

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

April 2, 2019

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

Re: Exxon Mobil Corporation

Incoming letter dated January 31, 2019

Dear Mr. Parsons:

This letter is in response to your correspondence dated January 31, 2019, February 12, 2019, March 12, 2019 and March 18, 2019 concerning the shareholder proposal (the "Proposal") submitted to Exxon Mobil Corporation (the "Company") by the New York State Common Retirement Fund et al. (the "Proponents") for inclusion in the Company's proxy materials for its upcoming annual meeting of security holders. We also have received correspondence on the Proponents' behalf dated March 8, 2019 and March 14, 2019. Copies of all of the correspondence on which this response is based will be made available on our website at http://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8.shtml. For your reference, a brief discussion of the Division's informal procedures regarding shareholder proposals is also available at the same website address.

Sincerely,

M. Hughes Bates Special Counsel

Enclosure

cc: Sanford J. Lewis

sanfordlewis@strategiccounsel.net

Response of the Office of Chief Counsel Division of Corporation Finance

Re: Exxon Mobil Corporation

Incoming letter dated January 31, 2019

The Proposal requests that the board, in annual reporting from 2020, include disclosure of short-, medium- and long-term greenhouse gas targets aligned with the greenhouse gas reduction goals established by the Paris Climate Agreement to keep the increase in global average temperature to well below 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit the increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

There appears to be some basis for your view that the Company may exclude the Proposal under rule 14a-8(i)(7), as relating to the Company's ordinary business operations. In our view, the Proposal would require the Company to adopt targets aligned with the goals established by the Paris Climate Agreement. By imposing this requirement, the Proposal would micromanage the Company by seeking to impose specific methods for implementing complex policies in place of the ongoing judgments of management as overseen by its board of directors. Accordingly, we will not recommend enforcement action to the Commission if the Company omits the Proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on rule 14a-8(i)(7). In reaching this position, we have not found it necessary to address the alternative bases for omission upon which the Company relies.

Sincerely,

Courtney Haseley Special Counsel