) 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 requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the meeting of shareholders.

(ii) 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:

(A) 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 at least \$2,000, \$15,000, or \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at

least three years, two years, or one year, respectively. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; or

(B) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you were required to file, and 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, demonstrating that you meet at least one of the share ownership requirements under paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section. If you have filed one or more of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting to the company:

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

(2) Your written statement that you continuously held at least \$2,000, \$15,000, or \$25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years, two years, or one year, respectively; and

(3) Your written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

(3) If you continuously held at least \$2,000 of a company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of January 4, 2021, and you have continuously maintained a minimum investment of at least \$2,000 of such securities from January 4, 2021 through the date the proposal is submitted to the company, you will be eligible to submit a proposal to such company for an annual or special meeting to be held prior to January 1, 2023. If you rely on this provision, you must provide the company with your written statement that you intend to continue to hold at least \$2,000 of such securities through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted. You must also follow the procedures set forth in paragraph (b)(2) of this section to demonstrate that:

(i) You continuously held at least \$2,000 of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of January 4, 2021; and

(ii) You have continuously maintained a minimum investment of at least \$2,000 of such securities from January 4, 2021 through the date the proposal is submitted to the company.

(iii) This paragraph (b)(3) will expire on January 1, 2023.

(c) Question 3: How many proposals may I submit? Each person may submit no more than one proposal, directly or indirectly, to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting. A person may not rely on the securities holdings of another person for the purpose of meeting the eligibility requirements and submitting multiple proposals 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 addresses substantially the same subject matter as a proposal, or proposals, previously included in the company's proxy materials within the preceding five calendar years if the most recent vote occurred within the preceding three calendar years and the most recent vote was:

(i) Less than 5 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on once;

(ii) Less than 15 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on twice; or

(iii) Less than 25 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on three or more times.

(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

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.

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.

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).

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.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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 16, 2012

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:

- the parties that can provide proof of ownership 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;
- the manner in which companies should notify proponents of a failure to provide proof of ownership for the one-year period required under Rule 14a-8(b)(1); and
- the use of website references in proposals and supporting statements.

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](#), [SLB No. 14E](#) and [SLB No. 14F](#).

B. Parties that can provide proof of ownership 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. Sufficiency of proof of ownership letters provided by affiliates of DTC participants for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i)

To be eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8, a shareholder must, among other things, provide documentation evidencing that the shareholder 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 shareholder meeting for at least one year as of the date the shareholder submits the proposal. If the shareholder is a beneficial owner of the securities, which means that the securities are held in book-entry form through a securities intermediary, Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) provides that this documentation can be in the form of a "written statement from the 'record' holder of your securities (usually a broker or bank)...."

In SLB No. 14F, the Division described its view that only securities intermediaries that are participants in the Depository Trust Company (“DTC”) should be viewed as “record” holders of securities that are deposited at DTC for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). Therefore, a beneficial owner must obtain a proof of ownership letter from the DTC participant through which its securities are held at DTC in order to satisfy the proof of ownership requirements in Rule 14a-8.

During the most recent proxy season, some companies questioned the sufficiency of proof of ownership letters from entities that were not themselves DTC participants, but were affiliates of DTC participants.¹ By virtue of the affiliate relationship, we believe that a securities intermediary holding shares through its affiliated DTC participant should be in a position to verify its customers’ ownership of securities. Accordingly, we are of the view that, for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i), a proof of ownership letter from an affiliate of a DTC participant satisfies the requirement to provide a proof of ownership letter from a DTC participant.

2. Adequacy of proof of ownership letters from securities intermediaries that are not brokers or banks

We understand that there are circumstances in which securities intermediaries that are not brokers or banks maintain securities accounts in the ordinary course of their business. A shareholder who holds securities through a securities intermediary that is not a broker or bank can satisfy Rule 14a-8’s documentation requirement by submitting a proof of ownership letter from that securities intermediary.² If the securities intermediary is not a DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant, then the shareholder will also need to obtain a proof of ownership letter from the DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant that can verify the holdings of the securities intermediary.

C. Manner in which companies should notify proponents of a failure to provide proof of ownership for the one-year period required under Rule 14a-8(b)(1)

As discussed in Section C of SLB No. 14F, a common error in proof of ownership letters is that they do not verify a proponent’s beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal was submitted, as required by Rule 14a-8(b)(1). In some cases, the letter speaks as of a date *before* the date the proposal was submitted, thereby leaving a gap between the date of verification and the date the proposal was 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 proponent’s beneficial ownership over the required full one-year period preceding the date of the proposal’s submission.

Under Rule 14a-8(f), if a proponent fails to follow one of the eligibility or procedural requirements of the rule, a company may exclude the proposal only if it notifies the proponent of the defect and the proponent fails to correct it. In SLB No. 14 and SLB No. 14B, we explained that companies should provide adequate detail about what a proponent must do to remedy all eligibility or procedural defects.

We are concerned that companies’ notices of defect are not adequately describing the defects or explaining what a proponent must do to remedy defects in proof of ownership letters. For example, some companies’ notices of defect make no mention of the gap in the period of ownership covered by the proponent’s proof of ownership letter or other specific deficiencies that the company has identified. We do not believe that such notices of defect serve the purpose of Rule 14a-8(f).

Accordingly, going forward, we will not concur in the exclusion of a proposal under Rules 14a-8(b) and 14a-8(f) on the basis that a proponent’s proof of ownership does not cover the one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted unless the company provides a notice of defect that identifies the specific date on which the proposal was submitted and explains that the proponent must obtain a new proof of ownership letter verifying continuous ownership of the requisite amount of securities for the one-year period preceding and including such date to cure the defect. We view the proposal’s date of submission as the date the proposal is postmarked or transmitted

electronically. Identifying in the notice of defect the specific date on which the proposal was submitted will help a proponent better understand how to remedy the defects described above and will be particularly helpful in those instances in which it may be difficult for a proponent to determine the date of submission, such as when the proposal is not postmarked on the same day it is placed in the mail. In addition, companies should include copies of the postmark or evidence of electronic transmission with their no-action requests.

D. Use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements

Recently, a number of proponents have included in their proposals or in their supporting statements the addresses to websites that provide more information about their proposals. In some cases, companies have sought to exclude either the website address or the entire proposal due to the reference to the website address.

In SLB No. 14, we explained that a reference to a website address in a proposal does not raise the concerns addressed by the 500-word limitation in Rule 14a-8(d). We continue to be of this view and, accordingly, we will continue to count a website address as one word for purposes of Rule 14a-8(d). To the extent that the company seeks the exclusion of a website reference in a proposal, but not the proposal itself, we will continue to follow the guidance stated in SLB No. 14, which provides that references to website addresses in proposals or supporting statements could be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) if the information contained on the website is materially false or misleading, irrelevant to the subject matter of the proposal or otherwise in contravention of the proxy rules, including Rule 14a-9.³

In light of the growing interest in including references to website addresses in proposals and supporting statements, we are providing additional guidance on the appropriate use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements.⁴

1. References to website addresses in a proposal or supporting statement and Rule 14a-8(i)(3)

References to websites in a proposal or supporting statement may raise concerns under Rule 14a-8(i)(3). In SLB No. 14B, we stated that the exclusion of a proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as vague and indefinite may be appropriate if neither the shareholders 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. In evaluating whether a proposal may be excluded on this basis, we consider only the information contained in the proposal and supporting statement and determine whether, based on that information, shareholders and the company can determine what actions the proposal seeks.

If a proposal or supporting statement refers to a website that provides information necessary for shareholders and the company to understand with reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires, and such information is not also contained in the proposal or in the supporting statement, then we believe the proposal would raise concerns under Rule 14a-9 and would be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as vague and indefinite. By contrast, if shareholders and the company can understand with reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires without reviewing the information provided on the website, then we believe that the proposal would not be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) on the basis of the reference to the website address. In this case, the information on the website only supplements the information contained in the proposal and in the supporting statement.

2. Providing the company with the materials that will be published on the referenced website

We recognize that if a proposal references a website that is not operational at the time the proposal is submitted, it will be impossible for a company or the staff to evaluate whether the website reference may be excluded. In our view, a reference to a non-operational website in a proposal or supporting statement could be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as irrelevant to the subject matter of a proposal. We understand, however, that a proponent may wish to include a reference to a website containing information related to the proposal but wait to activate the website until it becomes clear that the proposal will be included in the company's proxy materials. Therefore, we will not concur that a reference to a website may be excluded as irrelevant under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) on the basis that it is not yet operational if the proponent, at the time the proposal is submitted, provides the company with the materials that are intended for publication on the website and a representation that the website will become operational at, or prior to, the time the company files its definitive proxy materials.

3. Potential issues that may arise if the content of a referenced website changes after the proposal is submitted

To the extent the information on a website changes after submission of a proposal and the company believes the revised information renders the website reference excludable under Rule 14a-8, a company seeking our concurrence that the website reference may be excluded must submit a letter presenting its reasons for doing so. While Rule 14a-8(j) requires a company to submit its reasons for exclusion with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy materials, we may concur that the changes to the referenced website constitute "good cause" for the company to file its reasons for excluding the website reference after the 80-day deadline and grant the company's request that the 80-day requirement be waived.

¹An entity is an "affiliate" of a DTC participant if such entity directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, controls or is controlled by, or is under common control with, the DTC participant.

²Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) itself acknowledges that the record holder is "usually," but not always, a broker or bank.

³Rule 14a-9 prohibits statements in proxy materials which, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, are false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or which omit to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements not false or misleading.

⁴A website that provides more information about a shareholder proposal may constitute a proxy solicitation under the proxy rules. Accordingly, we remind shareholders who elect to include website addresses in their proposals to comply with all applicable rules regarding proxy solicitations.

Davis Polk

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
davispolk.com

EXHIBIT C

Cover Letter



December 9, 2022

Corporate Secretary
Meta
1601 Willow Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Via email at: [REDACTED]

Re: Shareholder proposal for 2023 Annual Shareholder Meeting

Dear Corporate Secretary,

Minderoo Foundation is filing a shareholder proposal on behalf of Sarah Wynn-Williams ("Proponent"), a shareholder of Meta Platforms, Inc. (Meta) for action at the next annual meeting of Meta. The Proponent submits the enclosed shareholder proposal for inclusion in Meta's 2023 proxy statement, for consideration by shareholders, in accordance with Rule 14a-8 of the General Rules and Regulations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Sarah Wynn-Williams has continuously beneficially owned, for at least three years as of the date hereof, at least \$2,000 worth of the Company's common stock.

A letter from the Proponent authorizing Minderoo Foundation to act on her behalf is enclosed. A representative of the Proponent will attend the stockholders' meeting to move the resolution as required.

Sarah Wynn-Williams and Minderoo Foundation are available to meet with the Company via teleconference on January 4, 5 or 6th at 9:30am PT. If needed, Ms. Wynn-Williams may be reached at [REDACTED] or via Minderoo Foundation, [REDACTED]

We are available to discuss this issue and appreciate the opportunity to engage and seek to resolve the Proponent's concerns. Please contact Ms. Wynn-Williams to schedule a meeting and to discuss any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "S Wynn-Williams".

Encl: Authorization letters and Proposal

January 20, 2023

Re: Withdrawal of No-Action Request Dated January 12, 2023 Regarding Shareholder Proposal of Minderoo Foundation on Behalf of Sarah Wynn-Williams

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
100 F. Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20549
Via email: shareholderproposals@sec.gov

Dear Sir or Madam:

On behalf of Meta Platforms, Inc., a Delaware corporation (the “**Company**”), and in reference to our letter, dated January 12, 2023 (the “**No-Action Request**”), pursuant to which we requested that the staff of the Office of Chief Counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission concur with our view that the Company may exclude the shareholder proposal (the “**Proposal**”) submitted by Sarah Wynn-Williams (the “**Proponent**”), with the Minderoo Foundation acting as the representative, from the proxy materials it intends to distribute in connection with its 2023 Annual Meeting of Shareholders.

Attached as Exhibit A is email communication, dated January 19, 2023 (the “**Withdrawal Communication**”), from the Proponent to the Company in which the Proponent voluntarily agrees to withdraw the Proposal. In reliance on the Withdrawal Communication, we hereby withdraw the No-Action Request.

Please contact the undersigned at (212) 450-4111 or michael.kaplan@davispolk.com if you should have any questions or need additional information. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'MK' or similar initials, written in a cursive style.

Michael Kaplan

Attachment: Exhibit A

cc: Sarah Wynn-Williams, Minderoo Foundation
Katherine R. Kelly, Vice President, Deputy General Counsel and Secretary,
Meta Platforms, Inc.

Withdrawal Communication

From: Sarah Wynn-Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2023 11:25 AM
To: Chiu, Ning [REDACTED] 'shareholderproposals@sec.gov' <shareholderproposals@sec.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Michael [REDACTED]; Kate Kelly [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Rule 14a-8 No-Action Letter (Meta)

Thank you for cc'ing us.

We wish to withdraw the proposal.

Kind regards,

Sarah Wynn-Williams

Sarah Wynn-Williams
Minderoo Foundation • Frontier Technology



M [REDACTED]
P [REDACTED]
L [REDACTED]

E [REDACTED]
W [REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and may be subject to legal professional privilege. This email and attachments are intended only for the named addressee. If you are not the named addressee your access to this material is not authorised and you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail or use the information contained in it. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. The sender does not guarantee that this e-mail or any attachments are secure, error-free or free from viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any loss or damage resulting (either directly or indirectly) from any such error or virus. The content and opinions set out in this email and any attachments are not necessarily those of Minderoo Foundation Limited, Tattarang Pty Ltd, their respective related entities, nor any person or entity who is or becomes a director, company secretary, officer, member, manager, employee or contractor (whether directly or indirectly) or related entity of the previously specified entities. This email and any attachments are also subject to copyright and may not be reproduced without permission.

-----Original Message-----

From: Chiu, Ning [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 12 January 2023 8:37 PM
To: 'shareholderproposals@sec.gov' <shareholderproposals@sec.gov>
Cc: Sarah Wynn-Williams [REDACTED]; Kaplan, Michael [REDACTED]; Kate Kelly [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Rule 14a-8 No-Action Letter (Meta)

The attached no-action letter on behalf of Meta Platforms, Inc. is being submitted to the Office of Chief Counsel at the Division of Corporation Finance, pursuant to Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (CF), Shareholder Proposals (November 7, 2008), question C. A copy of this submission is being sent simultaneously to Sarah Wynn-Williams, with the Minderoo Foundation acting as representative, who

is copied here.

Please direct any inquiries to either Michael Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] or me at the telephone and email address noted below.

Thank you.

Ning

Ning Chiu

[REDACTED] office
[REDACTED] mobile

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

Confidentiality Note: This email is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure. Unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this email or the information herein or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this email or the information herein, by anyone other than the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy the original message, any attachments thereto and all copies. Please refer to the firm's Privacy Notice for important information on how we process personal data. Our website is at davispolk.com.