



DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

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

February 7, 2013

Beverly L. O'Toole
The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.
beverly.otoole@gs.com

Re: The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.
Incoming letter dated December 21, 2012

Dear Ms. O'Toole:

This is in response to your December 21, 2012 concerning the shareholder proposal submitted to Goldman Sachs by Jing Zhao. We also have received a letter from the proponent dated December 28, 2012. 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,

Ted Yu
Senior Special Counsel

Enclosure

cc: Jing Zhao
zhao@h-china.org

February 7, 2013

Response of the Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance

Re: The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.
Incoming letter dated December 21, 2012

The proposal would establish a human rights committee to review, assess, disclose, and make recommendations to enhance the company's corporate policy and practice on human rights.

There appears to be some basis for your view that Goldman Sachs may exclude the proposal under rule 14a-8(i)(1) as an improper subject for shareholder action under applicable state law. It appears that this defect could be cured, however, if the proposal were recast as a recommendation or request to the board of directors. Accordingly, unless the proponent provides Goldman Sachs with a proposal revised in this manner, within seven calendar days after receiving this letter, we will not recommend enforcement action to the Commission if Goldman Sachs omits the proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on rule 14a-8(i)(1).

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

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

Sincerely,

Kate Beukenkamp
Attorney-Adviser