# Congress of the United States Washington, DC 20515

February 9, 2016

Shaun Donovan Director Office of Management and Budget 725 17<sup>th</sup> Street, NW Washington, DC 20503

Dear Director Donovan:

As the original drafters of a comment letter to the Department of Labor (the Department) regarding proposed rule RIN 1210-AB32 (Rule), defining who is a "fiduciary" under the Employee Retirement Income Securities Act (ERISA), we write to provide the Office of Management and Budget the attached copy of our letter submitted to the Department.

As members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, and Ways & Means, we have followed the Rule since it was originally proposed and believe our comments advance the intended purpose of the Rule to protect consumers while accommodating various business models, compensation practices, and products. We hope that the Office of Management and Budget will consider these comments as the agency reviews the Rule.

Sincerely, er of Con lember of Congress Ron Kind Ann McLane Kuster Member of Congress Member of Congress John Larson Grace Meng Member of Congress Member of Congress Gwen Moore Richard Neal Member of Congress Member of Congress Kyrsten Sinema

Member of Congress

## Congress of the United States Washington, DC 20515

September 24, 2015

The Honorable Thomas E. Perez Secretary U.S. Department of Labor 200 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20210

Re: Definition of the Term "Fiduciary;" Conflict of Interest Rule – Retirement Investment Advice (RIN 1210-AB32)

Dear Secretary Perez:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Department of Labor's (the Department) April 14, 2015, proposed rule, RIN 1210-AB32 (the Rule), defining who is a "fiduciary" of an employee benefit plan or individual retirement plan under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. We agree with the Department that updated retirement investment rules that align the incentives of advisors with investors will greatly enhance retirement security of millions of Americans. We would like to highlight several areas where we believe the Department could further refine the Rule to ensure it better serves the needs of retirement investors.

It has been widely noted, including by the White House Council of Economic Advisors study accompanying the Rule, that the landscape for retirement in America has undergone dramatic changes in the 40 years since passage of ERISA due to the shift away from defined benefit pension plans to defined contribution 401(k) and Individual Retirement Account (IRA) plans. The shift has necessitated that Americans be more involved in their retirement planning and to increasingly rely on advice from financial professionals.

The Department has stated that it is the intent of the updated Rule to accommodate various business models, compensation practices, and products. In large part, we agree that the framework of the Rule provides the flexibility to meet those goals, especially with the inclusion of the new Best Interest Contract (BIC) exemption, but we continue to hear from constituents, academics, providers, and investors that there are *specific* provisions of the Rule that may cause market disruptions and limit the ability of segments of the market to reasonably access advice. The following provisions are a sample of some of the concerns we believe need to be addressed.

#### **Best Interest Contract Exemption**

The BIC is intended as a principle-based exemption that is central to accommodating various common business and compensation models that would otherwise be prohibited under the Rule, while retaining an enforceable "best-interest" standard to protect investors. We are supportive of this flexible exemption structure designed to ensure that moderate savers continue to have access to investment advice, but are concerned that there may be practical problems for providers to

implement the exemption as proposed. We believe that the Department could implement the BIC using a less prescriptive and more principles-based approach.

The Department should continue to work with stakeholders to identify solutions to the issue of how to bring new and existing customers within the BIC by providing for a legally-enforceable commitment on the part of advisors without the administratively burdensome task of requiring signed contracts prior to any communication. We also believe the Department should examine the current disclosure requirements contained in the BIC and consider options for simplification, including incorporating already required disclosures. The BIC should also harmonize the standard for offering proprietary products, as to not disadvantage certain business plans without a corresponding consumer advantage and in accordance with Section 913 of the *Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act*. Finally, we believe that it would be appropriate for the Department to make the BIC available for advice to small businesses maintaining participant-directed plans, notwithstanding the availability of the "platform provider" exemption.

### **Education Exemption**

The Rule narrows the previous "investment advice" carve-out established in Interpretive Bulletin 96-1 to exclude advisors from providing examples of specific investment products, plans, or alternatives. Models for asset allocation and general information regarding investment vehicles without some additional, tangible examples may be frustratingly vague for investors. We believe the Department would benefit retirement savers by maintaining flexibility for advisors to provide investment education.

### **Lifetime Income Options**

Annuities provide retirement savers a guaranteed lifetime income option, similar to what defined benefit pensions and Social Security offer. The Department has recognized the value of annuities as part of a diversified retirement strategy and has acted to encourage and facilitate the use of lifetime income options in retirement savings accounts. Unfortunately, the Rule's emphasis on cost seems to discount the value of annuity products. As you know, the value of the guarantee may result in higher costs than other retirement options, but the guarantee offered by the annuity is a value to consumers not offered by other, lower cost options. Additionally, costs associated with setting up the annuity amortized over the life of the annuity may, in fact, bring the costs in line with options that initially appeared cheaper. The Department should, therefore, take steps to clarify that the Rule does not disadvantage lifetime income options.

#### **Implementation**

Given the number of outstanding "Questions" and "Requests for Comments" in the Rule, we urge the Department to continue to engage and maintain a transparent dialogue with stakeholders and Members of Congress. This is an essential and important step, because feedback on potential changes will determine how successfully the Rule is implemented. We would also strongly encourage the Department to consider options for convening a small working group of industry professionals and consumer advocates to aid with the finalization of the Rule as to further ease any final implementation issues.

In addition, given the significance of the Rule to the U.S. retirement saving framework, we believe it would be appropriate for the Department to provide a safe harbor for "good faith implementation," especially given the complexity of the Rule and the many outstanding questions regarding a final rule. We believe this would provide an opportunity for small businesses and financial advisors to comply with the rule without the threat of lawsuits, while still ensuring that the Rule benefits retirement savers. A safe harbor would help ensure continued access to retirement investment advice and minimal disruptions to the current marketplace.

We strongly support and share the Department's goal to ensure financial advisors act in the best interests of their clients. In order to have a successfully implemented rule, it is vital that the proposal doesn't limit consumer choice and access to advice, have a disproportionate impact on lower- or middle-income communities, or raise the costs of saving for retirement.

A number of studies have estimated the retirement gap for Americans is between \$7 and \$14 trillion, with one-in-five Americans approaching retirement age having insufficient retirement savings. The Rule should close this gap and protect access to investment information to help Americans responsibly save for retirement. We urge the Department to continue to seek a balanced approach to both consumer protection and access to retirement investment advice for all Americans.

Sincerely,

Tony Cardenas
Member of Congress

Ron Kind

Member of Congress

John Larson

Member of Congress

Gwen Moore Member of Congress

Kyrsten Sinema
Member of Congress

Member of Congress

Emanuel Cleaver

Member of Congress

Ann McLane Kuster

Member of Congress

Grace Meng

Richard Neal

ember of Congress

Alma Adams **Brad Ashford** Member of Congress Member of Congress Donald S. Beyer Jr. Member of Congress Member of Congress Sanford Bishop Earl Blumenauer Member of Congress Member of Congress Corrine Brown Julia Brownley Member of Congress Member of Congress Michael Capuano Member of Congress Member of Congress John Carney Kathy Castor Member of Congress Member of Congress Wm Lacy Clay Yvette Clarke William "Lacy" Clay Member of Congress Member of Congress James E. Clyburn Steve Cohen Member of Congress Member of Congress Gerald Connolly Jim Cooper Member of Congress Member of Congress

Jim/Costa Member of Congress

Henry Cuellar Member of Congress

Chaka Fattah Member of Congress

Marcia L. Fudge Member of Congress

Alcee Hastings
Member of Congress

Michael M. Honda Member of Congress

Hakeem Jeffice Member of Congress

William R. Keating Member of Congress

Joseph P. Kennedy, III Member of Congress Joe Courtney
Member of Congress

Elizabeth Esty Member of Congress

> Bill Foster Member of Congress

> Gwen Graham Member of Congress

Jim Himes Member of Congress

Steve Israel Member of Congress

Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr. Member of Congress

> Robin L. Kelly Member of Congress

> Dan Kildee Member of Congress

Derek Kilmer Member of Congress

Brenda L. Lawrence Member of Congress

Dave Loebsack Member of Congress

Michelle Michelle Lujan Grisham Member of Congress

> James P. McGovern Member of Congress

Gregory Meeks Member of Congress

Patrick Murphy Member of Congress

Rick Nolan Member of Congress

Ann Kirkpatrick Member of Congress

Ted W. Lieu Member of Congress

Ben Ray Luján Member of Congress

Sean Patrick Maloney Member of Congress

ony McNerney puber of Congress

Seth Moulton Member of Congress

grace J. Napolitano Grace Napolitano Member of Congress

Frank Pallone, Jr. Member of Congress

Bill Pascrell
Member of Congress

Scott H. Peters Member of Congress

Chellie Pingree
Member of Congress

Jared Polis Member of Congress

Charles B. Rangel Member of Congress

> Cedric Richmond Member of Congress

Adam Schiff Member of Congress

Terri Sewell Member of Congress

Ferri Sewell

ELAUS

Ed Perlmutter Member of Congress

Collin C. Peterson Member of Congress

Mark Pocan Member of Congress

Mike Quigley Member of Congress

Kathleen M. Rice Member of Congress

Linda Sánchez

Member of Congress

Kurt Schrader Member of Congress

Albio Sires Member of Congress Bul Sh Mark Lake **Brad Sherman** Mark Takano Member of Congress Member of Congress Mike Thompson Member of Congress Member of Congress Norma Torres Juan Vargas Member of Congress Member of Congress Marc Veasey Member of Congress Member of Congress Member of Congress Member of Congress John Yarmuth Jackie Speier Member of Congress mber of Congress Pete Aguilar Joe Crowley Member of Congress Member of Congress

John Garamendi

Member of Congress

Donald Norcross

Member of Congress

Danny L. Davis

Danny K. Davis Member of Congress

Donald M. Payne Jr. Member of Congress Denny Heck Member of Congress

Danny Heck