From: Jim Christian [mailto:jim@jcretire.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 12:01 PM
To: Talk to DOL
Cc: Jerry Murphy (jmurphy@fscorp.com)
Subject: Conflict of Interest Rule-Retirement Investment Advice

Mr. Perez,

It appears the proposed Fiduciary rule is entirely focused on investment costs and is silent on "value" in the eyes of the client. If lowest cost is the sole objective, then the lowest cost vehicles, food, attorney, medical services, appliances, clothing and homes should be in the best interest of the public too. However, the "value" a client wants or needs is entirely absent in the proposed rule language. **Do you brew your own coffee because it's the lowest cost or buy the more "expensive" coffee for convenience or some other reason you value?**

Fees paid to an advisor whether by up-front commissions, trailing commissions, advisory (assets under management) or hourly are the client's 3 choices for paying an advisor for services. Full disclosure by all advisors of those compensation options along with their respective costs and benefits is in the client's best interest. **Who is the DOL to effectively decide how clients should pay for their financial planning services?**

Financial planning consists of 5 primary planning areas: Protection, Estate, Retirement Income, Tax and Investments. The Fiduciary Rule speaks only to investment advice. Most, if not all advisors that use IRA's for clients do comprehensive planning for clients and not just giving investment advice. In many cases the investment product simply provides the compensation that pays for services in all 5 areas!

The method of compensation (commission, advisory, or hourly) provides the client choices for compensation to their advisor that best fits their personal needs and preferences so clients are well-served in all 5 areas, not just investment advice. Ask yourself this question -**Are you willing to spend more on a product or service if you receive greater value when you receive full disclosure and knowledge of the costs and benefits of the more expensive option? If yes, why then would a blanket rule on the lowest cost product be in everyone's best interest?**

Unfortunately, there are bad apples in every industry and those egregious cases of unethical behavior in financial services somehow become the rallying call that every advisor operates in that manner and rules are then established for the lowest common denominator. That is simply not the case. Consideration should be given to the vast majority of advisors providing client centered value/service with full disclosure rather than the smaller number of bad apples.

If the DOL stays myopic on fees alone and loses sight of the bigger 5-part comprehensive financial planning picture it could easily cause "harm to clients" by taking away their decision making right and "harm to the taxpayer" by unforeseen increased costs in social welfare benefits by exacerbating insufficient comprehensive financial/retirement planning and saving by advisors and consumers.

Giving consideration, control and decision making to the consumer to make informed choices armed with full disclosure for the value they desire is in the best interest of all stakeholders.

Respectfully,

Jim

James M. Christian CLU, ChFC
17595 Kenwood Trail Suite 170
Lakeville, MN 55044
Wk (952) 898-3060 Fax (952) 898-2458
Toll Free (877) 898-3060

jim@jcretire.com
www.jcretire.com

FSP

2014-2015 National President **Lakeville Rotary**

The Society is a network of select credentialed members working in diverse financial disciplines – bound together to pursue knowledge, uphold the highest ethical standards and form meaningful relationships for the benefit of our clients.