1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC HEARING:

DEFINITION OF FIDUCIARY INVESTMENT ADVICE

MARCH 1, 2011

Department of Labor Auditorium

U.S. DOL FRANCIS PERKINS BUILDING

200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C.

		2
1	PROCEEDINGS	
2	MR. LEBOWITZ: Good morning. I'm Alan	
3	Lebowitz, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program	
4	Operations here at the Employment Benefit Security	
5	Administration. Welcome to our public hearing on the	
6	Department's proposed regulation defining who is a	
7	fiduciary for purposes of rendering investment advice	
8	to an employee benefit plan or plan participants and	
9	beneficiaries.	
10	Prior to introducing today's hearing panel	
11	and an introductory statement from EBSA Assistant	
12	Secretary Phyllis Borzi, I will address a few	
13	procedural matters. Notice of today's hearing was	
14	published in the Federal Register on January 12th with	
15	an invitation to interested to testify on the	
16	Department's proposed regulation. In response to that	
17	invitation, the Department received 38 requests, each	
18	of which is reflected in the agenda for today's	
19	hearing, which also was posted on EBSA's website.	
20	Those requesting to testify have been	
21	organized into 13 panels generally consisting of three	
22	panel members each. For purposes of today's hearing,	

- 1 each panel member will be allowed ten minutes to
- 2 present their testimony, and let me just emphasize the
- 3 importance of sticking to that schedule. We obviously
- 4 have a very full agenda both today and tomorrow, and we
- 5 want to make sure that everybody who's on the list has
- 6 an opportunity to present their views.
- 7 Following the conclusion of the testimony,
- 8 all panel members, the government panel members will be
- 9 afforded the opportunity to ask the witnesses
- 10 questions. With regard to panel questions, I wish to
- 11 emphasize that the government panel members are
- 12 interested in developing the public record as fully as
- 13 possible, and accordingly, no inferences, conclusions -
- 14 or conclusions should be drawn from any questions
- 15 from government panel members.
- Witnesses will testify in the order in which
- 17 they appear on the hearing agenda. To assist us today,
- 18 we have a few requests of those testifying. First,
- 19 prior to your testimony, please identify yourself, your
- 20 affiliation, and the organization that you're
- 21 representing, if any. Second, as I said a few seconds
- 22 ago, please limit your remarks to the allotted time of

4

ten minutes. And in this regard, we will call your attention to our timer, which will assist in monitoring 3 your time. 4 At the end of today's hearing, we will keep the hearing record open for 15 days for those 5 testifying who wish to supplement their testimony and 6 for those who wish to submit comments, views, et cetera, that did not have an opportunity to testify today. All submissions will be made available to the 9 public on EBSA's website. 10 Finally, I will note that today's hearing is 11 being transcribed, and the hearing transcripts will be 12 made available to the public on our website within the 13 next two weeks. 14 Now I'd like to introduce today's panel. 15 16 my far left is Assistant Secretary for Employee Benefit 17 Security Phyllis Borzi. Next to me on the left is 18 Michael Davis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of EBSA. 19 my immediate right, Tim Hauser, Associate Solicitor, 20 Employee Benefit Security Division. Next to him is Joe 21 Piacentini, EBSA Director of Policy and Research. And next to him is Fred Wong, Senior Employee Benefit plan 22

5

1	Specialist in the Office of Regulations and
2	Interpretations.
3	Ms. Borzi?
4	MS. BORZI: Thanks, Alan. I just want to say
5	a few words to kick off this hearing this morning.
6	First I'd like to thank all the EBSA staff
7	who have worked to so hard to make this hearing happen,
8	and especially Susan and Luisa. And I want to thank
9	all of you for coming today to participate in this
10	hearing. In particular I want to thank our colleagues
11	from the SEC who have been working closely with us as
12	we develop this regulation and with whom we've been
13	engaged in ongoing collaboration and coordination, not
14	just on this regulation, but also on various other
15	pension-related provisions in the Dodd-Frank Act where
16	that new statute might intersect with ERISA issues.
17	I also want to welcome our colleagues from
18	the CFTC, with whom we also have been working again to
19	on the Dodd-Frank issues. Our goal is to harmonize
20	both statutes. And so whatever sets of rules both
21	agencies put out, the regulated community will have
22	clear and sensible pathways to compliance with both

6

statutes, and we're confident that this goal can be achieved. 3 So I want to thank again our colleagues at the SEC and the CFTC. We've been working with the SEC 5 for many, many years. Our work with the CFTC is just beginning, so I'm happy to have them join us today, and 6 we want to continue to work with them. 8 I want to just take one other moment to thank 9 one other person who's not here on the panel with us today and who normally would be on the panel. And I 10 see him in the back of the room, and he'll probably be 11 12 very angry for me to say -- because I said anything 13 about him. But I want to thank Bob Doyle, who many of you know has long been an employee of EBSA and for the 14 past 20 years has headed our Office of Regulations and 15 16 Interpretations. Bob has recently announced that he's 17 leaving the Department at the end of this week, and so 18 he isn't up here on the panel because he's recused from 19 being on the panel. But I just want to tell you all 20 how much we're going to miss Bob, and he knows we're 21 going to miss him -- I, in particular. I met Bob in 22 We had a dispute over a proposed reg, and 1979.

nothing has changed (laughter) in terms of our not always seeing eye to eye. On the other hand, I have a complete and utter respect for Bob, his expertise, and 3 will miss both his expertise and his voice as we move forward on this and other regulations. So Bob, I just 5 want to publicly thank you. 6 7 (Applause) Okay. Let's get to the matter at By way of background and to provide some context for today's discussion of this proposed regulation, I 9 just want to take a minute to describe the current law. 10 As you know, ERISA provides a simple 11 statutory test for determining who is a fiduciary by 12 13 reason of providing investment advice. Under this 14 test, a person is a fiduciary if he or she renders 15 advice for a fee or other compensation, direct or 16 indirect, with respect to any monies or any other 17 property of the plan. In 1975, however, the Department 18 adopted a regulation that severely cut back the application of this statutory definition by creating a 19 rigid five-part test for fiduciary status. Under this 21 regulation, before investment professionals can be held to ERISA's fiduciary standards with respect to their 22

- 1 advice, they must first render advice as to the value
- 2 of property or make investment recommendations. They
- 3 must do this on a regular basis; they must do this
- 4 pursuant to a mutual understanding that the advice will
- 5 serve as the primary basis for investment decisions,
- 6 and that that person will render individualized advice
- 7 to the plan based on the particular needs of the plan.
- 8 If the adviser meets any -- fails to meet even any one
- 9 of these criteria, it is not a fiduciary. So for
- 10 example, if a plan hires an investment professional on
- 11 a one-time basis to advise it on the expenditure of a
- 12 million dollars on a single complex investment, the
- 13 adviser has no fiduciary obligations, because the
- 14 advice was given on a one-time basis rather than on a
- 15 regular basis as the regulation requires. So it makes
- 16 no difference under this regulation as to how important
- 17 or non-important this particular advice was with
- 18 respect to the plan.
- 19 You know since the Department promulgated the
- 20 regulation in 1975, dramatic changes in the retirement
- 21 marketplace have occurred, including the increased
- 22 importance of investment advice. As you know, we have

- 1 spent a good period of our time focusing on this
- 2 question of investment advice. Our own experience with
- 3 the regulations have led us all to question whether
- 4 this 1975 regulation is still appropriate. And as you
- 5 know, under the new executive order, we are directed to
- 6 go back and look at all of our regulatory and other
- 7 guidance to see whether they are still valid and
- 8 useful, and this is part of that process.
- 9 As in most matters since 1975, the world has
- 10 changed, including significant changes such as the
- 11 introduction of 401(k) plans in 1978, three years after
- 12 the current regulation was adopted. The shift from DB
- 13 plans to DC plans; an increase in the types and
- 14 complexities of investment products and services
- 15 available both to plans and to IRA investors in the
- 16 financial marketplace. This regulation addresses the
- 17 conduct of investment advisers in both the plan and IRA
- 18 context since, as you know, EBSA has long had the
- 19 ability to regulate prohibited transactions in IRAs,
- 20 although the enforcement for violating those provisions
- 21 lies in the excise tax imposed by our colleagues in the
- 22 Internal Revenue Service.

1 In enacting ERISA, Congress recognized that the security of American retirement plans depends on its fiduciaries. ERISA protects retirement benefits by 3 holding important plan actors to fiduciary standards, 4 protecting workers and retirees from conflicts of 5 interest and providing remedies for violations. 6 it's vitally important when we define important terms, like who is a fiduciary, we get it right. 9 The proposed regulation that we issued last October and the hearing we're holding today are part of 10 our determined effort to get it right. We believe that 11 the types of advisory relationships that give rise to 12 13 fiduciary duties should be reexamined and that the rule should be updated so that plan fiduciaries receive the 14 15 impartiality they expect when they rely on their 16 adviser's expertise and advice. In so doing, we want to be sure that we have the information that we need to 17 18 create a regulation that accomplishes this purpose and makes sense in the context of today's retirement plans 19 and investment advice environment. We've already 20 21 received 200 comment letters. Maybe some in this room besides us have read them all. And of course all of 22

- 1 these are posted on our website.
- 2 We're now ready to continue the dialogue that
- 3 we intend to have in order to get this right by adding
- 4 your views on this proposal and adding your testimony
- 5 to the public record. And as Alan noted, the hearing
- 6 record is going to remain open for 15 additional days
- 7 so that those of you who will testify today and
- 8 tomorrow and those of you who haven't testified will
- 9 have the opportunity, again as the executive order
- 10 directs us, to have people comment on the comments on
- 11 the comments. So there will be ample opportunity for
- 12 public input here. And after the hearing is over and
- 13 the record closes, we're going to work through the
- 14 issues that have been raised both here in the comments
- 15 and the various meetings that I know will be coming
- 16 after the hearing is over. We're going to thoughtfully
- 17 and carefully evaluate the suggestions and concerns we
- 18 have heard. We're going to continue the dialogue with
- 19 the regulated community, and we're going to refine the
- 20 text of proposed regulation -- because after all,
- 21 that's all it is, is a proposed regulation -- so that
- 22 we'll be ready to issue final regulations by the end of

- 1 the year in accordance with the timetable that we have
- 2 announced publicly.
- 3 So again, I want to thank you all for your
- 4 participation and your input, and so let's just start
- 5 with the witnesses, Alan.
- 6 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you.
- 7 First panel, please: Norman Stein, Karen
- 8 Prange, and Anne Tuttle.
- 9 MS. BORZI: I should have said one other
- 10 thing, which is that I'm going to try to be here for
- 11 most of today and tomorrow, and I apologize in advance
- 12 to the witnesses whose hearing I won't actually --
- 13 whose testimony I won't actually hear, because I do
- 14 have a couple of things that I have to do, to leave.
- 15 But rest assured that my colleagues will brief me on
- 16 what you said, and if you have any written statements,
- 17 I'm going to be reading them.
- 18 MR. LEBOWITZ: Mr. Stein?
- 19 MR. STEIN: Good morning. I'm Norman Stein,
- 20 and I'm testifying today on behalf of the Pension
- 21 Rights Center. The Center is a nonprofit consumer
- 22 organization that has been working since 1976 to

- 1 protect and promote the retirement security of American
- 2 workers and their families. The Department deserves
- 3 high praise for these proposed regulations, which would
- 4 replace current regulations adopted in 1975 that
- 5 tightly circumscribe the circumstances under which a
- 6 person or entity becomes a fiduciary when providing
- 7 investment advice for a fee. The original regulations
- 8 were not compelled by the statute, and in our view
- 9 reflected an improper agency narrowing of the statutory
- 10 language and congressional intent. In addition, as the
- 11 Department suggests in its preamble, economic and legal
- 12 developments in the field of investments and employee
- 13 benefit plans have rendered the 1975 regulations
- 14 anachronistic and at times at cross-purposes with the
- 15 statute.
- 16 My statement today will cover five points:
- 17 First, that the current regulations improperly
- 18 constrict the statutory definition of fiduciary.
- 19 Second, that the current regulations were promulgated
- 20 in a different economic and legal environment than
- 21 today, and as a result sometimes fail today to shield
- 22 unsophisticated participants in retirement plans from

- 1 investment advice tainted by conflicts of interest.
- 2 Third, that the proposed regulation should not
- 3 condition fiduciary status on whether a person provides
- 4 individualized investment advice. Fourth, that the
- 5 sales limitation on the definition of fiduciary status
- 6 should not apply to advice given to participants. And
- 7 fifth, that advice about distributions should be
- 8 considered investment advice.
- 9 ERISA provides straightforwardly that a
- 10 person is a fiduciary if he renders investment advice
- 11 for a fee or other compensation, direct or indirect,
- 12 with respect to any monies or other properties of such
- 13 plan. In 1975 -- the 1975 regulations, however,
- 14 narrowed the scope of this language by limiting
- 15 fiduciary status to persons rendering investment advice
- 16 that is regular, rather than one-time or episodic; that
- 17 is given pursuant to an agreement or understanding that
- 18 it will be a primary basis for investment; and that it
- 19 is individualized to the particular needs of the plan.
- 20 These limitations are not consistent with the plain
- 21 meaning of the term "investment advice," and at least
- 22 in retrospect can be said to have impeded the

- 1 congressional goals of limiting self-dealing and of
- 2 assuring prudent investment to plan assets. As the
- 3 preamble to the proposed regulations notes, people
- 4 providing investment advice not covered by the current
- 5 regulations have considerable influence on the
- 6 decisions of plan fiduciaries and participants, and yet
- 7 can have conflicts of interest that result in lower
- 8 returns and thus less retirement income.
- 9 The existing regulations were promulgated in
- 10 1975 at the dawn of the ERISA era. Since then, there
- 11 have been significant changes in the retirement plan
- 12 and investment landscape that have undermined whatever
- 13 arguable justification there might have been in 1975
- 14 for the regulation's cramped scope. As the preamble to
- 15 the proposed regulations notes, there has been a
- 16 seismic shift in the retirement plan world, from
- 17 defined benefit plans in which investment advice was
- 18 generally rendered to sophisticated plan fiduciaries,
- 19 to self-directed defined contribution plans in which
- 20 investment advice is issued to individual participants,
- 21 including my mother, many of whom have only rudimentary
- 22 financial literacy.

Mutual funds and sellers and brokers for 1 mutual funds who played a relatively small role in retirement plans at the time ERISA was enacted have 3 become dominant players in the new economic order. variety and complexity of investment products has also 5 increased markedly over the last three decades. 6 have also been significant and unanticipated legal developments since the time the 1975 regulations were The Supreme Court in 1993 ruled that a 9 written. participant generally is entitled to legal relief under 10 ERISA only against a defendant who is a fiduciary whose 11 breach of duty caused monetary loss to a plan. Legal 12 13 relief is not available against a non-fiduciary even when that non-fiduciary knowingly and for personal 14 profit assisted a fiduciary in the commission of such a 15 16 A participant can sue a person other than a 17 fiduciary only for equitable relief, and the Supreme Court has narrowly circumscribed the extent to which 18 equitable relief is available. 19 The Department of Labor, which filed amicus 20 21 briefs arguing against these positions, could not have known in 1975 that the combination of its narrowly 22

- 1 drawn regulation and ERISA preemption would effectively
- 2 create a largely unregulated playing field for so many
- 3 actors who have a direct and substantial impact on plan
- 4 investment performance.
- 5 Another important change is simply the growth
- 6 of assets held by qualified retirement plans. In 1975,
- 7 defined benefit plans and defined contribution plans
- 8 held \$300 billion in assets. In 2007, qualified plans
- 9 held over \$6 trillion of assets, and this figure does
- 10 not include individual retirement accounts. Retirement
- 11 plans are thus today a critical market for virtually
- 12 all serious capital market participants. It is simply
- 13 where the money is. Notwithstanding a somewhat broader
- 14 definition of the term "fiduciary," vendors of
- 15 investment products and financial advisers will
- 16 continue to serve the retirement plan market, even if
- 17 they now will be required to provide prudent and
- 18 impartial investment advice. Those who are unwilling
- 19 to meet such a standard, in our view, have no business
- 20 advising retirement plan participants on how to prepare
- 21 financially for retirement.
- The proposed regulations make a person who

- 1 issues investment advice a fiduciary only if the advice
- 2 is individualized to the needs of the plan, a plan
- 3 fiduciary, or a participant or beneficiary. We are not
- 4 certain why a person should be a fiduciary only if his
- 5 advice to a plan or beneficiary is sufficiently
- 6 individualized. Many plan participants and
- 7 beneficiaries will be unable to discern a difference
- 8 between individualized and non-individualized advice.
- 9 Moreover, this aspect of the regulations may provide
- 10 perverse incentives to some providers of investment
- 11 advice to avoid tailoring their advice to the
- 12 particular needs of the individual for the very purpose
- 13 of avoiding fiduciary status.
- 14 At least with respect to participants, we
- 15 would prefer that the regulations provide that advice
- 16 that is directed to a particular participant to
- 17 purchase or sell a particular security is investment
- 18 advice, even though not necessarily individualized to
- 19 the particular needs of the participant. If the final
- 20 regulations take this position, as we hope it will, the
- 21 Department can clarify in the preamble to those
- 22 regulations that this will not prevent the furnishing

- 1 of non-fiduciary investment education so long as the
- 2 participant is not given specific investment
- 3 recommendations.
- 4 The proposed regulations also provide that a
- 5 person shall be considered to be a fiduciary investment
- 6 adviser if such person -- I'm sorry, will not be
- 7 considered a fiduciary investment adviser if such
- 8 person can demonstrate that the recipient of the advice
- 9 knows or under the circumstances should have known that
- 10 the person who's providing the advice or making the
- 11 recommendations in its capacity as a purchaser or a
- 12 seller of a security or other property, whose interests
- 13 are adverse to the interests of the plan or its
- 14 participants or beneficiaries, and that the person is
- 15 not undertaking to provide impartial investment advice.
- 16 While we believe that this limitation may be
- 17 appropriate when such advice is provided to a
- 18 sophisticated plan fiduciary, it is not appropriate
- 19 when the advice is given to individual participants or
- 20 their beneficiaries. The Center has worked with
- 21 participants for 35 years, and based on our experience,
- 22 it is our view that many plan participants will simply

- 1 be unable to discern when advice is impartial or
- 2 conflicted. In addition, even if there is express
- 3 disclosure of a fiduciary's conflicts in a one-on-one
- 4 meeting, whether in phone or by person, an
- 5 unsophisticated investor will often regard the adviser
- 6 as acting in his interests, notwithstanding the
- 7 disclosure. Indeed, an adviser salesperson's success
- 8 may depend on whether he can create in the customer the
- 9 belief that the adviser is interested primarily in the
- 10 customer's welfare, despite a declaration by the
- 11 adviser of self-interest.
- 12 There is the further fact that most
- 13 participants will not be knowledgeable about the types
- 14 of fees and benefits that can accrue to the purchaser
- 15 or seller of securities, and thus may not be able to
- 16 evaluate the extent of the adviser's conflicts. Thus
- 17 we strongly urge the Department to revise the seller
- 18 limitation so that it only applies to advice and
- 19 recommendations given to sophisticated plan
- 20 fiduciaries.
- The Department asked for comments on whether
- 22 and to what extent the final regulation should define

- 1 the provision of investment advice to encompass
- 2 recommendations related taking a plan distribution. A
- 3 recommendation to remove assets from the plan and
- 4 invest them elsewhere is in effect a judgment about the
- 5 relative merits of the plan options and the other
- 6 investments. The person making the recommendation can
- 7 have interests adverse to the plan participant, and the
- 8 recommendation can have a substantial effect on a
- 9 participant's retirement security, not only because of
- 10 future investment performance but also because of the
- 11 loss of an economically efficient means of taking
- 12 retirement income and annuity form and tax
- 13 considerations.
- 14 Moreover, under the current interpretation of
- 15 the Department, the person giving advice in these
- 16 circumstances has no obligation under ERISA to reveal
- 17 conflicts of interest. We thus believe it is essential
- 18 that the regulations treat advice on plan distributions
- 19 for what it is -- a type of investment advice.
- In sum, this is a much-needed regulatory
- 21 change that will better protect plans and plan
- 22 participants and facilitate more effective enforcement

- 1 when misconduct is uncovered. The Pension Rights
- 2 Center applauds the Department for pursuing this
- 3 initiative that will benefit both the retirement plans
- 4 and their participants and beneficiaries.
- 5 Thank you for the opportunity to be here this
- 6 morning, even if I went ten seconds over.
- 7 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you.
- 8 MS. PRANGE: Good morning. I'm Karen Prange,
- 9 Executive Director and Assistant General Counsel for JP
- 10 Morgan Chase and Company. I'm here today representing
- 11 our retirement plan services and worldwide security
- 12 services lines of business.
- We believe that the proposed regulation
- 14 should be modified and re-proposed to eliminate
- 15 unnecessary and subjective standards. Rather than
- 16 determining whether a person is impartial or has
- 17 adverse interests, the regulations will better serve
- 18 plan sponsors and participants by requiring objective
- 19 written disclosures from service providers, regardless
- 20 of whether or not they will be acting in a fiduciary
- 21 capacity. To enable plan sponsors and participants to
- 22 continue receiving valuable services from providers, JP

- 1 Morgan also believes the various limitations described
- 2 in the proposed regulation should be expanded or
- 3 clarified to clearly exclude non-discretionary
- 4 administrative services and distinguish between the
- 5 provision of information and advice.
- Finally, we believe that existing standards
- 7 governing plan distribution, education and guidance are
- 8 sufficient and need not be modified in the final
- 9 regulations.
- 10 We would first like to address the potential
- 11 industry impact of having the provision of information
- 12 regarding plan distribution options swept into the
- 13 fiduciary definition. The standards articulated by the
- 14 Department in advisery Opinion 2005-23A are both
- 15 appropriate and workable. Participants contacting a
- 16 record-keeper's call center generally do so to obtain
- 17 basic factual information about the plan, including its
- 18 distribution and investment options. The analysis in
- 19 the advisory opinion recognized that in most cases,
- 20 answering questions and providing plan information
- 21 about rollovers and other distribution options are
- 22 ministerial functions, and participants will not have

- 1 established any kind of trusting fiduciary relationship
- 2 with the representative who assists the participant.
- 3 Record-keepers must be able to provide information to
- 4 participants about their rights to receive or defer a
- 5 plan distribution and related concerns, such as tax
- 6 consequences and rollover vehicles like IRAs, in the
- 7 same manner as they are able to provide information
- 8 regarding other plan features, such as contribution
- 9 rights and the availability and related tax
- 10 consequences of loans or hardship distributions,
- 11 without becoming subject to ERISA's fiduciary
- 12 requirements.
- 13 Next I would like to address the sales
- 14 exception. We believe that the adverse and impartial
- 15 standards as currently drafted are too vaque. We
- 16 propose that the applicability of the sales exception
- 17 should turn on whether the service provider and plan
- 18 sponsor understand that the advice is being provided in
- 19 a sales context. Such an understanding could be
- 20 imparted through a written disclaimer that the service
- 21 provider is acting in a non-fiduciary capacity.
- 22 Also, record-keepers are frequently asked by

- 1 plan sponsors to develop proposed investment fund menus
- 2 during the sales process. These proposed menus are
- 3 sometimes used to create a uniform basis upon which the
- 4 fees of various record-keepers may be compared. The
- 5 Department should clarify in the final regulations that
- 6 developing such proposed fund menus does not constitute
- 7 investment advice that gives rise to fiduciary status.
- 8 We believe the written disclosure standard
- 9 for application of the platform exception is generally
- 10 appropriate, but suggest that the Department expand
- 11 this exception to apply to any objective data that a
- 12 service provider supplies to the plan sponsor for the
- 13 purpose of monitoring a plan's existing investment
- 14 funds for all types of plans, as long as the provider
- 15 does not make a specific investment recommendation
- 16 based on the data. Narrowly interpreting this
- 17 exception could deny plan sponsors and fiduciaries
- 18 valuable tools for monitoring their plan investments.
- 19 Further, the Department should expand this exception by
- 20 either removing or clarifying that the exception is
- 21 applicable when a service provider makes securities or
- 22 other property available without regard to the

- 1 individualized needs of the plan. Plan sponsors often
- 2 ask record-keepers to create sample fund line-ups from
- 3 the investments available on the record-keeper's
- 4 platform to evaluate sales or marketing proposals. But
- 5 by its very nature, this information may be deemed to
- 6 take into account the individualized needs of the plan.
- 7 However, if the information provided is accompanied by
- 8 a disclaimer regarding the record-keeper's non-
- 9 fiduciary status, it should not be considered the
- 10 provision of investment advice.
- 11 Elimination or at least clarification of the
- 12 individualized need standard is even more warranted in
- 13 the context of the selecting or monitoring exception.
- 14 Information supplied by a service provider for the
- 15 purpose of assisting plan sponsors in monitoring the
- 16 plan's investments would be meaningless if that
- 17 information does not consider the individualized needs
- 18 of the plan. As long as the information does not
- 19 include a specific recommendation for a fund and does
- 20 not include a disclaimer -- excuse me, and does include
- 21 a disclaimer similar to the one previously mentioned,
- 22 it should not be considered investment advice.

1	We also suggest that the selection or
2	monitoring exception be decoupled from the platform
3	exception. Currently the selecting or monitoring
4	exception is tied to the activities described in the
5	platform exception, so it appears to apply only to
6	participant-directed defined contribution plans when
7	sponsors of all types of plans rely on data and
8	analysis to fulfill their fiduciary oversight
9	obligations. For this purpose, service providers can
10	provide various types of analytic and reporting
11	services to plan sponsors based on the information and
12	data they maintain. These services do not involve any
13	discretion by the provider. Rather, they involve
14	comparisons of plan data to criteria designated by the
15	plan sponsor or the application of standardized
16	algorithms such as comparing an investment manager's
17	performance to a benchmark, reporting to a plan sponsor
18	if an investment does not meet a manager's guidelines,
19	or the generation of a list of potential investment
20	managers based on plan sponsor specifications. In all
21	cases, the service provider's analysis or reporting
22	provides information to the plan sponsor, but contains

- 1 no recommendations regarding actions that might be
- 2 taken based on that information.
- 3 Therefore, we believe the Department should
- 4 clarify in the final regulations that all non-
- 5 discretionary analytic and reporting services do not
- 6 constitute investment advice. Lack of such clarity may
- 7 lead service providers to discontinue valuable non-
- 8 discretionary analytic and reporting services.
- 9 With respect to the exception regarding
- 10 preparation of general reports or statements, we
- 11 suggest that the exception apply to any report or
- 12 statement that merely reflects the value of an
- 13 investment, regardless of whether the report or
- 14 statement is provided due to regulatory requirements or
- 15 on a continuous basis for a plan sponsor or
- 16 participant's convenience. We believe the proposed
- 17 regulation should make clear that service providers,
- 18 such as trustees and custodians, reporting valuations
- 19 of hard-to-value plan assets are not providing
- 20 investment advice under ERISA. Service providers do
- 21 not independently value these assets, nor do they
- 22 typically review the valuations provided by third

- 1 parties except to test the valuation's reasonableness
- 2 based upon a standardized process. The service
- 3 providers simply report the values provided by third
- 4 parties without the exercise of discretion.
- 5 We urge the Department to revise the
- 6 regulations to ensure that the standards for
- 7 determining whether a service provider is a fiduciary
- 8 are clear and objective, to enable providers to
- 9 determine in advance whether or not their activities
- 10 are fiduciary in nature and to design and implement
- 11 their business model based upon whether they intend for
- 12 their activities to be fiduciary activities and to
- 13 avoid potential litigation due to uncertainty. The
- 14 scope and generality of the proposed regulations will
- 15 cause functions that were previously considered
- 16 ministerial to become fiduciary, forcing service
- 17 providers to reconsider the authoring of the services
- 18 and related fees to address the increase in risk and
- 19 oversight requirements.
- 20 Finally, we are concerned that a service
- 21 provider may fall within the definition of a fiduciary
- 22 merely because it has an affiliate that is a registered

- investment adviser. When a service provider offers a service and presents itself as a fiduciary with respect to that service, it should be subject to the fiduciary 3 requirements of ERISA. However, we urge the Department to provide in the regulations that a service provider 5 that offers an administrative service and provides a written representation that it is not acting as a fiduciary with respect to that service should be presumed not to be a fiduciary with respect to those Such a disclaimer puts the parties on notice 10 that there is no mutual understanding that the services 11 are intended to be fiduciary in nature, creates a clear 12 13 delineation between the plan sponsor and service provider responsibilities, and will prevent dramatic
- 17 provider's communication relating to plan assets could

the-fact claims of an understanding that a service

increases in uncertainty and litigation based on after-

be considered investment advice. 18

14

15

16

- 19 I appreciate the opportunity to appear today
- 20 on behalf of JP Morgan. Thank you.
- 21 MR. LEBOWITZ: Ms. Tuttle.
- 22 MS. TUTTLE: Good morning, and thank you for

- 1 the opportunity to testify today. My name is Anne
- 2 Tuttle, and I'm here today as the general counsel of
- 3 Financial Engines.
- We applaud the Department's proposal to
- 5 update the definition of fiduciary. We support the
- 6 Department's objective of improving protections for
- 7 participants and beneficiaries. We applaud the
- 8 Department for confirming that persons providing
- 9 individualized investment advice be subject to ERISA
- 10 standards of fiduciary conduct. We share the concern
- 11 that the current regulation may no longer adequately
- 12 protect the interests of participants. ERISA's
- 13 fiduciary standards provide important protections
- 14 against conflicts of interest and self-dealing. And
- 15 particularly in light of changes in the financial
- 16 industry, it is timely to reexamine the types of
- 17 investment advice that should give rise to fiduciary
- 18 duties under ERISA.
- 19 As the Department has pointed out, it's a 35-
- 20 year-old rule. Thirty-five years ago when this
- 21 regulation was adopted, financial engines did not
- 22 exist. I was still in middle school. Our co-founder,

- 1 Bill Sharpe, had not yet been awarded the Nobel Prize
- 2 in Economics. But today, Financial Engines is the
- 3 nation's largest independent investment adviser.
- 4 Financial Engines launched its first advice service in
- 5 October 1998 as it set out to accomplish Bill Sharpe's
- 6 vision -- to provide high-quality, independent
- 7 investment advice to everyone. There are other
- 8 significant changes in the financial services industry
- 9 and also in the role that 401(k) plans play in our
- 10 society. The Department recognizes the need to respond
- 11 to these changes by taking another look at the
- 12 regulation.
- From our perspective, it is both important
- 14 and feasible that participants and plans be represented
- 15 by those willing to act as a fiduciary. We work with
- 16 eight of the largest retirement plan providers serving
- 17 the defined contribution market to make our services
- 18 broadly available. We offer services to plan
- 19 participants through leading employers, including 129
- 20 of the Fortune 500, reaching over 7.3 million
- 21 participants. To meet the needs of different
- 22 investors, Financial Engines provides both

- 1 discretionary investment management through a managed
- 2 accounts service and non-discretionary investment
- 3 advice through a non-aligned advice service. We act as
- 4 fiduciary to the plan participants under both ERISA and
- 5 the Investment advisers Act. Our managed accounts
- 6 service also includes income-plus, which provides
- 7 steady monthly payouts from a 401(k) that can last for
- 8 life.
- 9 Today I wanted to discuss several aspects of
- 10 the proposed regulation. The proposed regulation
- 11 provides that investment education, information, and
- 12 materials as described in Interpretive Bulletin 90-61,
- 13 will not constitute investment advice under ERISA.
- 14 Investment education is a valuable way to offer help to
- 15 participants. However, we know that investors are
- 16 confused about the roles and responsibilities of
- 17 different financial professionals. Thus, we are
- 18 concerned that an overly broad exclusion for investment
- 19 education may not account for certain industry
- 20 practices and the expectations of participants and
- 21 beneficiaries when they are provided information and
- 22 materials that are not generic in nature. Because

- 1 participants who receive specific and tailored
- 2 recommendations likely perceive those recommendations
- 3 as advice, rather than general education, providers of
- 4 such specific recommendations should be treated as
- 5 fiduciaries under ERISA. The Department should specify
- 6 that the exclusion for investment education will not
- 7 apply where specific investment recommendations are
- 8 provided. These modifications would help to provide
- 9 clarity about what constitutes investment education and
- 10 help to ensure participants and beneficiaries who take
- 11 action based on customized recommendations are not left
- 12 without ERISA's fiduciary protections.
- 13 The proposed regulation also provides that a
- 14 person will not be considered a fiduciary with respect
- 15 to the provision of advice or recommendations if such
- 16 person can demonstrate that the advice recipient knows,
- 17 or under the circumstances reasonably should know that
- 18 the person is providing advice in the capacity of a
- 19 seller or purchaser of a security or other product
- 20 whose interests are adverse to that of the plan or
- 21 participants, and that the person is not undertaking to
- 22 provide impartial advice. Individual plan participants

- 1 should not be expected to know that advice given with
- 2 respect to securities and other products is not
- 3 impartial.
- 4 We recommend that the Department modify the
- 5 proposed limitation so that the exception does not
- 6 apply where the recipient of advice pertaining to a
- 7 security or other product is an individual plan
- 8 participant. Alternatively, the limitation should more
- 9 precisely describe the burden that must be met by a
- 10 seller who seeks to avoid fiduciary status by claiming
- 11 that an advice recipient should have known that the
- 12 advice was not impartial.
- We also note the Department's request for
- 14 comment on advice regarding plan distributions. It's
- 15 difficult to distinguish distribution advice from
- 16 education and information, and several commenters have
- 17 identified issues of fine-tuning that are worth
- 18 examining. In other contexts, the Department has
- 19 recognized that a buyer and seller of products cannot
- 20 always stand in a fiduciary relationship. This appears
- 21 to recognize a distinction for the activities that
- 22 inform plans and participants of what is available to

- 1 them. It doesn't necessarily follow that one is
- 2 adverse by offering services to plans and plan
- 3 participants. It should be permissible to offer
- 4 additional services even if a preexisting fiduciary
- 5 relationship exists. But once there is an agreement to
- 6 provide a service, whether that agreement is with the
- 7 plan on behalf of the participant or directly with
- 8 participants, and if the subject of that agreement is
- 9 to provide investment advice as defined in the
- 10 regulation, the service provider should act as a
- 11 fiduciary.
- 12 Finally, the Department notes uncertainty
- 13 both as to the potential costs of the proposal, such as
- 14 whether service provider costs would increase, and
- 15 whether the service provider market could shrink
- 16 because of concerns about higher costs. Financial
- 17 Engines believes that our history and growth support
- 18 the conclusion that it is neither onerous nor
- 19 impossible for service providers to provide high
- 20 quality investment advice in a fiduciary capacity to
- 21 large numbers of plans and participants.
- 22 Financial Engines appreciates the opportunity

- to comment on the proposed regulation, and we support the Department's actions in seeking to better protect participants and beneficiaries. We welcome the 3 opportunity to work with the Department and to provide 5 any further assistance that may be useful. 6 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. MS. BORZI: Mr. Stein, you suggested that the seller exemption that we have in the regulation should be limited to sophisticated plan fiduciaries. Do you have some advice as to how you might define that or 10 thoughts? 11 12 MR. STEIN: What, the investment advice? 13 Well, I used the word "sophisticated" in hopes that that question wouldn't be asked. 14 15 (Laughter) 16 It does seem --17 MS. BORZI: I wouldn't even consider myself 18 sophisticated.
 - 21 of the comments that you received from small plans

19

20

22 reflect this -- that there's a difference between a

we thought there was a pretty clear -- and I think some

MR. STEIN: In discussions on the testimony,

- fiduciary for a plan sponsored by General Electric who's making decisions and a decision made by my brother who's a doctor and has a small plan for six 3 people. And, you know, it's -- one way of approaching it, and we toyed with talking about this but decided 5 not to, is to have the standard that has to be 6 satisfied by the seller be more specific and include consideration or suitability of the advice to the particular fiduciary, what the fiduciary would fully understand the advice. So that's -- that's I think 10 about as much as I could probably safely say now, 11 although we could think about it some more and 12 13 If you think about it some MS. BORZI: Yeah. more, that would be useful for us to -- for you to give 14 us that information. 15 16 Is Prange --17 MS. PRANGE: Prange. 18 MS. BORZI: Prange, sorry.
- 21 MS. BORZI: You suggested that the solution

19

20

Okay.

22 to -- to some of thee things, particularly to the sales

MS. PRANGE: We like to use every letter.

- exemption, would be to allow a written disclaimer: am not a fiduciary. Well, (a), I'm not sure that most participants know what that really means; but (b), the 3 -- put aside the current regulation, the statute creates a functional test. So when a court decides 5 whether somebody's a fiduciary or not, when the 6 Department in its investigations and litigation decides whether somebody is a fiduciary or not, the decision is based on what they do, not what they call themselves. So how do you square that with your written disclaimer? 10 When I was in private practice, I used to X out a lot 11 of these written disclaimers in service provider 12 13 contracts and simply substitute the statutory words. 14 MS. PRANGE: Hm-mmm. 15 MS. BORZI: So how -- how would you square 16 that? How would --17 MS. PRANGE: It would not be our intention
 - 20 not taking a position that the functional test should

that a disclaimer would supersede the actual

18

19

21 be eliminated or that if someone does act and engage in

performance of the service provider. I'm not -- we're

22 a fiduciary function, that they shouldn't be held to

4 0

- 1 the standards. Our goal would be to have a disclosure
- 2 regime that sets a level playing field at the onset of
- 3 the relationship of what it is, what the intention is
- 4 of the parties and what the role is intended to be of
- 5 the service provider. But we agree that if the service
- 6 provider then goes beyond those guidelines, that
- 7 intended function, that they should be held to the
- 8 fiduciary standards.
- 9 MS. BORZI: Okay. And how would, for
- 10 instance, a participant know that? I mean, if you're
- 11 their trusted financial adviser and you give advice
- 12 which is -- crosses that line, how would the
- 13 participant know that the line would be crossed?
- 14 MS. PRANGE: Well, I think in an individual
- 15 participant situation, one of the issues with service
- 16 providers such as JP Morgan is in our call centers, we
- 17 have hundreds of employees who are engaging with plan
- 18 participants across several plans. So we question
- 19 first and foremost the building of that trusted
- 20 relationship by a record-keeper such as our firm. I
- 21 think that if the individual does reach out and builds
- 22 that type of a relationship with someone, if there is a

41

service provider who's offering an advice service or a managed account service where it's intended for that, then there's the expectation. But I think that we need 3 to manage the expectation of plan sponsors and participants in the basic plan information that's 5 delivered to them through the call centers in guiding them to proper decisions that they need to make. 8 MS. BORZI: Well, do your plan sponsors come 9 in through the call centers as well? Don't you have a more personalized relationship with your plan sponsor 10 clients? 11 12 MS. PRANGE: We do. We have specific relationships that are developed through client 13 advisers, through relationship managers, and in that 14 case as you said earlier, a plan sponsor is different 15 16 than a participant. They are generally going to be 17 somewhat more sophisticated, although maybe not a 18 sophisticated investor. They are going into the marketplace and seeking services and investment options 19 20 for their plan, and they need service providers like our firm who can bring information to them on which 21 they can base their fiduciary decisions. But our 22

- 1 position is that bringing that information and helping
- 2 to educate plan sponsors and support them in those
- 3 decisions is an appropriate place for a record-keeper
- 4 such as our firm to sit in. If a participant -- I'm
- 5 sorry, a plan sponsor -- feels that they are not
- 6 sophisticated enough to make the decision on their own,
- 7 we don't disagree that they should hire an investment
- 8 adviser for that purpose to assist them in making that
- 9 decision.
- MS. BORZI: Who will be a fiduciary.
- 11 MS. PRANGE: Who will be a fiduciary.
- MS. BORZI: Ms. Tuttle, you get a bye because
- 13 you actually answered the question I was going to ask
- 14 you about costs and burdens.
- MS. TUTTLE: Excellent. Thank you.
- MS. PRANGE: Good job.
- 17 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Stein, you said investment
- 18 advice should not have to be individualized to qualify
- 19 as sort of a fiduciary act. What specific advice would
- 20 you give the Department on where to draw the line
- 21 between investment education and investment advice in
- 22 that context?

4.3

1 MR. STEIN: Well, in our written comments, 2 what we suggested was that the test really be whether specific investment advice is directed to a particular 3 participant rather than -- what our concern was with individualized investment advice is that if the advice 5 -- if the person giving the advice doesn't really understand the needs of the participant, that would be -- that would not be investment advice if they had -if they weren't aware of the particular needs of the individual with respect to their portfolio, and they 10 were just making recommendations to everyone about a 11 12 particular security, that that would not be 13 individualized. So what we -- what we suggested was the test really should be whether there was advice 14 concerning a specific investment directed to a 15 16 participant or beneficiary. And that can be a 17 definition of individualized, we -- we think. 18 MR. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. 19 And then Ms. Prange, you talked about just 20 the challenges that the reg as proposed would create. 21 But you and Ms. Tuttle seem to disagree on whether the 22 availability of advice would be affected. Was the

44

- 1 basis of your comments that the regulation as proposed
- 2 would actually reduce the availability of high quality
- 3 advice? Do you think providers would be
- 4 disincentivized to provide advice in this context?
- 5 MS. PRANGE: I don't think that they would be
- 6 disincented to purposefully provide investment advice,
- 7 either through an advice product or a managed account
- 8 product. Our concern is that if the -- if the final
- 9 regulation is not more specific, that those who provide
- 10 investment guidance and education, data, may not
- 11 provide as much or broad of information if the line is
- 12 not clearly defined. We believe we need to provide in
- 13 the marketplace the opportunity to provide information
- 14 and guidance and education to both sponsors and
- 15 participants alongside fiduciary products like advice
- 16 and managed accounts.
- 17 MR. DAVIS: Ms. Tuttle, would you agree with
- 18 that?
- 19 MS. TUTTLE: Yes, I think I agree that there
- 20 is a distinction between investment education and
- 21 investment advice. And it's not always easy to draw
- 22 that line crisply. But I think looking at those

- 1 concepts of is it directed to the participant; does it
- 2 take into account participants' own circumstances,
- 3 would be things that I would look to to say if you're
- 4 doing that and you're making a specific recommendation,
- 5 that you are then offering investment advice and should
- 6 do so as a fiduciary. But it is completely permissible
- 7 for folks to provide investment research or to
- 8 otherwise educate the market, and participants may gain
- 9 access to that. We hope that participants are looking
- 10 -- reading the Wall Street Journal or otherwise trying
- 11 to educate themselves about the choices they face. And
- 12 I would agree that we want to encourage those kinds of
- 13 activities and allow people to generally offer
- 14 education about asset classes and risk and return and
- 15 diversification without fearing that they must be a
- 16 fiduciary to somebody with whom they may not have a
- 17 personal or direct relationship.
- 18 MR. DAVIS: And one more question. In the
- 19 preamble, the Department talked a lot about the change
- 20 in age of the marketplace, the increasing need for high
- 21 quality advice, in particular with respect to
- 22 participant-directed accounts. What indicators are you

46

- 1 guys seeing with respect to the reliance of
- 2 participants on advice? Are you seeing greater
- 3 reliance on advice? Have you seen markers that would
- 4 suggest that this advice is even more important in the
- 5 context of the products that you deliver today?
- 6 MS. TUTTLE: Yeah. I think we have seen
- 7 several studies do show that participants are both
- 8 requesting advice, that there is some gaps in the
- 9 financial literacy of many of Americans. And I think
- 10 we do see that when advice is offered, it can improve
- 11 the retirement outlook for many of the investors who
- 12 are taking advantage of that advice.
- MR. DAVIS: Ms. Prange, would you agree?
- 14 MS. PRANGE: I would. And I would add in
- 15 addition to the participants' uptake on the products
- 16 available, the plan sponsors embracing the products and
- 17 using them in a QDIA circumstance has been very
- 18 encouraging, as well.
- MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
- 20 MR. HAUSER: I just have a couple of
- 21 questions. But one thing that strikes me, and tell me
- 22 if I am wrong -- it seems to me that all three of you

47 agree that specific recommendations as to purchasing, holding, selling, lending, whatever ought to be treated as investment advice, assuming at least that the 3 adviser isn't on the opposite side of the transaction 5 from the participant. Is that right? MS. TUTTLE: Yes. 6 MS. PRANGE: Yes. MR. HAUSER: And so -- but there seems to be 9 a disagreement beyond that about what should count -what should count as having kind of the requisite -- I 10 don't know what. Well, there seems to be a 11 disagreement beyond that about what ought to count as 12 13 advice, whether it needs to be individualized, what individualized might mean. But I'm not sure I exactly 14 15 appreciate what the scope of that disagreement is. 16 so maybe, for example, starting with you, Mr. Stein --17 a number of the commenters have worried that absent an 18 individualized sort of requirement, things like analysts' reports, newsletters, you know, these kind of 19 20 general documents that aren't really aimed at a 21 particular person for advice in a particular context

might get picked up by the req. Do you think those

22

		48
1	sorts of things should get picked up?	
2	MR. STEIN: Generally no, and I don't really	
3	think they would be picked up. I think a newsletter	
4	that doesn't that just provides information about	
5	various securities and doesn't say "buy this one" is	
6	not investment advice. I know a number of the	
7	commentators are concerned about those kinds of	
8	questions, but I you know, I think you can read far	
9	too much into these regulations, and at least in my	
10	view, courts have not been unusually sympathetic to the	
11	fringe kinds of claims that some people fear would be	
12	made.	
13	MR. HAUSER: Okay. And then Ms. Prange, I	
14	assume you agree a hundred percent with that statement.	
15	Is that	
16	MR. STEIN: I think that's a joke.	
17	(Laughter)	
18	But	
19	MS. PRANGE: Perhaps I can say I don't	
20	disagree.	
21	MR. STEIN: Okay.	
22	MS. PRANGE: I think our perspective on it	

49

- 1 would be we have hundreds of employees in our call
- 2 center. We train them; we educate them today, based on
- 3 96-1 and other guidance on giving participants
- 4 education and guidance. We clearly don't want, as
- 5 you've said, them inadvertently crossing a line that
- 6 now takes our firm into a fiduciary standard, just
- 7 because they're having a conversation with an
- 8 individual participant. It would not be our goal that
- 9 they would be giving individualized, specific
- 10 recommendations of "invest in Bond Fund A." There may
- 11 be the opportunity for the development of a
- 12 distribution product similar to the advice and managed
- 13 account products that have developed over time that
- 14 could be a fiduciary service. But it needs to be
- 15 clearly defined service with the investment advice
- 16 functions within the service, and not inadvertent
- 17 through a discussion one time with an individual
- 18 participant.
- MR. HAUSER: And so, is the line you're
- 20 drawing or trying to draw with respect to these call
- 21 center folks and the like centered on, you know, sort
- 22 of answering ministerial sorts of questions about what

- 1 the plan provides, what options are available to you,
- 2 as opposed to actually making recommendations about how
- 3 to invest your money? Is that --
- 4 MS. PRANGE: That's correct. We would not
- 5 engage, we do not engage in specific recommendations to
- 6 participants. We need the opportunity to discuss with
- 7 them not only the investment options that have been
- 8 made available in their plan for them to select from
- 9 and the different characteristics of those, but also
- 10 the plan provisions, including distributions and upon
- 11 termination, what options do you have as a form of
- 12 distribution, including leaving assets in the plan,
- 13 taking a lump sum distribution, rolling funds over to
- 14 an IRA provider.
- 15 MR. HAUSER: But not including
- 16 recommendations as to, you know, what IRA provider to
- 17 roll the money into or what investment option the money
- 18 should be rolled into? Or --
- 19 MS. PRANGE: Definitely not from a service
- 20 provider perspective to make a recommendation as to
- 21 what investment those funds should ultimately end up
- 22 invested in, whether it be a bond fund or an equity

- 1 fund. Discussing with plan participants and helping
- 2 them to navigate the options for distribution,
- 3 including how to evaluate where they might go for
- 4 rollover services, we think should be within the
- 5 context of education and guidance. Many participants
- 6 have come to the conclusion that they're going to take
- 7 a distribution from the plan. They work through the
- 8 tax implications and the poor decision of taking a lump
- 9 sum distribution. They evaluate the plan's provisions
- 10 and the investments that are available there and make a
- 11 determination that they don't want to remain in the
- 12 plan and need some opportunity to say, "Where would I
- 13 even go for an IRA?" You can go to your own financial
- 14 institution; you can go to other providers in the
- 15 marketplace for those products.
- MR. HAUSER: Thanks. And then one more
- 17 question. And you also testified about advice with
- 18 respect -- record-keeper sort of advice with respect to
- 19 the fund line-up on a plan's investment menu. And
- 20 again, if you could just maybe explain with a little
- 21 more precision where you think that line ought to be
- 22 drawn? I mean, for example, if the advice being given

is "You should look at these specific funds," or "This is an especially good fund to be on your menu," would you say that advice also shouldn't count as fiduciary 3 advice? Or are you trying to draw the line somewhere south of that? 5 MS. PRANGE: I think it would be predicated 6 based on the information that the service provider has and on which they make that -- that statement. use recommendation loosely here; right? Generally in our business, the plan sponsor will look to us to look 10 across our platform and provide them information about 11 funds that fall within certain criteria that they have 12 13 identified. They're looking for a new bond fund, or to add a bond fund. So bringing forward what is available 14 15 on our platform based on the criteria that the plan 16 sponsor has set or current industry criteria, such as 17 benchmarking, performance, fees, we believe should not 18 fall within a fiduciary definition. MR. PIACENTINI: Mr. Stein, at the beginning 19 20 of your testimony you said that where advice is given 21 in the presence of conflicts, an effect can be to have 22 lower returns and lower retirement income. So my first

- 1 question is, did you mean to apply that observation in
- 2 plans and IRAs both? Both where the advice is given to
- 3 individual participants or IRA owners and where it's
- 4 given to plan fiduciaries?
- 5 MR. STEIN: Well, again, I think you come to
- 6 the question about whether a plan fiduciary is
- 7 sophisticated or not. But I think that the types of
- 8 advice given by somebody with conflicts can -- can
- 9 result in lower returns. And, you know, we know that
- 10 similar funds somehow manage to charge very different
- 11 fees, and the market doesn't seem to provide sufficient
- 12 information to at least participants to really be able
- 13 to measure that very easily.
- MR. PIACENTINI: I think --
- 15 MR. STEIN: It's not a perfectly functioning
- 16 market, I don't think, for these products.
- 17 MR. PIACENTINI: So I think I heard you say
- 18 that it can have these effects. Is it your view or
- 19 your experience that it does have such effects? And
- 20 are those effects common and large, or not common and
- 21 not large?
- MR. STEIN: Well, I think there was -- wasn't

54 there a GAO report on -- issued, I think it was in last year or 2009, which found that conflicted investment advice can in fact result in lower returns? 3 4 MR. PIACENTINI: But I guess I'm asking whether you have personal experience or other beyond --5 the GAO report, I think, was a particular context, more 6 broadly --8 MR. STEIN: Well, I can give you a personal anecdote involving me. When I was -- when I was a 9 visiting professor at University of Texas, I had --10 somebody came in to sell a 403(b) annuity to me and it 11 12 was an insurance company. This was in 1987. And he 13 didn't really explain to me that -- the flat fees and that if I were only going to be at University of Texas 14 15 for a year, it probably wasn't a very good product. 16 Despite my wife's urging, I've never sold -- or never 17 cashed in the insurance contract. It's \$1,000 in 1987; 18 today it's \$1,030. I think he got a good commission, 19 though. 20 MR. PIACENTINI: And your reference to the 21 GAO study is actually a good transition to my other 22 question for you. I think, if I remember the GAO

study, it found that undisclosed conflicts might have these impacts that they reported. Is it your view that disclosure could correct the potential for this harm? 3 4 MR. STEIN: Well, it can mitigate it with 5 respect to some participants. But I bought a car three years ago from a car salesman who told me, I get a 6 commission, but the reason I'm in this business is I want you to get the most car for the least amount of money. And unfortunately, I believed him and I'll 9 probably believe the next car salesman that tells me 10 11 that. 12 MR. PIACENTINI: Thank you. 13 (Laughter) Ms. Prange, your testimony referred in 14 several instances to disclaimers, I guess a form of 15 disclosure, as a positive provision that could be 16 17 included in a rule. So is it your view that these 18 kinds of disclaimers will -- will change the way people will view information they're getting, whether it's 19 advice - - including will individual -- how will 20 21 individual participants behave differently because of a 22 disclaimer?

1 MS. PRANGE: So I believe that in today's disclosure regime, that is what we as an industry and what you as regulators truly believe, with plan sponsor 3 disclosures and participant disclosures on our doorstep -- that we all believe that more disclosure, clear, 5 concise disclosure to the individuals who are making 6 decisions, and leveling the playing field or -- or setting the foundation for the relationship and the roles of each of the parties involved will have an 9 impact on the decisions that are made. 10 MR. PIACENTINI: So I mean, are you drawing a 11 comparison to the rule, for example, that the 12 13 Department has issued that says that participants 14 should be told about the fees associated with their 15 investment options? 16 MS. PRANGE: That's correct. 17 MR. PIACENTINI: Because I think -- I think 18 I'm asking a slightly different question, which is, you know, a disclosure about a relationship or how to 19 interpret information that's being provided as opposed 20 21 to just, you know, sort of factual disclosure about a 22 particular option. So you think that the effects would

57

- 1 be the same?
- 2 MS. PRANGE: I think -- I think what I'm
- 3 saying is that it's a continuation of that thought
- 4 process, that we believe that the current disclosures
- 5 that are coming for plan sponsors and participants
- 6 related to factual information, along with disclosures
- 7 and disclaimers about the relationship and the roles of
- 8 the parties will further enhance each other, and that
- 9 it will put participants in a position, or plan
- 10 sponsors in a position to understand the relationships
- 11 of the parties and the decisions that are to be made by
- 12 each.
- MR. PIACENTINI: Thank you.
- 14 And one question for Ms. Tuttle. You made a
- 15 reference to the uncertainty that was talked about in
- 16 the economic assessment of the rule that the Department
- 17 issued. And you pointed out that -- if I understood
- 18 correctly; I'm going to paraphrase a little bit -- but
- 19 good and independent fiduciary advice can be and is
- 20 available in the marketplace now. So I guess my
- 21 question is, is it your view that that holds for all of
- 22 the different kinds of clients that are sort in play

- 1 here, from IRA owners, plan participants, plan
- 2 fiduciaries? Or are there some kinds of advice where
- 3 that may not be true, where it may be that some other
- 4 types of existing business models that may not be
- 5 independent are really the only efficient way? Or did
- 6 you intend your statement to apply sort of across the
- 7 board to everything that's in play under this rule?
- 8 MS. TUTTLE: Yeah. I intended it to apply to
- 9 the kind of business that we're in. We do not advise
- 10 plan fiduciaries or plan sponsors. I am aware that
- 11 there is a very active consultant community there. But
- 12 we ourselves do not enter into those activities.
- In terms of IRAs, again, we get lots of
- 14 questions in our adviser center from participants who
- 15 are asking about what they should do with their plan --
- 16 if they want to roll it over, they're ready to take a
- 17 disbursement, they -- they're looking for help. We
- 18 also get questions from plan sponsors asking what kind
- 19 of help we might make available to their employees.
- 20 We're not yet in that business. So in terms of what's
- 21 available to IRA participants now, I don't have the
- 22 degree of familiarity as to whether those existing

- 1 structures can provide it. But we can envision, you
- 2 know, a time when it is possible to provide similarly
- 3 disinterested, objective advice to participants when
- 4 they're facing that very complicated decision about
- 5 rolling over the monies that they've accumulated
- 6 throughout their working career. There may be many tax
- 7 complexities. There are complexities around whether
- 8 instruments such as long-term bond funds that could
- 9 help them to best utilize the monies they've
- 10 accumulated would be available through different
- 11 vehicles that aren't available in an employer-sponsored
- 12 plan. So I think there is a role there that will be
- 13 developing and evolving, and we would think that's an
- 14 area for further study and great care in regulating the
- 15 ways that that industry can be nurtured and given the
- 16 same kind of support that the Department has offered to
- 17 other new products and innovation throughout the
- 18 decades.
- MR. PIACENTINI: Thank you.
- 20 MR. LEBOWITZ: Ms. Prange, I just have one
- 21 question for you. It's sort of a follow-up. Go back
- 22 to your -- to your call center and the people you have

- 1 working there. And you started to describe a
- 2 circumstance where people would ask questions about a
- 3 rollover, about taking a lump sum distribution and want
- 4 to understand, I guess, what -- what the process is and
- 5 what they -- what options they have. So how -- how are
- 6 your call center staff instructed in terms of
- 7 responding to those specific questions? If an
- 8 individual calls and said, well, what should I do with
- 9 it? I have it in these funds; can I just put it into a
- 10 JP Morgan account? I mean, what -- what do they tell
- 11 them? How are they trained?
- 12 MS. PRANGE: They're trained generally to
- 13 review the tax implications with a participant, of the
- 14 different types of distribution methods. So you can
- 15 leave the funds in your plan; you'll still have access
- 16 to the investments that are currently offered in the
- 17 plan. Take a distribution; you'll have tax
- 18 implications there. You can roll it over. You can
- 19 roll it over to an IRA. If a participant specifically
- 20 asked whether or not there were JP Morgan IRA products
- 21 available, they would be referred to another area of
- 22 our company that offers those types of products to

- 1 build a relationship there and establish an IRA. But
- 2 generally the call center (inaudible) are directed to
- 3 first and foremost ensure that the participants
- 4 understand what their distribution options are and the
- 5 tax consequences associated with it, with a goal of
- 6 ensuring that they understand the need to protect their
- 7 retirement assets long-term and to avoid situations
- 8 where we see participants taking lump sum distributions
- 9 and wasting the retirement assets that they've built.
- 10 MR. LEBOWITZ: So there's no specific -- it's
- 11 up to the participant to ask a question about other JP
- 12 Morgan services or products? Your people are trained
- 13 not to say anything about it at all; is that right?
- 14 MS. PRANGE: Well, they're trained to walk
- 15 through a dialogue with the participant to -- to ask
- 16 the participant who is on the path of an IRA rollover,
- 17 "Do you have a relationship with a financial
- 18 institution that can provide you those types of
- 19 services?" Banks often offer those; other mutual fund
- 20 companies do. A participant who -- who does not have a
- 21 current financial institution or does not seem to have
- 22 any direction on where they might go for an IRA might

- 1 be told that those products are available at JP Morgan
- 2 if they have interest in those products. But then it's
- 3 up to the participant to specifically state that
- 4 they're interested in those products before they would
- 5 be referred to someone in one of our broker-dealers
- 6 that could assist them.
- 7 MR. LEBOWITZ: I guess -- I guess actually I
- 8 had one other question for you. As I was listening to
- 9 your testimony, I wasn't quite sure I understood what
- 10 your -- what's the right word -- vision is. I mean, if
- 11 you were constructing the regulation, what would it
- 12 look like? What -- would it be principally a
- 13 disclosure regulation? You put a lot of emphasis on
- 14 clarity and on disclosure, I think. Is that basically
- 15 it? If you check boxes that I gave people 27 pieces of
- 16 paper, then that's enough, no matter what? Or does it
- 17 still leave -- or it struck me that you were still
- 18 leaving a lot of subjectivity and a lot of ambiguity
- 19 about the actual relationship that might be created
- 20 between the individual and -- and the adviser.
- 21 MS. PRANGE: I don't think that that was our
- 22 intent. I think that the relationship between the

63 individual and the adviser is one of our primary concerns, and that it's a -- that it's a mutual understanding of what that relationship is going to be, 3 first and foremost. And that once established, then that the provider clearly discloses when -- when 5 there's an opportunity for a conflict or when they are acting in a sales role as opposed to an advisory role. 8 MR. LEBOWITZ: Okay. 9 Thank you all very much. Next panel: Marc Machiz, Charles Nelson, and 10 11 Ken Bentsen. 12 (Pause) 13 Can we all settle down, please? Everybody sit down. Thank you. 14 Mr. Machiz? 15 16 MR. MACHIZ: Mr. Lebowitz, Madam Assistant Secretary and the rest of the panel -- good morning. My name is Marc Machiz. I'm here today to testify on 18 behalf of the National Employment Lawyers Association, NELA. We represent the interests of participants and 20 21 beneficiaries in plans. 22 So, two trustees on an expense account walk

```
64
    into a fancy restaurant and scan the menu. The first
    trustee, a devotee --
 3
              MR. LEBOWITZ: They would never do that,
 4
   would they?
              (Laughter)
 5
              Go into a fancy restaurant?
 6
              MR. MACHIZ: No, not a trustee. Well, it's a
   big plan. They have a lot of money.
              The first trustee, a devotee of the efficient
 9
   menu theory of fine dining, closes his eyes and points
10
    randomly at the menu and hits a free-range chicken -- a
11
   boring but relatively low-cost alternative. The second
12
13
    trustee looks up at the waiter and decides to ask his
    advice.
            "What's my best choice?" The waiter looks at
14
    him and says, "Got any food allergies?"
15
    you, sir, the foie gras-encrusted Gila monster special
16
17
    with truffled oysters, I assure you it is magnificent."
    "But what's it cost?" The waiter scratches his chin,
18
    looks puzzled, and says, "Market price. I'd have to
19
    check in the kitchen and get back to you. But it's
20
21
    unforgettable. Hard on the goose, silk on the palate."
22
    (Laughter) At bottom, the opponents of the proposed
```

- 1 regulation want plans to deal with investment advisers
- 2 the way our trustees dealt with the restaurant. The
- 3 trustees will tip the waiter for his advice, but
- 4 they're not entitled to a disinterested dinner
- 5 recommendation. The up-sale is not confined to fancy
- 6 restaurants, though investment pitches are more likely
- 7 to glaze over the recipient's eyeballs than wet the
- 8 palate.
- 9 We're here to express our support for the
- 10 basic policy choices made by the Department; discuss a
- 11 few of the concerns raised in the comments; and make a
- 12 few suggestions to better protect plan participants
- 13 from poor or conflicted advice.
- 14 The thrust of the Department's proposed
- 15 regulation is to require most people making money by
- 16 recommending investments or managers to plans -- plan
- 17 fiduciaries, plan participants -- to do so subject to
- 18 ERISA's fiduciary duties. There are exceptions,
- 19 importantly, where advice is provided by a principal
- 20 dealing with a plan or an agent for such a principal.
- 21 The would-be adviser may disclaim fiduciary status by
- 22 informing the participant of his advice that he has

- 1 interests adverse to the plan and will not undertake to
- 2 provide impartial advice.
- NELA thinks the Department's basic policy
- 4 choice is both common-sense and consistent with the
- 5 straightforward language of the statute. The task of
- 6 the Department should always have been to define
- 7 investment advice so as to distinguish it from mere
- 8 education, generalized financial journalism, and simple
- 9 sales or marketing where the parties were clear that
- 10 they were on opposite sides of the transaction. If
- 11 someone engaged in a trade adverse to a plan, it is
- 12 fair to hold him to fiduciary standards unless he
- 13 declares himself adverse to the plan. Even so, when
- 14 the recipient of the advice is an individual
- 15 participant or beneficiary, we question whether a
- 16 simple declaration of adverse interest should be
- 17 sufficient to relieve an adviser of fiduciary status.
- 18 And that's what my colleague, Norm Stein, addressed in
- 19 the prior panel.
- Now SIFMA, as I understand it, objects that
- 21 routinely making broker-dealers fiduciaries will
- 22 interfere with transactions beneficial to plans by

- 1 rendering them prohibited transactions. Whether
- 2 exceptions should be made to prohibited transaction
- 3 rules to allow transactions in which the fiduciary
- 4 adviser or his affiliates have some financial interest
- 5 is a matter appropriately left to the Department in the
- 6 exemptions process. These issues will only arise when
- 7 a person or entity who does have some financial
- 8 interest in the advice being given will nevertheless be
- 9 obligated to provide impartial advice. The exemption
- 10 process was designed for precisely this purpose; we
- 11 should let it work.
- 12 Indeed, NELA believes that the Department in
- 13 some respects did not go far enough to protect plans,
- 14 plan fiduciaries and participants from poor advice.
- 15 Under the proposal, persons giving individualized
- 16 investment advice may nevertheless avoid fiduciary
- 17 status because they did not actually agree in advance
- 18 that their investment advice would be individualized
- 19 and agree that the advice to be provided may be
- 20 considered in connection with making investment or
- 21 management decisions. This is probably the most
- 22 important point I want to make. Fiduciary status

- 1 should depend solely on the nature of the advice
- 2 provided for a fee. plans and plan fiduciaries in the
- 3 ordinary course will contract for investment advice.
- 4 Full stop. That's all the contract need say. It
- 5 should be presumed that the advice may be used to make
- 6 investment or management decisions. Why else are you
- 7 contracting for it? Why else would -- simply omitting
- 8 from the agreement to obtain advice a written
- 9 requirement or a oral requirement that the advice be
- 10 individualized or a recital about how the advice might
- 11 be used should not relieve the adviser of fiduciary
- 12 responsibility.
- 13 Ironically, SIFMA and others read the current
- 14 regulation to permit them to avoid fiduciary status in
- 15 exactly this way. By omitting some or all of the magic
- 16 language of the regulation from their formal agreements
- 17 with plan fiduciaries, they provide themselves with a
- 18 shield from liability. As they would have it, no mere
- 19 adviser is a fiduciary except one who agrees as a
- 20 matter of contract to be a fiduciary. But SIFMA's
- 21 approach provides no protection at all to participants,
- 22 plans, or plan fiduciaries that are on the receiving

- 1 end of bad investment advice. Instead, this approach
- 2 protects those advising plans from being found to be a
- 3 fiduciary.
- In any event, we question whether the
- 5 requirement that advice must be individualized makes
- 6 sense at all when the advice is provided to individual
- 7 participants and beneficiaries. Again, this was one of
- 8 the issues addressed by Norm Stein in the Pension
- 9 Rights Center testimony.
- 10 Some of those commenting have sought more
- 11 specifics about what is meant by individualized advice.
- 12 This is a fair question. We think it means simply
- 13 advice directed at the recipient. When I call my
- 14 broker and say, "Bernie" -- and that's Levine, not
- 15 Madoff -- (laughter) -- "what should I buy?" And he
- 16 says, "Marc, I think you should buy Cisco," that's
- 17 individualized advice. It doesn't matter that he's
- 18 telling all his clients to buy Cisco or only those with
- 19 a high appetite for risk, or only those clients who
- 20 like me are bald and fat. He's telling me what to do.
- 21 Whether or not he has an intellectually respectable
- 22 reason for giving me that advice should not affect

70 whether the advice triggers fiduciary status. But if I ask my broker to send me his firm's 2 research on Cisco, and that research contains a buy 3 rating and a price target available to all the firm's 4 clients, that advice is not individualized and arguably 5 should not carry with it fiduciary responsibility, at 6 least when it's provided to plan fiduciaries. Again, the issue of confusion of individual plan participants 9 comes up. 10 While the broker-dealers contend that they should be fiduciaries only when they agree to be 11 fiduciaries, the appraisers insist that their duty to 12 13 provide independent, professional, disinterested opinions of value is inconsistent with fiduciary 14 15 Frankly, this perspective baffles us. 16 appraisers appear to believe that being a fiduciary 17 would require them to give dishonest opinions of value 18 that are shaded in favor of their plan client -shaving the valuation when the plan is the buy and 19 20 pumping it up when the plan is the seller. But plan 21 fiduciaries seek appraisers to provide them with an 22 honest opinion of value -- at least we hope so. Loyalty

71

- 1 in an appraiser consists of providing an honest
- 2 opinion, not a deliberate distortion. If a plan
- 3 fiduciary asked a professional appraiser for a
- 4 dishonest appraisal or to act in a transaction as an
- 5 advocate of a value different from his honest opinion,
- 6 the assignment would indeed violate the professional
- 7 ethics of appraisers. The appraiser should turn the
- 8 assignment down.
- 9 The appraisers seem to fear that holding them
- 10 to a fiduciary standard of care will require them to do
- 11 more than they must do now and prohibit them from
- 12 qualifying their appraisals, by, for example, noting
- 13 that they have not independently verified the company's
- 14 financial statements in the way that an auditor does.
- 15 But nothing in ERISA requires a fiduciary who
- 16 is not a trustee to do more than the job he's hired to
- 17 do. The Department should make clear that an appraiser
- 18 may limit the scope of his opinion. Fiduciary status
- 19 will, however, carry with it co-fiduciary liability. If
- 20 an appraiser learns of a breach by another fiduciary,
- 21 he will have a duty to blow the whistle and not stand
- 22 idly by.

1	The appraisers also argue that since they're
2	already held to a professional standard of care, making
3	them fiduciaries adds little protections for plans, but
4	does increase costs. The fact is that a plan fiduciary
5	who hires an appraiser will rarely pursue malpractice
6	remedies where he may also be liable in connection with
7	the same transaction as the appraiser. Making
8	appraisers who act in transactions fiduciaries gives
9	the Department, as well as plan participants, an
10	important enforcement tool to assure that appraisers
11	adhere to the high professional standards they already
12	support as a profession.
13	In the proposed regulation, the Department
14	excludes from the advice that gives rise to fiduciary
15	status either marketing or making available platforms
16	from which a fiduciary may designate investment
17	alternatives in those cases where the person marketing
18	or making available the platform disclaims an intent to
19	provide impartial advice. To obtain an exclusion from
20	fiduciary status, such a person should not merely
21	disclaim an intent to provide impartial advice. He
22	should disclose in detail the nature of his financial

- 1 incentives to provide the particular choices in the
- 2 platform. Otherwise, a person says, well, these
- 3 choices aren't impartial, but why? Where is the hidden
- 4 -- where is the hidden trap for me? That needs to be
- 5 disclosed if people are going to get out from being
- 6 fiduciaries.
- 7 Moreover, this exclusion makes little sense
- 8 to us unless the platform in question provides a broad
- 9 range of choices to the fiduciary that agrees to choose
- 10 from it. On the other hand, if the platform provider
- 11 wants to give advice as to which managers or options
- 12 within a platform should be selected, then it seems to
- 13 us that that becomes -- that that must be fiduciary,
- 14 individual advice.
- 15 And finally, we are concerned that the
- 16 preamble to the final regulation make clear how much of
- 17 what is clarified in the regulation is already
- 18 reflected in the Department's interpretation of the
- 19 existing regulation. It is clear from reading the
- 20 comments that some believe that advice with regard to
- 21 the selection of investment managers is not investment
- 22 advice within the meaning of the existing regulation.

- 1 But the Department has stated repeatedly that such
- 2 advice can qualify as investment advice under the
- 3 existing regulation. Likewise, advice given to plan
- 4 fiduciaries, including advice to fiduciaries of pooled
- 5 vehicles holding plan assets would be advice to a plan
- 6 under the current regulation. Similarly, advice paid
- 7 for by third parties after payment of commissions can
- 8 be investment advice, as well, under the current
- 9 regulation. It would be ironic indeed if parties used
- 10 this clarification -- the clarifications in the new
- 11 regulation to argue that their advice escapes coverage
- 12 under the old regulation.
- We wish the Department well with its efforts
- 14 to assure that plans, plan fiduciaries, participants,
- 15 and beneficiaries have available to them impartial and
- 16 prudent investment advice. It may always be perilous
- 17 for plans to send their trustees out for a fine meal at
- 18 a fancy restaurant. But plan and participant
- 19 investments are far too important to let advisers treat
- 20 those investments as just one more daily special.
- Thank you.
- MR. LEBOWITZ: Mr. Nelson.

75 1 MR. NELSON: Good morning. And thank you for the opportunity to testify at this hearing. I think I now understand why I'm in the middle. 3 4 (Laughter) I'm the President 5 My name is Charles Nelson. of Great-West Retirement Services and Great-West Life 6 and Annuity Insurance Company. WE are the fourth largest retirement plan record-keeper in the United States, providing 401(k), 401(a), 403(b), and 457 plan 9 retirement services to 24,000 plan sponsors, 4.4 10 million retirement participant accounts, and \$138 11 billion in assets. 12 ERISA's fiduciary provisions are the 13 cornerstone of our voluntary employee benefit system, 14 and I commend the Department for holding this hearing 15 16 as an important first step in a process to fully 17 understand and consider the proposal's effect on 18 participants and plans. Let me first start by saying that my testimony today is not a defense of the status 19 20 There are legitimate concerns of the current 21 regulation, and I think it is appropriate to review a standard established more than 35 years ago. There are 22

- 1 provisions in the proposal we support. However, we
- 2 find many more are ambiguous, and we are deeply
- 3 concerned that others will set the retirement industry
- 4 back 25 years by dramatically increasing costs to
- 5 401(k) participants and plan sponsors, eliminating
- 6 advancements that provide DC plans with greater
- 7 efficiencies and cost savings through open architecture
- 8 investment platforms; and substantially curtailing plan
- 9 distribution, communication, education, and counseling,
- 10 reducing the availability of information participants
- 11 need to make informed decisions about their
- 12 distribution options.
- We believe that the Department dramatically
- 14 underestimated, or in the case of IRAs, did not
- 15 estimate at all the cost of the proposal and its
- 16 unintended consequences, while overestimating the
- 17 benefits of the proposal. Our formal comment letter
- 18 raised many issues for your consideration, but in my
- 19 limited time this morning I will focus on several
- 20 particular concerns.
- 21 We believe the Department's intended policies
- 22 are not clear from the text of the proposal, preventing

- 1 thorough public review and comment. Crucial terms such
- 2 as the new form of fiduciary management advice are not
- 3 defined, making it impossible for the regulated
- 4 community to know with certainty what conduct is
- 5 intended to be covered. Revising and re-proposing the
- 6 rule for public review and comment will enable the
- 7 Department to articulate a clear standard. Rather than
- 8 speculating on what the rule might mean, commenters
- 9 will be able to offer more meaningful comments on what
- 10 the rule would actually do. We believe this is the
- 11 best way to comply with the requirements of the
- 12 regulatory process and ensure the rules result in
- 13 greater protection, not greater litigation.
- 14 Despite our concerns about the proposal as a
- 15 whole, we are encouraged that the Department included
- 16 an exception for operating a platform and for providing
- 17 information about the available investments. We are
- 18 pleased the proposal recognizes that offering a
- 19 platform of investment options is not a fiduciary act
- 20 under current law and should not be under any new
- 21 regulation. However, we believe the language in the
- 22 exception is too narrow. A significant issue is that

- 1 the platform must be made available, quote, "without
- 2 regard to the individualized needs of the plan." If
- 3 the intent of this language is to limit the exception
- 4 to true platform providers, we support this intent.
- 5 Unfortunately, it is all too common to see a DC plan
- 6 adviser or consultant custom-build a target date or
- 7 life cycle fund for a plan, but disclaim his or her
- 8 fiduciary status. These fiduciary service providers
- 9 should not be able to escape their duty by falsely
- 10 claiming to be a platform provider. However, the
- 11 individualized need language is too broad. A
- 12 legitimate platform operator cannot provide its
- 13 ordinary services without taking into account the
- 14 individual and varying needs of its plan clients.
- 15 We are also concerned that it is not clear
- 16 what the Department meant by limiting the exception to
- 17 providing general financial information about platform
- 18 investments. We offer our plan clients diagnostic
- 19 tools providing comparisons between options using
- 20 objective data regarding common fund metrics. Unless
- 21 the rule clarifies that such tools are considered
- 22 general financial information, platform providers

- 1 likely will not offer them, making it harder and more
- 2 expensive for plans to select and monitor options,
- 3 particularly small plan providers or plan sponsors.
- 4 Similarly, we believe that general financial
- 5 information should include information platform
- 6 providers provide related to plan mapping and
- 7 conversion, such as assistance in determining which
- 8 platform options are similar to the prior plan
- 9 investments. Finally, the platform exception should
- 10 expressly state that the platform operator is complying
- 11 with the process outlined in the Aetna Advisory Opinion
- 12 97-16A for removing and replacing investment funds are
- 13 not providing investment advice.
- 14 The sales exception is also vital to platform
- 15 operators. However, we are concerned that the
- 16 exception as written would not work in practice. First,
- 17 the proposal should expressly recognize that the sales
- 18 exception is not limited to a specific point at the
- 19 beginning of the relationship. Information related to
- 20 sales is exchanged on an ongoing basis as plans make
- 21 changes to fund line-ups or implement new design
- 22 features months or years later. It is this aspect

- 1 which will eliminate open architecture fund choices by
- 2 plan sponsors, as providers will set fund line-ups and
- 3 not be able to change them without risking becoming an
- 4 investment fiduciary.
- 5 Secondly, we do not believe it legally
- 6 accurate to use the term "adverse" to describe the
- 7 service provider/plan relationship during a sale.
- 8 Financial service providers are not engaged in caveat
- 9 emptor transactions with their clients. Federal and
- 10 state laws require financial service providers to take
- 11 into account the needs of their clients under the
- 12 prevailing duty of care. As a result of these legal
- 13 duties, a regulated service provider cannot properly be
- 14 considered adverse to his or her client. We believe
- 15 the Department's intention can be achieved by using a
- 16 better-suited phrase such as the adviser has a
- 17 financial interest, rather than an adverse interest.
- 18 The exception for certain valuations for
- 19 reporting and disclosure properly recognizes that not
- 20 all valuations should be subject to fiduciary status,
- 21 but it does not go far enough. We recommend exemptions
- 22 not conditioned on reporting and disclosure,

- 1 specifically: First, we urge the Department to clarify
- 2 that passing through a valuation performed by another
- 3 is not in itself a fiduciary act. Second, that --
- 4 clarify that the fair value pricing affected in
- 5 connection with underlying open-ended registered
- 6 investment company funds, for example, is also not a
- 7 fiduciary act. And finally, we believe the proposal
- 8 needs a general exception for valuations associated
- 9 with insurance products. The concern in the preamble
- 10 appears to focus on hard-to-value assets like closely-
- 11 held employer stock or certain pieces of real estate.
- 12 By contrast, group annuity insurance products and other
- 13 insurance investment contracts are readily valued, but
- 14 are not traded. We don't believe insurance companies
- 15 and their employees should be fiduciaries for
- 16 mechanically calculating a value of a contract for the
- 17 purpose of a participant's minimum distribution
- 18 requirement.
- 19 Another important issue is that the proposal
- 20 may have inadvertently created ambiguity regarding the
- 21 fiduciary status of bundled service providers. Aetna
- 22 Advisory Opinion 97-16A expresses the Department's view

- 1 that a record-keeper is not a fiduciary to the plan
- 2 merely because of one of its affiliates is a fiduciary.
- 3 We urge the Department to clarify in the proposal that
- 4 a record-keeper in a bundled service arrangement will
- 5 not be considered a fiduciary itself merely as a result
- 6 of its affiliation with a person who is a fiduciary.
- 7 Bundled service providers offer a very valuable and
- 8 cost-effective service to plans, and without
- 9 clarification of the paragraph, investment managers who
- 10 also perform record-keeping will likely stop performing
- 11 record-keeping. This will result in drastically
- 12 reduced record-keeping competition, with a
- 13 corresponding increase in record-keeping prices to
- 14 plans and participants.
- 15 Finally, we are concerned about the future of
- 16 advice to IRA holders and distribution counseling for
- 17 participants. IRAs are inherently different. They are
- 18 not ERISA plans. IRAs have no fiduciary-making
- 19 decisions on behalf of participants, and thus no need
- 20 for the highly protective structure of ERISA's
- 21 fiduciary provisions. The Department chose to not
- 22 apply the interim final 408(b)(2) rules to IRAs due to

- 1 concerns about disjointed regulation across retirement
- 2 products, and should do so again in this proposal.
- We are also concerned that if a 401(k) plan
- 4 distribution counseling becomes fiduciary investment
- 5 advice, it will be even more difficult for participants
- 6 to get the information they need to make informed
- 7 decisions. Non-fiduciary service providers provide
- 8 valuable information to workers, and preventing them
- 9 from discussing distribution options or providing IRA
- 10 rollover services would serve to limit the choices of
- 11 individual workers.
- 12 Similarly, the Department should use its
- 13 discretion again to avoid requiring Code 457 plan
- 14 sponsors which are not covered by ERISA to be subject
- 15 to these proposed regulations simply because a 457 plan
- 16 participant seeks to roll over assets to an IRA.
- 17 We believe the Department has identified some
- 18 valid concerns with the existing regulation. But we
- 19 also believe that the proposal as written does not
- 20 work. We should not create new problems while trying
- 21 to solve old ones.
- I appreciate the opportunity to help you work

		84
1	through this process and happy to answer any questions	
2	you may have.	
3	MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you.	
4	Mr. Bentsen?	
5	MR. BENTSEN: Thank you.	
6	Good morning. I'm Ken Bentsen. I'm	
7	Executive Vice President for Public Policy and Advocacy	
8	at the Securities Industry and Financial Markets	
9	Association. We appreciate the Department's decision	
10	to hold this hearing on the proposal and hope that our	
11	comments are helpful to the Department as it assesses	
12	the impact of the proposal on plans and their	
13	participants.	
14	We believe this regulation is far broader	
15	than the aims it seeks to address. It imposes	
16	fiduciary status without a relationship to a plan and	
17	creates prohibited transactions and co-fiduciary	
18	liability on entities who have no understanding with a	
19	plan or an IRA that any service at all will be	
20	provided.	
21	The Department also states that participants	
22	and beneficiaries would directly benefit from the	

- 1 Department's more efficient allocation of enforcement
- 2 resources by providing greater protections than are
- 3 available under the current regulation. However, no
- 4 example or explanation of this benefit is provided that
- 5 would justify these sweeping changes. We believe there
- 6 is no evidence that the proposed regulation will be
- 7 more protective, but a great deal of evidence that
- 8 these protected accounts will suffer greater cost and
- 9 fewer choices. New asset-based advisory fees to
- 10 replace commission spread-based structure; additional
- 11 transaction cost; elimination of investment options and
- 12 alternative vehicles; constriction of the dealer
- 13 market; limits on permissible assets in IRAs; and the
- 14 elimination of pricing of anything other than publicly
- 15 traded assets.
- 16 The Department suggests that the proposed
- 17 regulation will benefit its enforcement program by
- 18 helping to resolve difficult factual questions and
- 19 enforcement challenges by removing the requirements
- 20 that advice be provided on a regular basis, based on
- 21 the parties' mutual understanding, and that it serve as
- 22 the primary basis for plan investment decisions. This

- 1 proposed rule would reverse 35 years of case law,
- 2 enforcement policy, and the understanding of plans and
- 3 plan service providers without any legislative
- 4 direction to depart from the Department's
- 5 contemporaneous understanding of the statute in order
- 6 to make it easier for the Department to sue service
- 7 providers. That seems to us to be an inadequate basis
- 8 for proposing such a dramatic change. And of course,
- 9 this enforcement rationale cannot apply to our IRAs,
- 10 over which the Department has no enforcement authority.
- 11 This rule would appear to be, in fact, in
- 12 conflict with recent action by Congress. Just six
- 13 months ago in section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street
- 14 Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Congress asked the
- 15 Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study
- 16 on investment advisers and broker-dealers and the
- 17 distinctions between them when providing personalized
- 18 investment advice, and further authorized the SEC to
- 19 promulgate a rule establishing a uniform standard of
- 20 care for the provision of such advice. SIFMA strongly
- 21 supported this provision of the Dodd-Frank Act. The
- 22 SEC has now presented its study to Congress and

- 1 recommended that the Commission adopt such a standard
- 2 that, based on the SEC study and direction from
- 3 Congress, would appear to be quite different from the
- 4 standard being proposed in the DOL's proposed rule.
- 5 In addition, FINRA has proposed changes to
- 6 the Know Your Customer and Suitability rules. The
- 7 preamble of the DOL's proposed regulation notes that
- 8 the Department does not have the cost data regarding
- 9 how that conclusion alone would implicate the
- 10 prohibited transaction rules of ERISA and the code. One
- 11 would hope that the agencies will coordinate rulemaking
- 12 so that the change in the standard of conduct would be
- 13 effective at the same time that this regulation and the
- 14 changes in the necessary prohibited transaction trading
- 15 exemptions were effective.
- 16 Importantly, the section 913 study does not
- 17 suggest or recommend ERISA-like fiduciary duties with
- 18 its attendant prohibited transaction, but rather a
- 19 uniform standard of care that is business model fee-
- 20 neutral and permits principal trading commission-based
- 21 arrangements in sale of proprietary products -- all
- 22 activities that ERISA's prohibited transaction rules

- 1 would prohibit for fiduciaries. The SEC 913 study
- 2 changes the standard of care without requiring all
- 3 trading practices and products to be reconsidered. The
- 4 SEC approach is carefully tailored to help retail
- 5 accounts without increasing their cost, eliminating
- 6 their choices, and making their trading less efficient.
- 7 If all brokers who provide market color or
- 8 investment information are deemed to be fiduciaries
- 9 regardless of the intentions of the parties, the vast
- 10 majority of commission-based accounts may move towards
- 11 fee-based asset arrangements. Securities and currency
- 12 transactions that were formerly executed with a dealer
- 13 as principal will be executed on an agency basis
- 14 against a third party dealer, subjecting the account to
- 15 an asset-based fee plus commissions and markups. The
- 16 effect of these changes on the capital markets should
- 17 be studied by the agencies with jurisdiction over the
- 18 securities market.
- The Department's proposals would deem a
- 20 broker a fiduciary merely because it is complying with
- 21 industry rules intended to set standards for brokers
- 22 who are not investment advisers. Without some

- 1 clarification, brokers may simply refuse to effect
- 2 solicited trades for plans if, by calling a client with
- 3 investment ideas or market color, they back themselves
- 4 into fiduciary status. Accordingly, any suggestions,
- 5 array of alternatives or recommendations from a futures
- 6 merchant such as market or liquidity or time of day of
- 7 a trade, regardless of whether the plan is represented
- 8 by its own third party investment manager, may make the
- 9 futures merchant a fiduciary and its receipt of a
- 10 commission a prohibited transaction.
- In addition, we are concerned about the
- 12 impact on swap transactions. During the debate over
- 13 the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress considered the question of
- 14 a counterparty providing a fiduciary duty to plans, and
- 15 it rejected such an approach because it wanted to be
- 16 sure that plans could continue to engage in swaps.
- 17 However, this proposal would make it nearly impossible
- 18 for plans to engage in swaps, denying plans an
- 19 important risk management tool used by most major plans
- 20 and corporations.
- The Department's cost estimates focus on the
- 22 cost to service providers and not to the cost to plans

- 1 and IRA holders. While we believe the Department
- 2 greatly underestimated such costs, more importantly we
- 3 think this emphasis is misplaced. The real question is
- 4 the cost to plans and their participants and the impact
- 5 on their retirement savings.
- And even the list of uncertainties has not
- 7 once mentioned IRAs. IRAs hold more than \$4.3 trillion
- 8 of assets as of March 20, '10. The vast majority of
- 9 these assets are in self-directed accounts. The cost
- 10 to such account holders would be significant, in our
- 11 view. Data collected for a study SIFMA commissioned
- 12 from Oliver Wyman comprised of 33 percent of households
- 13 and 25 percent of retail investments suggested over 95
- 14 percent of households with investments hold commission-
- 15 based accounts, with a strong preference among the
- 16 small investor segment. These accounts hold \$58
- 17 billion of fixed income securities purchased through
- 18 commission-based accounts. If these self-directed non-
- 19 fiduciary accounts were to be deemed fiduciary accounts
- 20 as proposed, all fixed income securities would be
- 21 required to be purchased from broker-dealers
- 22 unaffiliated with the account's primary broker, at an

- 1 additional cost of 23 to 27 basis points each year.
- 2 While PTE 86-128 permits fiduciaries to select
- 3 themselves or an affiliate to effect agency trades for
- 4 a commission, there is no exemption that permits a
- 5 fiduciary to sell a fixed income security or any other
- 6 asset on a principal basis to a fiduciary account. The
- 7 result of that prohibition is that the broker would
- 8 trade away from his own firm, charging commission to
- 9 the trade on top of the markup charged by the selling
- 10 dealer.
- 11 It's also important to note that a potential
- 12 effect would be that most of these plans, if not all of
- 13 these plans, would become -- that would be governed by
- 14 this new fiduciary standard would shift completely to
- 15 an advisory fee model, which based on our data
- 16 indicates a much higher cost. And I would point out
- 17 that SIFMA represents both brokers and investment
- 18 advisers, but we also recognize there is a difference
- 19 in the cost provided for that service.
- The Department suggests that the cost of
- 21 complying with the new regulations will be \$10 million
- 22 in 2011 for existing service providers to analyze their

- 1 plan relationships and almost one million each year
- 2 thereafter for new service providers to do a compliance
- 3 review. The analysis does not include banks, trust
- 4 companies, fund administrators, private funds, FX
- 5 dealers, all of whom sell products to plans and may be
- 6 fiduciaries under the proposed regulation. The
- 7 analysis does not include advisers, which we think is
- 8 mistaken, since the rule imposes additional fiduciary
- 9 requirements on advisers simply because of the status
- 10 test for fiduciaries and advisers. The Department's
- 11 estimates are based on the Form 5500 data and thus
- 12 ignore the entire IRA universe.
- The estimates ignore the costs of retooling
- 14 all of the systems which create a compliance structure
- 15 for the 4,500 broker-dealers in this country alone,
- 16 ignoring the insurance agents, banks, and trust
- 17 companies, consultants, appraisers, record-keepers,
- 18 each of whom will have similar costs. The estimates
- 19 also ignore the costs of retraining hundreds of
- 20 thousands of professionals, of revising every plan
- 21 service provider contract, of changing how transactions
- 22 are effected in the principal markets such as fixed

- 1 income and currency, and the cost of the scores of
- 2 exemptions that will be required. The estimates also
- 3 ignore the additional fees and commissions that plans
- 4 and IRAs will incur to do all transactions away from
- 5 the broker-dealer, resulting in both markups and
- 6 commissions. The estimates ignore the constraints that
- 7 the regulation will put on dealers who disseminate
- 8 research or opinions publicly or privately to the plan
- 9 sponsor or to fiduciaries. The trading cost to plans
- 10 of dealing only with smaller dealers who are
- 11 institutional only are critical components of any cost
- 12 study, in our opinion. Finally, the estimates ignore
- 13 the cost of the litigation that will ensue because of
- 14 the lack of certainty or the lack of mutual
- 15 understanding between parties.
- On behalf of its members, SIFMA respectfully
- 17 urges the Department to reconsider its proposed changes
- 18 to the definition of "fiduciary" regulation, to
- 19 reassess its economic analysis, and to confer with
- 20 FINRA, the SEC, and the CFTC on the interaction of
- 21 these changes with these requirements of Dodd-Frank.
- 22 Thank you for permitting us to testify today, and we'd

94 be happy to answer your questions. MS. BORZI: Well, I thank all three of you 2 for your testimony. And in the spirit of the new 3 4 executive order, in lieu of my asking each of you questions, I'd like each of you to ask your panelists, 5 because the executive order wants comments on comments. So why don't we start with you, Mr. Bentsen. What question would you have for your fellow panelists? MR. BENTSEN: Well, that was a curveball that 9 I thought might be asked, but I can't say I'm 10 completely prepared. 11 But --12 MS. BORZI: That's the point. 13 (Laughter) 14 For all of you to be unprepared. MR. BENTSEN: Kind of like a dissertation 15 16 presentation. 17 MS. BORZI: I used to be an academic. 18 MR. BENTSEN: I know, so Well, I think that I would ask Marc, where we're concerned, you raised questions, the issues involving disclosure of 21 publicly available data, and questions related, for instance, to research reports and the like. And that 22

if that were -- if I were to ask my broker to provide me information or my broker sends me a research report but it's not deemed personal to me, that's not 3 necessarily investment advice. I guess our concern is that the rule is so broadly written and research --5 analysts' reports, for instance will often have a buy, hold or sell provision on it. How are -- how is -- how are we not to know, if we're doing that through our affiliate and we're providing it to you, that all of a sudden we don't become a fiduciary under this rule, 10 particularly after the fact? And so our concern is 11 things like may consider the provision of advice is so 12 13 broad that we really don't know if at any time after the fact we're going to be considered a fiduciary and 14 15 held responsible for advice that wasn't really given 16 directly to that individual. 17 MR. MACHIZ: There's a question in there 18 somewhere, and I intend to find it. The -- oddly 19 enough, your statement is to me is -- parallels very

much the question that I was -- that I was looking to

ask you, which is why is it that SIFMA, in writing its

testimony, seems to assume that almost any interaction

20

21

between a broker-dealer and a client, for example you mentioned a call with regard to market color, that the stock has moved. Getting back to my broker Bernie, he 3 calls me and he knows what I own a lot of, and if 5 there's news on a story -- there's a news story that's moved one of those particular stocks, either that I own or I've told him I'm interested in, he calls me up and says, Hey, Marc, did you see, you know, your stock just 9 cut in half because they announced that, you know, some disastrous FDA motion? And I say, Thanks a lot, 10 I appreciate the telephone call. But why are 11 calls like this, which are simply intended to provide 12 13 information, why do you presume that that's what the Department meant by individualized advice? 14 15 if all that kind of interaction between -that is basically informational and is not, you know, 16 17 "sell that pig" were deemed to be fiduciary advice, I 18 think your members would indeed have a huge problem. 19 But one thing: (a), I don't believe the 20 Department meant that, and (b), I suspect -- although 21 they won't say that because they're trained not to tell

us what they're going to do -- to us today, I suspect

- 1 they'd be happy to clarify that the meaning of advice,
- 2 individualized or otherwise, that they're describing
- 3 would -- at least when it's provided to plan
- 4 fiduciaries -- is much narrower than what -- than what
- 5 I think SIFMA fears that it -- that it is.
- 6 MR. BENTSEN: Well, then to the Assistant
- 7 Secretary's point, this may be very instructional to
- 8 you. Because from our standpoint, this goes -- in our
- 9 view, this is so overly broad and vague, we don't know.
- 10 And so we don't have the clarity. And so from our
- 11 vantage point, that creates huge risks for us in what
- 12 we provide, and that results in really one of two
- 13 options, in our view, from the standpoint of members
- 14 who provide services either to plans or to the IRA
- 15 market. And that is one, you stop; and two,
- 16 particularly as it relates to IRAs, you convert them
- 17 completely to an asset-based account as opposed to --
- 18 as opposed to a commission-based account. And based
- 19 upon our data, particularly for smaller IRAs where
- 20 trades are very limited, the asset-based account is
- 21 going to cost more.
- 22 So to our -- in our view, that is contrary to

- 1 what the intent -- some of the intent, we would think,
- 2 behind this rule is, which is to be to the benefit of
- 3 the -- of the beneficiary, and that would be working
- 4 against the beneficiary. But to be fair, I think the
- 5 exchange raises the concern that we have that there is
- 6 a lack of clarity.
- 7 MR. MACHIZ: Right. And I guess the question
- 8 that I would ask you is why -- why is it that SIFMA
- 9 thinks the way to resolve that lack of clarity is --
- 10 seems to be to simply allow a broker-dealer to enter
- 11 into a contract that says we are not going to provide
- 12 you with individualized advice or advice that will
- 13 serve as a primary basis, and by having entered into
- 14 that agreement, assuming that really is the agreement,
- 15 you say, well, okay, now whatever I say, I have this
- 16 agreement, so I may provide individualized advice, but
- 17 I didn't agree to provide it and therefore I'm not a
- 18 fiduciary. That, I fear, is how I read your testimony.
- 19 Did I misunderstand it?
- 20 MR. BENTSEN: No, I think -- I think our view
- 21 is that disclosure and contractual agreements matter
- 22 and that they provide a roadmap by which participants

- 1 on both sides of a transaction know how to act. This
- 2 is exactly what the Securities and Exchange Commission
- 3 is trying to deal with as they are in the process of
- 4 considering writing a rule. What are the
- 5 responsibilities of the parties? And from our vantage
- 6 point, if there's not clarity, then there's tremendous
- 7 risk. And we don't think there's sufficient clarity in
- 8 this proposal.
- 9 MR. MACHIZ: Yeah. I quess I would advert to
- 10 the -- to the cross-examination that Mr. Lebowitz did
- 11 of the lady from JP Morgan who insisted that all her
- 12 call center did was provide information. And as long
- 13 as she was saying that, I said yeah, provide
- 14 information -- not a problem, that's what -- that's
- 15 what call centers are supposed to do. But it turns out
- 16 that in the course of that interaction they find out
- 17 that somebody doesn't already have a relationship,
- 18 oops, that person gets steered to a salesperson,
- 19 someone else at JP Morgan.
- 20 So what you agree to do and what you do are
- 21 not necessarily the same thing. What you say you're
- 22 doing and what you do may not be the same thing unless

100 someone takes the trouble to inquire deeply. MR. BENTSEN: Well, I think from our vantage 2 point, and where our members operate, what we agree to 3 do is what the law and regulation says that we're supposed to do, and it's subject to enforcement by --5 in the case of a broker, it's subject to enforcement by the Securities and Exchange Commission and FINRA. might point out -- and this in a discussion on section 914; we can talk about 913 maybe when we talk about Dodd-Frank, but we talk about Dodd-Frank all the time -10 - and that --11 12 MS. BORZI: As do we. 13 MR. BENTSEN: Well, good. MS. BORZI: And our colleagues in the SEC and 14 the CFTC. 15 16 MR. BENTSEN: But the point being is that, you know, that our view is you can't divorce this 18 proposal from section 913 and where the SEC is going, and likewise you can't really divorce section 913 from 19 914 and the oversight of advisers and brokers. But 20 21 that's a discussion for another day. 22 MS. BORZI: Mr. Nelson, you may be in the

101 middle, but I'm going to give you the last question. MR. NELSON: Well, I really wanted to find a 2 little bit more out about that foie gras, but I'm going 3 to pass over that one and go to a different topic. I've 5 got to --MS. BORZI: It's the one thing I won't order 6 on the menu. 8 MR. NELSON: This one's for Ken. And, you know, I'm just trying to kind of follow, because I 9 think we are somewhat aligned here in that -- would you 10 -- would SIFMA be a proponent of revising and re-11 proposing the rule for public review and comment rather 12 13 than proceeding down the current path that we are by the calendar year this year? 14 MR. BENTSEN: Absolutely. Because I think 15 from our standpoint, largely for two reasons. One is 16 17 that again, the SEC, in our view, is going to move 18 forward with establishing a new uniform standard of care and a uniform fiduciary standard of care for 19 brokers and advisers that will apply to many of the activities -- certainly the IRA market -- encompassed 22 by that. And second of all, we think that the

102 Department has not done sufficient cost analysis, and I think that's -- I think that's stated as such, as it 3 relates certainly to the IRA market. And we don't think it's done it broadly enough as it relates to the service provider market, as well. So we think that the 5 -- that we would all be better served if this was withdrawn and more study was done. I appreciate the fact, I know the Department, you know, is talking to the Commission. But the Commission and the Department and other Commission all seem to be going different 10 directions, that there could be better coordination, 11 because our members will have to deal with all of these 12 13 rules. 14 MR. MACHIZ: Do I get to answer that

- 15 question?
- 16 MS. BORZI: I just want to point out that
- it's easy for you to say from the outside that there's
- 18 no coordination or not enough coordination. But I want
- to assure you that we are talking with our colleagues, 19
- and we have no interest -- none of the three agencies
- 21 have any interest in making it more difficult for
- 22 compliance with either Dodd-Frank or ERISA. So I need

103 to say that on the public record, even though I've said it once before. 3 Thank you all. MR. DAVIS: Mr. Nelson, you talked -- you started your comments by saying that there were some 5 legitimate concerns that the Department was trying to 6 accomplish with this regulatory initiative. Can you just expand on where you have concerns and where you think the Department might be appropriately focused 9 with respect to this initiative? 10 MR. NELSON: Expand on the items that I --11 12 that we're agreeing with? 13 MR. DAVIS: Yes. 14 MR. NELSON: There are a number of items that 15 we would agree with. And I think some of the things 16 that have actually even come out in the interim 17 proposed 408(b)(2) regulations on the fee disclosure. 18 We believe fee disclosure will go a long way -- a long way with the contractual requirements associated with 19 those for documenting to clarifying the relationship 20 between interested parties, whether they be fiduciary 21 or non-fiduciary, relative to a plan sponsor. So we 22

- 1 think a number of those items really do help the
- 2 process. And I think the discussion around sales
- 3 exemptions, as I stated, is a step in the right
- 4 direction. But the language just wasn't quite clear
- 5 enough to really kind of gather the entire process, to
- 6 gather in that it is not just a point of sale, that
- 7 it's really an ongoing relationship; and we've got to
- 8 be able to capture that communication on an ongoing
- 9 basis under that same umbrella. So a couple of
- 10 examples.
- 11 MR. DAVIS: And do you think disclosure as a
- 12 standard is enough in most cases to eliminate a lot of
- 13 the concerns that you've seen or that perhaps members
- 14 of your team have seen?
- 15 MR. NELSON: Yeah. I actually believe the
- 16 Department has made tremendous progress with 408(b)(2)
- 17 especially, also with the follow-up on 404(a) that's
- 18 coming later this year. So I think much progress has
- 19 been made and will be made as a lot of agreements
- 20 between providers and plan sponsors get documented to
- 21 the degree that is required within those regulations
- 22 and get communicated to the plan sponsors. We don't

- 1 believe that we should start to find a cure for
- 2 something before we've actually identified whether
- 3 there's going to be a result -- additional results from
- 4 the 408(b)(2) or 404(a) that need to be fixed.
- 5 MR. DAVIS: And Mr. Machiz, have you in your
- 6 work seen examples of the types of conflicts that the
- 7 Department is attempting to address that you could
- 8 share just generically?
- 9 MR. MACHIZ: When you're talking about the
- 10 types of conflicts, I mean, we've seen situations where
- 11 individual people are giving advice that is resulting
- 12 in tremendous fees to them, that are giving bad advice
- 13 and that those conflicts are -- the ability to generate
- 14 those fees create those conflicts. I mean most, you
- 15 know -- most obviously and most recently, the various
- 16 people who were -- found themselves recommending to
- 17 plan fiduciaries that they -- that they invest with Mr.
- 18 Madoff. You ask, well, why did they do that? Why did
- 19 they do that notwithstanding that they -- that many of
- 20 them had to one degree or another figured out that he
- 21 must be illegitimate, or might be? And the answer is,
- 22 because it was a beautiful thing to market. He was --

- 1 he had this pristine record. And so if you could
- 2 market Bernie's track record, either directly or
- 3 indirectly through another fund, you were in a position
- 4 to earn a huge fee.
- 5 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Bentsen, you talked about to
- 6 the extent that brokers would have to migrate from a
- 7 commission-based model to a fee-based model that in
- 8 your studies, the costs would go up overall. I'm just
- 9 -- could you expand a little bit more just specifically
- 10 why would the costs go up, and would they go up in all
- 11 situations? Just give us a little bit more
- 12 specificity.
- MR. BENTSEN: There are a couple of reasons.
- 14 One, in our -- commission-based models, obviously, are
- 15 done on a trade-by-trade basis. So particularly if you
- 16 have accounts that trade very little, like IRAs, the
- 17 annual cost is going to be fairly limited. Commission
- 18 -- asset-based accounts generally run at about a point
- 19 on an annual basis. I think the Department's own
- 20 guidance in some cases has been that they could run up
- 21 to a point and three-quarters on an annual basis. And
- 22 our study -- the study that we had Oliver Wyman conduct

- 1 as part of our submission to the SEC, and I believe we
- 2 submitted it with our comment letter to the Department
- 3 as well, they found in certain instances -- we looked
- 4 at different types of asset trades. So we looked at
- 5 fixed income securities, for instance. And we found
- 6 that there was a difference because in an asset-based
- 7 model, a true fiduciary model, in addition you wouldn't
- 8 be able to -- you'd have to trade on an agency basis
- 9 and not a principal basis, that the cost spread of
- 10 trading fixed income securities on an agency basis
- 11 versus a principal basis would be 23 to 27 basis points
- 12 annually. So that's where we derive our view that
- 13 there's a price differential between a commission-based
- 14 and an asset-based.
- Now to be fair, and as I said, we have
- 16 members -- we represent members that have both
- 17 registered representatives and registered investment
- 18 advisers. And in many cases, firms will have dually
- 19 registered individuals, and they will -- they will
- 20 provide the service based upon what the client is
- 21 asking for. But what our study also found is among the
- 22 households we looked at, the vast majority had some

- 1 form of a commission-based account. Customers seem to
- 2 be choosing that type of account. And it could be that
- 3 they're choosing it on price; it could be that they're
- 4 choosing it, that they want -- they like having a self-
- 5 directed account. But it does have a price
- 6 implication.
- 7 MR. DAVIS: And you think the sellers
- 8 exception as currently drafted in the regulation
- 9 wouldn't go far enough to preserve some of those
- 10 existing business models?
- 11 MR. BENTSEN: We don't believe so. We don't
- 12 think -- we certainly don't think that it would -- we
- 13 don't think it would allow a sufficient exemption for
- 14 principal transactions, and we are confident that it
- 15 doesn't provide an exemption for swaps business. So
- 16 that would be more on the plan side. And we're
- 17 concerned when you consider the rest of the rule and
- 18 questions of whether someone could subsequently be
- 19 deemed a fiduciary because of the -- of the -- may
- 20 consider in some of the other issues that the risk of
- 21 being ultimately deemed a fiduciary would cause it to
- 22 be -- cause a transaction, a principal transaction, to

109 be a prohibited transaction, and the liability associated with that would cause many firms to just back away and say just do it as an asset-based in an 3 4 agency basis. MR. DAVIS: Thanks. 5 MR. LEBOWITZ: Mr. Bentsen, was there 6 anything in the reg you liked? 8 MR. BENTSEN: We appreciate the fact that --9 that you had -- that you have -- the process that you have established. We appreciate the fact that you 10 agree to extend the comment period at least to get past the time that the SEC submitted their study. I think 12 that was beneficial to all of us who wanted to comment 13 on seeing where the SEC staff was going. 14 We appreciate 15 the fact that you have a hearing and that you have 16 developed a process which allows us to bring our 17 concerns. We - you know, contrary perhaps to at least 18 some of my fellow panelists -- you know, we think that

> (866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com 2011

the current standard as it relates to the businesses

that we're looking at has worked. We think that the

Department has been taking steps through some of the

disclosure recommendations to try and address it.

19

20

21

110 beyond that, you know, no, we're not -- we don't find a lot in it as it is currently written that we would be 3 supportive of. 4 MR. LEBOWITZ: You weren't convinced that 5 there are any problems that the current reg does not adequately address? 6 7 MR. BENTSEN: Well, the current reg, as we read it in the preamble is written to address problems in areas which aren't primarily a focus -- and there 9 are others here to talk about those. But in terms of 10 the IRA market, where we have a serious concern, you 11 12 know, it doesn't appear to us that that was necessarily 13 the intent in the way that the rule was written. it seems to us that it also runs head into -- and 14 15 again, I appreciate the Department's coordination with 16 the other agencies -- but it runs head into a standard 17 that is in the process, we believe, of being established. 18 19 MR. LEBOWITZ: Mr. Hauser? 20 MR. HAUSER: Maybe if I could start with you, Mr. Nelson. I just had a question about a valuation 22 point you made, which is that you wanted -- you wanted

- 1 the regulation to be written in such a way that when
- 2 your company, and I guess others, are valuing insurance
- 3 products, they'd be able to pass on the underlying
- 4 values of those contracts. And you referred to it
- 5 essentially as involving a mechanical calculation of
- 6 value. And I guess my question is for the specific
- 7 products you have in mind, how mechanical is that
- 8 calculation? I mean, are there hard-to-value assets in
- 9 there? Are there questions about pricing; are there
- 10 judgment calls to be made? Or is it truly just a
- 11 matter of plugging in market prices, adding it up, and
- 12 discounting based on a disclosed formula or something?
- MR. NELSON: Interesting question, because in
- 14 underlying open-ended registered investment company
- 15 funds, a mutual fund, there are examples of fair value
- 16 pricing that occur on a very frequent basis that need
- 17 to occur. Those funds are often wrapped in annuity
- 18 products, as well, by insurance companies. So you have
- 19 kind of a compounding feature. Now, many of those
- 20 products in variable annuities or the fixed annuities
- 21 would be valued on a daily basis. But they are not, as
- 22 the regulation stated, necessarily traded, you know, in

- 1 an exchange-type format. So that's where a lot of our
- 2 concern kind of came around in the language, is that it
- 3 really kind of seemed to fuss with the valued-but-are-
- 4 not-traded component. So it's -- many of them are
- 5 valued. There are certainly issues with some of the
- 6 valuations, as we said with even going beyond insurance
- 7 company products. But it's the traded component and
- 8 the language that fussed us.
- 9 MR. HAUSER: And so what -- I mean, just so I
- 10 have a sense of it, what kind of products are you
- 11 talking about in particular?
- 12 MR. NELSON: It'd be talking about variable
- 13 annuities, accumulation -- variable and accumulation
- 14 annuities in retirement plans, which are predominantly
- 15 used in the smaller plan 401(k) market. There would
- 16 also be fixed general account annuities, as well, and
- 17 some separate accounts.
- 18 MR. HAUSER: Okay. And in connection with
- 19 the seller's exception that's built into our
- 20 regulation, there's a suggestion -- I don't know that I
- 21 have it in front of me, but one of the commenters -- I
- 22 think AARP suggested that, well, maybe a seller's

- 1 exception makes sense, but it ought to have a fairly
- 2 comprehensive sort of statement of the conflict.
- 3 Because you made the point that well, you don't think
- 4 you "adverse" exactly captures what the nature of this
- 5 relationship is. But AARP has suggested that you ought
- 6 to be able to get the seller's exception if you're on
- 7 the other side of the transaction. And then it's
- 8 coupled with comprehensive disclosure of the fees and
- 9 conflicts; a statement of the conflict; full disclosure
- 10 of the sources and amount of fees; and then a clear and
- 11 unequivocal acknowledgment that there is a conflict.
- 12 Would that kind of -- if we were to write a regulation
- 13 that required that level of disclosure as part of this
- 14 seller's exception, and said if you have that
- 15 disclosure, you're good to go and you're not a
- 16 fiduciary, either as a safe harbor or just as a
- 17 mandate, would that be something you'd be willing to
- 18 endorse?
- 19 MR. NELSON: Well, I think that's something
- 20 we should look at. I think the more that you have on
- 21 an ongoing basis and understand that are exchanging
- 22 information, that it's not a point in time

- 1 relationship, and that certainly disclosing -- if a
- 2 record-keeper has an affiliate that has a fund and how
- 3 much revenue comes from that fund I think are all
- 4 perfectly and appropriate things that need to be
- 5 communicated in that type of a process and should, when
- 6 you do those types of things, should certainly not make
- 7 you a fiduciary.
- 8 MR. HAUSER: Maybe turning to Mr. Bentsen, I
- 9 quess where I'd like to start is with the IRA market,
- 10 because it seems to me that's obviously a very big part
- 11 of the concerns expressed by SIFMA in its comments. And
- 12 as I read SIFMA's comments as well as a number of the
- 13 other comments, I get a sense that there is a
- 14 perception, at least in the comments, that the effect
- 15 of the Department's regulation in this space would be
- 16 to preclude commission-based sort of arrangements and
- 17 to completely up-end current fee arrangements. I guess
- 18 in that connection my question is, the regulation as
- 19 drafted, and obviously it can be expanded or narrowed,
- 20 but -- and we are listening to people's concern -- but
- 21 the regulation as drafted has a seller's exception,
- 22 which is designed to enable people who are truly

- 1 counterparties to be counterparties, not fiduciaries.
- 2 There is 86-128, a class exemption, which covers
- 3 security transactions and permits commissions to be
- 4 taken and has virtually no conditions with respect to
- 5 IRAs at present. There is 84-24, which covers
- 6 commission-based arrangements and annuities and mutual
- 7 funds. There is at least theoretically going to be a
- 8 408(g) sort of exception. How -- and the Department
- 9 has, as Mr. Machiz noted, broad authority under the
- 10 class exemption procedures to grant exemptions where
- 11 they're administratively feasible and in the interests
- 12 of participants and beneficiaries and protective of
- 13 their interests. And so presumably if there's a
- 14 particular fee practice that on balance is beneficial
- 15 to participants, that in the sense that they would in
- 16 fact have worse performance because of additional fees
- 17 or the like would be something we could look at and
- 18 grant an exemption for. Given all those things, I
- 19 quess my question is one, how extensive is the problem?
- 20 What exactly is the universe of transactions in which
- 21 you think really commission-based arrangements are just
- 22 going to be rendered impossible? And second, why isn't

- 1 the Department's -- you know, it seems to me implicit
- 2 in your -- the comments is a view that the Department
- 3 simply shouldn't even have the authority in this
- 4 context to impose conditions on arrangements such as
- 5 principal transactions involving these folks and the
- 6 like, because we -- I mean, we certainly can grant
- 7 exemptions in this context for fee-based transactions
- 8 that are reasonable, but it might come at the cost of
- 9 conditions.
- 10 MR. BENTSEN: Well, I think -- you know, I
- 11 think even in how you laid that out underscores both
- 12 the complexity and the lack of clarity that the market
- 13 approaches this. So -- and the point that you make
- 14 that if there are problems, that we could -- you know,
- 15 that we could fix these problems through -- either
- 16 through adjusting this rule or subsequent rulemaking.
- 17 But absent that, our concern is, is we look at the
- 18 market today and we look at the way the rule is
- 19 constructed, that either directly not allowed or
- 20 indirectly because of concerns that other activity
- 21 would trigger a fiduciary status and then affect a
- 22 principal trade related to this creates a concern for

117 1 us. 2 So I would -- I think we would appreciate the fact that you recognize that we've raised a concern 3 about it, and hopefully others have raised a concern about this, and that there may be ways to fix it. 5 MR. HAUSER: Right. Well, the problem, I 6 guess, with asking an overly complex question is we don't quite get focused. But at least with respect to 9 84-24 and 86-128, those are class exemptions that already exist. And the seller's exception is laid out 10 in the reg, and it may or not may be broad enough, but 11 these provisions already permit a huge amount of 12 13 commission-based arrangements to move forward, don't they? 14 15 MR. BENTSEN: I mean, our view again is that 16 the way we read -- with what's in place now and the way 17 that we read -- the way that we read the proposed rule 18 is that it would -- it would greatly constrict the ability to move forward under the current structure in 19 20 being able to do commission-based with principal 21 transactions for the IRA market. Now I'd be happy to 22 come back to you for the record taking into

- 1 consideration the other items and maybe piece that
- 2 together in more detail for you, why those provisions
- 3 don't give us the sense of relief that you seem to
- 4 think we should have.
- 5 MR. HAUSER: Okay. And I'd appreciate that.
- 6 And I guess with respect to principal transactions, and
- 7 I think the other area you mentioned in your comments
- 8 were fixed income securities, also I think primarily
- 9 probably principal transactions, were at issue. I
- 10 mean, those are areas where there are pretty direct
- 11 conflicts of interest between broker-dealers and their
- 12 customers, aren't they? I mean at least in the sense
- 13 that there isn't, to the extent that you're selling a
- 14 product yourself in a market that's thinly traded and
- 15 there's not a readily available market price, there's a
- 16 potential for you to take advantage of the customer.
- 17 And the question I have is one, would you concede that
- 18 that's true; and two, if that is true, why shouldn't we
- 19 be in a position to create exemptions that place some
- 20 conditions on those kind of dealings between your
- 21 members and relatively unsophisticated investors?
- MR. BENTSEN: Well first, I would not concede

119 that that's true. And second of all --2 MR. HAUSER: Okay. MR. BENTSEN: -- I would make the point that 3 across the broad retail market, not just the IRA market but the broad retail market, that market holds a 5 tremendous amount of fixed income securities, both taxable and tax-exempt. And obviously in this instance, tax-exempt would not be applicable. And this is an issue that the SEC in the broader market has dealt with, and an issue that the SEC is trying to deal 10 with as they're trying to establish a uniform standard 11 of care of how you deal with potential conflicts in 12 13 terms of principal trading. But at the same time, our data has shown, as we discussed earlier, that customers 14 15 receive the benefit in terms of the cost as a result of being able to engage in principal transactions. And we 16 17 would argue that Congress, in considering Dodd-Frank, 18 made it clear that they did not want to preclude the ability for principal transactions with retail 19 20 customers, and in fact the way we read where the SEC 21 staff at least has recommended that they would be 22 moving in that direction as well, that that could be

120 addressed more through a disclosure regime. MR. HAUSER: Well, I guess following -- so in 2 3 a disclosure regime, this is just a question I've 4 wondered about maybe -- maybe anybody on the panel can answer it, but starting with you. If you're a 5 relatively unsophisticated investor and you're dealing 6 with a broker-dealer who may call himself a financial adviser or a financial planner, and you're advised of 9 the conflict, what is it you do with that information? How do you -- how do you use the disclosure of the 10 conflict to then protect yourself from advice that 11 12 scares you into investments that are actually 13 disadvantageous to you? 14 MR. BENTSEN: Well, I think that's a question 15 that -- you know, I think that's a question that people 16 confront, you know, whether it's in the investment or 17 any other part -- or any other part of their daily 18 lives, of -- and, you know, we have operated our markets very much on the basis of a disclosure regime 19 20 and in agreements between two parties. And so, you 21 know, what's the alternative to that of not having -not having a disclosure regime? It's having a purely 22

- 1 discretionary account where you're giving all your
- 2 assets to one individual and, you know, creating goals
- 3 with them and then having them do it but you limit your
- 4 choice. Investors seem to choose, based upon the data
- 5 we've looked at, overwhelmingly that they want to have
- 6 in many cases self-directed accounts, which are
- 7 commission-based accounts. So I think you have to
- 8 balance that with the types of regulations that you're
- 9 -- you know, that you're trying to put in place.
- 10 MR. HAUSER: Right. I suspect investors,
- 11 though, often assume that the person they're talking
- 12 to, you know, has their best interests at heart and
- 13 would in fact be accountable if the advice, you know,
- 14 was biased, was steered to support a bias and the like.
- 15 And I quess I just -- it strikes me that from, you
- 16 know, most investors' standpoint, certainly most
- 17 unsophisticated investors, the difficulty they have is
- 18 that on one side of the transaction you have somebody
- 19 who, you know, spends some significant amount of time
- 20 acquiring financial expertise. The participant doesn't
- 21 have that expertise, nor do they necessarily know
- 22 exactly how a conflict is going to play into what

- 1 recommendations they're getting. And the mere fact
- 2 that there was disclosure of that conflict may actually
- 3 encourage them to believe that this guy really does
- 4 have my interests at heart -- look how honest he was,
- 5 he told me about the conflict. And I'm just wondering,
- 6 how does conflict alone get past that, and why isn't,
- 7 you know, putting some conditions on the ability of
- 8 parties to interact in this conflicted way not a good
- 9 thing?
- MR. BENTSEN: Well -- sorry, go ahead.
- 11 MR. NELSON: There are already conditions and
- 12 restrictions. Most all have our securities license
- 13 with FINRA. They would have a six, seven, or a 63.
- 14 They would also be subject to state insurance if
- 15 they're selling an insurance product. And all of those
- 16 have, you know, suitability requirements, so if you're
- 17 going to sign someone up, you've got to go through the
- 18 suitability.
- MR. HAUSER: Hm-mmm.
- 20 MR. NELSON: And in the insurance regulations
- 21 you have the similar types of things there. So there's
- 22 multiple layers already. I don't think we need another

123 layer on top of that. MR. HAUSER: Okay. And just one last set of 2 questions for Mr. Bentsen. And that's just that in the 3 comment you -- or that SIFMA provided to us, you 4 included a Powerpoint with some financial data. And I 5 guess my first question is, can we have the study 6 that's behind that Powerpoint? Would you be willing to furnish that to us? MR. BENTSEN: This is the Oliver Wyman study? 9 MR. HAUSER: That's the -- yes. 10 11 MR. BENTSEN: It's actually part of the 12 public record with the -- with the SEC 913. 13 Okay. That'd be terrific if you MR. HAUSER: could pass that on to us. And does the part that's a 14 15 part of the public record explain in particular how the particular SIFMA members were chosen for the survey? 16 17 MR. BENTSEN: It has a section that explains 18 the methodology that was used. MR. HAUSER: Okay. Thank you. 19 And the same goes -- I think at the tail end of the Powerpoint, 20 21 there's a set of data points about the likely sort of 22 compliance costs. Are the methodologies for that laid

```
124
   out, as well?
 2
              MR. BENTSEN: I believe so.
 3
              MR. HAUSER: But is --
              MR. BENTSEN: I'll look and check and get
 5
   back to you if it's not.
 6
              MR. HAUSER: Okay. Appreciate it.
 7
              MR. PIACENTINI: I think I want to preface my
    couple of questions by saying that in asking them, I am
    thinking about IRAs as well as plans, so please
 9
    interpret them that way.
10
              And so the first question picks up on
11
12
    something that Tim was just talking about. So I think
13
    probably everybody -- maybe everybody would agree that
    there is sort of an asymmetry in the client/adviser
14
15
    relationship a lot of the time. Maybe not really big
   plan fiduciary as the advisee, but in a small plan or
16
17
    IRA and so forth, the adviser is the expert; the client
18
    is relying on the expert. Is that something we all
    agree on?
19
20
              MR. BENTSEN: I mean, I think our view is
21
    that the -- that the client is buying -- you know, is
22
    choosing to buy a service from -- from a financial
```

- 1 adviser who may be a registered representative, may be
- 2 a registered investment adviser, and they're choosing
- 3 the type of service that they want to buy.
- 4 MR. PIACENTINI: Right. But I guess my
- 5 question is a little different. I'm just suggesting
- 6 that as they're choosing this service, that part of
- 7 that relationship is that they are relying on this
- 8 person as the one who knows a lot about this topic and
- 9 that they themselves don't. Almost like when you go to
- 10 your doctor. If you're not medically trained, they're
- 11 the expert, and they're -- you're going to rely on
- 12 them. Is that -- do we share that view?
- MR. BENTSEN: Well, I think -- I think we
- 14 share the view, and the reason of why we think that
- 15 there should be a uniform standard of care between
- 16 investment advisers and brokers, and hence why -- not
- 17 because of us, but Congress itself determined that that
- 18 was necessary and authorized the SEC to do so.
- 19 MR. PIACENTINI: All right. So then let me
- 20 maybe shift a little bit and ask you in the
- 21 hypothetical. So if it's true that there is this
- 22 asymmetry and that the adviser, whatever their business

- 1 model is -- and you talked about business model
- 2 neutrality -- whatever their business model is, that
- 3 they have a much better understanding both of the
- 4 subject material on which they're advising, the basis
- 5 for and the merits of the advice that they're
- 6 providing, and the presence of potential conflicts of
- 7 interest and what the implications of those conflicts
- 8 might be. So if it's the case that they know more
- 9 about all those things than the client, then should I
- 10 interpret, or why should I interpret, what turns out to
- 11 be the dominant model as one that's necessarily more
- 12 favorable to consumers? Why in an asymmetric market
- 13 like that would it necessarily come to pass that the
- 14 business model that's most common would be the one
- 15 that's the most favorable to consumers?
- MR. BENTSEN: I mean, that's your
- 17 hypothetical question, so I think you have to look at
- 18 the data and determine, you know -- what we're looking
- 19 at is the empirical data and what investors are
- 20 choosing.
- 21 MR. PIACENTINI: Right. And I can see that
- 22 that's the most common business model.

127 1 MR. BENTSEN: And it would appear that it's 2 also being chosen based upon price. MR. PIACENTINI: Right. I'm not sure -- the 3 statistics that are in the Wyman report are one thing. But I think it's pretty clear that that's a very 5 common, probably dominant business model. 6 questioning that. 8 Does anybody else want to weigh in? MR. MACHIZ: I'm not sure I have a direct 9 answer to your question. But there's a -- underlying a 10 lot of the conversation that's come before is the 11 notion that these transactions are going to -- that's 12 13 coming from SIFMA is that these transactions are going to be unworkable. And I'm not sure -- somewhere about 14 15 ten minutes ago the conversation left the planet on 16 which I was living, because we have granted that there 17 is and perhaps to be expanded a principal exception 18 that's going to allow these brokers to say, hey, I'm I'm on the other side of this 19 selling you stuff. 20 transaction. Maybe the word "adverse" will have to be 21 changed, although I would caution against changing it in a way that gives people comfort and makes them think 22

- 1 there isn't really a conflict. So the premise that the
- 2 world can't operate as it operates now with
- 3 commissions, I'm not convinced. I'm not -- you know,
- 4 I'm missing -- I lose it at first principles.
- 5 MR. PIACENTINI: Okay. So maybe, if I can
- 6 place myself back on earth, my motivation here is in
- 7 thinking about the costs and benefits of different
- 8 kinds of arrangements or in rules that might encourage
- 9 or discourage one arrangement over another to one
- 10 degree or another. And I'm very appreciative of the
- 11 information that SIFMA and others have provided that
- 12 help us think more than we already have about some of
- 13 the kinds of costs. So I guess I'll just limit myself
- 14 to one another follow-up sort of along those lines, and
- 15 it's to one dimension of the cost consideration that I
- 16 don't think the SIFMA comment and some of the others
- 17 went into as much. And that has to do with whether --
- 18 and again, this goes to business model neutrality --
- 19 but whether there really is any difference in the
- 20 results that will be achieved by the consumer depending
- 21 on the presence of conflicts and what provisions are or
- 22 are not in place to mitigate or make transparent those

- 1 conflicts. Because there is some academic and other
- 2 research -- the GAO study was mentioned. There are
- 3 other things, including some that are cited in our
- 4 proposal, that suggest that people who are engaging in
- 5 markets where these conflicts exist sometimes end up
- 6 with poorer performance than those who don't, and that
- 7 we ought to take that into consideration as well.
- 8 So any reactions to that?
- 9 MR. NELSON: Well, I think we live in a world
- 10 that is full of business relation conflicts, and that
- 11 in our everyday life, we're engaging in a variety of
- 12 transactions, whether it's for a product or a service.
- 13 And I don't think this is really all that different,
- 14 and I actually have faith in the American consumer here
- 15 and -- as well as the distributors of products, both
- 16 advisers and consultants, that with good disclosure on
- 17 what their fees might be and contractual arrangements
- 18 around what their services are being provided, that a
- 19 consumer can make an informed decision. I do get
- 20 obviously very concerned when we try to, I would say,
- 21 maybe overreach a bit on the regulation and limit the
- 22 consumer's ability to make a decision, an informed

130 decision, because we've restricted providers of service so much. MR. LEBOWITZ: I want to thank the panel and 3 also thank the people coming behind them, because we've run a little late and violated my own rule. We may 5 have some additional questions for this panel and certainly maybe for some of the other panels to come. And so we may be presenting questions to them in writing, and those questions and responses will be 9 included in the public record. 10 MR. MACHIZ: And I have copies of my 11 testimony, which I didn't get a chance to hand out. 12 13 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. 14 (Pause) The next panel: David Cerner, Ross Bremen 15 16 and Kent Mason. 17 (Pause) 18 For those who are staying, if you'd take your seats and we're going to move on now. Thank you. 19 Mr. Certner? 20 21 Could we have some order here, please? Would 22 people please sit down? Thank you.

131 1 Mr. Certner. MR. CERTNER: Thank you, members of the 2 I am David Certner, the legislative counsel and 3 legislative policy director at AARP. And we thank you for the opportunity to discuss the important issues 5 surrounding who is and who is not a fiduciary under 6 ERISA. 8 AARP has consistently asserted that investment advice must be subject to ERISA's fiduciary 9 rules, based on sound investment principles and 10 protected from conflicts of interest. The recent 11 financial turmoil and scandals underscore the 12 13 imperative that such advice is independent and non-14 conflicted and that the standards governing industry practice involved in rendering investment advice are 15 16 fair, clear, and easy to understand. 17 Since ERISA's enactment in the '75 regulation 18 defining fiduciary, it's pretty clear that retirement plans and investments have changed dramatically. 19 result, there is no longer any justification, if every 20 21 there was one, for the current regulations nonstatutory based interpretation of "fiduciary." With 22

- 1 the shift from DB plans to the self-directed DC plans,
- 2 investment advice is now given to individuals who may
- 3 have poor general literacy, with 43 percent of adults
- 4 with a high school or higher degree falling into a
- 5 basic or below-basic literacy levels. And as we know,
- 6 financial literacy, certainly as illustrated by the
- 7 recent FINRA study, is even lower.
- 8 Not only has the emphasis shifted to
- 9 individual investment advice and 401(k) plans, but the
- 10 variety and complexity of investments available has
- 11 radically changed. For example, there were no such
- 12 things as collateral debt obligations or target date
- 13 funds back in '75.
- 14 And finally, I think we've seen that numerous
- 15 Supreme Court decisions have left many participants who
- 16 have been wronged actually without a remedy,
- 17 effectively leaving unregulated the many entities that
- 18 deal with the plans. Given all of these changes and
- 19 others in the benefits industry, we think that doing
- 20 nothing would simply leave plans and their participants
- 21 and beneficiaries unprotected.
- 22 AARP has also consistently asserted that

- 1 retirement plan money, which receives a tax incentive
- 2 and must meet certain tax qualification requirements,
- 3 deserves a higher level of protection than other types
- 4 of investments. And therefore the Department should
- 5 continue to coordinate with the SEC, as you've noted.
- 6 But we urge that the Department not delay its
- 7 regulation. While SEC action in this area is obviously
- 8 important, the two agencies are dealing with
- 9 overlapping but also sometimes different problems. So
- 10 in short, we strongly support the Department's decision
- 11 to update the current definition of fiduciary to better
- 12 protect the interests of the plans and the participants
- 13 and beneficiaries.
- 14 AARP submits that the regulation should
- 15 clearly and succinctly state a general rule of the
- 16 standards under which an entity will be considered a
- 17 fiduciary. Quite simply, if an entity informs a
- 18 fiduciary, such as a trustee, or a participant that the
- 19 fiduciary or participant should purchase a certain
- 20 investment and the entity is receiving a payment,
- 21 either directly or indirectly, through the plan for
- 22 providing that advice, such as a commission, then the

- 1 entity is a fiduciary. This is true regardless of
- 2 whether, among other things, there's a preexisting
- 3 arrangement; whether or not of the frequency of the
- 4 advice; whether there's understanding that the advice
- 5 will serve as the primary basis for the fiduciary or
- 6 participant decision; whether or how the advice is
- 7 individualized; what the risk tolerance of the
- 8 fiduciary or the participant is; or the composition of
- 9 the portfolio. In fact, we think this is a fairly
- 10 simple rule. If there's advice and there's payment
- 11 involved, then there's a fiduciary standard.
- 12 Entities that are providing the advice
- 13 concerning proxy voting, selection of investment
- 14 managers, portfolio asset allocations, selection of the
- 15 investments from a 401(k) platform, among other
- 16 activities should also be considered fiduciaries, and
- 17 that these activities are no different than persons
- 18 recommending the purchase of a specific investment. The
- 19 bottom line is that these activities relate to the
- 20 value of the investments.
- 21 We would note that if the Department decided
- 22 to keep the exemption to the definition of fiduciary

- 1 based on whether the recipient of the advice knows that
- 2 they are receiving advice which may be adverse to them,
- 3 then the participants and the beneficiary should be
- 4 excluded from any such exemption. This broad exemption
- 5 would dilute the value of the remainder of the proposed
- 6 rule as well as the PPA's investment advice provisions.
- 7 Most importantly, it leaves participants and
- 8 beneficiaries, many of whom, as noted, have a
- 9 significant lack of financial sophistication, quite
- 10 unprotected.
- We do agree, however, that mere research or
- 12 rating of investments, without more, does not make the
- 13 research or rating entity a fiduciary. Nor should
- 14 entities that simply provide investment education which
- 15 discusses broad concepts, such as asset allocation,
- 16 diversification, and risk tolerance be considered
- 17 fiduciaries.
- 18 We talk about appraisals in fairness
- 19 opinions. Private and government enforcement actions
- 20 concerning appraisals and fairness opinions have been,
- 21 in our opinion, inconsistent and generally inadequate
- 22 to protect the retirement security of participants and

- 1 beneficiaries. There has been more than one case where
- 2 these evaluations have been abusively manipulated to
- 3 reach a certain result or price.
- 4 The similarities between valuations and
- 5 appraisals with other investment advice is most
- 6 apparent where a business is valued or appraised for
- 7 sale or purchase. Like other investment advice, the
- 8 purchase or sale of the company will be based on the
- 9 valuation or appraisal. Valuations and appraisals are
- 10 also performed annually to determine the value of
- 11 benefits should a participant terminate employment and
- 12 request a distribution from an ESOP. Although many
- 13 commentators have argued that these valuations should
- 14 not be considered fiduciary actions in their
- 15 determination of benefit amounts, we would note that a
- 16 court would most likely review the appraiser's
- 17 valuation under an abuse of discretion standard and
- 18 thereby would, quite frankly, limit any liability to
- 19 the appraiser. And as a result, we support the
- 20 inclusion of valuations and appraisals as fiduciary
- 21 actions because of their impact on the value of the
- 22 plan and its benefits.

137 1 The Department also asked for comments on whether advice concerning distributions should be covered under its fiduciary definition. AARP believes 3 that the answer really turns on both where the plan assets lie and whether the entity providing advice has 5 a plan relationship with the participant. 6 In other words, is there a potential conflict? As an example, if a participant asks the current provider whether to take a distribution, at what time, in what form, and where and how to invest these plan assets, then the 10 provider is providing investment advice to an 11 individual and should be considered a fiduciary. 12 13 mean, in contrast, once the plan assets have been distributed and completely removed from the retirement 14 15 plan, the individual is no longer a plan participant. But decisions concerning plan distributions themselves 16 17 are critical to achieving the plan objective of 18 providing retirement security, and decisions made at that time are often effectively irreversible, due to 19 20 tax consequences and other transaction costs. 21 In conclusion, we look forward to our 22 continuing work with the DOL to ensure that plans and

138 participants have the full protections under ERISA. Thank you. 3 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. Mr. Bremen? MR. BREMEN: Good morning, and thank you for 5 your time today. My name is Ross Bremen, and I'm a partner in NEPC's defined contribution practice. NEPC is one of the largest consulting firms in the country. We service over 290 plan sponsors and about \$350 billion in assets. We're independent, and we represent the interests of plan sponsors and plan participants. We're not investment managers and we are not folks that 12 13 offer investment products. 14 I should also point out that we're not 15 attorneys, so our comments reflect our experiences as 16 practitioners as opposed to a legal review of the 17 issues. 18 The Department has stated that the types and complexities of investment products available to plans 19 have increased, and thus there is a need to reexamine 21 advisory relationships. The Department has also expressed a concern that when advisers are not deemed 22

- 1 to be fiduciaries, they may not disclose conflicts to
- 2 fiduciaries that expect impartiality. We share these
- 3 concerns.
- 4 Today more than ever, plan sponsors regularly
- 5 ask service providers if they're willing to accept
- 6 fiduciary status, if they'll serve as a co-fiduciary,
- 7 or if they manage assets. And while they ask these
- 8 questions and they get responses, they may not know how
- 9 to interpret or evaluate the answers. As proposed
- 10 today, three different answers may have the same
- 11 meaning. Alternatively, the same answer, that a party
- 12 is a fiduciary, may have different meanings.
- 13 While discretionary managers charge higher
- 14 fees and seem to accept a higher degree of fiduciary
- 15 responsibility, the proposed regulations seem to hold
- 16 all fiduciary advisers to a similar standard. In cases
- 17 where the same services are being provided, it's our
- 18 view that organizations should not be able to claim
- 19 different levels of fiduciary responsibility for those
- 20 same services. We believe that plan fiduciaries need
- 21 advice that helps them meet their duty, and while we do
- 22 think that providers should be able to limit the

- 1 activities in which they have responsibility, we do not
- 2 believe providers should somehow be allowed to disclose
- 3 away or contract away what are clear fiduciary
- 4 obligations. Ultimately we believe it's critical that
- 5 plan sponsors, who have a duty to their participants,
- 6 have a clear understanding of what protections are
- 7 afforded to them when hiring a service provider.
- 8 We support the Department's effort to foster
- 9 greater clarity, consistency, and transparency. To
- 10 help fiduciaries achieve necessary levels of
- 11 understanding, we would ask the Department to focus in
- 12 three areas.
- 13 First, clarify the status of a discretionary
- 14 versus a non-discretionary fiduciary. Second, further
- 15 specify the definition of advice. Third, reconsider
- 16 whether the platform and sales exemptions are the
- 17 appropriate exceptions to the rule.
- 18 First, clarify the status of a discretionary
- 19 versus a non-discretionary fiduciary. plan fiduciaries
- 20 are responsible for prudent investment of retirement
- 21 plan assets. For pension plans, this means that asset
- 22 allocation decisions need to be made and investment

- 1 managers need to be selected. Investment committees
- 2 approach this task in very different ways. Some
- 3 outsource discretionary management to third parties,
- 4 while others hire non-discretionary advisers for
- 5 advice. plan fiduciaries know they must make prudent
- 6 decisions and are not permitted to fully transfer their
- 7 obligation to a third party.
- 8 It's our opinion that under the current
- 9 system, plan sponsors do not know if greater
- 10 protections are afforded when discretionary managers
- 11 are hired. While discretionary managers knowingly
- 12 assume control of decision making and accordingly
- 13 charge higher fees, many plan sponsors believe that
- 14 they themselves are ultimately responsible for all
- 15 decisions whether or not the party assumes greater
- 16 control or not, and choose to work with a non-
- 17 discretionary adviser.
- 18 We believe that service providers who operate
- 19 in a similar capacity -- in differing capacities should
- 20 not be held to the same fiduciary standard. For
- 21 example, a defined contribution record-keeper who
- 22 happens to assist with a single action, such as a share

- 1 class selection, is not exerting as much control or
- 2 providing as much advice as an adviser who advises on
- 3 most investment activities or a manager that has
- 4 control of all activities. The fact that a plan
- 5 sponsor may pay significantly higher fees for a
- 6 discretionary manager suggests that the industry shares
- 7 our belief and attributes different levels of
- 8 responsibility to these advisers. Intuitively, while
- 9 it might seem clear that these different entities are
- 10 not equivalent in terms of the role they play, under
- 11 the current system the parties, even specific
- 12 individuals, could each be held liable for losses
- 13 sustained by the plan as a result of rule violations.
- 14 We ask that the Department help fiduciaries in the
- 15 marketplace understand to what extent control matters.
- 16 Second, further specify the definition of
- 17 advice. We understand why the Department has put forth
- 18 a more inclusive proposal. It's our belief that advice
- 19 is more often fiduciary in nature than service
- 20 providers may claim. Many commenters have asked that
- 21 various activities be classified as non-fiduciary in
- 22 nature. If the Department finds reason to comply with

- 1 these requests, it's our belief that the Department
- 2 will need to be very specific with regard to what
- 3 constitutes non-fiduciary advice. In some cases
- 4 service providers provide responses to plan fiduciaries
- 5 based on objective criteria set forth by the plan
- 6 fiduciary or an independent third party. In such
- 7 cases, it's our opinion that the service providers are
- 8 not taking on a fiduciary obligation. However, in many
- 9 other instances some level of subjectivity is
- 10 introduced by the service provider. If a fund is being
- 11 mapped on a like-to-like basis, there must be some
- 12 assessment of what "like" means and whether the
- 13 managers are sufficiently similar to pursue such an
- 14 approach. When preferred manager lists are maintained
- 15 by service providers, some level of subjective input is
- 16 required, regardless of whether the screening or
- 17 narrowing of the universe is plan-specific or not. When
- 18 managers are reviewed, in addition to performance
- 19 comparisons, there are often assessments made as to
- 20 whether the options continue to be appropriate, and
- 21 service providers are often determining which
- 22 information to provide, thus introducing some level of

- 1 subjectivity. When service providers are providing
- 2 subjective advice, we believe they're taking on a
- 3 fiduciary role.
- 4 Third, reconsider if the sales and platform
- 5 exemptions are the appropriate exceptions to the rule.
- 6 Once again, we reiterate our view that advice is more
- 7 often fiduciary in nature than many service providers
- 8 may claim. And this is true even in instances where
- 9 clear conflicts of interest may exist. The proposed
- 10 regulations provide both a platform exemption and an
- 11 exemptions for individuals selling a security. In the
- 12 case of the platform exemption, the Department suggests
- 13 that in some instances the service provider is offering
- 14 investments in which the provider has a financial
- 15 relationship, while in others the plan fiduciary is
- 16 relying on the service provider to provide impartial
- 17 investment advice. From our perspective, this raises a
- 18 fundamental question. How does a plan fiduciary know
- 19 where the platform ends and the impartial advice
- 20 begins? Some platforms could include hundreds of
- 21 options, all with financial relationships, and the
- 22 service provider might help the fiduciary choose among

- 1 them. Is this fiduciary advice? In another instance
- 2 at the other extreme, a platform might include only a
- 3 handful of investment options. And while the plan
- 4 fiduciary might acknowledge that there is a financial
- 5 arrangement with the investment managers in this
- 6 limited platform, he/she might still be relying on the
- 7 service provider to provide a series of options that
- 8 meet ERISA standards.
- 9 The other exemption in the proposal relates
- 10 to the selling of securities. Some comment letters
- 11 have suggested that the language might be broadened to
- 12 include the sale of services. The idea would be
- 13 similar to the platform exemption in that there would
- 14 be an understanding on the part of the plan fiduciary
- 15 that natural conflicts would exist, and as such, there
- 16 should be no expectation of impartial advice. Today
- 17 it's common for service providers to be required to
- 18 provide hypothetical line-ups and other potential forms
- 19 of advice and new business processes, so there's a
- 20 clear logic to this whole line of thinking. And we
- 21 will only ask that the Department be very careful in
- 22 approaching clarifying language. In our view, the sale

- 1 continues, or it could continue, on an ongoing basis.
- 2 If there is a need for assistance with share class
- 3 selection of a particular vehicle or need to change
- 4 funds in the future, given the indirect forms of
- 5 compensation service providers receive, the service
- 6 provider in a sense is continuously selling securities
- 7 in which it has a financial interest.
- 8 We applaud the Department for tackling this
- 9 very challenging definition of a fiduciary issue. We
- 10 appreciate the complexities of the issue. On the one
- 11 hand, a broader definition would foster greater
- 12 disclosure of conflicts and more accountability to plan
- 13 fiduciaries. On the other, service providers may
- 14 choose to avoid providing some levels of service or
- 15 charge plan fiduciaries higher fees to compensate them
- 16 for perceived risks. If a more narrow definition is
- 17 pursued, the challenge will be to define the line in
- 18 the sand very clearly so that it's clear to plan
- 19 fiduciaries when they're working with a fiduciary and
- 20 when they're not. In our view, as many commenters have
- 21 indicated in their written submissions, plan
- 22 fiduciaries rely on the data provided to them by

147 service providers, and not all plan fiduciaries make use of independent third parties for advice. Even if they do, today not all third parties communicate the 3 same level of fiduciary standing. It's critical that plan fiduciaries have 5 advice to them that helps them meet their fiduciary 6 duty. Ultimately if it does turn out that service providers need to assume greater levels of fiduciary 9 responsibility, it might actually be the best outcome for plan fiduciaries and plan participants if they get 10 improved levels, necessary levels, conflict-free levels 11 of advice. 12 13 Thank you for your time this morning. MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. 14 15 Mr. Mason? 16 MR. MASON: Good morning. My name is Kent 17 I'm a partner in the law firm of Davis & 18 Harman, though I'm thinking of moonlighting at Marc Machiz's restaurant later, but 19 20 (Laughter) 21 I'm speaking here today on behalf of the American Benefits Council, and we thank the Department 22

- 1 for holding this hearing and very much appreciate the
- 2 opportunity to testify.
- I think we understand the Department's desire
- 4 to update and improve the definition of fiduciary.
- 5 However, I think in this first cut of this proposed
- 6 regulation, we have concerns that the proposal cuts too
- 7 broadly and could have some adverse effect on, I think
- 8 one of the earlier speakers distinguished between
- 9 advice, and not necessarily inhibiting advice, but
- 10 inhibiting investment education and information. And
- 11 I'm going to walk through eight specific issues, sort
- 12 of a, you know, the pension version of a Letterman Top
- 13 Ten minus two. But obviously much funnier.
- 14 The first, the "may be considered" threshold
- 15 seems too low to us. Let's just take an example. I've
- 16 got a participant who sought out an adviser. They've
- 17 gone to the adviser; they got their fund line-up;
- 18 they're sort of settled on it, and they run into --
- 19 that particular participant runs into an H.R. person
- 20 who works for their company. And says, "Gee, you know,
- 21 I've been fretting about this. Do you think this line-
- 22 up makes sense? Is it similar to what you see for

- 1 other people in my situation?" And the H.R. person
- 2 says, "Hey, you know, I'm not an expert, but it does
- 3 look similar to what other people are doing. It seems
- 4 to make sense." That may be considered. That, under
- 5 our reading of the regulation, that's fiduciary advice.
- 6 That's not what fiduciary advice is all about. In
- 7 other words, fiduciary advice, fiduciary standard under
- 8 ERISA, is the highest standard on -- highest fiduciary
- 9 standard under the law. and it shouldn't be triggered
- 10 by casual sort of discussions in the hall. It should
- 11 only be triggered by a mutual understanding that the
- 12 advice will play at least a significant role in
- 13 investment decisions of the recipient. That's issue
- 14 one.
- 15 Issue two. We've had a lot of plan sponsors
- 16 reach out to us and say, wait a second, you know.
- 17 Here's our situation. We have a plan
- 18 committee of senior executives who make all the
- 19 decisions with respect to the plan, including big-
- 20 picture investment decisions: what investment manager
- 21 to pick, et cetera. But underneath those senior
- 22 executives is a whole crew of middle-level employees

- 1 who sort of frame the issues for them, sort of do the
- 2 research, talk to the investment managers. And all of
- 3 that research, all of that sort of -- those
- 4 recommendations, all those middle managers would be
- 5 fiduciaries under this regulation. And that would be --
- 6 finding people to sort of serve in that role is
- 7 problematic. Getting fiduciary insurance for those
- 8 people -- problematic. Cost of that fiduciary
- 9 insurance -- frightening. These are not the decision
- 10 makers. These are middle level people that help the
- 11 senior guys frame the issues. We've got to get them
- 12 out of the definition. We have plan sponsors very
- 13 concerned about that.
- 14 The seller exception: I think with the
- 15 deletion of the primary basis and the regular basis
- 16 rule, it puts enormous pressure on the distinction
- 17 between selling and advising. Because every time I
- 18 sell, I'm going to say to you, "Hey, this is a good
- 19 deal for you." That's what selling's about. So I'm
- 20 making a recommendation. And so I think Alan at one
- 21 point said, "Is there anything you like?" I think the
- 22 introduction of the seller exception was a major step

- 1 forward, and I really think it sort of -- we applaud
- 2 the department for that. I think it just needs to be
- 3 expanded and clarified. Let me sort of walk through
- 4 three examples which illustrate our perspective.
- 5 First scenario: Mutual fund family is going
- 6 out selling its target date fund. Seems clearly
- 7 covered, selling a product. Scenario two: Another
- 8 mutual fund family is selling its model portfolio
- 9 services to compete with target date funds. They're
- 10 basically selling the same thing. One is covered; one
- 11 is clearly not, because the second one's a service. No
- 12 coverage. They're selling the same thing. Third
- 13 scenario, which I've heard some people say is covered,
- 14 some people say it's not covered. An adviser with a
- 15 clear and disclosed commercial relationship to the
- 16 first mutual fund family sort of sells that mutual fund
- 17 family's target date fund. Clearly sort of being
- 18 compensated for this. They're not the principal
- 19 selling; they're sort of somewhat third party selling
- 20 with a commercial relationship with the manufacturer of
- 21 the product. Covered or not covered? The answer is,
- 22 all three are exactly the same situation. All three

- 1 are selling and should all three be covered by the
- 2 seller exception.
- Fourth issue: plan menu. I'm going to come
- $4\,$ at this a little bit differently. I want to come at
- 5 this I'm a service provider, and I go to a hardware
- 6 store owner with 12 employees. And I say, "Hey, you
- 7 know, you're getting up there in age. You really ought
- 8 to be putting in a plan." And I say, "Here are the 300
- 9 options -- investment options that we offer. And by
- 10 the way, here's this phone book full of data,
- 11 historical data on all 300. And by the way, when you
- 12 go through that phone book, good luck, because you have
- 13 fiduciary duty to make the right choices. And your
- 14 only alternative to going through the phone book with
- 15 fiduciary duty is to pay that guy down the street X
- 16 thousand dollars to make that choice for you." Well, I
- 17 mean I can tell you, from dealing with these things for
- 18 many, many years, that hardware store owner's not going
- 19 to have a plan. Because they're not going through that
- 20 phone book and they're not paying that guy down the
- 21 street X thousand dollars. So we -- it's essential
- 22 that we give the providers some tools to assist. It

- 1 doesn't mean they give necessarily sort of "this is
- 2 exactly what you should do." But in our written
- 3 comment, we sort of give a whole lot of things, some of
- 4 which, I think, the woman this morning from JP Morgan
- 5 sort of alluded to that are very important in helping
- 6 that hardware store owner go through and make
- 7 selections.
- 8 Fifth issue, and this is something, Phyllis,
- 9 you've touched on a couple of times and I just want to
- 10 reiterate the importance, which is coordination
- 11 consistent with the executive order. But coordination
- 12 with other agencies, you know, in our mind I think we
- 13 want to emphasize that it is -- and again I want to use
- 14 your words, just because I'm agreeing with you -- it is
- 15 not coordination in the sense of telling each other
- 16 what you're doing, but actually I think you were saying
- 17 harmonizing the rules. And we can't overemphasize
- 18 that. And let me -- I want to talk about two examples
- 19 here.
- 20 One -- and again, you alluded to this, and
- 21 this is the CFTC -- under the law, under the rules, the
- 22 CFTC would actually require swap dealers who are

- 1 entering into a swap with a plan to perform functions
- 2 that would make them fiduciaries. And because they're
- 3 the other side of the transaction, if they're a
- 4 fiduciary, it's a prohibited transaction. So the net
- 5 effect is no more swaps with plans. There needs to be
- 6 a categorical rule under these regulations that says
- 7 anything required by the business conduct standards of
- 8 the opposing party does not make the opposing party a
- 9 fiduciary. Otherwise, swaps are shut down.
- 10 The SEC issue: As everybody knows, the SEC
- 11 is conducting a study of the fiduciary status of
- 12 broker-dealers. I think our point here again -- it's
- 13 coordination on a single standard. The SEC staff has
- 14 just come out with a study saying having dual standards
- 15 is confusing and harmful to participants. So if there
- 16 is a dual standard, one by the SEC and one by the DOL,
- 17 that is, in the view of the SEC study, harmful and
- 18 confusing to participants.
- 19 Seventh issue, and again, people have talked
- 20 about this a lot so I'm just going to be very, very
- 21 brief. In some cases under the regulation,
- 22 individualized advice is not required, such as a firm

- 1 newsletter, a brokerage firm newsletter could be
- 2 fiduciary advice. I think that's been well discussed
- 3 by other speakers, and I'll just leave it there. But
- 4 we don't view the brokerage firm newsletters as
- 5 fiduciary advice.
- 6 And the last thing I want to hit is the
- 7 management of securities. We sort of read the preamble
- 8 in terms of the issues you wanted to address, and I
- 9 think we perfectly understand those issues that you
- 10 want to address. I think our concern is that term is
- 11 very broad and somewhat frightening. And let me give
- 12 you an example.
- I've got a new trustee, for example, and I'm
- 14 negotiating a trustee agreement with that trustee.
- 15 Well, the trustee manages plan assets. So advice with
- 16 respect to structuring that trust agreement, that's
- 17 advice with respect to the management of plan assets.
- 18 So every company personnel who participates in that
- 19 negotiation -- contract people, ERISA people,
- 20 securities people -- all those people are fiduciaries.
- 21 And the scariest part is, so are the people on the
- 22 other side. The people on the other side are also plan

- 1 fiduciaries, because in negotiations, you're all been
- 2 saying, "Here's a good provision for you." If you say
- 3 that once as a member of the other side -- I'm going to
- 4 have to take ten more seconds -- if you say that once,
- 5 you become a fiduciary, and there is no seller
- 6 exception. Because the seller exception doesn't apply
- 7 to services. It only applies to products. So every
- 8 trust agreement would be an automatic prohibited
- 9 transaction. You need to narrow -- in our view, you
- 10 need to narrow that definition of what management is to
- 11 get the sort of well-intended targets you were looking
- 12 for.
- I thank you very much for giving me the extra
- 14 few seconds, and I'd be pleased to answer any
- 15 questions, though I'm scared of Phyllis.
- 16 (Laughter)
- 17 MS. BORZI: Believe me, I'm going to try to
- 18 get us back on time, because I surely don't want people
- 19 to miss their lunch.
- 20 Mr. Bremen, have you had the kind of
- 21 experience that I had when I was in the private sector?
- 22 I understand your distinction between discretionary --

157 I think I do -- I understand between individuals involved and what did you call them, discretionary -- I thought you called them fiduciaries. But that's -- I 3 don't know -- but it seems to me a non-discretionary 5 fiduciary is an oxymoron. Could you tell me what you meant by that? 6 7 MR. BREMEN: Sure. So a discretionary manager is a investment manager who had control of the decisions. They have the ability to analyze data and 9 then pull the trigger. So I think that part of it is 10 11 pretty clear. The non-discretionary fiduciary is the 12 13 adviser who has no control. They have the ability to 14 present recommendations to some other party; ultimately 15 that other party has control. And so they could say 16 no; they could say yes. And so ultimately if you're an 17 adviser and the -- the party with control doesn't take 18 your advice and something goes wrong, does that adviser have the same amount of responsibility as the 19 20 discretionary manager who has control of all decisions? 21 MS. BORZI: Okay. I think I understand that 22 better.

		158
1	MR. BREMEN: Yes.	
2	MS. BORZI: In your experience as a	
3	practitioner, have you ever had the kind of experience	
4	that I had when I was in private practice where a	
5	service provider would approach our clients, represent	
6	that he or she was accepting fiduciary responsibility,	
7	perhaps even put it in the written agreement that they	
8	agreed to be a fiduciary, and then something went	
9	wrong. And the Department would come to investigate or	
10	they'd get sued by participants, and then the service	
11	provider basically walked away from the written	
12	representation that they were a fiduciary and hid	
13	behind the five-part test to claim they weren't a	
14	fiduciary?	
15	MR. BREMEN: So	
16	MS. BORZI: Have you ever had that	
17	experience?	
18	MR. BREMEN: No. I have not been part of a	
19	situation like that. No, but I think I think the	
20	MS. BORZI: But what if somebody	
21	MR. BREMEN: Yeah, I	
22	MS. BORZI: somebody agrees to be a	

159 fiduciary, even puts it in writing. Do you think they should be able to walk away from that? 3 MR. BREMEN: So I -- so no, I think the challenge is that sometimes there can be differences when it comes to interpreting what the contract said or 5 what the arrangement was. So clearly for a firm like ours where we assume fiduciary responsibility, there could conceivably be cases where we feel we're not a 9 fiduciary. And so I think I gave the example or I mentioned that we believe people can limit the amount 10 of exposure they have because they might agree to be a 11 fiduciary, you know, for a variety of activities, but 12 13 maybe not some other activity where they have no oversight. So I think the devil's in the details. 14 15 MS. BORZI: So, but -- so then you really do 16 agree with Ms. Prange, who said that you could 17 basically disclaim fiduciary duty in some areas? 18 MR. BREMEN: Well, so my belief is that you're not -- you should be able to not be accountable 19 for certain activities if you're not performing those 21 functions. If you --22 MS. BORZI: Agreed, if you're not performing

160 the functions you shouldn't be accountable. But if you agree to perform X, Y and Z --3 MR. BREMEN: And then you go beyond and you are, in fact, performing those functions? MS. BORZI: Right. Even though you say I've 5 only -- I'm only a fiduciary with respect to X, Y and 6 7 Ζ. 8 MR. BREMEN: Well, then, it feels to me in a clear situation like that that you're providing your services as part of your broader arrangement. 10 MS. BORZI: Okay. I think the other two of 11 12 you I'll give a bye. Kent, I can see, is relieved. 13 (Laughter) 14 But that's because I have other colleagues --15 MR. DAVIS: And actually that's -- that's my first question, actually, Mr. Mason. The -- I wasn't 16 17 clear about your comments. You had eight points that 18 you wanted to address with respect to the reg, and a lot of them seemed to be drafting issues. 19 I just 20 wanted to know -- does ABC accept the basic premise of 21 the reg that the marketplace has become a lot more 22 complicated and, you know, with respect to these advice

- 1 arrangements, that there would be value in revisiting
- 2 the definition of fiduciary in the context of the
- 3 current environment?
- 4 MR. MASON: I don't think we have any sort of
- 5 opposition at all to sort of the revisiting. In other
- 6 words, it is a different environment. I think that the
- 7 sort of the point of sort of the improving and updating
- 8 the regulation is not something that we have any
- 9 opposition to. I think -- I mean, I think this is a
- 10 very healthy dialogue here, because, you know, are
- 11 there sort of things that could be improved about the
- 12 current req? Absolutely. And I think as I mentioned
- 13 sort of earlier during my comments, I think the
- 14 introduction of a seller exception is an important
- 15 movement forward. Because I think a lot of this turns
- 16 on disclosure, and the idea that somebody could
- 17 communicate to a participant or a plan without full
- 18 disclosure of sort of their role, I think we think is
- 19 not the right thing. So I think that sort of moving
- 20 forward in a direction where sort of their disclosure
- 21 can clarify the relationship between the two people --
- 22 I don't want to call them adviser/advisee -- but

- 1 between the receiver of information and the giver of
- 2 information I think is a great step forward. And I
- 3 think we have a lot of concerns about the current req,
- 4 but the process we think is an excellent one. I mean,
- 5 the hearing here and sort of the extension of the
- 6 comment period and the -- you know, we look forward to
- 7 the dialogue on this.
- 8 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Bremen? Is that the way to
- 9 pronounce it?
- 10 MR. BREMEN: Yes.
- 11 MR. DAVIS: Sorry if I mispronounced. Can
- 12 you talk a little bit more about plan distributions and
- 13 what you're seeing in that space? Do you think -- we
- 14 asked for comment in this area in the reg. Could you
- 15 just talk a little bit about what you're seeing there?
- 16 Do you think there'd be some value in extending this
- 17 conversation of investment advice to plan
- 18 distributions, and how those conversations are
- 19 happening?
- 20 MR. BREMEN: Sure. So it's clearly a huge
- 21 issue. If you can't keep participants in a plan where
- 22 they get the benefit of all the good work that goes

- 1 into the plan -- the low fees, the good investments,
- 2 and so forth -- plan participants need some strong
- 3 vehicle that they can use to ensure that they make it
- 4 to the finish line. And some -- some plans will
- 5 actually force participants out if they're age 65 and
- 6 they're inactive.
- 7 So there needs to be assistance for those
- 8 folks. Historically speaking, any number of service
- 9 providers have contracted with, say, a single service
- 10 provider, an insurance company, to provide an annuity
- 11 solution. There are some other services out there.
- 12 Kelli Hueler has a product which is a platform where
- 13 you have multiple insurance companies that are
- 14 competing. And then there are even other products out
- 15 there. Because this is such an important issue and
- 16 because participants really are unable to make a
- 17 decision on their own, it stands to reason that they
- 18 require some sort of assistance. So it -- without
- 19 being the expert in this particular area, it seems
- 20 reasonable to me that parties that push them towards
- 21 one product or another, you know, are giving those
- 22 individuals advice and should be held accountable for

164 the decision to guide them one way or another. Then you also made a statement 2 MR. DAVIS: earlier about advice being more fiduciary in nature 3 than a lot of service providers want to admit. 5 you expand on what you meant by that? Are there examples that you want to share? 6 7 MR. BREMEN: Sure. So in the defined contribution world, for example, there are so many activities, whether you're picking a share class, 9 whether you're picking a fund line-up, whether you're 10 helping -- which would be the initial managers you 11 If you replace fund managers with other 12 13 managers, that's what we would refer to as a search. If 14 you help with a mapping, you take one manager out and 15 you migrate those assets to another fund -- you know, 16 all of these activities we would say are fiduciary in 17 nature, because you are selecting the securities the 18 participants are going to be able to invest in. as you look across the spectrum of advisers, if you 19 will, it could very well be the record-keeper who is 20 21 providing assistance, and they may claim not to be a 22 fiduciary. You may have investment consultants that

- 1 provide the service that may or may not claim to be a
- 2 fiduciary. And then along the spectrum you have, you
- 3 know, other parties that may provide that service, and
- 4 they may claim to be a fiduciary, and then you may
- 5 still further have the discretionary folks that come in
- 6 in one way or another. So at least today, you have all
- 7 of these different parties providing the same service,
- 8 and yet very clearly some are saying that they're
- 9 fiduciaries and others are not.
- 10 MR. DAVIS: Finally, Mr. Certner. Previous
- 11 testimony has suggested, at least some have suggested,
- 12 that the reg as currently proposed will actually reduce
- 13 the availability of high quality advice, that you see
- 14 providers decide not to offer it for various reasons.
- 15 Are those concerns that you share, based on just the
- 16 things that you see with your members?
- 17 MR. CERTNER: Well, obviously the environment
- 18 has changed over the last ten years, where I think
- 19 there's a greater understanding about the needs in
- 20 defined contribution plans. I think the marketplace in
- 21 that respect has been responding in trying to provide
- 22 different levels of first, education and then advice to

- 1 individuals. But -- and from our perspective, we
- 2 obviously want to encourage advice. But it seems to us
- 3 a false choice if the choice is between, you know, sort
- 4 of no advice and bad advice. I mean, we should be able
- 5 to encourage good independent, non-conflicted advice
- 6 and encourage the market to move in that direction, not
- 7 simply to settle for this notion of well, the only
- 8 advice we can provide is from people who have
- 9 conflicts. I mean, that just doesn't make sense to us.
- 10 I think the market, I think, has responded over the
- 11 last decade, and I think with greater encouragement and
- 12 clearer rules, we can continue to do that.
- MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
- 14 MR. LEBOWITZ: So Kent, just maybe you can
- 15 take a crack at Phyllis' question, you know, the
- 16 circumstance being an adviser enters into an agreement
- 17 which says -- in which it says, "I will act in a
- 18 fiduciary capacity," and then subsequently we come
- 19 along, open investigation, assert that there was a
- 20 breach of that fiduciary responsibility. And so the
- 21 adviser should be stuck with that, right, no matter
- 22 what? They shouldn't be able to say, well, now let's

167 take a look at the five-part test or however many parts are left to the test? 3 MR. MASON: I mean, guess my reaction to that is if I as a, sort of a plan or a plan participant do the adviser on the other side who steps up to the plate 5 and says, I am a fiduciary, I guess I have -- it causes me to put my trust in that person to sort of represent me and sort of pursuant to the standards under ERISA. And I think consistent with, I think, your -- the first of your status requirements -- if I acknowledge that 10 I'm a fiduciary with respect to my actions. 11 12 that to me -- you know, that to me sort of says, I as a 13 participant or a plan have the right to rely on you as a fiduciary, and the fact that you try and wriggle out 14 15 later by sort of arguing well, I said it, but maybe I didn't sort of completely live up to it -- I'm not sure 16 17 we'd have a lot of sympathy there. 18 MR. LEBOWITZ: Okay. So that's what you mean 19 by mutual understanding?

you know, I think my example sort of on the other end

is sort of things that nobody would dream of that their

I mean, I think that --

MR. MASON: Yeah.

20

- 1 fiduciary relationship has started up. But where it is
- 2 clear that there is a fiduciary relationship that
- 3 started up, I don't think we're having any sympathy for
- 4 the people who sort of say no, I sort of want to sort
- 5 of take advantage of the fact that even though my
- 6 participant viewed me as a fiduciary, I -- it's not
- 7 convenient to sort of live up to that.
- 8 MR. HAUSER: Just a couple of quick questions
- 9 for you, Mr. Mason. The -- I guess for the most part,
- 10 I don't know if you would take this as reassuring or
- 11 not, but for the most part it seems to me your eight-
- 12 point list did go to drafting sorts of issues. You
- 13 know, the reality of it is that, at least as I read the
- 14 comments, it seemed to me there's a bit of a tendency
- 15 to aggressively and broadly read the sweep of the
- 16 fiduciary provisions and to read the exceptions
- 17 extraordinarily narrowly, which is kind of the opposite
- 18 of what plaintiffs normally do. But anyway, that's the
- 19 level a lot of the comments have proceeded on, and it
- 20 strikes me, for example, I mean just to use one
- 21 example, whether or not we achieved it with the
- 22 language, there's no intention at the Department to

- 1 prohibit swap dealers from being able to act adversely
- 2 to plans, when it's clear that they're on the opposite
- 3 side of the transaction. And we don't really see any
- 4 inconsistency at all between the two statutory regimes
- 5 here. So that's pretty plainly just a drafting
- 6 question, at best.
- 7 But so the two questions I have, though, are
- 8 one, I think the last example you gave had to do with
- 9 somebody who was giving legal, and I suppose there
- 10 might be other services, but they're giving legal
- 11 services and they really are just giving legal
- 12 services. But is your point of view that the rule
- 13 ought to be that as long as they're giving legal
- 14 services, for example, that that shouldn't be covered
- 15 by the exception? Or -- and it's only when they cross
- 16 the line and actually start giving financial advice
- 17 that they might be potentially liable as advisers for a
- 18 fee? Or do you just think that certain classes of
- 19 people like attorneys, accountants and the like should
- 20 just get a pass, regardless of whether or not they do
- 21 cross the line and start giving kind of conventional
- 22 financial advice?

170 1 MR. MASON: Yeah. I mean, can I answer also your sort of implicit question from where you're Because I actually completely agree with what 3 you said about a lot of this is drafting. And I think that a lot -- because of how central this issue is, 5 who's a fiduciary, that there's a lot of angst. think we're feeling it. I'm sure if you're reading comment letters, you're feeling it, too. And so I -- I 9 was talking to one person at the Department, and I said you know, I think two-thirds of our comments, we would 10 all sort of sit down and agree with. 11 It's just sort of a matter of really putting it -- clarifying it, you 12 13 know, sort of really starkly in the regulations. -- I really do agree with your point, Tim, you know. 14 15 On your question, I don't think -- I think there are really two issues on that sort of trust 16 17 agreement issue, but let me answer your specific 18 question. If a lawyer sort of gives legal advice, as for example, "This would be a prohibited transaction. 19 To enter into this swap would be a prohibited 20 21 transaction. Therefore, I advise against it," that to 22 me is -- you know, could be conceived as legal advice

171

- under here. In fact, under my sort of angst theory, that would be fiduciary advice under the reg. know, I don't think that was really intended, and I put 3 that in sort of a drafting thing, that if it's pure 5 legal advice, it's not fiduciary advice. If they do cross the line and say, gee, you know, I give you some 6 legal advice, but I, you know, "I'm pretty darned good with investments, too, " and start saying and "and this is what I do here and this is what I do here," and there's a clear sort of relationship that grows in 10 terms of sort of adviser/advisee, well, then, they've 11 just crossed the line. And so the fact that they're a 12 13 lawyer doesn't mean they're insulated from sort of -from these rules. It just means that when they're 14
- 16 not implicated. If they cross the line and establish

acting as such, that they are -- that these rules are

- 17 an adviser/advisee relationship where there's a mutual
- 18 understanding that the lawyer's advice is going to be
- 19 given -- have a significant role in investment

- 20 decisions, then there absolutely should be a fiduciary.
- I do think also that this trust agreement
- 22 issue is broader. It's not just legal. You know,

- 1 there are also negotiation points. So with someone
- 2 who's a non-lawyer just says I want this provision to
- 3 be different from that provision, from the way it's
- 4 drafted, they would also be -- they would also be a
- 5 fiduciary under the sort of angst theory of this -- of
- 6 this reg. And so I don't think it's a pure legal
- 7 advice point that I was making.
- 8 MR. HAUSER: And -- and so you brought up
- 9 this point about the mutual agreement again in that
- 10 answer. And I guess a question I have is, well, what -
- 11 how -- what does it take in your view to have the
- 12 kind of mutual agreement, you know, that should be
- 13 respected? It seems to me there's -- some of the
- 14 comments from the industry groups talked about the
- 15 problem of the unwitting fiduciary. But there's also
- 16 the problem of the kind of unwitting advice recipient
- 17 who thinks he's dealing with somebody who's a financial
- 18 adviser and who's in a position of trust who maybe
- 19 calls himself a financial planner or a financial
- 20 analyst or a financial adviser, but you know, buried
- 21 somewhere in the document is -- the documentation is
- 22 something that says essentially, while I'm giving you

- 1 advice, you know, you should never just rely on my
- 2 advice, but rather should consult other professionals
- 3 and sources. Is that good enough? What kind of
- 4 disclosure should count, and how do we protect people
- 5 from thinking they have somebody who stands in a
- 6 position with respect to them when they really don't?
- 7 MR. MASON: And I -- actually I think that's
- 8 a great question. I'm not sure I have a sort of a
- 9 perfect answer. I mean, in some sense we're all sort
- 10 of groping for that, because I don't see it under the
- 11 regulation, either. In other words -- in other words,
- 12 we sort of established this threshold, and the
- 13 threshold -- and I think this is sort of a function of
- 14 the proposed reg -- is sort of casting the net so
- 15 broadly that basically anybody who says something about
- 16 investments is a fiduciary. You know, because it may
- 17 be considered. And so I'm sort of at loss, like who is
- 18 really my fiduciary in this situation? Who do I really
- 19 -- who can I really trust? And you're sort of saying
- 20 well, if we back off of that and we put this
- 21 significant role concept into place, how is it that the
- 22 participants are going to understand who's on their

- 1 side and who's against them? And I don't have a
- 2 perfect answer, but I think our recommendation would be
- 3 do it as much as possible through disclosure. In other
- 4 words, if I don't want to be the primary basis of the
- 5 sort of significant role in your decision making, I
- 6 would say I disclaim fiduciary status. I have some
- 7 financial interests which may sort of lead me in one
- 8 direction as opposed to another. And you should seek
- 9 other advice if you sort of -- if you want to sort of
- 10 get someone who doesn't have a financial interest.
- 11 That -- and again, sort of going back to a
- 12 question Phyllis would have asked earlier, that would
- 13 never be dispositive. If I disclaim that and I act
- 14 differently, I'm still a fiduciary. But at least I'm
- 15 putting the participant on notice that I'm not sort of
- 16 taking on that mantle.
- 17 I don't know if that's a full answer to your
- 18 question, Tim, but I think it's a hard question, and
- 19 I'd like to think about it some more. But I would like
- 20 to do it through disclosure as opposed to -- I worry
- 21 that what we've done is we've cast the net too broadly
- 22 and we're going to inhibit sort of basic -- sort of

175 exchange of information. MR. HAUSER: Maybe to Joe, why don't you go 2 I'll come back if there's time. 3 ahead? 4 MR. PIACENTINI: I don't have a question. MR. HAUSER: Then I'm back. 5 (Laughter) 6 I mean, I guess the question I have that I asked of the last panel, too, is I understand the desire to make this a disclosure regime. 9 Which of course isn't generally what ERISA is. I mean, ERISA 10 has disclosure features, but it also requires that if 11 you're a fiduciary, you act in unconflicted ways. 12 13 I think part of the premise for that is there are certain situations, at least, where people can't 14 15 effectively quard against the conflicts. So I kind of 16 have the same question for you. I'm an unsophisticated 17 investor. I don't have years of training in finance. 18 I am not going to be able to intelligently invest my assets without guidance. I've come to you for 19 20 guidance, and you tell me, "I may have a financial 21 interest in some of the products that I recommend to 22 Now, " you know, putting your arm around me,

- 1 "let's talk about how I can plan your financial future
- 2 so you're secure in your old age." What is it I do
- 3 with the information about the conflict? How do I
- 4 protect myself?
- 5 MR. MASON: Well, I'm not sure I'll call him
- 6 co-counsel yet, but you can answer.
- 7 MR. BREMEN: So I think the -- certainly
- 8 disclosure is a great first start. But I think as we
- 9 said, that we don't think that you can disclose away
- 10 fiduciary responsibility, which I think is what you're
- 11 suggesting. And so just because somebody discloses --
- 12 someone claims to be a fiduciary, they disclose that
- 13 they have conflicts, if those conflicts are significant
- 14 and sort of impair the ability to give good advice, the
- 15 Department should have the ability to pursue what are
- 16 sort of horrendous, you know, heinous activities if an
- 17 investment consultant discloses conflicts.
- 18 Say that we -- say that an investment
- 19 consultant discloses that -- and this is not something
- 20 that we do, but say that an investment consultant
- 21 receives compensation from an investment manager for
- 22 some sort of activity that it engages in. And the plan

177 fiduciary still hires that investment consultant, and then it comes to light that because of the relationship with these different investment managers -- they 3 receive compensation for managers going to a conference or whatever, it somehow led the -- it impaired the 5 investment consultant's ability to give unbiased advice. It seems the Department should have the ability to pursue action in a case like that. I think that certainly disclosure is a great first step, but 9 disclosure in itself shouldn't mean that it puts 10 everybody in the fair and clear of what would be termed 11 fiduciary violations 12 13 MR. HAUSER: And Mr. Mason, do you agree with your co-counsel's answer and we'll call it a day? 14 15 MALE: Maybe not. 16 MR. MASON: I enjoyed it. I mean, gives more time to think and all that sort of thing. 17 18 (Laughter) You know, it's interesting, because you're 19 20 saying ERISA's a disclosure regime, and I understand 21 that. I think when you -- when you move away from regular basis and primary basis, and I'm not trying to 22

- 1 second-guess that one way or the other, you -- and this
- 2 is what I mentioned in the testimony. You put enormous
- 3 pressure on this distinction between selling and
- 4 advising. That's what sellers do. Sellers recommend.
- 5 They advise. That's their business. That's their job,
- 6 is to say, "This is great for you." And so what you're
- 7 really doing by taking away those two requirements --
- 8 and again, I'm not -- I'm just saying you've shifted
- 9 the world so that you have to become a disclosure
- 10 regime, which you recognize by creating the seller
- 11 exception. So -- so we're not really now -- you know,
- 12 once we sort of take away the primary basis and regular
- 13 basis, we have to become a disclosure regime by --
- 14 otherwise nobody could sell anything. And so I -- and
- 15 so I think to me, what I'm saying is if we're across
- 16 that line, we need to sort of look at how to
- 17 communicate it effectively. And do I want it to be on
- 18 page 27 of a 27-page document? I mean, that's not
- 19 communication. That's not a disclosure. In other
- 20 words, effective disclosure is what we're looking for.
- 21 I'm selling you something.
- MS. BORZI: So in that case, really what

		179
1	you're saying is you have to say, "I'm selling you	
2	something. This is good for you, but man, it's even	
3	better for me." Isn't that the kind of disclosure? If	
4	you're going to make money and a substantial amount of	
5	money by directing the participant to X rather than Y,	
6	isn't that the kind of disclosure you have to make?	
7	MR. MASON: Well, I don't want to say it's	
8	sort of better for me. This is if you come with my	
9	fund, look at the great the history we've had. We've	
10	done very well for our investors. And what you	
11	MS. BORZI: Look at what my salary was last	
12	year. I've done very well for myself.	
13	MR. MASON: Yes. Yes. And then say, "I	
14	don't make money when you go over there."	
15	MS. BORZI: Yeah.	
16	MR. MASON: "I make money when you come here,	
17	and you should know that when you're talking to me."	
18	And I don't think we have any sort of problem with that	
19	kind of disclosure	
20	MS. BORZI: We've got a model notice, Tim.	
21	(Laughter)	
22	MR. MASON: No, but seriously	
I		

```
180
 1
              MR. LEBOWITZ:
                             There's an element of this
    that requires an understanding on the part of the
    recipient of this disclosure, of this material, as to
 3
    what you're saying; right?
              MR. MASON: Yeah.
 5
              MR. LEBOWITZ: It could be on the first page;
    it doesn't have to be on the 27th page --
 8
              MR. MASON: Well, I --
 9
              MR. LEBOWITZ: -- and still be
    incomprehensible.
10
              MR. MASON: Well, you know, I mean I -- I
11
    guess Phyllis is -- you're being facetious, but maybe -
12
13
14
             MS. BORZI: Moi?
              MR. MASON: -- only half facetious.
15
           You know, I think the dialogue here in terms of
    sort of crafting something that is clear and effective
18
    is something that we're -- it's in all of our
    interests. And I actually mean that very -- don't --
19
   don't look at me that way.
21
              (Laughter)
22
              But you know, I do think, and so I think we
```

181 can achieve this. And I think that we get to a good result. 3 MR. HAUSER: I'm not sure which way I was looking at you -- (laughter) -- but did -- but would 4 you -- you know, AARP has suggested one circumstance, 5 and maybe more broadly. I mean, are there some circumstances where really the sale, the seller's exception ought to be more restrictive than it is because the sale is really ancillary to what is fundamentally an advice relationship? That the 10 relationship, the participant, the beneficiary, the IRA 11 holder has is primarily with somebody who's giving them 12 13 advice on how to invest, and occasionally the investor crosses over a line to sell them something, too. 14 15 mean, should there be a carve-out for that sort of 16 situation? 17 MR. MASON: Well, I mean, I guess I'm having 18 a little trouble sort of envisioning your facts, you know, in a sense that if I'm sort of -- I'm normally 19 20 indifferent with respect to the advice. In other 21 words, I have sort of -- I'm a flat fee. 22 certain respects, I could benefit. I mean, I -- and I

182 think we would want to work on some sort of particularized sort of disclosure to say, "Here I don't have any financial interest in your decision. Over 3 here, I have a distinct financial interest in your decision, and you should know about that." 5 6 MR. HAUSER: Yeah. MR. MASON: But the world is built on this. I sort of listened to Norman this morning and sort of saying, he sort of believed the car dealer when he was 9 sort of saying it was a good deal for him. We all have 10 to sort of -- that's what the whole rest of the world 11 12 is built on sort of listening to the sales pitches and 13 sort of distinguishing. And -- and sort of listening to different sales pitches and sort of seeing who's 14 15 going to sort of give me the sort of the straightest 16 answer and the best product. So I mean, I don't know 17 why --18 MR. CERTNER: I'd just like to add one thing Because this is a little bit 19 to that, though. 20 different context than people just going out in the 21 world and making a purchase. You're in the plan, so 22 you're in a closed universe. And so the adviser that's

- 1 been put before you is a probably a closed one that's
- 2 been selected by the employer. And an individual
- 3 generally tends to trust their employer. And so this
- 4 person that's being put in front of him is already
- 5 coming with a different kind of aura as an adviser,
- 6 regardless of some kind of -- the disclosure regimen
- 7 than just somebody going out in the world and shopping
- 8 among people. So I think it's a very different
- 9 environment here, and I think there's a much higher
- 10 duty that's required.
- MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you very much.
- 12 We will break for lunch and try to get back
- 13 on schedule. So we'll reconvene at 1:15. Thank you.
- 14 (AFTERNOON SESSION)
- 15 MR. LEBOWITZ: We can reconvene. The first
- 16 panel this afternoon is Karin Feldman, Jim McCarthy,
- 17 and Steve Saxon. Ms. Feldman?
- 18 MS. FELDMAN: Good afternoon. I am Karin
- 19 Feldman, the Benefits and Social Insurance Policy
- 20 Specialist at the AFL-CIO, and I thank you for the
- 21 opportunity to present the views of the AFL-CIO and
- 22 it's more than 50 affiliates representing over 12

- 1 million working men and women across the country. We
- 2 appreciate the opportunity to testify at the hearing
- 3 today on the Department's proposed rule defining an
- 4 individual who will be considered a fiduciary, as the
- 5 result of providing investment advice to a plan or a
- 6 plan participant. The AFL-CIO supports the
- 7 Department's decision to update the rule issued more
- 8 than 35 years ago, and we appreciate its taking the
- 9 initiative in doing so.
- In our view, the proposed expansion of the
- 11 scope of advice and recommendations that may constitute
- 12 investment advice is appropriate. We appreciate the
- 13 specific inclusion of advice or recommendations with
- 14 respect to the management of securities or other
- 15 property, as there should be no question that the
- 16 selection of individuals to manage plan investments
- 17 falls within the scope of investment advice. That has
- 18 been the Department's view for many years, and
- 19 providing explicit regulatory guidance will be helpful
- 20 to plan fiduciaries.
- 21 Perhaps the most significant change or the
- 22 one that has definitely gotten the most attention are

- 1 the modifications of the current five-part test for
- 2 determining whether someone is a fiduciary rendering
- 3 investment advice. The elimination of the existing
- 4 requirements that advice be provided on a regular
- 5 basis, and that it be the primary basis for investment
- 6 decisions appropriately recognizes that fiduciary
- 7 status should not depend on these fine distinctions.
- 8 The proposed rule, in our view, more closely reflects
- 9 the expectations of plan fiduciaries when they retain
- 10 investment advice providers, and we believe it will
- 11 better protect plans and plan participants.
- 12 We also wanted to take this opportunity to
- 13 respond to the Department's request for comments on
- 14 whether the provision of investment advice should
- 15 include advice about taking a plan distribution. The
- 16 AFL-CIO urges the Department to reconsider the
- 17 conclusion it reached in Advisory Opinion 2005-23A, and
- 18 include recommendations relating to plan distributions
- 19 as investment advice. The recommendation to take a
- 20 distribution and invest the proceeds of that
- 21 distribution outside the pension plan reflect, if you
- 22 will, an adviser's opinion about the investment and

- 1 distribution options under the plan compared to those
- 2 that might be available in the market. The decision to
- 3 take a distribution will impact a participant's future
- 4 retirement security. It could affect future investment
- 5 returns and the fees charged on any investment. It
- 6 could affect the availability of payment options,
- 7 including lifetime income options, and the benefit
- 8 amount paid under any such option. It could affect the
- 9 availability of benefits from related plans, such as
- 10 retiree health care or death benefits. So the ultimate
- 11 decision to take a distribution is an extraordinarily
- 12 significant one for a participant, and we believe
- 13 treating those who make recommendations with respect to
- 14 that distribution, as fiduciaries, will afford
- 15 additional protection to participants as they make this
- 16 critical decision. We think it is especially important
- 17 that participants be made aware of any financial
- 18 interest that advisers may have in making investment
- 19 recommendations, although we are not certain that
- 20 simple disclosure will be enough.
- 21 We have two concerns with respect to the
- 22 proposed rule that we hope are clarified. One of them

- 1 was discussed at length perhaps at the last panel; the
- 2 breadth of the seller's exception set forth in proposed
- 3 paragraph C(2)(i). While it's even debatable whether
- 4 this exclusion is appropriate with respect to plan
- 5 fiduciaries, in our view, it is certainly not
- 6 appropriate for plan participants. In our view,
- 7 individuals providing advice to plan participants
- 8 should and must always be fiduciaries, and they should
- 9 and must be truly independent advisers. The simple
- 10 offer of a disclaimer will not be understood, and we
- 11 don't think, in any event, it goes far enough, because,
- 12 as has been pointed out, it's unclear what a
- 13 participant ought to do when faced with that
- 14 disclaimer. We also have some concerns that the
- 15 proposed limitation, as applied to participants,
- 16 undermines the already inadequate protections for
- 17 conflicted advice afforded by the statutory investment
- 18 advise prohibited transaction exemption, in sections
- 19 408(b)(14) and 408(q) of the statute, and as the
- 20 members of the Panel well know, much more than
- 21 disclosure is required under that statutory regime.
- 22 Our other concern, which was also touched on

- 1 during the last panel, is the breadth of the proposed
- 2 rule and its unintentional potential to treat
- 3 professionals, who provide services to the plan
- 4 fiduciaries within the scope of their professions, to
- 5 treat them as providing investment advice. We do agree
- 6 that it probably could be addressed simply with
- 7 modifications to the language or clarifying comments,
- 8 and we also agree that, if a professional steps across
- 9 the line, then, consistent with the Department's long-
- 10 held view about whether professionals, like attorneys,
- 11 accountants and actuaries could be fiduciaries, it
- 12 really depends on the actions that they take and what
- 13 they do, and it should be no different in this
- 14 instance.
- And so we appreciate the opportunity to
- 16 testify this afternoon, and look forward to attempting
- 17 to answer your questions.
- 18 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. Mr. McCarthy?
- MR. McCARTHY: Good afternoon. My name is
- 20 Jim McCarthy, and I am a Managing Director of Morgan
- 21 Stanley Smith Barney, in charge of retirement services
- 22 for our corporate and individual clients. Unlike Kent

- 1 Mason, I brought with me co-counsel, who I knew I would
- 2 agree with. Bill Ryan, seated to my right, is an
- 3 Executive Director of Morgan Stanley's Legal Compliance
- 4 Department, responsible for ERISA and tax-qualified
- 5 issues. Together we would like to thank the Department
- 6 for the opportunity to address you today to comment on
- 7 the proposed regulation regarding investment advice and
- 8 that prong dealing with the fiduciary standards under
- 9 ERISA.
- 10 As we described in our comment letter, we
- 11 believe the Department should re-propose an amended
- 12 regulation, or, at a minimum, defer the proposed
- 13 regulation for further study for the following reasons.
- 14 First, as the Department notes, simultaneous
- 15 regulatory efforts addressing market conduct and
- 16 fiduciary status have been undertaken by the SEC and
- 17 the CFTC that's been copiously talked about today. As
- 18 we read them, the proposed regulation has significant -
- 19 has certain specific conflicts in many more places
- 20 where it is not at all clear to us how these competing
- 21 frameworks would interact.
- 22 Second, it is conceded by the Department that

- 1 several types of implementation costs of the proposed
- 2 regulation are currently labeled simply unknown.
- 3 Additionally, given the number and complexity of the
- 4 technology systems involved, the effective date, while
- 5 currently specifically indeterminate, is at 180 days
- 6 post-publication, calibrated at a point that we believe
- 7 is physically impossible to achieve. We have some
- 8 historical data on actual implementation costs and
- 9 timelines versus prior Department estimates that we
- 10 think will be helpful for the Department in assessing
- 11 this claim.
- 12 Third, as both the Department and other
- 13 commentators have noted, we believe that the impact
- 14 analysis of the proposed regulation has not adequately
- 15 considered the market impact, both economic and in
- 16 terms of client choice. The sea change would have
- 17 unplanned plan participants and IRA holders. I will
- 18 spend the majority of my later time addressing this
- 19 issue. First, I will ask Bill to focus on -- just a
- 20 few minutes on the impacts on our institutional and
- 21 asset management business, keeping the aggregate
- 22 remarks within our 10 minutes.

191 1 MR. RYAN: Well thank you, Jim, and good 2 afternoon, everyone. I'd like to spend a minute or two discussing -- and I really am going to keep it to a 3 minute or two -- discussing what the regulation may inadvertently do with respect to the availability of 5 plans and plan asset funds to do business with brokers 6 and other counter-parties, and this is both as a broker, as a counter-party, we would say this, and also 9 as an investment manager, since we have both 10 businesses. Now I think we have talked about the CFTC 11 12 comments in our comment letter. We also talked about 13 the SEC, section 913 Rule. We are just going to focus on five points in particular, and notice it's three 14 less than Kent Mason, in talking about how the CFTC 15 rules and this proposed regulation interact. As you 16 17 already probably are painfully aware, the CFTC Business Conduct Rules require swap dealers to provide counter-18 party or a prospective counter-party with detailed 19 information on the material risks of the swap, the swap 20 21 scenario analyses, designed in consultation with the

counter-party and daily marks and evaluations.

192 1 I am not going to try to give a full description of these, but in terms of the five points 2 in particular we would like to focus the Department's 3 4 attention on. First, under the proposed regulation, if you 5 are in fact registered as an investment adviser and 6 providing advice for a fee you, are in fact presumed to be a fiduciary. Most counter-parties in the institutional trading market are, in fact, dual-9 registered as both broker dealers and investment 10 advisers. Under that standard it would generally mean 11 that the broker dealer is presumed to be a fiduciary 12 13 simply by fact of its registration, and these are all principal transactions where we are the counter-party, 14 15 our financial interests are diverging from the plans, 16 so the prohibitive transaction concern that we have is 17 real. 18 Second, if the valuation of daily marks required by Dodd-Frank for swaps, which, even if 19

> (866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com 2011

negotiated between us and the fiduciary, may include

non-public information is now under the regulation

presumed to be fiduciary; that means, in order to

20

21

- 1 comply with one federal requirement, Dodd-Frank, in
- 2 providing the information, we may violate ERISA in
- 3 actually entering into the transactions at all since
- 4 that simple provision of information could be deemed
- 5 and should in fact be considered to be part of a
- 6 fiduciary relationship.
- 7 Third, under the current proposal, if all
- 8 that is required for investment advice under ERISA to
- 9 be fiduciary is that the communications may be
- 10 considered as part of a transaction -- and also, when
- 11 you put that next to the fact that the CFTC rules
- 12 actually require that you provide this information so
- 13 it can be considered by the counter-party, we are again
- 14 concerned about our ability to do the transactions at
- 15 all.
- 16 Fourth, if we are required to, under Dodd-
- 17 Frank, to make sure the plan representative has
- 18 sufficient knowledge or information, and we do that by
- 19 questioning, we again are concerned about whether or
- 20 not those questions rise to a fiduciary status.
- 21 And finally, since the presumption under the
- 22 regulation that all these actions are the fiduciary,

- 1 even if we disclaim in writing fiduciary using the
- 2 seller's exemption, we are not clear that the scope
- 3 covers any of the subsequent and required oral
- 4 conversations described above. As the Department has
- 5 indicated, this can in fact be modified orally.
- 6 So whatever comes out of the process, we and
- 7 others, we believe, need a clear statement from both
- 8 the regulators, in coordination, that trying to adhere
- 9 to one set of regulations doesn't in fact cause us to
- 10 violate another.
- 11 Jim?
- 12 MR. McCARTHY: Thank you, Bill. First, a bit
- 13 of context about our retail business. Through Morgan
- 14 Stanley Smith Barney, Morgan Stanley serves as the
- 15 broker, custodian and investment adviser for over 3.2
- 16 million accounts, of which approximately 2.7 million
- 17 are IRAs and 500,000 are plans. The value of these
- 18 \$400 billion dollars. We offer a wide range of
- 19 products and services, such as: plan documents and
- 20 serving as custodian; brokerage accounts offering the
- 21 full range of products; equity fixed income notes;
- 22 other products for which we serve as an underwriter or

- 1 an agent; mutual funds, both proprietary and not; ETS
- 2 bank products, et cetera. Most of this business is
- 3 generally priced on a commission or spread basis. We
- 4 offer relationships with a wide variety of 401(k) plan
- 5 recordkeepers and investment providers where we assist
- 6 in vendor selection and participant education, again,
- 7 as a broker; investment advisory services for assets,
- 8 both custody with us and at other institutions, with
- 9 firm acts and investment advisers under the adviser
- 10 Act, and from retirement clients, as an acknowledged
- 11 fiduciary under ERISA.
- In reviewing the Department's proposed
- 13 regulation, we are primarily concerned about and would
- 14 like to emphasize the following three points.
- 15 First, we believe the Department may not have
- 16 fully appreciated the effective interplay of these
- 17 rules with the other regulatory initiatives. Both
- 18 Secretary Solis and the Chairman of the SEC, Mary
- 19 Schapiro, have acknowledged the importance of
- 20 coordinating; however, it is clear that the critical
- 21 objectives in implementing any new fiduciary retail
- 22 standards cited in the SEC study do not appear to be

- 1 dealt with anywhere in the proposed regulation. These
- 2 include the preservation of customer choice, the
- 3 importance of retaining different delivery markets for
- 4 products and services, differential pricing for such
- 5 products and principal trading.
- 6 Second, we believe the cost estimates, as to
- 7 both the cost of implementation as well as the client
- 8 costs, have been seriously understated. As an example
- 9 we would offer our own experience to date in complying
- 10 with the Department's various disclosure projects,
- 11 notably, the Form 5500 and the upcoming 408(b)(2)
- 12 disclosure requirements. For the 5500, we would note
- 13 that the cost estimate proposed by the Department was
- 14 slightly north of \$15 million dollars for the entire
- 15 service industry, with approximately a two percent
- 16 market share in the private defined contribution and
- 17 private defined benefit markets. Morgan Stanley alone
- 18 has spent, to date, in excess of \$17 million dollars in
- 19 internal and external costs in complying with these
- 20 requirements.
- 21 For 408(b)(2), the construction of various
- 22 disclosure reports and website offerings to make

- 1 available and indirect compensation was estimated
- 2 industry-wide of \$59 million. Our spending, not yet
- 3 complete, is already in the millions. Regrettably a
- 4 significant portion of this work may, in fact, turn out
- 5 to have been throw away work, as the imposition of the
- 6 broader fiduciary status of the proposed regulation
- 7 will cause certain exemptions to be unavailable, and
- 8 thus redefine what narrow subset of compensation costs
- 9 will be permissible going forward. I would emphasize
- 10 that the enumerated costs of the fiduciary proposal,
- 11 which we view as the most complex and far-reaching of
- 12 the three, is currently \$2 million dollars.
- Third, and most importantly, given the way
- 14 the regulation has been drafted, we believe that the
- 15 vast majority of our accounts will need to be treated
- 16 as ERISA fiduciary accounts. We believe that the
- 17 impact of this would be no principal trading; which, in
- 18 the fixed income market, removes a key member of the
- 19 competitive set; limits access to certain investments
- 20 the clients want and dictates agency trading, which is
- 21 frequently more expensive for the retail client to
- 22 execute; little or no access to underwriting or

198

syndicates in which we act as a lead underwriter, thus impairing the capital raising capacity of corporations and governments, and again depriving clients of desired 3 investments; and no holding of property that does not have an independent market or valuation agent; shifting 5 many of these accounts billed from a commission basis 6 to an all-in advisory fee, which is ironic, in that the SEC and FINRA sanctioned firms that bill clients for accounts that don't transact frequently. In addition to the loss of choice and the likelihood of additional 10 out-of-pocket expense, we believe that the regulations 11 will result in an overall less competitive, higher 12 13 priced environment. There will be very high costs of re-engineering and ongoing compliance, which will force 14 certain providers from the market, and we believe there 15 16 will be greater and greater amounts of operational and 17 stress risk capital, which will need to be allocated to 18 these businesses. As everyone learned in the financial crisis, capital is not free. The capital needs will be 19 20 driven by our regulators -- I'm going to take another 15 to 20 seconds, if that's okay -- our regulators --21 ERISA is a prescriptive statute with a default that 22

- 1 says everything is a violation. This will narrow the
- 2 number of exemptions available. Under LaRue, since
- 3 2008, you have a vast multiplication in the number of
- 4 people who can bring suit, and we know that this
- 5 operational and risk capital, right; those costs will
- 6 have to be socialized across the marketplace.
- 7 So with that I will conclude my remarks.
- 8 Thank you for the opportunity to testify. We stand
- 9 ready to answer any questions you may have.
- 10 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. Mr. Saxon?
- 11 MR. SAXON: Thank you. I am Steve Saxon, I
- 12 am a partner in a law firm in Washington, D.C., here
- 13 today on behalf of a number of plan service providers
- 14 offering a variety of services from investment
- 15 consulting, recordkeeping, insurance and investment
- 16 management. We appreciate the opportunity to be here,
- 17 and I'm going to highlight just a few of the comments
- 18 that are in our written submission.
- 19 Our initial concern is that the proposal
- 20 applies the fiduciary definition to persons providing
- 21 investment advice to plans, as defined by the Internal
- 22 Revenue Code. This expansion should not be adapted for

- 1 two reasons. First, it provides no additional
- 2 protection for plans outside of the protections already
- 3 offered under the Code, although the Code contains
- 4 provisions generally paralleling risks as prohibited
- 5 transactions rules, the Code does not otherwise
- 6 establish standards of conduct for fiduciaries, nor
- 7 does the Code permit plans or participants to bring
- 8 suit for breaches of fiduciary duty or prohibited
- 9 transactions. Secondly, the Department should
- 10 coordinate with the SEC expanding the fiduciary
- 11 definition. Under Dodd-Frank, the SEC was directed to
- 12 study the standards of care that should apply to broker
- 13 dealers registered under the Securities Exchange Act of
- 14 1934. The SEC released a study only in January, and it
- 15 makes recommendations with respect to a number of
- 16 issues central to the proposed regulation; for example,
- 17 the study recommends a uniform standard of conduct for
- 18 brokers and investment advisers. Accordingly, we urge
- 19 the Department to review this study and coordinate with
- 20 the SEC on the proper standard of conduct applicable to
- 21 broker dealers and investment advisers before
- 22 finalizing the proposal.

201 1 Next I would like to talk about Deseret. The final regulation should affirm the Department's Advisory Opinion, the 2005-23A addressed to Deseret 3 Mutual Benefit Administrators. In this guidance the Department opined that advising a plan participant to 5 take a permissible plan distribution, even when 6 combined with a recommendation as to how the distribution should be invested, does not constitute investment advice, because it does not involve a 9 recommendation or advice concerning a particular 10 investment of the plan. This position was taken by the 11 12 Department a mere five years ago. We request that the 13 Department not re-write its requirements related to 14 distribution-related discussions with participants. Ιf financial institutions are going to be deemed to be 15 16 fiduciaries when they provide distribution consulting 17 services, they will simply stop providing those 18 services or participants will be left without 19 information relating to the consequences of plan distributions. 20 21 Distribution consulting typically involves a participant who has already made the decision to 22

- 1 liquidate his or her individual account balance in the
- 2 plan. In these cases the participant is not seeking
- 3 the adviser's opinion about whether doing so is
- 4 prudent; he or she is seeking advice on the appropriate
- 5 investments to make following the distribution. In
- 6 such cases, advice on the distribution proceeds no
- 7 longer relates to the assets of the plan, and therefore
- 8 cannot constitute fiduciary activity with respect to
- 9 the plan. This is particularly important to discourage
- 10 leakage. In a recent report the GAO found that the
- 11 substantial majority of leakage from retirement plans
- 12 was in the form of cash-outs at a job change. The
- 13 report found that providing information to participants
- 14 about the long-term effects of these cash-outs would
- 15 reduce leakage. If the Department changes its existing
- 16 positions set out in the Deseret opinion, it would
- 17 essentially remove distribution consulting from the
- 18 marketplace. This would make it far more likely that
- 19 this source of information would not reach the
- 20 participants, and thus exacerbate the leakage problem.
- 21 Next, I would like to address the status
- 22 issue. We think the Department should eliminate the

203

status of a person as a relevant factor under the With few exceptions, a person's status has never been a basis on which to conclude that the person 3 is a fiduciary with respect to a plan. By structuring 5 the proposed regulation in this way, the Department has established an approach that is incompatible with one 6 of the major tenants of ERISA, that fiduciary status is determined by function. The Department should instead 9 require ongoing services in an explicit and mutual agreement between the parties in order for a person to 10 be deemed to be an investment advice fiduciary. 11 12 second problem with the status element of the proposed 13 regulation is that it is unclear how the Department 14 intends a person's status in one context to affect the 15 person's interactions with the plan in a different 16 context. It is well-established under the law that a 17 person may provide both fiduciary, non-fiduciary 18 services to a single plan; in other words, a single 19 organization or person can wear two hats, one a 20 fiduciary hat, the other a non-fiduciary hat. 21 scope of fiduciary status under ERISA has always been 22 limited by the understanding that a person is a

- 1 fiduciary only to the extent that he or she performs
- 2 certain functions. The functional test has been
- 3 acknowledged repeatedly by the Supreme Court in such
- 4 cases as Peagram and Mertens. The Department relied on
- 5 this same concept in the Aetna Advisory Opinion, the
- 6 1997 opinion that they issued to me, where
- 7 recordkeeping activities were deemed non-fiduciary even
- 8 though an affiliate managed the essence of the plan.
- 9 Although we do not believe it was the Department's
- 10 intent to do so, the proposed regulation could be read
- 11 as a significant departure from this longstanding
- 12 approach. We request that the Department clarify this
- 13 issue.
- 14 Next I would like to talk about some of the
- 15 limitations. With regards to the limitations proposed
- 16 by the fiduciary definition, the final regulation
- 17 should broaden the scope of limitations to make clear
- 18 that ordinary, routine sales activities are non-
- 19 fiduciary. In the context of marketing or making a
- 20 menu of funds available, our experience has been that
- 21 plan fiduciaries frequently request a sample or model
- 22 investment line-up from a prospective recordkeeper.

- 1 These services provide useful information to plan
- 2 fiduciaries and, in many cases, the plan fiduciaries
- 3 will not consider a prospective service provider that
- 4 refuses to provide these services. Therefore, our
- 5 group requests that the Department either clarify that
- 6 this limitation would accommodate such a request, or
- 7 broaden the limitation so that it does. These basic
- 8 sales presentations are necessary to the proper
- 9 functioning of plans and should not be discouraged by
- 10 the threat of fiduciary liability.
- 11 The final regulation should also clarify the
- 12 types and frequency of disclosures that plan service
- 13 providers must make in order to comply with the
- 14 limitations provided under the proposed regulation. The
- 15 proposed regulation requires that a person acting as a
- 16 seller must disclose that the person who is providing
- 17 advice has interests which are adverse to the interest
- 18 of the plan, and that the plan is not undertaking to
- 19 provide impartial investment advice. This requirement
- 20 forces the service provider to choose between two
- 21 options; accept fiduciary status or brand itself a
- 22 conflicted adviser. In any business built on

- 1 relationships, sellers and buyers both benefit when the
- 2 buyer feels as though he has received good value.
- 3 Automatically characterizing the seller relationship as
- 4 adverse is inaccurate and inappropriate. It would be
- 5 far more useful for the seller to note that it is not
- 6 giving advice, but merely proposing a sale, if
- 7 accompanied by a disclosure simply stating that the
- 8 seller receives compensation on the products that are
- 9 sold and that the compensation received may vary by
- 10 type of products sold, then this would give the
- 11 recipient better information to form his or her opinion
- 12 on whether to purchase the product or service being
- 13 sold.
- 14 Finally, I would like to address valuation
- 15 issues. I must say that most of what was contained in
- 16 the proposed regulation was not unexpected to me, but
- 17 the Department's position on valuation was a surprise.
- 18 To the extent that the Department is concerned about
- 19 valuation, it should study the issue in light of the
- 20 recent comments received, and if necessary, should
- 21 engage in a separate rulemaking process specifically
- 22 addressing valuation issues. The group is concerned

- 1 that imposing fiduciary status on persons providing an
- 2 appraisal fairness opinion or information as to the
- 3 value of securities of property is overly broad and
- 4 counter-productive. By way of example we are concerned
- 5 that custodians will either charge a lot more or exit
- 6 the business if deemed to be fiduciaries. In any
- 7 event, the limitation related to reporting a disclosure
- 8 should not be -- it should not operate to broaden the
- 9 scope of fiduciary status. As written, this limitation
- 10 is confusing, because it operates to expand rather than
- 11 limit the scope of the fiduciary definition. The sub-
- 12 section implies that preparing valuation reports for
- 13 other than reporting and disclosure is a fiduciary act.
- 14 To say that every statement not made for reporting and
- 15 disclosure purposes that reflects the value of plan
- 16 investment constitutes advice would be incredible, and
- 17 we believe, unjustified under the proposed regulation.
- 18 The Department needs to fix this.
- 19 In addition, we are concerned that by
- 20 characterizing the preparation of a valuation statement
- 21 as a fiduciary activity, the proposed regulation
- 22 inadvertently includes a number of activities that

208 simply should not be fiduciary in nature. This would cause many parties -- I have about 10 seconds left -this would cause many parties, such as appraisers and 3 sub-custodians, to become ERISA fiduciaries to plans where those parties have no direct contractual 5 arrangements with ERISA plans, or even an ability to 6 identify the ERISA plans to which they owe fiduciary 8 duties. 9 I'll end it there. Thank you very much. Thank you. 10 MR. LEBOWITZ: MS. BORZI: Mr. Saxon, let me start with you. 11 12 Could you tell us who is in your group that you 13 represent? Neither of the comments, the written 14 comments, nor --15 MR. SAXON: Yeah. I'll send you a whole list 16 of credits. 17 MS. BORZI: Okay, great. We'd just like --18 MR. SAXON: It's investment consultants, investment managers, banks, insurance companies --19 MS. BORZI: Well, we would like to know who 20 21 they are. 22 MR. SAXON: I'll send you a list.

209 1 MS. BORZI: Okay, great. Let me ask you one more question, and that is, you, as well as many of our other industry witnesses, have used the term 3 coordination; you keep telling us we need to coordinate with the SEC and the CFTC. What exactly do you mean, 5 because one of the other witnesses said talking isn't enough; so what exactly do you mean by coordinating? 8 MR. SAXON: I actually think that you 9 probably will coordinate. I think that you will designate staff in your department to talk to the folks 10 over at the SEC, to jointly meet and get an 11 12 understanding of what their concerns, what their 13 purposes are, --14 MS. BORZI: Mmm-hmm (in the affirmative). MR. SAXON: -- how they are going to affect 15 16 their mission. 17 MS. BORZI: Well you are not suggesting we --18 I mean, ERISA and Dodd-Frank are two very different statutes, very different purposes, very different 19 20 structures, and to the extent that there is some 21 intersection, it has to do with the types of entities that provide services to ERISA plans and IRA-holders; 22

210

coordination that we defer to these other agencies? MR. SAXON: No. I have always been on the 3 side of the DOL in that regards, so . . . for 31 years. 5 But, what I am saying is that if you have an understanding of where they are going and the changes 6 that they are going to make and how those changes are going to impact how broker dealers and investment 9 advisers operate and that will impact their business, then you need to take that into account so that we 10 11 don't have one federal agency saying that you must do 12 this, you must disclose this, and we have another

so you are not suggesting in this advocacy of

- 15 they will just set up a disclosure regimen, and we
- 16 need to understand where they are going with respect to

federal agency saying something that's quite different,

or even probably more likely they are going to set up -

- 17 their disclosure so that we can set up ours in a way
- 18 that compliments what they are doing, so they are not
- 19 working at cross purposes.

13

- MS. BORZI: So the word I prefer to use is
- 21 harmonize, because it seems to me that illustrates,
- 22 first of all, the nature of the discussions we have

211 had, certainly with the SEC even before the regulation was proposed, because we sent it to the SEC and got their comments and input, before we even sent it 3 forward within the Department or to OMB, because we 5 were trying to be sure that we were harmonizing their regime and our regime. But, the reason I ask you this 6 question about are you -- when you use the word coordinate are you really talking about deferral, is because Mr. McCarthy said something that some of our 9 other witnesses said as well, which is: you want 10 assurances that compliance with one law will make you 11 compliant with another law; so that suggests to me -- I 12 13 mean that isn't the way laws work in general. 14 MR. RYAN: Madam Secretary, if I could? MS. BORZI: Sure, absolutely. Could you 15 16 explain that to me? 17 MR. RYAN: Of course. I think Morgan 18 Stanley's concern with respect to the CFTC Rules, in particular, is that the specific legal duties that are 19 20 required from an entity, as we sort of enumerated, 21 appear to, in fact, be exactly within the scope of what 22 the Department thinks is fiduciary advice. So if that,

212 if we are wrong in that, we are more than happy to be wrong on that, but what we were looking for, at least 3 in the CFTC context, was some clear assurance by the Department that complying with the Business Conduct Rules itself did not implicate negatively on -- by the 5 provision of information marks, et cetera, our ability to serve as a counter-party. 8 MR. McCARTHY: We weren't looking for a pass 9 10 MR. RYAN: No. MR. McCARTHY: -- by complying with the CFTC 11 versus the DOL; we just don't want to be in a position 12 13 of serving one and causing a problem with the other. 14 Right. MR. RYAN: I can understand that. 15 MS. BORZI: Yeah. Again, that's why we refer this to a process of 16 17 harmonization rather than one agency basically strong-18 arming the other, because it's certainly clear to me, and feel free to disagree if you do, that the fiduciary 19 duties under ERISA are much higher -- the highest 20 21 standard that we know in the legal world, which is not 22 to denigrate the legal standards in the other statutes,

213 but when you are a fiduciary with respect to a plan under ERISA, it's a higher standard than some of these other statutes. 3 4 MR. RYAN: Agreed. 5 MS. BORZI: And so I get a little concerned when -- I am with you completely, which is the reason that we have been working with these other agencies; that we don't want to put the regulated community in a position where compliance with one law puts them out of compliance with another, but people regularly -- there 10 are regularly multiplicity of laws that a single entity 11 is subject to, and I am not sure where there is any 12 13 guarantee that the multiple laws that you are subject to, whether they be federal laws or state laws, are 14 15 exactly the same. 16 MR. McCARTHY: But --17 MS. BORZI: So our goal is to harmonize, but 18 I just want you to understand that harmonization does not mean that we are simply going to roll over and play 19 20 I hear people say, well you need to wait to see 21 what the FCC is doing or the CFTC, because you can't move forward under your statutory authority until we 22

214 see what they do. That suggests to me that what you are suggesting to us is that our efforts are inferior to those other agencies' efforts, and I hope that's not what you are saying, but please tell me if that is what 5 you are saying? MR. RYAN: It is clearly not what we are 6 saying. 8 MR. McCARTHY: Yeah. Can I take that? MR. RYAN: Feel free. 9 MR. McCARTHY: So I think there are two 10 points, right? 11 MS. BORZI: Mmm-hmm (in the affirmative). 12 13 MR. McCARTHY: One is not what we are saying, right, but as the --14 15 MS. BORZI: I didn't want to put words in your mouth; that's why I gave you the opportunity to 17 open it up. 18 MR. McCARTHY: No. No. But, as the operators of businesses, right, that need to comply 19 with various regulators, we do -- we have two 20 21 interests, right? One, in making sure that the cost 22 benefit, right; that the solutions aren't proposed,

- 1 right, against problems that are either nonexistent or
- 2 less severe than we perceived them to be, and that's
- 3 what these public forums talk about, right; like, what
- 4 is the severity of the solution versus the size of the
- 5 problem? And you have asked some very pointed
- 6 questions about what people have experienced, you know,
- 7 in practical everyday life.
- 8 The second thing is, just as a practical
- 9 matter, from a timing standpoint, it's about, you know,
- 10 can you exercise your statutory authority; but it is
- 11 the practical implication of saying to a systems
- 12 community, listen, you need to go program these things
- 13 and it's got to be done in six months, and you book up
- 14 their time, right, and there are only so many surgeons
- 15 that can be around the body at one time, and then
- 16 another regulator drops out of the sky and says here is
- 17 another set of requirements that has to be done in a
- 18 different timeframe, right? Some of these things
- 19 become physically impossible, right? So we are
- 20 definitively sensitive to the implementation
- 21 practicality.
- MS. BORZI: And I am completely sympathetic

216 to those arguments. We don't -- there is no mileage in it for us, to drive up plan costs needlessly, because all that does ultimately is take money from benefits. 3 4 MR. McCARTHY: Right, the social costs. So we don't start with the idea 5 MS. BORZI: that we are unmindful of costs, but it's possible, just possible that the cost benefit analysis that we do might vary from the cost benefit analysis that you do. But, the point of this dialogue is so that everybody understands what people perceive the costs and the 10 11 benefits to be. So I really appreciate your comments. 12 MR. McCARTHY: If I can make one suggestion? 13 MS. BORZI: Sure. 14 MR. McCARTHY: So, in the Federal Impact 15 Statement that's included in all these rulemakings, there is a discussion of the methodology by which the 16 17 cost benefits -- there are surveys and there are 18 profiles and there are outside entities that presume that -- I am not sure, right? And it may happen that I 19 20 just didn't get the letter, but I am not sure that there is a process whereby people say, listen, our 22 initial estimate on this was X; and then two years

217 later, when the project is done, we go out and survey the community and figure out the order of magnitude, like, how good were we at estimating, because I would 3 tell you my experience is that the gap is large, right? 5 MS. BORZI: It's always large, because what you are doing is measuring behavior. I mean all of you 6 and many of the witnesses on our other panel have said advice will dry up, you know; this will cost a 9 gazillion dollars. Well, you know, that's -- you are estimating what the behavior will be. 10 11 MR. McCARTHY: No, no. I am saying I can show you \$17 million dollars worth of checks we wrote 12 13 in regard to the 5500 against a \$15 million industrywide estimate, right? I can show you those canceled 14 15 checks, right? 16 MS. BORZI: Sure. 17 MR. McCARTHY: So, in terms of just refining 18 this process, right, I would --MS. BORZI: It's a continual refinement of 19 20 the process. 21 MR. McCARTHY: Right. 22 MS. BORZI: that's why, when we put out a

- 1 regulation, you are asked to comment not just on the
- 2 substance of the regulation, but on the regulatory
- 3 impact analysis, because, as I said at the beginning,
- 4 we want to get it right and we want to get it right not
- 5 just on the substance, but we want to have a genuine,
- 6 and to the best we can, accurate estimation of what
- 7 this is going to cost. But, that's why we need to work
- 8 together, and if you have got that kind of information,
- 9 that's helpful to us.
- 10 MR. McCARTHY: Great.
- 11 MS. BORZI: Michael?
- 12 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. That's actually what I
- 13 wanted to ask about, just costs. Mr. McCarthy, you
- 14 talked about the costs that your firm experienced for
- 15 the Form 5500. You said there were millions spent on
- 16 408(b)(2). I just want to get a sense, as you think
- 17 about this regulation and then maybe also back to
- 18 408(b)(2), how would you categorize those different
- 19 costs? Is that systems? Is that training? Can you
- 20 break it down into more specific categories so we can
- 21 understand it better?
- MR. McCARTHY: Sure. Just in terms of the

- 1 5500, right, I'll be within a 10 percent kind of
- 2 tolerance accurate. So we spent \$17 million dollars in
- 3 terms of systems, right, including systems consultants
- 4 to write requirements and so forth. We spent \$7 or \$8
- 5 million dollars. Now, just -- I want to, in the
- 6 interest of full disclosure, that's two very large
- 7 platforms, because we had acquired Smith Barney, right,
- 8 in a joint venture with Citigroup, so we had two large
- 9 broker-dealer platforms to do the same work on, right?
- 10 And the way this works is you would anticipate is we
- 11 have spent probably \$10 million on the first platform
- 12 and \$7 on the second, because we were more efficient
- 13 and so forth. But, we have spent, as I said, \$7 or \$8
- 14 million dollars on systems work and systems
- 15 consultants. We spent another \$2.5 or \$3 million
- 16 dollars on temp staff, right, to organize the data and
- 17 get all the -- to review all the sources of fees and
- 18 revenues and so forth, right, because there is a giant
- 19 reconciliation that has to be done. We have to take
- 20 all of this data and kind of match it up. And then the
- 21 last part of the spend was -- what did we spend,
- 22 probably a quarter of a million or half a million

220 dollars on legal --2 MR. RYAN: It was worth every penny. 3 MR. McCARTHY: Yes. And then the last part of the spend is, yeah, we had to put in 26 or 28 additional operational people to operate the system, 5 right, that didn't exist before that now exists. when it's all said and done, right, it equals \$17 million dollars, and we can break it out more precisely for you. 9 10 MR. DAVIS: But, as you think about the current regulatory initiatives we are talking about 11 today, definition of fiduciary, and you talk about 12 13 costs and the cost burden, where do you think the cost burden would be created most specifically; would that 14 15 be a change of business model within the systems again; 16 would that be . . . 17 MR. McCARTHY: It's a really good question 18 because -- so ERISA is prescriptive, right, which means you have to look at everything to make sure you are not 19 violating a law, right? Because you live in the sea of 21 no until you can get to the island of yes. And, from that perspective, you have to examine every process 22

- 1 flow, right? How do you process a mutual fund? How do
- 2 you process an equity ticket? How do you process a
- 3 structured investment rate? How do you charge fees,
- 4 and so forth? So all of those things need to be kind
- 5 of tracked through. So that is a large amount of
- 6 chasing the wiring, right; some of which is five years
- 7 old and some of which is 35 years old. You have to
- 8 chase the wiring through the entire house to figure out
- 9 where everything goes, and what are the points of --
- 10 where, you know, unshielded things are together and
- 11 they may short, right? I am staying with that
- 12 metaphor. So from that perspective, right, we will
- 13 spend just -- my guess is we'll spend \$4 to \$8 million
- 14 dollars with PWC or something -- I am not awarding a
- 15 bid right now, but with some, you know, kind of systems
- 16 consultancy, right, to help us with that, right?
- 17 Because your choices are either maintaining a lot of
- 18 staff or flexing up using consultants. We will spend
- 19 probably \$2 to \$4 million dollars in terms of actual
- 20 systems programming time. The big issue for us, right,
- 21 is not going to be -- and that's a big -- so that's a
- 22 big number, right? My guess is, you know, all in out-

- 1 of-pocket costs, \$10 to \$12 million dollars. The
- 2 bigger issue is there are a whole bunch of things that
- 3 we do today that we are going to have to do very
- 4 differently, and that means that whether it's revenue
- 5 that stops happening, right, or has to be redone in a
- 6 different way or disclosure. We have 4.5 million
- 7 retail clients, so one of the things that was in that
- 8 operational expense that I talked about was we had to
- 9 send a lot of mailings to clients, right? We had to --
- 10 you know, and every time you have to mail something
- 11 three million times it's expensive, right, not good for
- 12 the planet; so, from that perspective. So I would say
- 13 mostly it's about assessment and it's about the build,
- 14 right? Those are the costs that you would recognize.
- 15 There is a lot of business practice rework that will
- 16 come out of this where people will say, hey, we used to
- 17 do it this way, now we need to do it this way. A lot
- 18 of the -- as I said before and I think other people
- 19 have said it, a lot of business will move to flat fee
- 20 wrapped accounts, right? It's just -- it's going to be
- 21 the nature of you either have to stop doing something,
- 22 or you have to price it very differently.

223 1 MS. BORZI: Well again you are assuming that 2 commissions are not . . . 3 MR. McCARTHY: No. I am not assuming that commissions don't matter, right, but if you are doing a business that you either have to tear it down and 5 rebuild the whole thing, right, it may be easier to convince the client, right, and the client is not -they are not all lambs, right? You know some of them 9 are tigers. It might be easier to convince the client, to say, listen, effectively we were charging you 45 or 10 105 basic points or whatever it is, right; why don't we 11 12 just wrap this together, remove the conflicts, right, 13 and go forward? So there will be a lot of transition 14 as far as that goes. 15 MS. BORZI: And some product transitions? 16 MR. McCARTHY: Right, and some product 17 transitions. Right. And I haven't talked it -- I 18 haven't even thought about what happens on the institutional platform. 19 20 MR. RYAN: That's right. And I think, at 21 least from that side, some of the products and 22 services, people have gone -- I have linked to that

- 1 principal trading and fixed income and structured notes
- 2 and underwriting. So, if you think of all of these
- 3 accounts on the retail space as in fact fiduciary,
- 4 which is generally where we are presuming, not only are
- 5 we putting in a wrapped construct, because we think it
- 6 actually is less likely to be a problem, but we are
- 7 also excluding certain products, because they can't be
- 8 offset in terms of the few structures that's put forth
- 9 in Frost. They can't -- there are no effective ways to
- 10 necessarily deal with this outside of an open- end
- 11 mutual fund product. We tend to believe that these are
- 12 fairly easy -- well easier anyway, to locate, describe
- 13 and candidly offset. So even within the retail
- 14 construct it's not only just moving them two products,
- 15 but it's also, in our view, limiting the types of
- 16 products that they will be in. And, we know from
- 17 internal surveys that they are in a lot of these
- 18 (inaudible) counseling candidly a brokerage IRA sitting
- 19 next to advisory IRAs with the same client because they
- 20 wanted certain products that weren't available in the
- 21 advisory space.
- On the institutional side, truthfully, the

225

harmonization point is well-taken. It is literally -literally though our concern is the cost, and it is the exposure that we have as an institution financially for 3 a risk-based analysis in trying to comply with the prohibited transaction rules. 5 6 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. MR. LEBOWITZ: Mr. Saxon, you testimony in connection with the status, you said that status shouldn't be a relevant factor; that it should be an 9 analysis, but status should require ongoing services 10 and -- and an explicit mutual agreement, arrangement or 11 12 understanding. So let's go back to this morning's discussion that we had with Kent Mason and others about 13 the circumstance where an adviser and the client sign 14 15 an agreement, and the agreement establishes a 16 relationship that says -- where the adviser says I am 17 going to be a fiduciary and that's what the plan/client 18 expects. And then later on the adviser says, well, maybe I really wasn't a fiduciary. I may have told you 19 20 I was, or maybe they tell it to use -- maybe I told 21 them I was, but I didn't really mean it or I didn't 22 really do the things that your current five-part test

- 1 requires. So is that what you are saying; you want
- 2 that to continue, right? You want to be able to walk
- 3 away from your commitment to your clients when you tell
- 4 them you are a fiduciary, and then say well maybe not,
- 5 particularly if you lost money as a result of my
- 6 advice?
- 7 MR. SAXON: Here is where I am coming from,
- 8 and I apologize -- I would like to address your
- 9 disclaimer point at the same time -- that if you have a
- 10 contract where you acknowledge fiduciary status, it
- 11 gets a little bit more complicated than this, but let's
- 12 assume that it's an investment management-type contract
- 13 where none of us would -- where you are picking
- 14 securities, and then the person later on tries to take
- 15 the position that they weren't recommending securities
- 16 at all; the facts would be that they were picking
- 17 securities, and I don't have a problem whatsoever with
- 18 calling them a fiduciary. I do think though that it's
- 19 more complicated because sometimes you have contracts
- 20 where you have the same institution providing
- 21 investment advisory services alongside a, say a
- 22 recordkeeping or an administrative component, and what

- 1 I want to be crystal clear about is that while we can
- 2 acknowledge fiduciary status with respect to the
- 3 aspects of the contract where we fit within 3(21) of
- 4 ERISA, where we have traditionally taken the view that
- 5 our recordkeeping administrative services are non-
- 6 fiduciary, we have a problem with taking the position
- 7 that because you are a fiduciary under one aspect of
- 8 the contract, you become a fiduciary with respect to
- 9 everything that occurs in the contract. This --
- MS. BORZI: Well that wasn't what we were
- 11 suggesting.
- MR. SAXON: Okay. That's good. The
- 13 disclaimer point, I actually have it -- I have
- 14 litigation in the Federal District Court with respect
- 15 to this kind of issue. If someone disclaims fiduciary
- 16 status, in my mind, it becomes a facts and
- 17 circumstances test. Unfortunately, you probably have
- 18 an acknowledgement from a plan sponsor that they signed
- 19 a piece of paper saying, given all the things that you
- 20 are doing as a service provider, I acknowledge that you
- 21 are not a fiduciary even though they might be, they
- 22 might be providing all kinds of investment advice where

228 we would all agree that you are a fiduciary. In those cases, I don't have a problem in holding that person, notwithstanding the disclaimer. It might have been 3 4 imprudent for the plan sponsor to enter into that contract --5 6 MS. BORZI: Or maybe he wouldn't even know? MR. SAXON: -- but I would apply the functional test and say, look, if you are providing 9 advice and there is an understanding that the plan sponsor is relying on that advice, and there is an 10 understanding that they are relying on that advice, 11 then you are a fiduciary, and I am comfortable with 12 13 that notwithstanding the language in the contract. Ι have another case where we have an investment 14 15 consultant that had a disclaimer in their contract, and 16 they sat before a trustees meeting year after year on a 17 quarterly basis and made recommendations, not just in 18 front of the trustees, but they made recommendations in front of the outside accountant and the third-party 19 20 administrator, and everybody heard that person make 21 specific recommendations that you need to be in this particular fund, and then when the fund went south they 22

- 1 took the position that they were not a fiduciary. I
- 2 don't have a problem with bringing a lawsuit against
- 3 them to the extent that their actions were imprudent.
- 4 MR. HAUSER: I just, again, for you, Mr.
- 5 Saxon, just two line drawing sorts of questions. The
- 6 first is, I wasn't sure what you were saying with
- 7 respect to recordkeepers and other folks' advice as to
- 8 what goes on a fund line-up. Under what circumstances
- 9 would you think that kind of advice ought to be
- 10 fiduciary, and under what circumstances would you say
- 11 it shouldn't be treated as fiduciary advice?
- MR. SAXON: Yeah. That's a very tough
- 13 question. I think the simple answer is that where you
- 14 provide a generic line-up or a menu, even though you
- 15 have ratcheted down the number of funds from say 1,000
- 16 funds to 100 funds, if you are doing that without any
- 17 particular plan in mind, you are doing that because you
- 18 are applying various performance screens to get the
- 19 very best funds available. The issue is where you are
- 20 sitting down with the plan sponsor and you offer --
- 21 let's say you offer three or four funds in a particular
- 22 asset category, and you -- I would still say that you

230

are in a non-fiduciary position where you are still providing information on three or four funds, and even if it's, you know, qualifying-type information; this 3 one does this better; this manager has been around a long time; these guys are good in down market, the 5 problem would surface where the plan sponsor says to you, okay, tell me which of these funds I absolutely -which of these funds is best for me given that you know all about everything that I am doing? And in that, you know, -- and they have been working with them for a 10 long time, then I think that, at that point, you are 11 12 risking crossing the line. Does that help you? 13 Well, I am not sure. But, MR. HAUSER: should it matter who is coming -- when you talked about 14 15 performance screens, should it matter where the performance screens are coming from; whether it's you 17 selecting the sorts of screens that you think that the 18 plan ought to be applying, or whether it's kind of the converse --19 20 MR. SAXON: I really don't --21 MR. HAUSER: -- and the plan is saying, here 22 are the benchmarks, find the entities that (inaudible)

231 these? 2 MR. SAXON: The screens that will involve -some screens involve analysis against other managers in 3 a particular peer group; others compare against various 4 5 kinds of benchmarks. What you are suggesting is that because I apply some of my own technical skills on a 6 subjective basis that I have crossed a line. I don't think that should be the key element. I think the key element should be the understanding between the recipient of the advice and the reliance of that and 10 the understanding that they have that this -- I am 11 relying in making this decision based on what you are 12 13 telling me; rather than the kind of screen that I develop and how -- and what objectivity or subjectivity 14 I have in the screen. 15 16 MR. HAUSER: But the way you described it 17 there, it's not necessarily a mutual understanding as 18 to the person's legal status, but rather as to the level of reliance in making a particular fund choice, 20 is that right? 21 MR. SAXON: Right. Yeah. MR. HAUSER: Okay. And then the second 22

question I had, just a similar line-drawing question; I

232

- appreciate that you were surprised by the inclusion of valuation firms in the regulation, but even the five-3 part, you know, test regulation specifically includes advice as to the value of the asset as one of the 5 categories covered in advice; so is there no -- under 6 what circumstances would you think advice as to the value of an asset should be fiduciary, if any? 9 MR. SAXON: Right. You know, it's funny that you ask that question that way, because I -- we were 10 prepping for this yesterday and I said to my guys, I 11 said, look, if you look at the existing regulation it 12 13 talks about valuation, and they said to tell to tell you -- so I am going to pass this along to you -- that 14
- 17 it -- but, I have to concede, you look at the

15

16

18 regulation, the regulation says what it says, but here

you have never looked at valuation advice as fiduciary

advice before, so this is the first time you are doing

- 19 is the problem. The problem is that you have a number
- 20 of appraisal and valuation firms out there that, unlike
- 21 almost anybody else that we are talking about today in
- 22 the retirement services space, these folks, they don't

- 1 understand ERISA; they have never thought of themselves
- 2 as being ERISA fiduciaries; they have trouble
- 3 understanding the concept of the highest standard that
- 4 Madam Secretary was talking about; and they, more
- 5 likely than anybody else, will exit this business or
- 6 find some other way to provide services because they
- 7 are not organized. They don't have the insurance. They
- 8 don't have expertise to serve as ERISA fiduciaries.
- 9 But, here is the -- if there is a concept of a solution
- 10 it would be the following; that wherever you have a
- 11 valuation provider that's providing that information to
- 12 some other fiduciary who is making that decision, like
- 13 a trustee, -- so I am a trustee and I need some expert
- 14 advice with respect to this property that I am either
- 15 purchasing or selling, so I go out and I get a
- 16 valuation firm. The firm doesn't know -- they might
- 17 even know that they are doing this with respect to a
- 18 plan; they just know that a financial institution has
- 19 called them and they have this property, they want them
- 20 to do -- in accordance with all of their appraisal
- 21 standards that apply, the MAI standards that they are
- 22 going to value this property, they are providing that

- 1 information to the fiduciary. If you look at the way
- 2 the Department has dealt with this in the exemption
- 3 process for years and years, that fiduciary takes that
- 4 valuation as one element of their overall decision-
- 5 making process. They can rely on it. If the valuation
- 6 provider did a bad job, then they can sue them for
- 7 breach of contract. But, I think that you still -- in
- 8 terms of the protections that the participants have,
- 9 you still have, in the solution that I have given, you
- 10 still have a fiduciary on the hook for making that
- 11 decision and relying on that valuation, and they have
- 12 to ask the right questions; they have to get the right
- 13 kind of reputable valuation firm in there, et cetera,
- 14 to make that decision.
- 15 MR. LEBOWITZ: That's current law, isn't it?
- 16 That's no different from the current?
- 17 MR. SAXON: Well sometimes the current law,
- 18 you don't always have -- you don't always have a
- 19 reputable fiduciary between making that decision, but,
- 20 yeah, both, pretty much it is.
- 21 MR. LEBOWITZ: Well, I mean, in terms of --
- 22 in terms of the target of a lawsuit it's going to be

```
235
   the decision-maker?
 2
             MR. SAXON: Yes.
             MR. LEBOWITZ: But, the decision-maker is
 3
   unarmed really? The only information the decision-
   maker has is from the valuation firm; has no capacity
 5
   to second-quess it?
             MR. SAXON: Well they, under ERISA, they have
   to ask questions.
             MR. LEBOWITZ: So they need a second
 9
   valuation?
10
             MR. SAXON: They have to go beyond -- well
11
   sometimes they do get --
13
             MR. LEBOWITZ: So they need a second
   valuation to judge the first one, --
15
             MR. SAXON: No, but you have to sit down and
16
17
             MR. LEBOWITZ: -- and then maybe a third one
18
   to judge the second one?
             MS. BORZI: And then they are all out of the
19
   test, the five-part test?
21
             MR. SAXON: First of all, as you know, you
   have to make a prudent decision on selecting the
```

- 1 valuation firm to make sure that they have the right
- 2 kind of qualifications and experience. You would look
- 3 at -- you would tear apart the valuation if they, for
- 4 example, they had a -- if they had a list of
- 5 comparables that were somewhere between 98 and 100, but
- 6 they selected a value of 110 for this particular asset,
- 7 you would have to ask them well why; everybody else is
- 8 between 98 and 100?
- 9 MR. LEBOWITZ: Yeah. I mean I think there is
- 10 a reason why fiduciary, plan fiduciary decision-makers
- 11 hire a valuation firm to advise them, because they are
- 12 not capable of tearing apart the valuation. That's not
- 13 what they do. They do whatever their business is.
- 14 That's what they do.
- 15 MR. SAXON: But, I mean, I'd like to flip it
- 16 around, because I have been -- I have sat across from
- 17 you guys for so many years where you have told me that
- 18 that fiduciary has a responsibility to ask questions.
- 19 MR. LEBOWITZ: Because that's the inevitable
- 20 consequence of the current regulation; that's where it
- 21 leads us. It doesn't lead us to the individual whom we
- 22 think is really the culpable party, or at least being

237 able to include the individuals whom we think are culpable in the fiduciary breach into, you know, into a 3 legal action. MR. SAXON: Well, we disagree on that one. MR. LEBOWITZ: We have to move on too. 5 MR. PIACENTINI: Okay. I'll limit myself to 6 just one question, and it's for Mr. McCarthy. I think it was in response to a question from Mr. Davis that you talked about what you called business practice rework, and you said something about how an account that was, you know, where the revenue was generated one way, 11 12 how that might be able to be restated as an equivalent 13 flat fee, or something to that effect? Did I understand that correctly, or can you elaborate a 14 little bit on that? 15 16 MR. McCARTHY: Yeah. I wouldn't say 17 restated, right; I would say restated, right. So you 18 would go to an account, right, that traded with X 19 frequency at Y revenue rate, which produced Z total revenue, and you would say, listen, we are doing 20 21 business, but because you have a tendency to buy fixed 22 income from us and structured notes, right, those two

- 1 things are potentially verboten under the new regime;
- 2 so, in order for us to remove that conflict, right, we
- 3 should enter into an agreement where you give us Z
- 4 revenue and you can buy anything, right, whether it's a
- 5 money market fund or a structured product or whatever,
- 6 and at the end of the day, right, we take all of the
- 7 product versus product financial incentive, right, one
- 8 way or another out of it, right, because you basically
- 9 levelize all the choices. Now, when I talk about that,
- 10 right, that is entirely dependent on where the
- 11 Department comes out on the issue of where levelization
- 12 happens, right? Today I would say very proudly that we
- 13 have a regime where, you know, we sold our proprietary
- 14 retail asset management business, right, so we don't
- 15 have a retail asset management business, but, you know,
- 16 whether it's -- whatever the product is within the
- 17 category, compensation is leveled. Now, I can't tell
- 18 you that we figured out a way to say, hey, here is an
- 19 annuity, right, that produces revenue of 200 bases
- 20 points versus a mutual fund that produces revenue of
- 21 bases points, because those two things are two
- 22 fundamentally different structures, and when people try

- 1 to equate them and say, well you have an incentive to
- 2 do this, it also does a different thing for the client,
- 3 right? It has an entirely different cost structure,
- 4 not just as a result of the expense of distribution,
- 5 but the expense of the underlying construct, the hedges
- 6 and so forth, right? So one of the things that we are
- 7 concerned about, right, is how we address to a client
- 8 the fact that -- client situations are complicated,
- 9 right, and the solutions generally will tend to be a
- 10 quill (ph), right? It's not going to be all of one
- 11 thing or all of another. So from a -- we deal with
- 12 asset allocation all the time. We have a generation in
- 13 and nearing retirement that is precariously saved, at
- 14 best, and so we have to think about not just asset
- 15 allocation, right; we have to think about product
- 16 allocation, in terms of how much of it is market
- 17 correlated versus how much of it is quaranteed and so
- 18 forth and put those things together, and all of them,
- 19 right, we are frequently not the manufacturer, but all
- 20 of them have different kind of economic dynamics,
- 21 right? We are concerned, right, about how we have to -
- 22 we are in a highly regulated business, so we already

- 1 disclose all this to the client, right? The question
- 2 is how we have to characterize the interplay between
- 3 those different things, right? And that's one of the
- 4 things they are waiting with -- to figure out where
- 5 this goes. Does that help?
- 6 MR. PIACENTINI: Thank you.
- 7 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. The next panel is
- 8 Ted Novy, Marla Kreindler, and Theresa Atanasio. Mr.
- 9 Novy?
- 10 MR. NOVY: Thank you. Good afternoon. My
- 11 name is Ted Novy, and I am an attorney in Aon Hewitt's
- 12 Legal Department. I lead its retirement outsourcing
- 13 team. I want to thank you and the Department today for
- 14 the opportunity to testify at these proceedings. Aon
- 15 Hewitt has extensive experience in both designing and
- 16 administering retirement plans for mid- and large-sized
- 17 employers. We are the largest independent provider of
- 18 administrative services for retirement plans serving
- 19 more than 11 million plan participants. With
- 20 Americans' retirement income needs in mind, we support
- 21 the Department for moving to update the definition of
- 22 fiduciary. In particular, my testimony today will

2.41

- 1 address the question that the Department posed in the
- 2 preamble; namely, whether and to what extent investment
- 3 advice should encompass recommendations related to
- 4 taking a plan distribution? Aon Hewitt recommends that
- 5 the Department answer this question in the affirmative;
- 6 namely, that the final regulation should include
- 7 recommendations to participants to take plan
- 8 distributions from their plan accounts. As the
- 9 Department well knows, many Americans face serious
- 10 challenges and risks with respect to their retirement
- 11 concerning inflation, longevity, and market
- 12 fluctuation. It's no wonder that many Americans are
- 13 looking for assistance with their retirement
- 14 challenges; however, too few are equipped to manage
- 15 their retirement challenges alone, so they rely upon
- 16 others for assistance. Within the mid-sized and large-
- 17 sized qualified plan environment, many participants
- 18 receive access to unbiased advice, guidance and
- 19 education. The individual retail market also provides
- 20 a host of options to address these retirement needs,
- 21 but those choices can be overwhelming to even an
- 22 informed consumer. Furthermore, when participants from

- 1 a qualified plan to an individual retail market, they
- 2 may experience higher fees, which can erode their
- 3 retirement savings. Also, confused participants are at
- 4 a greater risk of purchasing products that are
- 5 inappropriate for their needs, or making decisions
- 6 based on biased quidance. In some cases there may be
- 7 benefits to the retirement market, the retail market,
- 8 that make the move outside the plan worthwhile, but
- 9 participants must be fully informed about the
- 10 advantages and the disadvantages.
- 11 As we discussed in our comment letter, we
- 12 believe that the Department should include in the
- 13 definition of investment advice recommendations to take
- 14 a plan distribution for two primary reasons. The first
- 15 is that the participant's decision to take a plan
- 16 distribution is comprised of two significant decisions
- 17 affecting the participant's plan assets; namely,
- 18 whether to liquidate current investments, and how to
- 19 manage the distribution of funds. Secondly, we also
- 20 wish to suggest that the failure to include
- 21 distribution advice under the final regulation may
- 22 result in an unintended consequence; that is, it may

- 1 create a bias towards a recommendation from an adviser
- 2 for a participant to take a distribution so that the
- 3 adviser is not an ERISA fiduciary, and may provide
- 4 advice with respect to investments, in which the
- 5 adviser has a financial interest.
- From a participant's perspective, the
- 7 decision to take a plan distribution is comprised of
- 8 two smaller, but significant decisions. The first is
- 9 the participant must decide whether to liquidate
- 10 current investments. Investment decisions to buy or
- 11 sell a particular plan investment are at the core of
- 12 the participant's management of his or her account.
- 13 This is true whether the sale of the investment is
- 14 merely as a prelude to investing in another plan
- 15 investment option, or as a precursor to a plan
- 16 distribution. Furthermore, the decision becomes even
- 17 more complicated when the distribution recommendation
- 18 is with respect to less than a total distribution of
- 19 the participant's account. The participant is forced
- 20 to make a decision concerning which investments to
- 21 retain in the plan and which investments to liquidate
- 22 and distribute with respect to the distribution advice.

- 1 In other words, the participants must decide on the
- 2 suitability of the investments that stay and those
- 3 investments that liquidated and the funds that go.
- 4 Second, a participant must decide how to
- 5 manage the distribution of funds from his or her plan
- 6 account; that includes the time, tax year, the manner,
- 7 the form, and the future custody of the plan
- 8 distribution. The decision of where to invest assets
- 9 outside the plan and to whom to entrust with the
- 10 custody of those assets is a significant decision. A
- 11 participant must make this decision, however, prior to
- 12 the actual distribution while the funds remain in the
- 13 plan and therefore are plan assets. When the adviser
- 14 provides advice with respect to either of these
- 15 decisions, or both, the assets in question remain or
- 16 are already in the plan; that is, they are still in the
- 17 plan. Together these two important and inter-related
- 18 decisions regarding the investment of plan assets can
- 19 play a significant role in the participant's future
- 20 retirement savings.
- 21 In Advisory Opinion 2005-23(a), the
- 22 Department determined that a recommendation to take a

- 1 distribution did not constitute an investment advice
- 2 because the assets would be invested outside the plan.
- 3 However, at the time the adviser provided that
- 4 distribution recommendation, the assets in question
- 5 were still within the plan; therefore, differentiating
- 6 between a recommendation to invest in plan options or
- 7 to invest in options outside the plan create an
- 8 inconsistency in the application of ERISA fiduciary
- 9 rules. Or, maybe to phrase the question in this way;
- 10 why should the advice to liquidate an investment
- 11 position and take a distribution be treated any
- 12 differently than the decision to liquidate an
- 13 investment position and re-invest in a different plan
- 14 option. This inconsistent position appears to create a
- 15 potential bias, as I mentioned, towards a
- 16 recommendation to take a distribution so that the
- 17 adviser is not subject to fiduciary standard, standard
- 18 funds of ERISA, and also recommend potentially an
- 19 investment in which the adviser has a financial
- 20 interest. We suggest -- that is, Aon Hewitt suggests,
- 21 that while a participant has assets invested in the
- 22 plan, any recommendation is a recommendation as to the

- 1 management of the participant's securities in the plan.
- 2 Such advice should therefore constitute investment
- 3 advice under ERISA.
- 4 With my remaining time I would like to
- 5 discuss the costs and benefits related to a more
- 6 inclusive definition of investment advice. By
- 7 extending the regulation to include recommendations to
- 8 take a distribution, we believe the associated costs
- 9 would be minimal, and the benefits to the participants
- 10 and beneficiaries would greatly outweigh those costs.
- 11 We also anticipate that these recommendations with
- 12 respect to the management of plan assets, if applied
- 13 consistently, would result in more participants
- 14 remaining in the plan and not being subject to steerage
- 15 or inappropriate advice. Retention of assets within
- 16 the plan provides a participant or beneficiary with a
- 17 number of rights and protections, including spousal
- 18 protections that they may not receive outside of the
- 19 plan. Examples of those benefits and
- 20 protections are: they benefit from the protective
- 21 oversight of a plan fiduciary, who must exercise his or
- 22 her fiduciary duty with respect to the plan; they also

- 1 have access to unbiased advice and decision-making
- 2 tools, and these tools are normally priced at a
- 3 significant discount compared to individual investment
- 4 advice that's available in the retail market; there is
- 5 also a more specialized and tailored plan
- 6 communications; they would receive fee disclosure, and
- 7 they would also benefit from the leverage buying power
- 8 that employer plans can bring to bear. Recommendations
- 9 to participants and beneficiaries to take a
- 10 distribution from the qualified plan should be
- 11 considered in the context of these potential advantages
- 12 and dollars. Including such recommendations in the
- 13 definition of investment advice will result in a more
- 14 balanced and unbiased recommendation considering all
- 15 options available to the plan participant. That said,
- 16 we do not believe that the provision of general
- 17 education and information about the advantages or the
- 18 details surrounding a distribution should invoke
- 19 fiduciary status.
- In closing, we support the Department's goal
- 21 of updating the rule for changes in the financial
- 22 industry, and the expectations of plan participants and

- 1 beneficiaries. As I have explained, we believe that
- 2 the goals can best be achieved, in part, by expanding
- 3 the definition of investment advice to include
- 4 recommendations to a participant to take a plan
- 5 distribution. We appreciate the opportunity to share
- 6 our thoughts with the Department. Thank you.
- 7 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you.
- 8 MS. KREINDLER: Thank you. Good afternoon.
- 9 Thank you for the opportunity to testify at this
- 10 important hearing. My name is Marla Kreindler, and I am
- 11 a partner with Winston and Strawn. I am pleased to
- 12 testify today on behalf of DCIIA, the Defined
- 13 Contribution Institutional Investment Association.
- 14 Formed last year, DCIIA is dedicated to
- 15 enhancing the retirement security of American workers
- 16 through Defined Contribution plans. Our members are
- 17 leaders in the defined contribution community and
- 18 include institutional investment managers, consultants,
- 19 recordkeepers, and others that support our core
- 20 beliefs. Winston and Strawn is proud to serve as
- 21 counsel to DCIIA.
- To start, we support your commitment to

- 1 protect D.C. plans through regulatory initiatives, and
- 2 thank you for the opportunity to offer our
- 3 perspectives. In today's testimony, I'll address some
- $4\,$ of the topics that we included in our comment letter,
- 5 including recommended revisions and clarifications to
- 6 the proposed rule, our views on advice regarding
- 7 distributions, and also our recommendations to
- 8 withdraw, and, as appropriate, re-propose the rules and
- 9 provide sufficient time for transition for these
- 10 important changes.
- 11 Turning to our comments to the proposed rule,
- 12 we support efforts to clearly provide for when a person
- 13 acts as a fiduciary, and also certainly support
- 14 fiduciary best practices. At the same time, we believe
- 15 changes to these fundamental rules should be carefully
- 16 considered and revised so as not to create unintended
- 17 consequences or be over-broad. For example, we ask
- 18 that you consider retaining the requirements that
- 19 advice be individualized to the needs of the plan, and
- 20 that the advice be provided as part of a mutual
- 21 understanding that the advice form the primary basis in
- 22 the plan's decision-making. Of course, if primary

- 1 basis were viewed as too limiting, we suggest then, you
- 2 know, a reasonable solution such that there will at
- 3 least be a mutual understanding that the advice would
- 4 constitute a significant factor in the plan's decision-
- 5 making. Otherwise, we are concerned that these changes
- 6 could result in significant uncertainty and cause the
- 7 providers of generic advice to become ERISA
- 8 fiduciaries. Importantly, we also believe these
- 9 conditions should apply; so meaning, primary basis and
- 10 individualized advice and significant factor, at least
- 11 to registered investment advisers, ERISA fiduciaries
- 12 and affiliates of registered investment advisers and
- 13 fiduciaries to have the benefit of speaking and
- 14 testifying a little later. To answer the question, we
- 15 are not objecting to when someone acknowledges that
- 16 they are a fiduciary to being held to the fiduciary
- 17 standards, but the point is, is that when someone is
- 18 only an investment adviser or a fiduciary for other
- 19 reasons, or an affiliate of such a person, that they
- 20 shouldn't be swept into these rules. So we also
- 21 suggest that the types of advice covered by the
- 22 proposed rule, it basically be revised to ensure that

- 1 only investment advice and not other types of advice be
- 2 covered. Advice provided by brokers, accountants,
- 3 lawyers could be swept into the definition of fiduciary
- 4 advice, and we advise that the precedence, some of
- 5 which were cited in the preamble to the exceptions
- 6 under the Investment adviser's Act, which specifically
- 7 excludes advice provided by brokers, lawyers,
- 8 accountants and others, under appropriate
- 9 circumstances, would be something that could be used as
- 10 a model for this purpose.
- 11 Regarding the exceptions, you know, again, we
- 12 commend you for including exceptions in the proposed
- 13 rules for sellers or counter-parties, and for
- 14 investment platform providers. We believe these
- 15 exceptions are helpful, but, you know, again, suggest
- 16 that they be revised. For the counter-party or seller
- 17 exception, we encourage you not to limit the exception
- 18 to the purchase and sale of securities or property. For
- 19 example, D.C. plans routinely contract for and conduct
- 20 RFPs for services. Those responding should not be
- 21 concerned that their RFP responses would become
- 22 fiduciary advice. The exception should also apply to

- 1 other types of plan transactions that may not
- 2 technically be purchases and sales, such as extensions
- 3 of credit and finance transactions. As well, we
- 4 believe that the requirement that a party to be adverse
- 5 may unnecessarily exclude transactions with parties
- 6 whose interest are more aligned and less conflicted.
- 7 And, as others have said, the exception could apply to
- 8 a broker, but here the key is that if -- the way that
- 9 the proposed regulation was drafted, that the
- 10 individualized advice, mutual understanding and primary
- 11 basis threshold conditions are not required and are not
- 12 met, so you have someone that is operating where none
- 13 of those requirements or conditions are met. So there
- 14 is not individualized advice, not a mutual
- 15 understanding, no primary basis, then we believe that
- 16 the broker certainly in that situation should be able
- 17 to not be a fiduciary when providing information,
- 18 including about all fees and expenses, and conflicts of
- 19 interest to the plan.
- 20 On a drafting note, we also suggest that the
- 21 exception be clarified to include not only the initial
- 22 transaction in question, but modifications and

253 amendments to the transaction. For the investment platform provider 2 exception, we ask that you clarify the accepted ways in 3 which the information and guidance may be used. experience, plans look to platform providers to assist 5 them with narrowing the large number of options that 6 may be available in different ways, as we have heard Sometimes plans seek advice through an 9 investment manager or consultant; other times, platform providers may engage independent third-parties to 10 construct a narrow list of funds that may be focused on 11 -- that is not focused on the individualized needs of 12 13 the plan. In other cases, plan fiduciaries directly request specific information and data to help them meet 14 15 their fiduciary responsibilities. Narrowing is 16 performed to identify specified significant factors, 17 such as investment performance, cost, manager tenure, 18 et cetera. When these narrowing services are based on objective or third-party criteria, we believe these 19 services alone need not make a platform provider a 21 fiduciary.

We also respectfully request that you

- 1 consider adding an additional limitation for when
- 2 sophisticated parties agree that the provider of advice
- 3 is not a fiduciary. In our experience, there will be
- 4 circumstances when a sophisticated plan fiduciary may
- 5 wish to receive advice that is more limited in scope
- 6 and not fiduciary in nature. Sophisticated parties for
- 7 this purpose could include investment managers or other
- 8 professional fiduciary advisers. It could also include
- 9 other persons that are sophisticated in these matters.
- 10 In these cases where the plan is represented by an
- 11 independent fiduciary sophisticated in these matters,
- 12 it is clearly disclosed and understood that the
- 13 services are not intended to be fiduciary, and the
- 14 advice is impartial and not conflicted, as the outcome
- 15 of the plan's investment decision. We believe an
- 16 additional exception should be warranted.
- 17 Regarding distributions, we would like to
- 18 take a minute to address your request for comments.
- 19 Participants who are nearing retirement have a great
- 20 need for financial help, but can also be vulnerable to
- 21 the negative effects of poor conflicted advice. We
- 22 believe that you should provide guidelines that clearly

- 1 set out who is and isn't a fiduciary when providing
- 2 advice on plan distributions, but also suggest a safe
- 3 harbor for plan sponsors, who select and monitor
- 4 financial advisers to assist retiring participants, as
- 5 well as a safe harbor for advisers that set forth the
- 6 type of information that may be provided to retiring
- 7 participants. For example, something similar on the
- 8 lines of your Interpretive Bulletin 96-1, but written
- 9 in this case with distributions in mind, we believe
- 10 would be helpful.
- 11 Supporting the ability of financial advisers
- 12 to educate participants about investment alternatives
- 13 available, as well as about general issues and
- 14 education is important, particularly as products are
- 15 continuing to change in this area with lots of emphasis
- 16 on retirement income today. At the same time, we also
- 17 believe that advisers who are outside the plan should
- 18 not be afforded greater access to or influence over
- 19 plan participants and current plan service providers
- 20 and believe that there needs to be a balance there as
- 21 well.
- In our comment letter we spoke about some of

- 1 the cost estimates and coordination, and have listened
- 2 to your comments today on harmonization of regulatory
- 3 initiatives and agree that that is desirable. Thank
- 4 you for that. At the same time, we believe that
- 5 sharing these perspectives, such as the helpful comment
- 6 we heard earlier about swaps in written quidance would
- 7 help address the questions that are being raised in
- 8 this area.
- 9 To conclude, we again would like to thank you
- 10 for your efforts in considering further the proposed
- 11 rule and addressing industry comments. We acknowledge
- 12 that these issues are complex, yet important. Given
- 13 the very significant and potentially sometimes
- 14 unintended consequences of the proposed rule, we
- 15 respectfully suggest that the rule be withdrawn and re-
- 16 proposed after consideration of the wide range of
- 17 comments received in today's hearings. Lastly, because
- 18 the current regulations have been in existence for over
- 19 35 years and business practices and systems, as we have
- 20 heard, have developed over time on that basis, we
- 21 suggest a transition period of at least two years from
- 22 issuance of any final rules.

257 1 Thank you again for this opportunity to speak 2 to you today. We are happy to answer any questions you may have regarding our comments and this testimony. 3 4 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. Theresa? MS. ATANASIO: We had negotiated that I would 5 have an extra minute from yours, but it looks like it's not going to happen. 8 Good afternoon. My name is Theresa Atanasio. I am Vice President and ERISA counsel for Ameriprise Financial, a diversified financial services, which 10 being in business for over 110 years, is a leader in 11 financial planning and a member of the Insured 12 Retirement Institute. The Insured Retirement Institute 13 is a non-profit association dedicated to the growth and 14 15 better understanding of quaranteed lifetime income 16 products that contribute to a secure retirement. IRI 17 represents all segments of the annuity insured 18 retirement product and retirement planning industries with over 300 member organizations, including insurance 19 companies, broker dealers, banks, investment management 20 21 firms and industry service providers. For the sake of 22 focus and time, I will direct the majority of my

- 1 testimony today to the practical impact of the
- 2 Department's proposed regulations on the \$4.5 trillion
- 3 dollar IRA market, as well as the impact on small
- 4 business owners, who sponsor a retirement plan for
- 5 themselves and their employees.
- 6 Although we agree with the Department's
- 7 desire to provide clarity around who is a fiduciary for
- 8 purposes of providing investment advice under ERISA, we
- 9 believe that the unintended consequences of the rules
- 10 will have a substantially negative impact upon the very
- 11 persons the Department is trying to protect. In that
- 12 regard, many broker dealers, including Ameriprise
- 13 Financial, support the SEC's efforts to create a
- 14 uniform fiduciary standard that would apply to brokers
- 15 and other financial professionals. However, the
- 16 important difference is that the SEC standard would not
- 17 prohibit commission-based sales or the sale of
- 18 proprietary products. It would not favor one business
- 19 model asset-based advisory fee over another commission-
- 20 based brokerage. Although the Department's proposed
- 21 regulations are limited to divining who is a fiduciary
- 22 under ERISA in the Code, we are concerned about what

- 1 happens once the definition is expanded to cover
- 2 everyday activities of broker dealers, insurance agents
- 3 and financial advisers as they attempt to help their
- 4 clients. These financial advisers are typically not
- 5 considered fiduciaries under ERISA today, so they are
- 6 allowed to provide to their clients, who hold qualified
- 7 accounts, comprehensive information and access to the
- 8 full suite of products and services available to non-
- 9 qualified accounts, including commission-based
- 10 products, such as mutual funds and annuities. Again,
- 11 we are not seeking to avoid a fiduciary status, but
- 12 rather we are supportive of the SEC's uniform standard
- 13 that would not prevent small business and IRA owners
- 14 from working with the financial professional of their
- 15 choice. As you know, approximately 41 percent of U.S.
- 16 households, or 48.6 million Americans use IRAs to save
- 17 for their retirement. Making financial advisers
- 18 fiduciaries under ERISA will reduce both the choice of
- 19 investments and types of services these IRA owners can
- 20 access, and will increase their costs and create
- 21 confusion for both them and the advisers seeking to
- 22 help them. It also creates inconsistencies and

- 1 confusion relative to the work being done by the SEC to
- 2 streamline and simplify the regulatory and investor
- 3 experience.
- 4 As a result of the Department's proposed
- 5 regulations, financial professionals have to either
- 6 level fees across a diverse array of investments, use a
- 7 computer program, or navigate and comply with a
- 8 patchwork of complex, prohibitive transaction
- 9 exemptions issued decades ago, and whose applicability
- 10 has been eroded over time by Department guidance.
- 11 Practically speaking, trying to use a flat fee model
- 12 across stocks, bonds, mutual funds and annuities that
- 13 pay differing compensation results in driving IRA and
- 14 small business retirement plan owners into wrap
- 15 programs, which charge a fixed asset-based fee
- 16 irrespective of the level or type of transaction. While
- 17 a great option for many investors, wrap programs can be
- 18 more expensive and are not a good choice for investors
- 19 who have long-holding periods and individual
- 20 investments. For these investors, entering into or
- 21 maintaining a wrap account would actually be more
- 22 expensive than a commission-based account, and in

- 1 conflict with existing securities laws. IRA owners
- 2 would be the most negatively impacted. IRAs, workplace
- 3 savings, SEPs and Keoghs account for 51 percent of
- 4 the mass affluence investible assets. Unlike plan
- 5 participants, IRA owners often don't have access to
- 6 education or help with investment choices; they need
- 7 and desire the help of professional advisers.
- 8 The remainder of my testimony will be focused
- 9 on real world examples that highlight some of the
- 10 concerns I have noted for you. My first example is one
- 11 where a broker is working with an IRA owner in a mutual
- 12 fund-based investment account. Mutual funds charge
- 13 differing fees with equity funds generally charging
- 14 higher fees and money market funds charging the lowest
- 15 fees. Under current law, if a fiduciary under ERISA
- 16 recommends an investment that pays that fiduciary more
- 17 than another investment, she would be committing a
- 18 self-dealing prohibitive transaction. On the other
- 19 hand, if she recommends that a 25-year-old investor
- 20 purchase solely money market funds, she would be making
- 21 an unsuitable recommendation and also breaching her
- 22 fiduciary duty to act in the best interest of the

- 1 investor; therefore, the client would not be able to
- 2 invest in different funds offered by the broker.
- 3 My second example is one that happens every
- 4 day. A long-time client walks into a broker's office
- 5 and asks for investment ideas for his portfolios. The
- 6 client holds three brokerage accounts: a self-direct
- 7 brokerage window under his employer's 401(k); an IRA
- 8 brokerage account funded from the rollover from the
- 9 client's former employer; and a non-qualified brokerage
- 10 account funded with after-tax savings. The broker
- 11 knows that the client plans to use all three of these
- 12 accounts to fund the client's eventual retirement. The
- 13 broker explains that she cannot provide any
- 14 recommendations relating to the client's IRA and
- 15 401(k) brokerage accounts; however, with respect to his
- 16 non-qualified brokerage account, she tells the client
- 17 she likes the energy sectors, and in particular, Exxon
- 18 common stock. The client later logs on-line and
- 19 purchases Exxon in his IRA brokerage account. Arguably
- 20 the broker could be deemed an ERISA fiduciary under the
- 21 proposed definition.
- 22 As demonstrated by examples one and two,

- 1 brokers will be unable to sell mutual funds or service
- 2 commission-based brokerage accounts holding ERISA or
- 3 IRA assets. Instead clients would be forced into
- 4 advisory wrap accounts where the broker can be paid an
- 5 asset-based fee. For clients that hold investments
- 6 with long holding periods, this would likely result in
- 7 higher fees and less retirement income. Instead of
- 8 paying five percent once up front, they may pay one
- 9 percent per year for 20 years. Advisory wrap accounts
- 10 are generally not available to clients with small
- 11 account balances, so these individuals would receive no
- 12 help with respect to their qualified accounts.
- 13 Furthermore, certain types of investments, such as
- 14 annuities, are generally not sold in wrap advisory
- 15 accounts for good reasons.
- 16 First, the sale of an annuity requires
- 17 substantial up-front work by the financial adviser to
- 18 determine which annuity is best for the client, which
- 19 riders are appropriate, and how much of the client's
- 20 portfolio should be invested in an annuity.
- 21 Second, educating clients regarding the need
- 22 for quaranteed retirement income, and helping them

- 1 understand the need to part with an access to a portion
- 2 of their funds as a trade-off for guaranteed income is
- 3 not an easy process.
- 4 Third, these products often have much longer
- 5 holding periods than mutual funds, as they are
- 6 purchased to address long-term goals. Even in a
- 7 variable annuity, there may be a managed account option
- 8 that does not require additional support by an adviser,
- 9 and therefore no justification for charging an ongoing
- 10 advisory fee. The end result of these regulations
- 11 would be to make IRA owners less likely to have access
- 12 to quaranteed income.
- 13 My fourth example highlights the benefits of
- 14 a commission-based model for small business employers.
- 15 Small employers often have very little time to devote
- 16 to establishing a retirement plan and even less money
- 17 to do so. Brokers introduce small employers to the
- 18 idea of adopting a retirement plan often over several
- 19 years. Fee-only planners do not usually operate in
- 20 this marketplace because small employers are not
- 21 willing to pay an advisory fee to set up a plan.
- 22 Frankly, in most cases, even the commission on the

- 1 small start-up plan is not enough to justify the time a
- 2 broker spends educating the employer regarding the
- 3 benefits of adopting a retirement plan. In most cases
- 4 the broker is hoping to establish a long-term financial
- 5 relationship with the small employers and key
- 6 employees. Removing the financial incentives for
- 7 brokers to work with small employers will not suddenly
- 8 make the economics work for fee-only planners. The end
- 9 result would be fewer small employers adopting
- 10 retirement plans for their employees.
- 11 My final example underscores the premise that
- 12 clients are best served through long-lasting
- 13 relationships with their financial adviser. We are
- 14 concerned that the Department's regulations would be
- 15 that individuals would receive advice on their 401(k)
- 16 assets from one professional, advice on their IRA
- 17 assets from another, and advice on any other assets
- 18 from a third financial professional. For instance, if
- 19 a broker recommends with respect to a client's 401(k)
- 20 client and becomes a fiduciary to the plan as a result,
- 21 then according to the Department, a recommendation by
- 22 that broker to roll assets into an IRA sponsored by the

- 1 broker's firm would be a prohibited transaction. This
- 2 would result in brokers avoiding providing information
- 3 relating to a client's 401(k) account for fear of being
- 4 excluded from advising the client with respect to her
- 5 distribution decision. The reality is that the biggest
- 6 mistake made by plan participants is not that they roll
- 7 their plan assets to an IRA, but that they cash out
- 8 their retirement plan when they switch jobs. While
- 9 some commentators have raised concerns that plan
- 10 participants may receive conflicted advice, these
- 11 concerns are easily solved through disclosure.
- 12 In conclusion, due to the unintended
- 13 consequences I have outlined here today, we would ask
- 14 the Department to carve out IRAs from the proposed
- 15 regulations until such time as it has studied the
- 16 needs, expectations and services being provided to this
- 17 diverse marketplace. Today, more than ever, Americans
- 18 are seeking professional help with all of their
- 19 accounts in order to plan for a secure retirement; that
- 20 is why it is vitally important that the Department not
- 21 consider the definition of who is an investment advice
- 22 fiduciary under ERISA in a vacuum. Rather, the

267 Department must consider the impact of such a change on the retirement plan marketplace giving the SEC's fiduciary standard, existing prohibitive transaction 3 4 rules, and exemptions in effect today. 5 Thank you. MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. 6 MS. BORZI: Ms. Kreindler, I have just a couple of questions for you. You veered into the Norman Stein territory of sophisticated investors 9 asking us to distinguish between sophisticated and non-10 sophisticated investors, and the one thing I heard you 11 12 say was, for instance, if there were an independent 13 fiduciary . . . are there some other things that you 14 might want to include into that ambit of sophisticated 15 investors? 16 MS. KREINDLER: Yeah. Sure. I mean that, to 17 me, was a clear example, where, when you have an 18 independent fiduciary that they may -- you know, so the example there would be that they are working with one 19 20 investment manager and they want to talk to some of 21 their other providers to see what other perspective 22 they may have, but they clearly don't want to pay for

- 1 it as additional fiduciary advice; they are just asking
- 2 for information. And, you know, so that would be a
- 3 clear answer of where the manager is the one that is
- 4 seeking the information, or the professional. But,
- 5 other cases could be, you know, scenarios where the
- 6 party, themself -- you know, so you think of large plan
- 7 sponsors that have asset size where they routinely
- 8 manage and definitely have a level of sophistication
- 9 that can be comfortable saying -- as you did, in a way,
- 10 in your QDIA regulations, that named fiduciaries should
- 11 be able to set up custom target glide paths, and be
- 12 able to do that as sophisticated parties. And so, on a
- 13 similar analysis, they could also fall within that.
- 14 MS. BORZI: On the participant's side, it
- 15 seems like that would be a much heavier or much more
- 16 difficult thing to do.
- 17 MS. KREINDLER: It could --
- 18 MS. BORZI: G. Warren Buffett wouldn't need
- 19 this kind of advice for his IRA. I wonder if he even
- 20 has an IRA -- but -- he probably has several of them
- 21 actually. So how would you do that on the
- 22 participant's side?

269 1 MS. KREINDLER: Yeah. So this exception, in particular, was meant to be separate from and independent of the counter-party or seller exception, 3 and so this really was intended to say that sophisticated fiduciaries --5 MS. BORZI: Okay. 6 MS. KREINDLER: -- will need advice that could be limited in scope and should not have to pay for it as fiduciary advice. 9 10 MS. BORZI: There was one other thing that you said that caught my attention and I just -- I don't 11 want to -- I want to make sure that I correctly 12 13 scribbled down what you said -- I think you said that it's one thing if the adviser within the plan is giving 14 15 people advice, and that would be fiduciary advice. think this was in the context of the distribution 16 17 question. But, I think you said it would be another thing if advisers out of the plan were given special --18 outside of the plan were given special access; am I 19 20 quoting you correctly? 21 MS. KREINDLER: What we are trying to say is we think the rules should not be biased one way or 22

- 1 another to provide special access or, you know,
- 2 additional relief, if you will, to those either inside
- 3 or outside of the plan. We think both services are
- 4 important and critical to have open as a choice for
- 5 plans and plan sponsors to adopt.
- 6 MS. BORZI: Well, the discussion we were
- 7 having this morning with a couple of the witnesses had
- 8 to do with -- and the discussion we had in connection
- 9 with the call center questions really had to do with
- 10 the adviser who was inside the plan, who, because of
- 11 that inside the plan special relationship, had access
- 12 to participants, who then might be steered to another
- 13 business division or another profit center within the
- 14 same company or the same group of companies; so I
- 15 assume your concern there -- I mean our concern and the
- 16 witnesses who raised this concern was that those folks
- 17 should not be given some special access, or people
- 18 shouldn't be steered to another branch of the same
- 19 company, or another division or another operating
- 20 center of the same company simply because they had the
- 21 business from the employer within the plan. I mean how
- 22 would you respond to that?

271 1 MS. KREINDLER: So I think our point really was that the regulation should not create a preference for one over the other. I think the question that you 3 are asking maybe, if I can restate it, is --MS. BORZI: (inaudible). 5 MS. KREINDLER: -- yeah -- is really that 6 when someone provides that type of referral or relationship, then is that something that is fiduciary 9 and may be beyond some of the exceptions that are provided, and I think that's an interesting question 10 11 and one that -- you know, when we look at and when we responded on the platform exception really was -- when 12 13 the information being provided is generic, when it's -also at the same time when it is being -- not being 14 15 individualized, et cetera, then we think that exception 16 applies to that. But, to the extent the line goes 17 beyond that, then, yeah, it raises other questions. 18 MS. BORZI: So you were more focusing on the advice versus education question, is that it? 19 20 MS. KREINDLER: Correct. Yeah. Correct. 21 MS. BORZI: Okay. Michael? MR. DAVIS: Ms. Kreindler -- did I pronounce 22

272 thatch correctly? MS. KREINDLER: Yes, exactly right. 2 3 MR. DAVIS: Okay. I want to make sure I get it right. I wanted to understand about DCIIA. 4 5 represent investment managers, consultants, recordkeepers, insurance companies, plan sponsors. 6 some cases there might be issues that those subcomponents may have divergent views, and I don't -we have had representatives from different -- of these subgroups who have expressed different views, so the 10 perspectives that you expressed, I assume with a 11 consensus view among your membership, but can you talk 12 13 more about just the complexion of your membership? it dominated by plan sponsors, or which group 14 15 dominates? 16 MS. KREINDLER: You know, so -- thank you. It's a very good question and it's, as a new 18 organization, it's something that we work with. 19 MR. DAVIS: Right. 20 MR. KREINDLER: To start with though, what we have found pretty much across the board is where we 22 find consensus among our members is the fact that

- 1 everyone is really committed to moving the ball forward
- 2 and to creating better outcomes and better solutions
- 3 for participants, and so together the group wants to do
- 4 that. And I didn't include in a long list all the
- 5 different types of members that we have, because I only
- 6 had 10 minutes, you know, but the point is that it is
- 7 institutional investment managers serve on the Board,
- 8 insurance companies, recordkeepers, providers. I am
- 9 with a law firm and serve as counsel, and other law
- 10 firm members are involved too. And, sponsors are
- 11 involved in an advisory board capacity and are involved
- 12 at our Executive Committee level, but it is something
- 13 where we solicit input from providers for the solutions
- 14 that they are looking for within the marketplace. And,
- 15 what will be of assistance to them and to meet their
- 16 needs and try to always keep that ahead of us, and yet
- 17 at the same time try to address the various different
- 18 concerns that are being raised about the defined
- 19 contribution system, and work together to try and
- 20 create something that's a better product and for better
- 21 solutions. So, at this point we have really found many
- 22 opportunities more so for consensus, even recognizing

```
274
   that, yes, we do have members that might have testified
    and had different comments on these particular
   regulations.
 3
             MR. DAVIS: Okay. But you said plan sponsors
 4
   acting in an advisory capacity; they are not on the
 5
   Board, is that correct?
 6
 7
             MS. KREINDLER: Yeah. They are currently
   members of our Executive Committee, correct, and then
   otherwise it's providers --
 9
10
             MR. DAVIS: Okay.
             MS. KREINDLER: -- of various different
11
12
    types.
13
             MR. DAVIS: Okay. And, Aon Hewitt, Mr. --
             MR. NOVY: It's Novy. That's all right, Mr.
14
    Davis.
15
16
             MR. DAVIS: You are right. You talked a lot
    about obviously the distribution issue, --
18
             MR. NOVY: Exclusively.
             MR. DAVIS: -- and obviously you guys work
19
   with a lot of clients, a lot of plans; --
21
             MR. NOVY: We do.
22
             MR. DAVIS: -- have you seen a lot of
```

- 1 situations where there have been -- maybe the advice
- 2 was conflicted in the context of plan distributions
- 3 where you have seen assets get directed in a way that
- 4 perhaps without these conflicts they would not have
- 5 been directed in that way, or are there specific
- 6 conversations that you have observed that you have a
- 7 lot of concern about?
- 8 MR. NOVY: No. I don't think that we are in
- 9 a position to -- and we haven't made it a practice to
- 10 assess or evaluate the content of the advice. What we
- 11 do see though is, upon either termination of employment
- 12 or separation of service, whatever the circumstance
- 13 might be, or age, particular attainment of age, the
- 14 individuals are taking large, if not total
- 15 distributions, large distributions, and moving it in
- 16 ways in which have forced us, through many studies, to
- 17 really look at why is this happening? I think one term
- 18 that is used in the industry is leakage. And, I think
- 19 part of the concern is that a portion of these lump
- 20 sums are losing value not only in the sense of not
- 21 being rolled over to another tax-sheltered investment,
- 22 but also the types of fees that we are seeing, these

276 higher fees -- and I think the question really -- it begs the question, do participants really understand the value that they are getting by leaving -- or receiving by leaving their investments in the plan, as opposed to taking a rollover, or an indirect rollover, 5 however their actual form of distribution might actually be? So I don't want to -- just to be clear, Mr. Davis, we are not evaluating the content of the advice. 9 10 MR. DAVIS: Okay. That's helpful. Thanks. Sure. Tim? 11 MR. NOVY: 12 MR. PIACENTINI: I am struggling how to 13 refine a question I have sort of tried to ask witnesses already. It goes to this question of broker business 14 15 model. Maybe I'll start this way? Ms. Atanasio? 16 MS. ATANASIO: Correct. 17 MR. PIACENTINI: You talked about how 18 sometimes the broker may not --19 MR. LEBOWITZ: Can you move the mike closer? 20 MR. PIACENTINI: -- may not receive, in some sense, adequate compensation in the early stages of 22 business development, and then you said that a flat fee

277 adviser -- that their business model isn't suddenly going to make that possible, but for a broker it's possible. Can you elaborate on that a little bit? I 3 mean what's going on there? 5 MS. ATANASIO: Sure. The first broker is working under a commission-based model, and so they are looking at differing compensation depending on which investments the individual invests in, and of course there is FINRA and SEC in insurance disclosure around all those fees and the differing compensations. 10 MR. PIACENTINI: You talked about a small 11 12 plan --MS. ATANASIO: Sure. 13 14 MR. PIACENTINI: -- where they might be hoping to develop a longer term relationship with the 15 16 owner, 17 MS. ATANASIO: Right. 18 MR. PIACENTINI: -- with some of the (inaudible). 19 MS. ATANASIO: Sure. Many times advisers 20 will -- you know, let's say the President or the owner of a small company, and will be working with him or her 22

- 1 on all of her portfolios and her household assets, and
- 2 will say, you know, you should probably look into
- 3 establishing a retirement plan for you and you are
- 4 employees. It's a good idea. And, of course, the
- 5 employer says, no, you know, I am investing in my
- 6 business right now. I don't have a lot of money to do
- 7 that, you know. I really got to focus on building my
- 8 business. And they say, well okay, let's talk about it
- 9 a little bit more on Tuesday, and they come back on
- 10 Tuesday and they say, okay, well, it really would be a
- 11 good idea for you and here is how we can do it. And
- 12 then that's where the commission-based model works,
- 13 because it's fairly inexpensive, and even though the
- 14 broker has worked, you know, maybe three weeks for this
- 15 maybe smaller commission, what he or she is hoping for
- 16 is that that owner will say, you know, now come and
- 17 meet Bob over here in my company, and I think you did a
- 18 good job for me; whereas, you know, small business
- 19 owners, you know, do not want to pay somebody \$1,500 up
- 20 front, \$3,000 up front to establish a 401(k) plan
- 21 because of the very reasons I discussed, which is they
- 22 are trying to invest in their business. They don't

279 really have that kind of money. And, fee-only planners are not really in that market, you know, just because economics don't really work for them. So, if you don't 3 have access to sort of this commission-based model and they won't pay for the advisory fee model, then you end 5 up with no 401(k) plan. Did that answer -- okay. 6 7 MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. I just had one question, Theresa. At the end of your testimony you said -- toward the very end, you said something about 9 disclosure. I think you said that concerns about 10 conflicts could be easily addressed through disclosure, 11 12 you said. 13 MS. ATANASIO: Mmm-hmm (in the affirmative). MR. LEBOWITZ: But, given the discussion we 14 15 had this morning --16 MS. ATANASIO: Right. 17 MR. LEBOWITZ: -- about disclosure and, at 18 least some views that it's inadequate to really -particularly in the context of the receiver of the 19 20 disclosure really appreciating --21 MS. ATANASIO: Right. 22 MR. LEBOWITZ: -- what the significance of

- 1 the information is and, at the end of the day, having
- 2 some idea of what to do with that information; maybe
- 3 you would like to elaborate a little bit more?
- 4 MS. ATANASIO: Sure. I think, you know,
- 5 there is a great deal of disclosure out there regarding
- 6 fees and services, and I guess, you know, our viewpoint
- 7 is -- let me make sure I think through this -- you are
- 8 right, ERISA is not a disclosure-based regime. And, I
- 9 think, you know, I am directing most of my comments to
- 10 the IRA market, which has not really historically been
- 11 the subject of sort of an ERISA regime, and I think,
- 12 you know, the SEC is working extremely hard to
- 13 harmonize and create a fiduciary standard that's going
- 14 to cover these IRA assets. And I think they will do a
- 15 great job at it. I think it will be a good, uniform
- 16 fiduciary standard, and I think to the extent that the
- 17 Department believes that it has not gone far enough and
- 18 does not protect those assets, then at that time it
- 19 could issue additional guidance, perhaps after studying
- 20 the diverse needs of the marketplace and in greater
- 21 detail.
- MR. LEBOWITZ: Thank you. Thank you, all.

		281
1	MS. ATANASIO: Thank you.	
2	MR. NOVY: Thank you.	
3	MR. LEBOWITZ: The next panel, Ed Ferrigno,	
4	Tom Roberts and Larry Goldbrum.	
5	MR. DAVIS: You guys ready?	
6	MR. FERRIGNO: Yes.	
7	MR. DAVIS: Okay. Let's get started. Ed?	
8	MR. FERRIGNO: Thank you for this opportunity	
9	to comment on behalf of the Profit-sharing 401(k)	
10	Council of America, commonly known as PSCA. I am	
11	Edward Ferrigno, and I serve as PSCA's Vice President	
12	for Washington Affairs.	
13	PSCA is a 64-year-old non-profit association	
14	representing companies that sponsor profit-sharing 401-	
15	K and similar plans. PSCA's members range in size from	
16	very small firms to conglomerates with hundreds of	
17	thousands of employees.	
18	PSCA supports the Department's initiatives	
19	with some reservations that are discussed later in this	
20	testimony. The elimination of this objective regular	
21	basis and primary basis test will reduce uncertainty	
22	for plan sponsors, participants and beneficiaries, and	

- 1 service providers. Today the potential exists for plan
- 2 fiduciaries and participants to believe that they are
- 3 receiving impartial advice, while the provider believes
- 4 that ERISA's fiduciary standards are not applicable.
- 5 PSCA believes that removing this misunderstanding by
- 6 applying the fiduciary standard regardless of the
- 7 regularity of the advice, or to what degree the
- 8 recipient will consider it is a very positive
- 9 development. PSCA urges the department to reverse its
- 10 position that a recommendation to take a distribution,
- 11 even when combined with a recommendation as to how the
- 12 distribution should be invested does not constitute
- 13 investment advice. The decision by a participant or a
- 14 beneficiary to request a distribution of their account
- 15 assets and how to subsequently invest those assets can
- 16 profoundly affect an individual's retirement. We
- 17 believe the public policy benefit of our position is
- 18 self-evident, and that a recommendation to take a
- 19 distribution constitutes a recommendation to sell a
- 20 particular investment.
- 21 The expansion of activities that will be
- 22 considered advice under the proposed rule raises

- 1 concerns that the provision of marketing informational
- 2 and educational materials will be constrained by new
- 3 liability concerns. PSCA believes the Department
- 4 shares our concerns, as evidenced by provisions in the
- 5 proposed rule relating to limitations for selling
- 6 activities, actions pursuant to interpretive bulletin
- 7 96-1, and marketing and assistance provided under
- 8 platform arrangements. We have several suggestions in
- 9 this regard.
- 10 The Department should clarify in the preamble
- 11 in the body of the final rule that educating
- 12 participants about distribution options, including
- 13 discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of
- 14 seeking a distribution and managing retirement assets
- 15 outside the plan does not constitute advice. As long
- 16 as these communications do not include a clear
- 17 recommendation to seek a distribution, they should not
- 18 be treated as advice.
- 19 Education information advice regarding the
- 20 tax effects of taking a distribution should not
- 21 constitute a provision of advice under the proposed
- 22 rule. This important information is frequently sought

- 1 by or provided to plan participants that are
- 2 contemplating taking a distribution of their plan
- 3 assets.
- 4 In the course of the Department's joint
- 5 inquiry with the Department of Treasury on lifetime
- 6 income products, the Agencies requested comments
- 7 regarding the provision of information to help
- 8 participants make choices regarding management and
- 9 spend-down of retirement benefits. PSCA and several
- 10 other organizations identified the expansion and
- 11 clarification of Interpretive Bulletin 96-1 to
- 12 explicitly apply to the provision of information, to
- 13 help participants and beneficiaries make better
- 14 informed retirement income decisions. We urge the
- 15 Department to take this action in conjunction with the
- 16 development of this rule.
- 17 PSCA believes that the limitations in
- 18 subparagraph (c)(2)(I) for selling activity should be
- 19 referred to as a provision of a sales proposal, not the
- 20 provision of advice. A plan fiduciary who makes a
- 21 decision regarding the investment of plan assets
- 22 pursuant to a sales proposal is not acting in response

- 1 to advice. Our concern is that a plan fiduciary that
- 2 acts on conflicted advice may be liable for a fiduciary
- 3 breach. We suggest, for purposes of clarity, that the
- 4 language in paragraph (c)(2)(I) be amended to read:
- 5 "Knows, or under the circumstances, reasonably should
- 6 know that the person is providing a sales proposal in
- 7 his capacity as a purchaser or seller."
- 8 The proposed rule specifies in (c)(2)(II)(B)
- 9 that marketing or making available securities or other
- 10 property from which a plan fiduciary may designate
- 11 investment alternatives under a fund platform or
- 12 similar arrangement does not constitute the provision
- 13 of advice if certain disclosures are made.
- 14 Subparagraph (c)(2)(II)(C) provides the
- 15 general financial information and data to assist a plan
- 16 fiduciary's selection or monitoring of such securities
- 17 or property does not constitute the provision of advice
- 18 if certain disclosures are made. PSCA strongly
- 19 supports these provisions and urges the Department to
- 20 retain and expand them in the final rule. The relief
- 21 provided for the provision of general financial
- 22 information and data is currently limited to

- 1 information provided in conjunction with offering a
- 2 platform arrangement. It should be available for all
- 3 plans regardless of whether or not it is offered in
- 4 conjunction with a platform arrangement.
- 5 It's common for fund investment managers to
- 6 provide newsletters, economic market analyses and
- 7 forecasts to plan fiduciaries. For example, the recent
- 8 worldwide debt crisis and its effect on capital
- 9 markets, the economic impact of the political crises in
- 10 the Middle East and Africa, or reports about emerging
- 11 markets, such as China or Brazil, might be discussed in
- 12 these reports.
- 13 Another common topic of analysis is
- 14 Washington's political environment and its potential
- 15 impact on industries and markets. These reports and
- 16 analyses may influence a plan fiduciary's decision
- 17 about the selection and monitoring of plan investments.
- 18 PSCA believes that the Department does not intend that
- 19 these activities constitute the provision of advice. We
- 20 request the final rule include specific provisions that
- 21 clarify our interpretation.
- Under the proposed rule the provision of

- 1 advice or an appraisal or fairness opinion concerning
- 2 the value of securities or other property of an
- 3 employee benefit plan constitutes a provision of
- 4 advice. The Department simultaneously announced that
- 5 the proposed rule supersedes this position in Advisory
- 6 Opinion 76-65A, where it held that making valuations to
- 7 be used in establishing an ESOP (ph) does not establish
- 8 a fiduciary relationship because a plan did not yet
- 9 exist, and an advice provided to an existing ESOP
- 10 regarding the value of employer securities also does
- 11 not constitute the provision of advice. These changes
- 12 will create a new fiduciary relationship for a large
- 13 group of service providers that provide valuation and
- 14 appraisal services for all types of retirement plans.
- 15 According to the preamble of the proposed rule, the
- 16 Department would expect a fiduciary appraiser's
- 17 determination of value to be unbiased, fair and
- 18 objective, and to be made in good faith, and based on a
- 19 prudent investigation under the prevailing
- 20 circumstances unknown to the appraiser. PSCA supports
- 21 this standard of conduct and generally supports the
- 22 assumption of fiduciary status by plan service

- 1 providers that deal with plan investments. However, we
- 2 also share the significant concerns in the retirement
- 3 plan community about the increased costs that may
- 4 result from their proposed changes. For example,
- 5 questions have been raised of whether the Department's
- 6 standard of impartiality is consistent with the
- 7 fiduciary duty of loyalty. The magnitudes of the cost
- 8 and the willingness of providers to provide valuation
- 9 services under the proposed rule are, we believe,
- 10 undetermined. We expect that additional information
- 11 about the costs and benefits of this proposed change
- 12 will be provided in this hearing, and we are hopeful
- 13 that a clearer understanding of the impact of this
- 14 proposal will result. At a minimum, valuations
- 15 fairness opinions and appraisals of assets traded on
- 16 generally recognized markets should never be considered
- 17 the provision of advice.
- 18 Additionally, the Department's position in
- 19 Advisory Opinion 76-65A that, where a plan is not yet
- 20 in existence, a fiduciary relationship within the
- 21 meaning of section 3(21)(a) cannot be established is
- 22 widely recognized as established law that applies to

289 all retirement plans subject to ERISA. We urge the Department to clarify that it is superseding this particular finding in the Advisory Opinion. 3 Thank you for considering my comments. 4 MR. DAVIS: Thanks so much. Mr. Roberts? 5 MR. ROBERTS: Good afternoon. My name is Tom 6 Roberts, and I am Chief Counsel with ING Insurance U.S., testifying on behalf of the American Council of Life Insurers. ACLI member companies represent more than 90 10 percent of the assets in premiums of the U.S. life 11 insurance annuity industry, and offer insurance 12 13 contracts and other investment products and services to qualified plans, including defined benefit pension and 14 15 401(k) arrangements, and to individuals through 16 individual retirement arrangements, or in a non-17 qualified basis. ACLI member companies also are 18 employer sponsors of retirement plans for their own 19 employees. 20 We appreciate this opportunity to offer our views of the proposed rule with the Department. 21 22 ACLI submitted written comments describing 11

- 1 key concerns, and today I focus on three of them: one,
- 2 the importance of the seller's limitation; our
- 3 suggestions to ensure that all interested parties
- 4 clearly understand when advice is subject to ERISA; and
- 5 lastly, our concerns regarding the proposed rules
- 6 applicability to IRAs, and the need for further inquiry
- 7 on the nature of these programs, and the products and
- 8 services offered to support them.
- 9 The proposed rule would dramatically enlarge
- 10 the universe of persons who owe duties of undivided
- 11 loyalties to ERISA plans, and to whom the prohibited
- 12 transaction restrictions of ERISA and the Internal
- 13 Revenue Code would apply. It substantially broadens
- 14 the concept of rendering "investment advice for a fee".
- 15 ACLI appreciates the Department's concern that, under
- 16 some circumstances, the current rule impinges the
- 17 Department's ability to bring enforcement actions in
- 18 situations that are clearly abusive. We share the
- 19 Department's interest in seeing that plans and
- 20 participants, who seek out and are promised advice that
- 21 is impartial ultimately receive advice that adheres to
- 22 the rigorous standards imposed by ERISA. At the same

- 1 time, we are concerned that the proposed rule's pursuit
- 2 of this objective interferes with investment sales and
- 3 distribution practices that are customary in the
- 4 marketplace, well understood, and commonly relied upon
- 5 by financial services providers, plans and participants
- 6 alike. We are concerned that these changes will result
- 7 in plans, plan participants and IRA owners having less
- 8 access to investment information, and/or increased
- 9 costs. Our comments seek to preserve the Department's
- 10 enforcement objective while avoiding unnecessary
- 11 disruption and negative impacts to plans, participants
- 12 and individuals.
- 13 First, we would like to address the seller's
- 14 limitation of fiduciary status. In the preamble to the
- 15 proposed rule, the Department notes that, in the
- 16 context of selling to a purchaser, communications with
- 17 the purchaser may involve advice or recommendations,
- 18 and that those communications ordinarily should not
- 19 result in fiduciary status. We believe that this point
- 20 is absolutely critical to the development of a workable
- 21 rule. Persons who are engaged in the sale and the
- 22 distribution of investment products and services need

- 1 to have confidence that ordinary course sales
- 2 recommendations will not, in hindsight, be subjected to
- 3 a fiduciary standard that disallows the payment of
- 4 sales commissions and other traditional forms of
- 5 distribution related compensation.
- 6 Parties engaged in transactions with ERISA
- 7 plans and IRAs need clear, unambiguous rules by which
- 8 to determine their duties and obligations. Financial
- 9 institutions, such as life insurers and their sales
- 10 representatives, should not be treated as fiduciaries
- 11 under ERISA when they are engaged in selling
- 12 activities, and are clear that they are acting in a
- 13 sales capacity. As written, the wording of the
- 14 seller's limitation, which describes sellers and their
- 15 agents, may raise some uncertainties about the
- 16 availability of the seller's limitation for other
- 17 distribution channels, such as independent insurance
- 18 agents, insurance affiliated and unaffiliated broker
- 19 dealers and resident investment advisers that offer
- 20 life insurance products; whether exclusively, or as
- 21 many other products from a variety of different product
- 22 manufacturers. It is essential that these parties be

- 1 covered by the limitation. The seller's limitation is
- 2 only available when the recipient of the advice knows
- 3 or has a basis for knowing that the interest of the
- 4 selling firm and its distributors are adverse to the
- 5 interest of the plan and its participants. We think
- 6 that the word adverse is not the right word to explain
- 7 that a seller is not impartial. While the seller of a
- 8 financial product has a financial interest in the
- 9 outcome of a transaction, we think that it is
- 10 inappropriate to describe that financial interest as
- 11 necessarily entailing broad adversity of interest. As
- 12 responsible providers, we have an interest in seeing
- 13 that our customers are well-served, that they are happy
- 14 with their products and services, and that they find
- 15 our products and services useful to the attainment of
- 16 financial goals. We believe the seller's limitation
- 17 should make the point that the seller of an investment
- 18 or an investment product has a financial interest in
- 19 the transaction it is recommending. And, so long as
- 20 purchases are provided with that information, they will
- 21 have the requisite basis for evaluating the recommended
- 22 transaction in light of the seller's financial

- 1 interest, and will be in a position to understand that
- 2 the selling firm's recommendation is not impartial.
- We think the rule should provide an example
- 4 or examples of circumstances in which a person
- 5 reasonably demonstrates that the recipient of
- 6 information knows that a recommendation is being made
- 7 by a seller. For example, a written representation
- 8 would suffice if it clearly notes that the person is a
- 9 seller of products and services; that the person and,
- 10 if applicable, its affiliates will receive compensation
- 11 for the selection of the products and services; and
- 12 that such compensation may vary depending on which
- 13 product is purchased, or which investments under a
- 14 product or products are selected. This type of
- 15 representation would provide a clear indication to the
- 16 plan, plan fiduciary or participant that the person is
- 17 a non-impartial seller of products and services, and it
- 18 would also address the Department's stated concern
- 19 about undisclosed conflicts of interest. The
- 20 Department should clarify that the seller's limitation
- 21 covers all aspects of both an initial sale and the
- 22 subsequent ongoing relationship between a plan, plan

- 1 fiduciary, or individual and an investment provider, or
- 2 any agent, broker, and/or registered investment adviser
- 3 involved with the sale of the investment provider's
- 4 products and services. This would include information
- 5 and recommendations regarding the use of a product; for
- 6 example, advice regarding the choice of investments
- 7 available under a product's menu of investments. It is
- 8 common for Defined Contribution plans to request of
- 9 potential investment providers a sample menu of
- 10 investments from among a provider's available
- 11 investments, which, in the opinion of the provider,
- 12 best match the plan's current investment options. There
- 13 should be no expectation that any such recommendation
- 14 is impartial, or that the plan seeks advice upon which
- 15 it will rely for its investment decisions. The nature
- 16 of this relationship should not change after a sale. A
- 17 product provider, agent, broker, and/or registered
- 18 investment adviser may continue to make recommendations
- 19 regarding products and services, and there should be no
- 20 expectation that these recommendations differ in nature
- 21 following the initial sale.
- I'd like to address next written

- 1 representations. In its preamble, the Department
- 2 expresses the belief that explicitly claiming ERISA
- 3 fiduciary status, orally or in writing, enhances the
- 4 the adviser's influence and forms a basis for the
- 5 advice recipient's expectation that the advice rendered
- 6 will be impartial. The proposed rule reflects that
- 7 view by applying fiduciary status to all persons
- 8 offering those acknowledgments and disallowing the
- 9 availability of the seller's limitation to such
- 10 persons. We think prudence dictates that where a plan,
- 11 plan participant or individual seeks out impartial
- 12 disinterested advice delivered in a manner consistent
- 13 with ERISA's fiduciary standard of conduct, then the
- 14 plan, plan participant or individual should obtain the
- 15 appropriate acknowledgement in writing in order to
- 16 secure the acknowledgement in a permanent form. We are
- 17 concerned about the potential proof issues that are
- 18 inherent in claims that an adviser provided oral
- 19 representations of fiduciary status. advisers may be
- 20 hard put to dispute erroneous or otherwise fictitious
- 21 claims that oral assurances of fiduciary status were
- 22 provided. And, for these reasons, we request that the

- 1 rule be modified to apply only to persons who represent
- 2 or acknowledge in writing, electronic or otherwise,
- 3 that they are acting as a fiduciary within the meaning
- 4 of ERISA with respect to the advice they are providing.
- 5 Lastly, we suggest that the Department
- 6 separately consider a rule for IRAs. We request that
- 7 the Department take additional time to study the IRA
- 8 and self-employed markets, and to carefully consider
- 9 the economic impact of the proposed rule on both
- 10 individuals and providers of products and services. The
- 11 Department is separately considering welfare benefit
- 12 plans under the recently issued 408(b)(2) regulations.
- 13 We would ask that the Department do likewise for IRAs
- 14 and for self-employed plans, and hold them apart from
- 15 the scope of a final rule. The Department should take
- 16 time to consider the IRA and the Keogh marketplace, and
- 17 the economic impact that a change to the current rules
- 18 would have on this retail marketplace. In addition,
- 19 the Department should consider changes in the
- 20 regulatory environment affecting retail products; in
- 21 particular, there are regulatory efforts that are
- 22 underway by the Securities and Exchange Commission

- 1 regarding the standard care under the securities laws
- 2 for broker dealers and investment advisers that provide
- 3 personalized investment advice about securities to
- 4 retail customers. On January 21st, 2011, the SEC issued
- 5 a study on broker dealers and investment advisers, and
- 6 we think it is essential that the SEC and DOL efforts
- 7 lead to rules that are complimentary and harmonized in
- 8 nature. We urge the Department to provide the public
- 9 sufficient opportunity to consider the SEC's regulatory
- 10 efforts, and to offer additional comments on the
- 11 proposed rule.
- 12 As we read the proposed regulation, the
- 13 seller's limitation applies to IRAs. It is common for
- 14 advisers and for agents to engage customers and
- 15 perspective customers on their particular goals and
- 16 objectives in order to better understand their product
- 17 and service needs. Based on those conversations an
- 18 adviser might explain the pros and cons of various
- 19 investment vehicles, including variable annuities,
- 20 mutual funds, brokerage accounts, banking products,
- 21 fixed annuities, alternative investments, and several
- 22 types of advisory accounts, and within each of these

- 1 types of securities and property, advisers and agents
- 2 can usually recommend several different specific
- 3 securities that may have different features.
- 4 Compensation paid by product and by service will vary.
- 5 For instance, compensation charged for executing a
- 6 stock trade will differ from compensation received for
- 7 selling an annuity. The seller's limitation, with an
- 8 appropriate indication of the seller's interest, makes
- 9 it possible to recommend products and services to
- 10 customers.
- I would like to thank the Department again
- 12 for holding this hearing, and thank you for inviting
- 13 the ACLI to testify. I am happy to answer any
- 14 questions you may have.
- 15 MR. DAVIS: Right on time. Thanks, Mr.
- 16 Roberts. Mr. Goldbrum?
- 17 MR. GOLDBRUM: Good afternoon. My name is
- 18 Larry Goldbrum, and I am General Counsel of the SPARK
- 19 Institute, an industry association that represents the
- 20 interests of retirement plan service providers,
- 21 including recordkeepers, mutual fund companies,
- 22 insurance companies, bank, investment managers and

- 1 others. Thank you for the opportunity to share our
- 2 views with you.
- 3 The SPARK Institute supports clarifying and
- 4 updating the definition of who is a fiduciary; however,
- 5 we urge the EBSA to consider the following five guiding
- 6 principles as it makes any changes to the rules.
- 7 First, any new definition must be clear and
- 8 precise. It is crucial that service providers are able
- 9 to structure their products, services and compensation
- 10 arrangements with reasonable certainty about whether
- 11 they will be a fiduciary. Absent clear and precise
- 12 quidance, service providers will be at substantial risk
- 13 of unintentionally and unwillingly becoming fiduciaries
- 14 and engaging in prohibitive transactions. Unfortunately
- 15 the proposal includes broad changes that are unclear
- 16 and will result in unintended consequences.
- 17 Additionally, the availability and scope of the
- 18 proposed exceptions are unclear. Unintentional
- 19 fiduciary status will be a realistic possibility for
- 20 service providers. For example, we are concerned about
- 21 investment platform providers' ability to provide non-
- 22 fiduciary information and assistance to plan sponsors,

- 1 to help them narrow down the investment choices
- 2 available to a plan; for example, from 1,000 funds
- 3 available on a platform to 30 possible alternatives. We
- 4 are also concerned about a provider's ability to rely
- 5 on the seller's exception, because of the complexities
- 6 associated with the selling process and how and when
- 7 plan sponsors make plan investment decisions. For
- 8 example, investment decisions may be made after a
- 9 General Services Agreement is signed, but the plan
- 10 sponsor will expect the seller to continue to provide
- 11 the information and assistance that was provided before
- 12 the agreement was entered into. The stakes for the
- 13 service providers are very high because a
- 14 misinterpretation of the rules or an unintentional
- 15 violation could affect a provider's entire line of
- 16 products and services and all of its plan
- 17 relationships. We urge EBSA to provide clear and
- 18 precise guidance, and to consider the value, importance
- 19 and complexity of plan products and services.
- 20 Second, any new regulations must provide
- 21 flexibility and preserve choices. Today's service
- 22 providers have the ability to structure their products

- 1 and services so that they can provide fiduciary and
- 2 non-fiduciary services that plans need and demand. We
- 3 believe that service providers and plan sponsors should
- 4 have flexibility and discretion in determining and
- 5 agreeing on the service provider's role, and whether a
- 6 fiduciary relationship is mutually expected. The
- 7 proposal substantially lowers the threshold for when a
- 8 service provider will be considered a fiduciary, and in
- 9 some instances, treats some services as investment
- 10 advice that, in our view, should not be treated as
- 11 such. As a result, service providers will be forced to
- 12 discontinue providing many services that plan sponsors
- 13 demand, or to charge substantially higher fees in order
- 14 to account for the higher risk and responsibility that
- 15 comes with being a fiduciary. Many plan sponsors do
- 16 not want and cannot afford to hire someone to serve in
- 17 a fiduciary capacity, to provide the limited non-
- 18 fiduciary assistance that they can get today. If plans
- 19 are forced to hire fiduciary services, plan
- 20 participants will ultimately bear the burden of higher
- 21 fees. We believe that this does not advance EBSA's
- 22 other goals of facilitating lower cost ways for

- 1 American workers to save for retirement.
- 2 Additionally, our comment letter included a
- 3 safe harbor recommendation that would allow service
- 4 providers and responsible plan fiduciaries to determine
- 5 and agree, in writing, on the provider's role and
- 6 whether a fiduciary relationship is mutually expected.
- 7 The provider would have to disclose the financial
- 8 interest it may have regarding plan decisions. We
- 9 recognize that under certain circumstances EBSA would
- 10 be unwilling to allow the provider and plan
- 11 representative to agree to non-fiduciary status. For
- 12 example, when the provider exercises discretion, or
- 13 when it provides individual investment advice that is
- 14 clearly and mutually intended to be the primary basis
- 15 for the plan investment option decisions, those
- 16 circumstances should be clearly defined in any final
- 17 rule. We urge EBSA to consider including the safe
- 18 harbor in its final rule.
- 19 Third, any new regulation must avoid
- 20 unintended potential harm. We are concerned that the
- 21 proposal is likely to cause such harm and be disruptive
- 22 to the retirement plan community in at least two ways.

304

1 First, as I already mentioned, service providers will likely have to discontinue providing 2 services or start charging higher fees to account for 3 being a fiduciary. Some organizations that represent financial advisers that typically provide fiduciary 5 services will try to convince EBSA that this is a good 6 outcome. Such views seemingly underestimate the issues, concerns and potential harm that are identified 9 in the majority of the comments submitted to EBSA. While the proposal may be good for those who want to 10 serve and charge for serving as a plan fiduciary, it 11 12 will likely be harmful and disruptive to the vast 13 majority of the retirement plan community, particularly 14 small plans that cannot afford to hire outside 15 fiduciaries. 16 Second, services providers should not be 17 subject to the significant risks that an arrangement to provide non-fiduciary products and services will be 18 treated after the fact as a fiduciary relationship. 19 Class action attorneys have discovered retirement plans 20 as potentially fertile grounds for large settlements 21 from perceived deep pocket defendants; typically large 22

- 1 plan sponsors and service providers. Although they
- 2 have had limited success on the merits of their cases,
- 3 the greater risk of hindsight recharacterization of
- 4 relationships, the increased threat of litigation and
- 5 the costs to defend against them will have a chilling
- 6 effect on the retirement plan community.
- 7 Our fourth guiding principle is that any
- 8 changes should be measured and harmonized with other
- 9 initiatives. The proposed changes are significant and
- 10 we are encouraged that EBSA is working with the SEC, as
- 11 it evaluates regulatory action that will have a direct
- 12 impact on the standards of care and fiduciary
- 13 obligations of brokers and financial advisers.
- 14 We urge EBSA to continue to engage the
- 15 retirement plan community, as it is doing today, as it
- 16 evaluates the issues and concerns raised by many
- 17 different organizations. We believe that significant
- 18 changes to the proposal are needed, and that the
- 19 retirement plan community would benefit greatly if EBSA
- 20 reproposed the modified rule. This will ultimately
- 21 result in a more harmonized set of regulations
- 22 governing these matters in a more effective and

- 1 transition for everyone, including plan sponsors.
- 2 Contrary to what has been suggested by the
- 3 limited number of groups encouraging EBSA to move
- 4 quickly in finalizing the proposal, uncertainty and
- 5 consistencies will not benefit or -- help or benefit
- 6 anyone except for the litigators and perhaps those who
- 7 want to expand the number of plans for which they
- 8 provide fiduciary services. I am encouraged by the
- 9 comments I heard this morning, that perhaps many of our
- 10 changes and our issues and concerns would fall into the
- 11 category of line drawing and drafting, so I do want to
- 12 mention that. That was encouraging.
- Our fifth guiding principle is to allow
- 14 adequate time for compliance. The proposed changes
- 15 raise very complex issues and will dramatically impact
- 16 the products and services available to plans, and could
- 17 have devastating consequences for any provider, who
- 18 unintentionally and unwillingly becomes a fiduciary. We
- 19 urge EBSA to allow 18 months from the date that any
- 20 rule is published for the retirement plan community to
- 21 evaluate the rules, determine how to comply with them,
- 22 and for service providers to educate their customers

- 1 about the rules, and to modify their service
- 2 arrangements.
- Finally, with respect to distribution
- 4 counseling, the SPARK Institute supports EBSA's efforts
- 5 to safeguard the interests of participants in
- 6 connection with plan distributions, and encourages it
- 7 to develop further guidance, but not in connection with
- 8 the current effort to redefine who is a fiduciary. EBSA
- 9 has received many comments on this topic with differing
- 10 views; however, most agree that plan participants want
- 11 and need assistance when deciding whether to take a
- 12 distribution, what distribution to take, and what to do
- 13 with the proceeds. Groups will disagree over who a
- 14 participant can trust when seeking help on these
- 15 issues. We agree that a plan fiduciary should neither
- 16 be able to act in its own interest, nor be able to
- 17 influence its own compensation when helping a plan
- 18 participant with these decisions. We also believe that
- 19 it is equally, if not more important, for EBSA to
- 20 consider the concerns about unknown advisers who make
- 21 cold calls to plan participants, and their ability to
- 22 exercise greater influence when participants are unable

- 1 to get the assistance that they need from the plan
- 2 sponsor and incumbent service providers. Moreover, we
- 3 do not believe that the solution to this problem is to
- 4 deem all distribution counseling to be fiduciary
- 5 activities. That would have a chilling effect on the
- 6 availability of health. Instead, we urge EBSA to issue
- 7 additional guidance that is comparable to IB-96-1 that
- 8 clearly defines acceptable distribution counseling,
- 9 assistance and education that can be provided by the
- 10 plan sponsor and incumbent service providers, including
- 11 plan fiduciaries.
- 12 On behalf of the SPARK Institute I want to
- 13 thank you for the opportunity to share our views.
- 14 MR. DAVIS: Thanks so much. We'll turn to
- 15 the Panel for questions, but first, for the record, I
- 16 just want to note you guys have harmonized your own
- 17 choice of wardrobe today. It's very impressive. In
- 18 the spirit of harmonization, I just want to note that
- 19 for the record.
- 20 MR. GOLDBRUM: It's a shame that we couldn't
- 21 get a picture.
- MS. ATANASIO: Is that a commentary?

309 1 MR. DAVIS: We'll start with Virginia. 2 MS. SMITH: Actually, I noticed that halfway 3 through and for a few minutes I couldn't listen to the 4 testimony. 5 I do have a couple of questions. My first one is for Mr. Ferrigno. I am intrigued by your recommendation that the Department reverse its position that a recommendation to take a distribution, even when combined with a recommendation as to how the distribution should be invested, does not constitute 10 investment advice, and my question is, do you come to 11 this position based on experience that you have seen? 12 13 Can you give examples of situations that would cause you to make this recommendation? 14 15 MR. FERRIGNO: Well, I mean, we have never 16 thought it made sense from the day it was issued; that, 17 to us, it was self-evident that clearly telling someone 18 to sell their assets in their plan and seek a distribution would constitute advice. And, we always 19 felt that that particular piece of advice was at least 21 as important to the plan participant as any other 22 advice that we could get.

		310
1	MS. SMITH: Have you seen abusive situations?	
2	MR. FERRIGNO: There are definite abuses from	
3	outside advisers that target certain companies that	
4	have extremely rich profit-sharing programs, and	
5	MS. SMITH: Okay.	
6	MR. FERRIGNO: and there are stories of	
7	people who have been talked into quitting. Even	
8	internally there is some level of discomfort in the	
9	plan sponsor community regarding rollover activity.	
10	MS. SMITH: Okay. Mr. Roberts, when you were	
11	talking about the seller's limitation you emphasized	
12	quite a bit about disclosure and all of the things that	
13	should be disclosed, in order to take advantage of the	
14	seller's limitation, but the one thing that I didn't	
15	hear is the amount of the compensation. Do you think	
16	that that should be part of the disclosure?	
17	MR. ROBERTS: The amount of the compensation?	
18	Well, I mean I am with that that takes me back to	
19	is I know that, you know, some of the prohibited	
20	transaction exemptions that were issued years ago	
21	provide disclosure-based relief where the amount of the	
22	compensation is disclosed. And, what I am thinking of	

- 1 particularly is PTE-8424, which covers insurance
- 2 agents, and part of taking advantage of 8424 is to
- 3 disclose the fact that you are being compensated what
- 4 the amount is to an independent plan fiduciary who
- 5 would make the purchase decisions. So,
- 6 philosophically, disclosing the amount of compensation
- 7 I don't think troubles me.
- 8 MS. SMITH: And just one more, if I may? The
- 9 second point that you made, Mr. Roberts, was that --
- 10 that the determination of fiduciary status should only
- 11 be based on written representations, and I tried to
- 12 follow what your suggestion was, and it seemed to me --
- 13 and correct me if I am wrong -- that what you were
- 14 saying was really that the burden should be shifted to
- 15 the plan level fiduciary to get this written
- 16 acknowledgement of fiduciary status; is that what you
- 17 were saying?
- 18 MR. ROBERTS: Not quite. You know where I
- 19 was going is that the seller's limitation becomes
- 20 awfully important to our members, because our members
- 21 are insurance companies who are in the business of
- 22 selling insurance products. We are all about selling

- 1 insurance products, and we need to make sure that we
- 2 don't find ourselves strained into a situation where we
- 3 might be deemed to be fiduciaries with an impermissible
- 4 conflict of interest, so we seek the seller's
- 5 exception. And, what troubles us in the proposed
- 6 regulation is that you lose the benefit of the seller's
- 7 exception if you have asserted that you are acting as a
- 8 fiduciary under ERISA. So the point I was trying to
- 9 make is that given the gravity of the loss of that
- 10 seller's exception to us, we think it should only be
- 11 subject to being forfeited, if you will, if the
- 12 assertion or the acknowledgement of ERISA fiduciary
- 13 status is made in writing; in other words, so you don't
- 14 have someone saying, you can't take advantage of the
- 15 seller's exception because you told me you were acting
- 16 as an ERISA fiduciary, and you get into a quarrel of,
- 17 well, no, we didn't. We think that something of that
- 18 magnitude ought to be put in writing if it's going to
- 19 lead to the loss of that exception.
- 20 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Goldbrum, you, in your
- 21 testimony, you said that if the regulation went forward
- 22 as proposed there are certain services that would be

- 1 discontinued, certain retirement services, advice
- 2 services perhaps. Can you be more specific; what
- 3 specific would be discontinued and why?
- 4 MR. GOLDBRUM: Yeah. Our comment focused
- 5 mainly on the relationship between the vendor and the
- 6 plan sponsor, so some examples that we included in our
- 7 comment letter related to the whole narrowing of the
- 8 number of funds that are available on a vendor's
- 9 platform. If the information that a plan sponsor is
- 10 seeking, whether it's through an RFP because they are
- 11 asking for a sample line-up or they are asking for
- 12 specific information in order to narrow a field of
- 13 funds from thousands down to perhaps the several dozen
- 14 from which they can choose from, that's considered a
- 15 fiduciary activity. Then we are concerned that service
- 16 providers will simply stop providing that assistance
- 17 and say that in order for us to maintain the service
- 18 arrangement that we are proposing with you and the fee
- 19 arrangement that we are proposing with you, we are
- 20 unable to provide you any information that would cause
- 21 us to be a fiduciary, or we may have a potential
- 22 conflict. And we don't think that that's a desirable

- 1 outcome. We think that, you know, there is a line that
- 2 can be drawn that would allow service providers to
- 3 continue to provide information on objective criteria
- 4 that would help a plan sponsor narrow the field, and
- 5 then ultimately the plan sponsor would make the final
- 6 decision. I think based on some of the earlier
- 7 testimony today, you know exactly where that line will
- 8 be. You know I don't think that I have the answer for
- 9 you today as we sit here, but I think that's part of
- 10 the process that we are encouraging the Department to
- 11 go through and engage the retirement plan community, so
- 12 we can see where that line is, and if the line is clear
- 13 so that both the service provider and the vendor -- the
- 14 vendor provider and the plan sponsor know where that
- 15 line is and have mutually similar expectations of what
- 16 the relationship is.
- 17 MR. DAVIS: Thanks.
- 18 MR. HAUSER: Mr. Roberts, and this is
- 19 following up on Virginia's question, but I think the
- 20 way you put it was, well, if somebody wants a fiduciary
- 21 sort of relationship with its intending consequences,
- 22 the burden really ought to be on them to seek it. But,

- 1 at least when you are talking about, you know, people
- 2 who aren't plan fiduciaries, but rather are
- 3 participants, accountholders of one sort or another, I
- 4 would think that more typically they have an
- 5 expectation that they are getting fiduciary conduct,
- 6 and that it's almost the reverse; if you want to assert
- 7 the seller's exception and you want a very bright line
- 8 approach to take to avoid it, why wouldn't the burden
- 9 be on you to get -- essentially to give a statement
- 10 that's in writing that says I am a seller, I am
- 11 conflicted, here are the fees I am going to get, and
- 12 you acknowledge -- and here are the rights you lose if
- 13 I am not a fiduciary, you know, you won't have a
- 14 remedy, a loss remedy, you won't be entitled to
- 15 prudence and loyalty under ERISA, and then say -- and
- 16 have a signature line that says, never -- you know,
- 17 yes, you are good to go. Please, don't treat -- don't
- 18 be a fiduciary. I mean would that be -- that kind of
- 19 approach work?
- 20 MR. ROBERTS: Well, I don't think -- you know
- 21 I don't think our members have talked about anything
- 22 quite as extensive as you have just described, but I

- 1 will say we have talked a fair amount about the fact
- 2 that -- you know, in situations where we are selling
- 3 products or services, we want to make sure that the
- 4 person to whom we are selling understands that, and so
- 5 we would be comfortable with putting a written
- 6 statement out saying you should know that we are not an
- 7 impartial provider of investment advice; we have a
- 8 financial interest in this transaction and whatever
- 9 goes along with that. You know in my dialogue with Ms.
- 10 Smith earlier, what I was trying to get at is, we were
- 11 concerned about the possibility that even after you had
- 12 done all of that, you might still lose the benefit of
- 13 the seller's exception if the person to whom you were
- 14 selling stood up and said, ah, but, you know, yesterday
- 15 he told me he was acting as an ERISA fiduciary orally.
- 16 We think that the threat of losing the seller's
- 17 exception on the basis of claims of unwritten
- 18 statements is extremely troubling and problematic, and
- 19 we think that, given the magnitude of potential loss,
- 20 it is not unreasonable to ask for a requirement that
- 21 the loss of the seller's exception occurs when a
- 22 written representation of ERISA fiduciary status has

317 been given. MR. HAUSER: Well, would that need to be, in 2 3 your view, done as a requirement for fiduciary treatment, or could it simply be a safe harbor; you do a statement in this form, you get the participant's 5 signature and acknowledgement, and if you do that, you 6 won't be treated as a fiduciary? 8 MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, really my 9 remarks are not aimed at one who is acting as a fiduciary, but rather aimed at the situation where one 10 makes no bones about the fact that they are acting as a 11 seller, but that they are subject to the loss of the 12 13 seller's exception by claims of unwritten assertions of fiduciary status. 14 15 MR. HAUSER: Right. No, I understand, but I 16 quess my question is just in terms of writing a 17 regulation, as I understood while you were saying it, 18 was almost as if, well, this ought to be a requirement of falling outside of the seller's exception is that 19 there be this written statement, but what about just a 21 safe harbor sort of document? I mean, would that just 22 as easily meet your goal?

		318
1	MR. ROBERTS: You mean a	
2	MR. HAUSER: I mean essentially a rule that	
3	will say, if you have this kind of statement, that kind	
4	of argument is going to be unavailing?	
5	MR. ROBERTS: I think we would be quite	
6	receptive to that sort of approach.	
7	MR. HAUSER: And then I know, Mr. Goldbrum,	
8	you didn't want to do any line drawing, but you know,	
9	what do you have any advice you would care to give	
10	when it comes to this business of giving advice or	
11	information, however you want to characterize it, in	
12	connection with narrowing down essentially the options	
13	on a fund menu or on a plan menu?	
14	MR. GOLDBRUM: With the caveat that I may	
15	decide to supplement what I say or revise it, but, yes,	
16	I mean, to the extent that you are providing generic	
17	information or you are helping serve a plan sponsor	
18	narrow down the field based on objective criteria. We	
19	mention this in our comment letter. So, you know, when	
20	you are looking at historical returns, comparison to a	
21	peer group, you know, Morningstar ratings, whatever	
22	objective criteria, and you are running the funds that	

- 1 are on your platform through those screens, you know,
- 2 that should still be considered non-fiduciary
- 3 assistance. You know there are other situations that
- 4 we talked about where there are -- in the comment
- 5 letter where there are problems; you know, handling the
- 6 plan conversions, you know; what does a plan do with
- 7 the assets while they are shifting from an old provider
- 8 to a new provider? plan sponsors are going to want
- 9 help in understanding, well, should we liquidate all
- 10 the assets to cash and hold them in cash temporarily;
- 11 should we put them in some sort of equity fund
- 12 temporarily while we are conducting the conversion? You
- 13 know those are other questions that plan sponsors will
- 14 have where they really do need help from someone who
- 15 understands the situation, and we are concerned --
- MR. HAUSER: It sounds like they need
- 17 investment advice.
- 18 MR. GOLDBRUM: No. I don't think that that
- 19 is investment advice. I think that that is sort of
- 20 education of what the different options are; what are
- 21 the advantages and disadvantages of them so that they
- 22 can ultimately make an informed decision for

- 1 themselves. And I think that's where some of the art
- 2 is in the line drawing is sort of understanding the
- 3 practical situations, and there are probably about four
- 4 or five of them that we identified in our comment
- 5 letter, that service providers are faced with where
- 6 plan sponsors are coming to them and saying, help us
- 7 understand what our choices are and what the advantages
- 8 and disadvantages of those are. And, to the extent
- 9 that the Department can provide guidance on that as to,
- 10 you know, what is acceptable education to a plan
- 11 sponsor in making those decisions versus where does --
- 12 where do you become a fiduciary would be very, very
- 13 valuable. And, I think that should be done in
- 14 conjunction with any change, because to simply change
- 15 the definition of fiduciary without telling the
- 16 industry what is it you can do would be a concern.
- 17 MR. HAUSER: Thanks.
- 18 MR. PIACENTINI: I guess let me pick up on
- 19 Tim's question and take it in a little bit different
- 20 direction. So, if this narrowing down of a menu off of
- 21 a platform, if that is a fiduciary act, then you said
- 22 that that would introduce costs, I think?

321 1 MR. GOLDBRUM: Well, there are two things that can happen: the plan service providers can simply decide that they are unable to provide that information 3 and assistance because it will cause them to be a 5 fiduciary, and under their fee structure, perhaps engaging in prohibited transactions; or they can decide 6 to re-price their products to factor in the increased responsibility and risk that comes along with being a fiduciary. 9 10 MR. PIACENTINI: So I guess my question is, how big is that? Do you see this as a large risk that 11 12 will be expensive to take on? I mean, I am trying to 13 juxtapose that against your characterization of this process as being one that is based on objective 14 15 criteria and so forth. It sounds like it's pretty 16 clear-cut and maybe doesn't have much risk, so how do I 17 put that together? 18 MR. GOLDBRUM: Yeah. You know there are probably others that are, you know, more of the direct 19 service providers that may be able to give you a better 20 sense and may have tried to quantify that, but let me 21 say this; you know, generally the information and the 22

- 1 assistance that is provided in the process today is
- 2 provided at no additional cost. It's, you know,
- 3 something that can be done and provided cheap,
- 4 relatively cheaply. But, when you tell a service
- 5 provider, okay, you are now a fiduciary and you have to
- 6 figure out what is suitable for that particular plan
- 7 and what is best for that particular plan, it's going
- 8 to involve more due diligence; it's going to involve
- 9 extensive monitoring of and for that plan, and there
- 10 will be some price to it; whether it's 50, 75, 100
- 11 basis points a year, I'm just not able to tell you.
- MR. PIACENTINI: Okay. And then one
- 13 different question, and I guess this is maybe for Mr.
- 14 Ferrigno. So you talked about your view that a
- 15 recommendation to distribute an account should be
- 16 advice; Mr. Novy, in the preceding panel, I think had a
- 17 similar view, but also went further to say that he
- 18 thought that the cost of that being fiduciary advice
- 19 would be minimal. Do you share that view?
- 20 MR. FERRIGNO: Yeah, I do. I do. Absolutely.
- 21 You know, most people today will tell you that they
- 22 don't provide -- they don't steer people to take a

323 distribution, so basically codifying that shouldn't be a problem. 2 3 MR. PIACENTINI: Okay. Thanks. MR. WONG: I just have one question that I 5 hope is very narrow. It's for Mr. Roberts. I think, in talking about the seller's limitation, you indicated 6 that, by the way, we drafted and used the term agent, it might not encompass other parties involved in the distribution of investments, who might need to take advantage of it. Can you go into a little bit more 10 detail about who some of those parties are and why you 11 are and why using the agent might not capture them? 12 13 MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, true confession; you know, it's partially concerned with the 14 15 drafting. It's also partially a concern about some of 16 the remarks that were made by various officials from 17 the Department in terms of explaining the regulation 18 immediately after it was published. There was some confusion and some concern frankly amongst our members 19 20 that, at different points in time, it seemed that it 21 was not clear how far the seller's exception extended; 22 that certain folks, who we would have thought naturally

324 would be recognized as acting in a sales capacity as agents of a seller, if you will, sometimes seem to be covered, and other times seem not to be. So my remarks 3 were really aimed at trying to pin that down once and 5 for all, and to go back to the language that was in the preamble, which seemed to recognize that, if you are engaged in selling activity and you are willing to say you are engaged in selling activity, there shouldn't be a problem in terms of casting you inside the seller's 9 exception and not as an ERISA fiduciary. So when we 10 look at all of the various sales channels we have, we 11 just want to make absolutely sure that they are all 12 13 available for coverage under that sales exception; whether they are independents; whether they are 14 15 captives, general agents, what-have you. 16 MR. DAVIS: Okay. No more questions? 17 (No audible response). 18 MR. DAVIS: Okay. Thanks so much. 19 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. MR. DAVIS: We'll call Panel 7. Brian? 20 21 he comes. 22 MR. GRAFF: I almost didn't make it.

		325
1	MR. DAVIS: Okay. I think we'll get started	
2	with Brian Graff, first on the agenda.	
3	MR. GRAFF: Hi, Michael.	
4	MR. DAVIS: How are you?	
5	MR. GRAFF: On behalf of ASPPA and its sister	
6	organizations, NAIRPA (ph) (the National Association of	
7	Independent Retirement plan advisers) and CIKR (ph)	
8	(the Council of Independent 401(k) Recordkeepers), I	
9	thank you for this opportunity to testify today on this	
10	important subject.	
11	My testimony today will focus on two points:	
12	one, we generally support the proposed change to the	
13	basic definition of investment advice, and want to	
14	encourage you to stay the course; two, we believe that	
15	it is critically important that these rules not apply	
16	to IRAs, as such application would effectively create	
17	an uneven marketplace playing field, to the ultimate	
18	detriment of participants.	
19	Regarding the proposed change to the	
20	definition of advice, many of those testifying today,	
21	as well as many comments filed, suggest that there is	
22	no need to change a definition, since the current	
1		

- 1 definition provides clarity and certainty. We agree,
- 2 sort of. The current definition does provide clarity
- 3 on how a non-registered broker or adviser can avoid
- 4 providing what is considered ERISA investment advice,
- 5 and thus provides clarity on how a broker or adviser
- 6 can avoid being subject to ERISA's fiduciary duties.
- 7 The current definition also certainly is confusing to
- 8 plan sponsors, who really have no idea whether or not
- 9 their broker or adviser is providing advice for the
- 10 protections of ERISA. A recent survey of plan sponsors
- 11 reported that 60 percent of small business plan owners
- 12 indicated they received advice on their plan. Well, if
- 13 that's ERISA investment advice, what are we all arguing
- 14 about? That would mean that almost two-thirds of small
- 15 plans are getting served by a fiduciary adviser. Of
- 16 course, what we believe is that the investment advice
- 17 most of these small business owners and plans are
- 18 receiving is actually non-ERISA investment advice,
- 19 whatever that means, which is really the point. There
- 20 is nothing clear and certain about that, particularly
- 21 to a small business owner trying to provide a
- 22 retirement plan for his or her employees. When a

- 1 broker or adviser is helping a small business owner set
- 2 up a 401(k) plan and says to the owner, these are the 20
- 3 investment options that you should offer to your plan,
- 4 that owner naturally thinks he or she is getting
- 5 advice. If you never heard of the current five-part
- 6 definition, wouldn't you? In our members' experience,
- 7 small business owners are rather surprised when they
- 8 are informed that the advice that they have received
- 9 for their ERISA-covered 401(k) plan is not actually
- 10 ERISA-covered investment advice. The idea that the
- 11 same advice would theoretically have to be given two,
- 12 three, maybe four times for the advice to be considered
- 13 ERISA investment advice, under the current rules, it's
- 14 a victory of form over substance. What should matter
- 15 most is the perception of plan sponsors, and to them,
- 16 particularly small business owners, advice is advice is
- 17 advice. Marketplace confusion about the roles and
- 18 responsibilities of brokers and advisers is not a new
- 19 issue, and is definitely not limited to retirement
- 20 plans. The SEC recently issued a study recognizing
- 21 that the recipients of advice are often confused about
- 22 the duties and obligations of the persons providing

- 1 advice. Some commentators have argued that the
- 2 Department should postpone its consideration of the
- 3 proposed regulation until the SEC has completed its
- 4 work on a fiduciary standard for brokers and advisers
- 5 to avoid potential inconsistencies. We strongly
- 6 disagree. The issues and implications of advice given
- 7 to ERISA plans are very different than retail level
- 8 advice. For instance, advice given to a plan sponsor
- 9 directly impacts other individuals, namely
- 10 participants, and thus it's appropriate for the
- 11 Department to develop its own standards specifically
- 12 designed for ERISA plans. It's also important to point
- 13 out that the proposed regulation would not, as some
- 14 commentators have suggested, preclude commission-based
- 15 brokers and advisers from working with sponsors, and
- 16 thus would not eliminate an important distribution
- 17 channel for plans. Under the so-called limitation of
- 18 the proposed regulations, such brokers and advisers
- 19 would be able to exempt themselves from the regulation
- 20 provided certain disclosures are made to the recipient
- 21 of the advice. Admittedly, we believe these
- 22 disclosures are over-broad and unduly harsh. The vast

- 1 majority of professional brokers and advisers are
- 2 dedicated and qualified, and are very much focused on
- 3 the interest of their clients. No broker or adviser
- 4 could ultimately be successful in their practice, if
- 5 their interest were adverse to their clients, and to
- 6 require disclosure indicating as such, as the proposed
- 7 regulation does, is just not fair in our view.
- In these instances, what we believe is most
- 9 important to be disclosed to recipients of advice are
- 10 three things: one, that the broker or adviser is not
- 11 acting as an ERISA fiduciary, and thus the advice given
- 12 is not afforded the protections of ERISA; two, that the
- 13 broker or adviser's advice may not be impartial since
- 14 he or she is compensated by the provider of the
- 15 investment options being considered, and the amount of
- 16 the compensation may be affected by the investment
- 17 selected; and three, the amount of compensation the
- 18 broker or adviser is reasonably accepted to receive
- 19 based on the investments selected, which ties nicely
- 20 into what the Department has already done in its ERISA
- 21 section 408(b)(2) regulations. This kind of
- 22 disclosure will reasonably and effectively give plan

- 1 fiduciaries the information they need to understand
- 2 what role their broker or adviser is playing, and what
- 3 financial relationships exist between the broker or
- 4 adviser and the plan investment providers. However, it
- 5 is also critical that this disclosure be clear and
- 6 conspicuous and not allowed to be buried in a lengthy
- 7 service agreement. We suggest the Department provide a
- 8 model notice along these lines. Interestingly, such a
- 9 disclosure framework would actually be very much in
- 10 line with what was suggested by the SEC staff in its
- 11 recent study; namely, a possible fiduciary standard
- 12 would not preclude commission-based compensation, but
- 13 would rather require a clear disclosure.
- 14 We believe what we are suggesting would
- 15 address the current confusion of plan sponsors and will
- 16 level the playing field between those providing advice
- 17 that are currently ERISA fiduciaries and want to be,
- 18 and those that are not ERISA fiduciaries and don't want
- 19 to be. In other words, if a broker or adviser provides
- 20 to a plan what any layperson would think is advice, the
- 21 broker or adviser will either: one, be subject to the
- 22 duties and responsibilities of an ERISA fiduciary; or

- 1 two, disclose they are not acting as an ERISA
- 2 fiduciary, and that their advice may not be impartial
- 3 due to compensation received from the investment
- 4 providers. That's it. What could be more clear and
- 5 certain that that?
- 6 I'd like to spend a few minutes now talking
- 7 about IRAs. The proposed regulation as currently
- 8 written, as you know, would apply to IRAs. Further,
- 9 the proposed regulation asks for comments on whether
- 10 the definition of investment advice should extend to
- 11 recommendations related to taking a plan distribution,
- 12 namely, IRA investments. We strongly recommend that
- 13 the regulation should not apply in either case. There
- 14 is no debate that IRAs are an important retirement
- 15 savings vehicle. Over 40 percent of American
- 16 households owned IRAs, and they are the primary tool
- 17 for retirees to manage their retirement assets. But,
- 18 IRAs are different than ERISA-covered plans. As the
- 19 Department itself said to the preamble to the fee
- 20 disclosure regulations, IRA holders have considerable
- 21 flexibility in the choice of their IRA provider, or the
- 22 ability to roll over their balances to an IRA provider

- 1 of their choice. The Department thus appropriately
- 2 concluded that the participant fee disclosure
- 3 regulation should not extend to IRA-based plans. We
- 4 believe the Department should do the same here with
- 5 respect to IRAs in general.
- 6 IRAs are different than ERISA plans in
- 7 another critically important respect; in contrast to
- 8 the thorough enforcement regime applicable to ERISA
- 9 plans, there is no federal agency that currently has a
- 10 comprehensive enforcement program for IRAs. The fact
- 11 is, IRA enforcement appears to be more often occurring
- 12 at the state level, and is hodge-podge at best. Recent
- 13 warnings issued by the states of Kansas and Oregon
- 14 about investing IRAs in fractional shares of viatical
- 15 (ph) settlements are a good example. The fact that
- 16 states have felt the need to get involved in IRAs is
- 17 testament to the current lack of federal enforcement.
- 18 If the Department decides to extend these regulations
- 19 to IRAs, this is what will happen. Players in the
- 20 retirement industry who are more formally regulated
- 21 with extensive compliance departments, like the firms
- 22 represented by my colleagues on this Panel, will comply

- 1 with the rules, and those less formally regulated, who
- 2 know there is no practical enforcement of the rules,
- 3 will choose not to comply. While responsible firms
- 4 will have limitations on their ability to distribute
- 5 IRAs, less responsible firms will practically have free
- 6 reign giving them a competitive advantage and uneven
- 7 playing field. Consumers will be exposed to a
- 8 significantly great risk as a consequence. Further, if
- 9 the Department chooses to apply the definition of
- 10 investment advice to plan distributions, including
- 11 distributions to IRAs, retirement plan service
- 12 providers who already have existing relationships with
- 13 participants will be severely hampered from discussing
- 14 IRA options with them. These service providers have
- 15 done an excellent job building programs to work with
- 16 employees approaching retirement, to encourage them to
- 17 roll over their retirement savings and prevent leakage
- 18 from the retirement system. The IRAs they offer have
- 19 investment options that are generally consistent with
- 20 those available to the employee in the plan, are high
- 21 quality, and have reasonable fees. If these service
- 22 providers are effectively precluded from offering IRAs

- 1 to employees, that means participants will be
- 2 potentially left exposed to less responsible vendors
- 3 making it easier for some vendors to offer retirees
- 4 IRAs investing in viatical settlements which is
- 5 certainly not a result anyone would want.
- 6 Some people in our industry has described the
- 7 IRA market as the Wild West. If you apply these
- 8 regulations to IRAs, you will, metaphorically speaking,
- 9 be taking the guns away from the good guys leaving only
- 10 the bad guys with guns. Forgive me, that's not a fair
- 11 fight. Simply put, any regulatory initiative in the
- 12 IRA area must be supported by an active, comprehensive
- 13 enforcement regime to ensure consistent application. In
- 14 the absence of such enforcement, we strongly encourage
- 15 you to exclude IRAs from these rules.
- 16 Thank you, and I would be happy to take any
- 17 questions.
- MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Graff. Mr.
- 19 Stevens?
- 20 MR. STEVENS: Thank you, and I thank the
- 21 Department for holding this hearing, and I congratulate
- 22 you on your stamina and diligence. I guess you have

335 been at this since about 9 o'clock this morning? Fiduciary status entails one of the highest 2 obligations known to the law. It also entails some of 3 the heaviest liabilities known to the law. underpins the entire ERISA compliance structure, and 5 thus we believe that rules governing who is a fiduciary need to provide clarity. They should not impede commonplace financial interactions. They must allow plans and retirement savers to obtain investments that meet their needs, and also to gather a range of market 10 input into their decision-making process. 11 12 Now the Department's current rule is 35 years 13 old, and we agree that the Department should review its rule in light of changes in how Americans save for 14 15 retirement. But, what has not changed in those 35 16 years is the need to make very clear the line between 17 commonplace financial market interactions and true 18 advisory relationships. The rule adopted in 1975 did not narrow the definition of investment advice, as some 19 now suggest, but rather implemented Congress' intent 20 21 that ERISA not disrupt established business practices 22 of financial institutions interacting with employee

- 1 benefit plans. In our judgment, revisions to the rule
- 2 should embrace the following principles. Persons who
- 3 deal with plans or IRA investors must know whether or
- 4 not they are fiduciaries. Fiduciary status should
- 5 attach only to genuine advisory relationships where a
- 6 position of trust and confidence exists. Simply
- 7 selling an investment product or a service cannot be a
- 8 fiduciary act without more, and the rules should not
- 9 discourage the assistance that recordkeepers engaged to
- 10 administer plan accounts provide to help fiduciaries
- 11 prudently select and monitor plan menu investments.
- 12 Now, in our judgment, to this end, the Department
- 13 should revise it's proposal as follows.
- 14 First, the rules should create fiduciary
- 15 duties only when the adviser provides advice or
- 16 recommendations individualized to the plan or
- 17 participant. Unfortunately the proposal does not
- 18 require that the investment recommendation be specific
- 19 to either. General statements about an investment or a
- 20 class of investments, indeed all manner of ordinary
- 21 business interactions, could be swept in. Many firms
- 22 send out market newsletters, for example, that might

- 1 suggest where interest rates or the price of gold are
- 2 headed. When someone calls an IRA provider about a
- 3 rollover, a call center representative might advise
- 4 that X fund is designed to meet a particular investment
- 5 objective, or that Y fund is a target date fund
- 6 designed for people who expect to retire around a
- 7 particular date. While providing no investment advice
- 8 as such, no reasonable person would believe those sorts
- 9 of interactions create or should create an advisory
- 10 relationship of trust and confidence.
- 11 Second, the rule should not deem an entity to
- 12 be a fiduciary based on a person's status, such as
- 13 whether the entity or its affiliate is an investment
- 14 adviser as defined in the Investment adviser's Act of
- 15 1940, if meeting that definition is unrelated to how
- 16 the entity and the plan sponsor or participant
- 17 interact. Determining whether someone gives advice
- 18 under ERISA requires looking at the interaction itself
- 19 and not whether that person or an affiliate is an
- 20 adviser under the adviser's Act, the Department and the
- 21 Courts consistently and properly have viewed ERISA
- 22 fiduciary status as a functional test based upon what

- 1 you do. Now, to be sure, advisers do owe a fiduciary
- 2 duty under the securities laws, but this duty extends
- 3 only to their clients; that is, to those institutions
- 4 or individuals with whom the adviser has a mutual
- 5 agreement to provide investment advisory services for
- 6 compensation. It does not apply to every person with
- 7 whom the adviser or its affiliates or any of its
- 8 employees interacts. If Congress had wanted every firm
- 9 that meets the adviser's Act definition to be an ERISA
- 10 fiduciary, it could and would have said so. It did
- 11 not. Moreover, the Department should clarify that
- 12 fiduciary status requires a mutual agreement that the
- 13 person will be providing individual advice that the
- 14 recipient will consider in making investment decisions.
- 15 This should be objectively determined; so parties
- 16 dealing with plans and IRA customers in good faith are
- 17 not forever in doubt about their obligations and their
- 18 potential liabilities.
- 19 Third, our letter suggests several ways to
- 20 improve the exceptions in the proposal. The exceptions
- 21 are essential to making the rule work. We strongly
- 22 urge the Department to retain the exceptions for

- 1 participant investment education and information
- 2 related to platform investments, so as not to
- 3 discourage the assistance and education the
- 4 recordkeepers provide to plan fiduciaries making
- 5 decisions on plan menu investments, and to participants
- 6 deciding how to allocate their accounts. As our letter
- 7 points out, these exceptions also should be available
- 8 for IRAs.
- 9 The Department also should retain and clarify
- 10 the exception for selling an investment product. As
- 11 proposed, transactions that might entail advice are
- 12 exempt if it can be demonstrated that the recipient
- 13 knows or should know the person is providing any advice
- 14 in its capacity as a seller or an agent of a seller,
- 15 whose interests are adverse to the interests of the
- 16 plan or its participants, and that the person is not
- 17 undertaking to provide impartial investment advice. In
- 18 this context the Department should make clear first
- 19 that the exception is available to a broad range of
- 20 sellers and agents; for example, it should be available
- 21 when a mutual fund is sold directly by the fund company
- 22 or its affiliated distributor, and when a fund is sold

- 1 through a broker dealer. Second, the exception should
- 2 not require that a seller characterize itself as
- 3 adverse. The sale of a mutual fund is not a zero sum
- 4 game where one side benefits only at the expense of the
- 5 other.
- 6 Fourth, the Department should carefully
- 7 consider how the rules relate to rollovers and IRAs. In
- 8 our view, it should maintain its position that the
- 9 recommendation to take an otherwise permissible
- 10 distribution is not investment advice; otherwise, it
- 11 will chill the routine process in which a worker leaves
- 12 a job, contacts a financial services firm for help in
- 13 rolling over a 401(k) balance, and the firm explains the
- 14 investments it offers and the potential benefits of a
- 15 rollover. This is simply not investment advice with
- 16 respect to the old 401(k) plan even if the result is a
- 17 liquidation of the prior employer's 401(k) account. And
- 18 I would add here that, if the Department does say that
- 19 advising on a rollover is investment advice, it should
- 20 take the same position with respect to an employer
- 21 advising a participant not to rollover. There has to
- 22 be symmetry if the rollover decision is an advisory one

- 1 and entails a fiduciary obligation. And, from the
- 2 employer's perspective, that would require considering
- 3 -- and I think this is an impossibility -- the range of
- 4 all the possible rollover options that the employee
- 5 might consider, and also whether its plan offerings are
- 6 or are not suitable for an individual at that point in
- 7 his or her career, including someone who may be
- 8 approaching retirement. I think that illustrates why
- 9 it shouldn't be looked at as investment advice on
- 10 either side of the coin, although we can all agree that
- 11 advising participants about the pros and cons of one
- 12 strategy or the other is a good idea.
- In addition, we think the Department should
- 14 complete and publish an analysis of the costs of the
- 15 proposal on IRA investors and providers. While the
- 16 proposal's language reaches non-employer-based IRAs,
- 17 the Department's economic analysis, which derives from
- 18 Form 5500 data, does not consider the cost of the
- 19 proposal on IRA investors and providers at all. The
- 20 proposal will generate costs for IRA savers, in that
- 21 the prohibited transaction rules prohibit commission
- 22 compensation to fiduciaries in many instances. If

- 1 financial advisers must move from a commission
- 2 structure to a wrap fee in the IRA market to comply
- 3 with those prohibited transaction rules, this may, in
- 4 many cases, result in higher fees to IRA investors,
- 5 especially given the long-term nature of any IRA
- 6 investments. In addition, there are costs to IRA
- 7 savers if financial advisers must curtail the
- 8 information and services they offer to avoid crossing
- 9 into fiduciary status.
- 10 Finally, we strongly urge the Department to
- 11 look at the entire proposal in light of the comments it
- 12 has received, to draft appropriate revisions, and issue
- 13 a re-proposal. This would be in keeping with President
- 14 Obama's recent direction to make sure that interested
- 15 parties are given a full and fair opportunity to
- 16 comment on significant regulatory proposals. And, it
- 17 is in the best interest of Americans saving for
- 18 retirement that the final rule is clear and workable,
- 19 and that like it's predecessor, can stand the test of
- 20 another 35 years.
- 21 Thank you all very much.
- 22 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Stevens. Mr.

343 1 Sweeney? 2 MR. SWEENEY: Thank you, Mr. Davis. is John Sweeney. I am an Executive Vice President with 3 Fidelity. I am responsible for planning and advisory 4 services there. Fidelity Investments is the leading 5 provider of investment management, retirement planning, portfolio guidance, brokerage, and many other financial products and services to more than 20 million individuals and institutions, as well as through 5,000 financial intermediary firms. Fidelity is the number 10 one provider of IRAs and workplace savings plans 11 providing recordkeeping and other services to other 8.5 12 million IRA accountholders, and over 11 million covered 13 participants with close to 17,000 401(k) plans. 14 15 During my 13-year career at Fidelity I have 16 held a variety of roles that have centered on the 17 development and management of a wide range of investor 18 products and services. At present I am responsible for the development and management of Fidelity's planning 19 and guidance tools for investors. 20 21 Our team sits as a shared resource between the divisions that serve retail investors and divisions 22

- 1 providing recordkeeping services to our employer-
- 2 sponsored retirement plans. The structure of our team
- 3 is purposely aligned with customer needs rather than
- 4 the account that they are invested in. Investors don't
- 5 ask us, how do I save in my 401(k); rather, they ask us,
- 6 how do I save to meet all of the goals that I have?
- 7 Many investors that we have are members of the
- 8 proverbial sandwich generation; one that has many
- 9 competing needs for a finite amount of savings. An
- 10 investor is often trying to pay down mortgage debt,
- 11 save for their own retirement, and might be trying to
- 12 save for a child's education at the same time they are
- 13 preparing for an aging parent. Fidelity provides a
- 14 continuum of products and services so that the investor
- 15 can choose how they want to interact with us. The
- 16 simplest end of the spectrum, we offer target date
- 17 retirement funds, like Fidelity's freedom funds, that
- 18 provide diversified, age-appropriate investment options
- 19 in the form of a mutual fund that adjusts out the
- 20 allocation as the investor ages. Many investors want
- 21 additional assistance with their investments and we
- 22 offer a range of planning and educational tools to help

- 1 investors answer questions like, how much should I save
- 2 in my 401(k); how do I construct a diversified portfolio
- 3 to meet my investment needs; how much income will I
- 4 need in retirement; and what choices are available to
- 5 me to help construct a reliable stream of retirement
- 6 income.
- 7 For customers who want Fidelity to manage
- 8 their portfolios, we offer a managed account service.
- 9 And finally, for customers who have more complex
- 10 planning needs, we offer a referral to an independent
- 11 financial adviser. My testimony today will focus on
- 12 that second category of interaction where Fidelity
- 13 provides education to investors and prospects free of
- 14 charge regardless of the type of account that the
- 15 investor holds.
- 16 The current investment environment, as you
- 17 know, is declining -- you know, market declines through
- 18 2008 to the first quarter of 2009, investors without an
- 19 understanding of asset allocation, time horizons and
- 20 risk tolerances may have panicked and left the market.
- 21 Without the benefit of guidance many remain sidelined
- 22 today unsure of how to re-engage with their portfolios.

- 1 Those who understood the role of equities, bonds and
- 2 cash, and a diversified portfolio, and had the
- 3 perspective to remain focused on their long-term goals
- 4 remained invested, and, in most cases, continued to
- 5 contribute to their 401(k)s even as the market declined.
- 6 Beginning in March 2009, as the markets
- 7 rebounded, those shares purchased when assets were
- 8 depressed began to appreciate. By the end of 2010, our
- 9 review corporate-defined contribution plans and 11
- 10 million participants revealed that the average account
- 11 balance for participants continually invested for the
- 12 last year had rebounded 55 percent to almost \$72,000,
- 13 reaching a 10-year high. More importantly, for
- 14 participants continually invested for the last decade,
- 15 this was not a lost decade. In fact, the average 401(k)
- 16 balance increased from \$59,000 at the end of 2000 to
- 17 \$183,000 at the end of 2010, which is a combination of
- 18 continuous contributions, plus appreciation of the
- 19 underlying securities.
- As you can well imagine, the last couple of
- 21 years have tested investors' resolve. Investors looked
- 22 for answers from their financial services providers.

347 1 As financial services providers are providing services for many different types of accounts: taxable 2 accounts, brokerage accounts, and the range of 3 investment options available for retirement, we had many inquiries from our customers over the last couple 5 of years and they delivered some very clear messages to 6 One, now, more than ever, investors need our help. Since 2008, the number of investors attending seminars at our branches have increased nearly 30 percent; so, in response, last year we hosted 20,000 live investor 10 forums with more than half a million investors 11 12 attending an event at either an investor center or at 13 their workplace. 14 In response to customer requests for more 15 insight, we increased the frequency of our investor 16 viewpoints, targeted educational articles on a wide 17 range of investor topics. These have been read fourand-a-half million times. 18 And finally, in response to customer 19 20 inquiries about what to do with their portfolios, we 21 have seen a dramatic increase in the usage of our guidance tools, such as portfolio review and retirement 22

- 1 income planner, and last year Fidelity provided more
- 2 than 1.4 million guidance center actions to both
- 3 customers and prospective customers, free of charge.
- 4 To summarize, our data has shown us that what
- 5 is a clear investor need during good economic times
- 6 becomes an absolute necessity during times of market
- 7 volatility.
- 8 The second point is that much of our help
- 9 assists those who need it the most; the low balance and
- 10 younger participants. We know that for most workers
- 11 the primary way that that they receive financial
- 12 education and guidance is through their workplace
- 13 savings plan. While some may claim that low and
- 14 moderate income workers are not savers, our data shows
- 15 that 53 percent of eligible employees who make between
- 16 \$20,000 and \$40,000 do participate in their plan, and
- 17 71 percent of employees making between \$40,000 and
- 18 \$60,000 participate in the workplace savings plans.
- 19 These numbers increase significantly for those who have
- 20 auto enrollment features as part of their plan. And,
- 21 based on an analysis that we did last year of workplace
- 22 utilization of our My plan Guidance Tools, nearly three

- 1 out of four plan participants were under the age of 50.
- 2 It's unclear where this group of investors could turn
- 3 for immediate, no cost guidance of this type.
- 4 The third major finding that we have is that
- 5 guidance improves investor outcomes. Based on a six-
- 6 month workplace analysis that we did last year,
- 7 participants who used our guidance tools increased
- 8 their deferral savings rates, on average, by about
- 9 three percent. When it comes to asset allocation, 40
- 10 percent of the people who use our on-line investment
- 11 modeling tool, Portfolio Review, initiated a change to
- 12 their asset allocation. And, we continue to innovate
- 13 and respond to investor needs.
- 14 Nearly three million baby boomers will turn
- 15 65 today -- that's about 7,500 per day -- and they'll
- 16 begin their transition into retirement, which must
- 17 account for longer lifespans, stockmarket volatility, a
- 18 low interest environment, rising health care costs, and
- 19 a potentially changing tax landscape. We recently did
- 20 a study, which found that 62 percent of our pre-
- 21 retirees heading towards retirement feel anxious or
- 22 stressed about making that transition from saving for

- 1 retirement to living off those savings in retirement.
- 2 Despite that concern, 75 percent of those pre-retirees
- 3 do not have a formal retirement income plan in place
- 4 that could help alleviate some of that anxiety. Several
- 5 years ago we launched Retirement Income planner to help
- 6 customers answer the question, how much will I need to
- 7 live in retirement? By helping customers understand
- 8 concepts like inflation, rising health care costs and
- 9 longevity, we began a dialogue with our customers that
- 10 helped them understand some of the risks they faced
- 11 when they entered retirement. But, today's retirement
- 12 environment is facing -- forcing even more questions
- 13 for America's workers; interest rates are low,
- 14 corporations have cut the dividends they pay their
- 15 investors, pensions are under pressure, and retirees
- 16 are being asked to shoulder a larger portion of their
- 17 health care expenses.
- 18 Last month we expanded our education and
- 19 guidance to pre-retirees by unveiling an innovative new
- 20 program to help investors and workplace participants
- 21 close to retirement explore vehicles that provide
- 22 income in retirement. We know that lifetime income is

351 an important priority for the Department and view the tools that we have developed is an important step in helping to educate investors on how to shift their 3 portfolios from the accumulation mode towards portfolios that will provide income streams throughout 5 retirement. The program's highlights include an intensive 30-day coast-to-coast education, an investor education initiative that includes 200 free live educational seminars and events, one-on-one quidance sessions with Fidelity professionals, and the 10 introduction of a Fidelity income strategy evaluator, 11 an on-line tool designed to help participants 12 13 understand how different investment products can help generate income throughout retirement. This program is 14 15 already available to more than 10 million workplace 16 plan participants and to non-Fidelity customers as 17 well. 18 We appreciate the Department's desire to thoughtfully re-examine what constitutes fiduciary 19 investment advice. What we cannot stress enough is 20 21 that the new rules must encourage, not restrict, the ability of financial services providers to provide 22

- 1 educational support. Over 11 million participants
- 2 invested in Fidelity through a workplace-sponsored 401-
- 3 K plan. Most of these participants also have IRAs and
- 4 other savings vehicles, either at Fidelity or at other
- 5 firms. We know that most Americans will be required to
- 6 use a combination of their workplace retirement
- 7 accounts, their IRAs, as well as taxable accounts to
- 8 supplement social security and any pension that might
- 9 be available to provide income in their retirement.
- 10 At Fidelity our experience has been that
- 11 investors do not treat these accounts differently when
- 12 considering questions such as: am I prepared for
- 13 retirement; am I meeting my savings goals; and how can
- 14 I transform my savings into retirement income.
- 15 Similarly, regardless of whether an investor is
- 16 deciding between 30 investment option in his or her
- 17 401(k) or broad universal investment choices when
- 18 dealing with his or her IRA, the deliberations are the
- 19 same; investors do not and cannot be expected to
- 20 believe that the legal framework governing these
- 21 investment decisions is different based solely on the
- 22 vehicle they have chosen to make their investment.

353 1 Given the importance of proper oversight on behalf of investors and the services they receive, we appreciate that the Department is working with the SEC 3 to ensure that these investor services are protected and not restricted under a new regulatory regime. 5 6 Any changes to the current ERISA definition of fiduciary investment advice should not threaten access to the guidance that all the investors receive 9 every day by placing a phone call, going on-line, attending an investor workshop, or visiting a branch 10 for one-on-one assistance. Investors do not understand 11 the underlying regulatory complexity that allows for 12 13 the valuable services they receive; however, they have a growing awareness that they need to save and invest 14 15 in their workplace plans, their IRAs, and other 16 accounts, as the saving and retirement tools for most 17 Americans. We ask for your assistance in providing a 18 framework in which we continue to respond to the thousands of American investors who ask us every day, 19 how do I save and invest to meet the many goals I have 21 in life? 22 Thank you for the opportunity to testify

354 today. I am happy to respond to any questions you have at this time. 3 MR. DAVIS: Thanks so much, Mr. Sweeney. I'll turn to Virginia for the first question. 5 MS. SMITH: Mr. Stevens, in the previous panel Mr. Ferriqno talked about his experience with 6 rollover distributions and why people involved with that should be considered fiduciaries, and you indicated that that should not be considered investment advice, and the way you provided the example is really 10 what I want to hone in on. Your example was, when a 11 participant approaches somebody about rollover advice 12 13 then that shouldn't be considered fiduciary advice. Did you really mean to narrow it just in situations where 14 15 the participant instituted the discussion, or are you 16 looking as both ways? 17 MR. STEVENS: Well, first of all, my focus on 18 the rollover issue, as such. Presumably you could then get into a whole range of issues. Well having decided 19 20 to rollover, I recommend this, that and the other 21 thing. That may very well constitute investment 22 advice.

355 1 MS. SMITH: Mmm-hmm (in the affirmative). 2 MR. STEVENS: That may very well be subject to all sorts of regulatory issues, but it's not 3 investment advice of the sort that we are talking about here, I don't think. The rollover decision --5 MS. SMITH: Which is whether to rollover? 6 MR. STEVENS: -- the rollover decision itself, I could say it's advice about tax planning; I 9 could say it's advice about structuring one's financial I personally have had five 401(k) plans in my 10 career, and frankly I would have been very ill-advised 11 to keep my assets in five different places. So I would 12 13 look at that as advice not with respect to the investments in the old plan, but advice with respect to 14 15 how you are going to maintain your investments going 16 forward and the tax advantages or disadvantages there 17 might be of one or the other, and the flexibility in 18 terms of the investment options in one as opposed to the other. 19 20 MS. SMITH: Okay. I listened to your 21 description of what you think the regulation should be 22 that started out with the caveat that you think

356 standard business practices should not be disrupted, and I am not sure I followed you, but is there any part of the five-part rule that you would agree is 3 4 unnecessary? 5 MR. STEVENS: I appreciate, Ms. Smith, the 6 opportunity to address that. We think it's quite reasonable that the Department would, for a variety of reasons. One, to address this notion that it's not investment advice and let's just provide it on an ongoing or regular basis. We certainly would 10 acknowledge that you can have investment advice, which 11 is a one-off event, which could be quite significant. 12 13 MS. SMITH: Okay. 14 MR. STEVENS: We also think that it's 15 reasonable to say that there shouldn't be a requirement 16 to prove that it was the primary basis for investment 17 decision-making. It could simply be a basis or a 18 factor, or something of that nature, and that would 19 make sense to us as well. 20 MS. SMITH: Okay. 21 MR. STEVENS: There are other things the 22 Department can do to as it thinks about this going

357 You have identified for yourselves an issue we don't really have any position on with respect to valuation, for example, which is predicated on 3 experience the Department has. So, we would say there are certainly things that you could do that, from our 5 perspective at least would not be terribly 6 controversial, but it's some of the other aspects of the rule and the lack of clarity that they entail that causes us the concern. MS. SMITH: Okay. One last question, if I 10 may, of Mr. Graff, if I can find my question? When you 11 12 were talking about -- putting aside the IRA issues 13 please for me --14 MR. GRAFF: Sure. 15 MS. SMITH: -- I mean --16 MR. GRAFF: Oh, come on, Virginia? Okay. 17 MS. SMITH: But, the other information that 18 you provided, one of the things that you did not address that several people today have addressed is 19 this idea that a regulation is going to cause a lot of increased cost; how does ASPPA view that? 21 22 MR. GRAFF: We don't agree with that

		358
1	assertion at all.	
2	MS. SMITH: You don't? And, why not?	
3	MR. GRAFF: Because the what we believe is	
4	that if we can fashion a seller's exemption that is	
5	somewhat more is written in a way that people are	
6	more comfortable with, we believe frankly the	
7	marketplace will settle out such that those people that	
8	want to be ERISA fiduciaries, who currently are right	
9	now, will continue to do so. Those costs are already	
10	baked into their fees. And, those that don't want to	
11	will take advantage the seller's exemption. So that's	
12	what's important, is that the marketplace clearly	
13	understands what's going on with the person that they	
14	are working with. If they are a commission-based	
15	adviser, the customer should know that they are dealing	
16	with someone who is a commission-based adviser and	
17	decide to work with that person and move on. So we	
18	don't believe, in the end, if this is fashioned	
19	correctly, that it would have any significant	
20	marketplace disruption.	
21	MS. SMITH: Thanks.	
22	MR. DAVIS: Mr. Stevens and Mr. Graff, I	

- 1 think you both in your testimonies talked about the use
- 2 of the word adverse, and we have heard testimony on
- 3 that word in previous panels. Do you guys have
- 4 thoughts that you would share on what you would use in
- 5 place of the word adverse?
- 6 MR. STEVENS: Well, I guess my point is
- 7 fairly simple. If you think about economic
- 8 transactions -- I took a cab over here just now -- I
- 9 got in the cab. I knew I was going to have to pay the
- 10 taxicab driver and I paid the taxicab driver, and he
- 11 did a fine job of getting me here to the Labor
- 12 Department. But, I didn't consider the fact that he
- 13 was going to be compensated for what he did, to create
- 14 a conflict of interest, because if it does, then we
- 15 have conflicts of interest virtually everywhere in our
- 16 economic society. It proves too much. The
- 17 compensation is a subject for disclosure, and the
- 18 Department has worked long and hard on making sure that
- 19 plans and plan participants and others are well-
- 20 informed, and we have supported that idea. But, the
- 21 fact that a service has provided for compensation or an
- 22 investment product for compensation doesn't necessarily

360

mean that's a conflict of interest. I doubt that my colleague here, Brian, would say that the unregulated advisers that he -- the providers that he represents, 3 who are providing recordkeeping services, necessarily are adverse to the plans that -- by the recordkeeping 5 services just simply because they expect to be paid for 6 So I think it's gratuitous. It's not necessary to the rule to put that in. And frankly, in our frame 9 of reference, we don't accept it as a characterization. 10 MR. GRAFF: Yeah. And, as I said, I certainly think it's unduly harsh. We -- you know, 11 12 again, what does the customer need to know, the plan 13 sponsor need to know so they can approach this in a 14 transparent way and understand who they are dealing 15 with and what the financial arrangements are. 16 said before, I think, one, they need to know that the 17 person that they are dealing with is not an ERISA 18 fiduciary, okay; two, that the advice may not be impartial because they are being compensated by the 19

> (866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com 2011

individual, the investment providers, and that the

amount of that compensation could be affected by the

investments selected; and three, what -- as 408(b)(2)

20

21

- 1 is going to require, what's the amount that's
- 2 reasonably expected to be received as compensation from
- 3 those investment providers? We think -- you know we
- 4 can dither over the word impartial, if that's the right
- 5 word. I think there is a word somewhere along the
- 6 lines -- I think their principles frankly are more
- 7 important than words, and we believe if that, the
- 8 essence of those points of information are conveyed,
- 9 then the plan sponsor, with open eyes, will be making a
- 10 choice. And, we absolutely believe, particularly in
- 11 the small business market, that many small business
- 12 sponsors will continue to work with an adviser, who is
- 13 commission-based, and there is nothing wrong with that,
- 14 and I think it's important that everyone recognize
- 15 that. We just want to make sure that, in our world,
- 16 there is this -- sometimes it's referred to as the
- 17 blind squirrel -- you may have heard that expression --
- 18 and our basic concern, from a policy standpoint, is we
- 19 want to make sure that, to the extent there is behavior
- 20 out there that is concerning, that this information is
- 21 clearly disclosed.
- MR. STEVENS: May I supplement my comment,

- 1 because the disclosure issue seems to be taking such a
- 2 front and center attention here? I worry about
- 3 disclosure for two reasons as a way of approaching this
- 4 issue.
- 5 One, it celebrates form over function. You
- 6 can essentially get a boilerplate disclaimer, and I
- 7 don't know what lengths you'll have to go to get it,
- 8 but a boilerplate disclaimer that then basically says,
- 9 well, I can now invite all the trust and confidence I
- 10 want because you have said that I am not your
- 11 fiduciary, and I think that invites lots of mischief
- 12 potentially.
- The second thing about a disclosure regime is
- 14 that it will burden the system with paperwork, because
- 15 you will have to get it into each interaction. There
- 16 is not a once and forever way of doing that, and you
- 17 will even only -- as a provider of a service, you think
- 18 about an interaction about a mutual fund call center,
- 19 perhaps discover long into the conversation that the
- 20 context that the individual is calling you about is one
- 21 where you need to give a disclosure. And then some
- 22 have suggested that it be written. And so you'll have

- 1 to stop the world and say, you'll have to send this
- 2 form back to me before I can talk to you about anything
- 3 here just to acknowledge that I am not your fiduciary.
- 4 The Department ought to be looking at the course of
- 5 dealing between the parties and ask itself whether it
- 6 is reasonable for the individual to expect that the
- 7 person on the other side of the table has undertaken to
- 8 provide impartial investment advice to them. And,
- 9 irrespective of whatever paperwork -- if that's the
- 10 case, then that's fine -- I also don't believe that you
- 11 can simply ask people, do you think this person is a
- 12 fiduciary, and that solves it. The fiduciary concept
- 13 is a legal concept. Most people don't understand it,
- 14 but I think, looking at the course of dealing, the
- 15 Department ought to be able to tell when the line has
- 16 been crossed or not.
- 17 MR. GRAFF: You know just to add to what Paul
- 18 is saying, I think there is a concern, and this goes to
- 19 the issue of whether or not there should be a
- 20 postponement of these -- of considering these rules,
- 21 waiting for the SEC to act. There are plenty of folks
- 22 in our industry, who are regulated by the SEC by FINRA,

- 1 but there are also plenty of folks who are not, and you
- 2 need to be mindful of that. They may be subject to
- 3 some state regulation; they may be subject to no
- 4 regulation, and they are out there. And, it's
- 5 important that you guys address this because of that
- 6 gap. So there are going to be situations where there
- 7 will be customers, in our view, that will not
- 8 appreciate who they are dealing with, and so it's
- 9 important that they understand that.
- 10 MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
- 11 MR. LEBOWITZ: I -- not to be argumentative,
- 12 but I was intriqued by your cab driver story. It seems
- 13 to me that the only reason that your interests were not
- 14 adverse was because your ride was very tightly
- 15 regulated; the cab driver was not free to set his own
- 16 compensation, unless he went by Bethesda or something
- 17 from wherever you were coming from. But for that
- 18 regulation, if you got into the cab and there were no
- 19 meters, no regulations at all, the cabbie says let's
- 20 negotiate. In that circumstance your interests, it
- 21 seems to me, were quite adverse to the driver's. So I
- 22 think it proves the value of regulation.

365 1 MR. STEVENS: Can I respond? They were adverse, Alan, only because the cab driver had an interest in being paid more and I have an interest in 3 paying less. 5 MR. GRAFF: Right. MR. STEVENS: And that operates without a 6 framework, you are right, but that's true within markets too. 9 MR. LEBOWITZ: Right. MR. STEVENS: But it's always in the 10 provision of any kind of service or sale of any product that those two interests are, or it seems to me, at 12 13 odds with one another. MR. LEBOWITZ: Yeah. And I think that's 14 15 really all we are getting at in the use of the word. But, I just wanted to -- just one question for Brian. 17 You described the IRA market as the Wild West, but you 18 are opposed to our proposed approach to it, leaving it 19 the way it is, I quess, --20 MR. GRAFF: Mmm-hmm (in the affirmative). 21 Yeah, that's right. 22 MR. LEBOWITZ: -- which you think is better

		366
1	than it would be?	
2	MR. GRAFF: Correct.	
3	MR. LEBOWITZ: So can you talk about that a	
4	little bit more?	
5	MR. GRAFF: Explain why?	
6	MR. LEBOWITZ: Yeah.	
7	MR. GRAFF: Well, very much so, and we	
8	thought long and hard about this. I personally spent	
9	some time in dealing with some state issues. I	
10	personally spent some time in the state of Nevada,	
11	quite a bit of time, dealing with a situation with some	
12	vendors that were selling fractional shares of viatical	
13	settlements, interest in limited partnerships, and	
14	literally the enforcement regimen that was practically	
15	being employed to these providers was minimal, and	
16	that's probably overstating it. And so, your concern,	
17	as policy makers, your concern and our shared concern	
18	isn't about the fact that, on a marginal basis it might	
19	be that the retirement plan service provider is going	
20	to get five basis points more on an IRA investment	
21	versus the in-plan investment. The bigger concern	
22	frankly is elderly people losing their entire IRA and	

- 1 their entire retirement assets because they had been
- 2 investing in limited partnerships interests and
- 3 viatical -- stuff that they shouldn't be anywhere near.
- 4 And, if the more regulated providers, the larger
- 5 providers who have compliance departments, are hampered
- 6 in any way, then they are going to be disadvantaged in
- 7 that marketplace. And right now, given what's going
- 8 on, our concern about where the money has been going in
- 9 the first place is paramount relative to the issue of
- 10 fees. And we think, frankly, the IRA market is
- 11 generally very competitive. As you pointed out in your
- 12 preamble, there are -- you know the IRA is under the
- 13 control of the retiree; they can decide to move the
- 14 money where they want to be and they have control over
- 15 it, and given all those factors, until there is some
- 16 basis where you can apply enforcement in a consistent
- 17 way and meaningful way, we think you will do more harm
- 18 than good in the short run.
- 19 MR. LEBOWITZ: Do you have a vision of a --
- 20 MR. GRAFF: Well, I mean, you know there has
- 21 been some -- there has been -- it's interesting --
- 22 there are people in our industry who are scared to

- 1 death about what I am about to say, but I'm going to
- 2 say it anyway, because I think you guys know that I
- 3 never am shy about these things -- I do think that, as
- 4 more and more baby boomers are retiring, as my
- 5 colleague to my left said, and they are choosing to
- 6 move their money typically to an IRA, there is a larger
- 7 universe of consumers who are prey to vendors who are
- 8 selling products that, for most retirees, they
- 9 shouldn't be anywhere near. And I think we are going
- 10 to start hearing more and more of these stories. I do
- 11 think we need some type of regime -- it may have to be
- 12 disclosure only because, practically speaking, the idea
- 13 of an army of -- of any agency having an army of
- 14 employees, to imagine that right now in this fiscal
- 15 situation is rather unlikely, but nonetheless, if there
- 16 was some uniform disclosure rules, at least it would be
- 17 somewhat easier to identify whether the enforcement is
- 18 happening. And, where would that be placed? That's --
- 19 you know, that's an inter-agency issue and, as a
- 20 general manner, I have learned that that's generally
- 21 $\,$ not something I should get myself in the middle of.
- MR. LEBOWITZ: Mr. Sweeney, do you have any

369 observations about that? MR. SWEENEY: I think that in terms of IRAs, 2 what you -- what I mentioned before is that people 3 think of them as one of the stools of retirement income 5 -- well, retirement savings first of all, and then ultimately retirement income; so we think that they are 6 used in combination. Legislatures have given investors the option to save in a workplace sponsored retirement account plus an IRA, and most customers that we see have to use both of those to solve their retirement 10 income. And we think it's important that people know 11 about their options and be able to choose from them. 12 13 To Mr. Stevens' point earlier around the choices, we think it's important to make sure that 14 15 people understand their options, so whether they -when they are leaving their jobs -- you said you had 16 17 five 401(k)s at some point -- the average American will 18 work for seven employers over their career, and so 19 managing investments across seven different 401(k)s is 20 very difficult. We talk about concepts not only around 21 asset allocation, but asset location. You want to 22 think about what accounts you hold different asset

- 1 classes in. You want your high turnover or high tax
- 2 accounts in the accounts that are tax deferred, and you
- 3 want more efficient vehicles in the accounts that are
- 4 taxable. So when you start thinking about a client's
- 5 portfolio, you want to educate them on concepts when
- 6 they are thinking about their portfolio in totality,
- 7 because it's important that they see all of the options
- 8 available to them when they are trying to accumulate
- 9 savings and then ultimate generate income in
- 10 retirement.
- 11 MR. HAUSER: For Mr. Stevens, I was intrigued
- 12 by your suggestion that the focus ought to be on, you
- 13 know, whether the person had a reasonable expectation
- 14 that they were in a position of trust and confidence,
- 15 vis-the adviser, as opposed to getting too into the
- 16 weeds on various disclosure sorts of documents. But,
- 17 with respect to the seller exception, I just wonder
- 18 exactly how you go about accomplishing that purpose,
- 19 because it seems to me one of the problems is that
- 20 there is a lot of confusion, and especially in
- 21 unsophisticated investors' minds, as to whether they
- 22 are being sold a product or whether they are really

- 1 being sold advisory services? And, even broker
- 2 dealers, they may -- you know they are brokers when
- 3 they are submitting comment letters to us, but they are
- 4 financial advisers and financial planners, you know,
- 5 when they are dealing with participants. And, the
- 6 commercials, you know, suggest that they are there.
- 7 They are in your corner. They are -- you know, they
- 8 are going to be there for your retirement. And so I
- 9 think for a lot of people there probably really is kind
- 10 of an expectation that we are getting good faith,
- 11 professional advice that's in no way steered by any
- 12 conflicts we may have. And, I quess, what, short of
- 13 disclosure, is where you draw the line and have a
- 14 seller's exception that's going to get at that problem?
- 15 MR. STEVENS: Well, first of all, I would say
- 16 that I am very sympathetic. I understand the challenge
- 17 of drawing the line, but my point most basically is
- 18 that there has to be a context in which it is in fact a
- 19 sale and it's not been that relationship of trust and
- 20 confidence that's been assumed. I think if you were to
- 21 adopt a rule with that as the standard and make it
- 22 clear that the Department will look at all the facts

- 1 and circumstances for that purpose, that will encourage
- 2 people, not necessarily in some sort of wooden,
- 3 regulatory, mandated disclosure regime, but just as a
- 4 matter of a course of dealing with participants or with
- 5 plan sponsors to try to make sure that they are on the
- 6 right side of that line when they want to be looked at
- 7 as sellers. And, there are people, there are
- 8 industries, certainly in our context included, where
- 9 that would be the case. If you have a directly
- 10 marketed fund firm, you know, they don't undertake --
- 11 and this is in the normal marketplace -- they do not
- 12 undertake to have an advisory relationship with a
- 13 customer. They offer a menu, they inform you about the
- 14 menu, and you select from the menu, and it's s sale. So
- 15 my point is that the rule needs to make room for both
- 16 and draw the line as best you can. I wouldn't do it
- 17 simply on the basis of some disclaimer document, but
- 18 more in the context and all the circumstances, and
- 19 thereby incentivize people to make sure that dealing
- 20 honestly and conscientiously with people they don't
- 21 leave a lot of room for doubt about which part of that
- 22 -- which side of that line they are on.

			373
1		MR. HAUSER: Thank you.	
2		MR. DAVIS: I think that's it. Thanks so	
3	much.		
4		MR. STEVENS: Thank you.	
5		MR. DAVIS: We are adjourned for the day. Our	
6	panel	number eight starts tomorrow at 9:15 in this	
7	room.	Thank you.	
8		(Whereupon, the meeting is adjourned).	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			

		374
1	CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC	
2	I, NATALIA KORNILOVA, the officer before whom the	
3	foregoing meeting was taken, do hereby certify that the	
4	witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing pages	
5	was recorded by me and thereafter reduced to	
6	typewriting under my direction; that said hearing is a	
7	true record of the proceedings; that I am neither	
8	counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the	
9	parties to the action in which this hearing was taken;	
10	and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of	
11	any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto,	
12	nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome	
13	of this action.	
14		
15		
16		
17	Natalia Kornilova	
18	Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia	
19		
20		
21	My commission expires: April 14, 2012	
22		

		ı	1
\$		1978 9:11	27 62:15 91:1
\$1,000 54:17	1 1 1:5	1979 6:22	107:11 178:18
\$1,030 54:18		1987 54:12,17	27-page 178:18
\$1,500 278:19	1,000 229:15 301:2	1993 16:9	27th 180:7
\$10 91:21 219:11	1.4 348:2	1997 204:6	28 220:4
222:1	1:15 183:13	1998 32:5	290 138:9
\$12 222:1	10 90:8 190:22 208:2 219:1		
\$138 75:11	273:6 351:15	2	3
\$15 196:14 217:13	100 229:16 236:5,8	2.7 194:16	3(21 227:3
\$17 196:18 217:12	322:10	20 6:15 90:8	3(21)(a 288:21
219:2 220:7	105 223:11	198:21 263:9 327:2 343:8	3.2 194:15
\$183,000 346:17	10-year 346:13	20,000 347:10	30 301:3 347:9 352:16
\$2 197:12 221:19	11 240:19 289:22	20,000 347.10 200 1:11 10:21	300 152:8,11
\$2.5 219:15	343:13 346:9	238:19 351:8	257:19
\$20,000 348:16	352:1	2000 346:16	30-day 351:7
\$3 219:15	110 236:6 257:11	2005-23(a 244:21	31 210:4
\$3,000 278:20	12 152:6 183:22	2005-23A 23:14	33 90:12
\$300 17:8	129 32:19	185:17 201:3	35 90.12 35 19:21 31:19
\$350 138:9	12th 2:14	2007 17:8	75:22 86:1 184:8
\$4 221:13,19	13 2:21	2008 199:3 345:18	221:7 256:19
\$4.3 90:7	13-year 343:15	347:8	335:12,15 342:20
\$4.5 258:2	14 374:21	2009 54:2 345:18	
\$40,000 348:16,17	15 4:5 11:6 198:21	346:6	38 2:17
\$400 194:18	17,000 343:14	2010 346:8,17	4
\$58 90:16	18 306:19	2011 1:5 91:22	4,500 92:15
\$59 197:2	180 190:5	298:4	4.4 75:10
\$ 59,000 346:16	1934 200:14	2012 374:21	4.5 222:6
\$6 17:9	1940 337:15	21st 298:4	40 331:15 349:9
	1975 7:17 8:20	23 91:1 107:11	401 281:14 352:2
\$60,000 348:18 \$7 210:4 12 12	9:4,9 13:4,13	24,000 75:10	401(a 75:9
\$7 219:4,12,13	14:13 15:10,13	25 76:4 90:13	401(k 9:11 32:9
\$72,000 346:12	16:8,22 17:6 335:18	25-year-old	33:7 75:9 76:5
\$8 219:4,13 221:13	1976 12:22	261:19	83:3 112:15
	17/0 12.22	26 220:4	132:9 134:15

348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 65A 287:6 288:19 255 300 343:12 24 311:2 24 115:5 117:9 128 91:2 115:2 17:9 117 9 35:1 5 373:6 289:10 61 22 12 262	:19 119:19 :7 129:22 :9,13 :14,15 :6,8 193:14 :6 212:6 :11 290:17 :21 301:4,22 :21 331:22 :4 351:22 20:15 24:3,7 accej 12 77:9 78:9 accej 3 104:8 107:8 :3 113:6 :20 119:16 :25 :18,22 :26 :2,19 164:18 :26 :4,22 169:1 :18 226:2 :1,12 252:16 :1 268:11,12 accej accej :21 31:22 accej :22 32:37 accej :23 35:42 accej :24 35:22 accej :25 35:43 accej :26 36:11,12 accej :27 35:42 accej :28 32:42 accej :29 32:42 accej :20 119:16 accej	emic 94:17 9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15 7:19,22 1:18 247:1 5:18 259:7,20 1:5 264:1,11 9:19 0:1,11,17 9:4 291:8 3:8 mmodate 5:6
117 348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 365A 287:6 288:19 255 300 307 343:12 333 24 311:2 24 115:5 117:9 118 91:2 115:2 17:9 119 117 9 35:1 166 289:10	19 119:19 12 17 129:22 12 19,13 16 14,15 16 16,8 193:14 36 11 290:17 32 12 1 301:4,22 32 12 1 331:22 32 20:15 24:3,7 32 12 77:9 78:9 3104:8 107:8 13 113:6 24 12 20 119:16 25 18,22 26 12,19 164:18 26 24,22 169:1 27 18 226:2 27 1,12 252:16 35	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15 7:19,22 1:18 247:1 5:18 259:7,20 1:5 264:1,11 9:19 0:1,11,17 9:4 291:8
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	19 119:19 17 129:22 19,13 14,15 16,8 193:14 16 212:6 11 290:17 121 301:4,22 121 331:22 124 351:22 1277:9 78:9 13 104:8 107:8 13 113:6 120 119:16 132 242 252 263 272 273 274 275 275 275 275 275 275 275 275	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15 7:19,22 1:18 247:1 5:18 259:7,20 1:5 264:1,11 9:19 0:1,11,17
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 365A 287:6 288:19 255 300 307 343:12 333 24 311:2 24 115:5 117:9 117:9 117:9 139 159	19 119:19 12 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 16 17 17 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15 7:19,22 1:18 247:1 5:18 259:7,20 1:5 264:1,11 9:19
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 365A 287:6 288:19 255 300 307 343:12 24 115:5 117:9 118 91:2 115:2 17:9 117 139	19 119:19 12 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 16 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15 7:19,22 1:18 247:1 5:18 259:7,20 1:5 264:1,11
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 65A 287:6 288:19	19 119:19 12 12 12 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 15 16 16 17 17 17 17 17 17	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15 7:19,22 1:18 247:1 5:18 259:7,20
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 65A 287:6 288:19	19 119:19 17 129:22 19,13 16:14,15 16:6,8 193:14 16:6 212:6 11 290:17 121 301:4,22 121 301:4,22 121 331:22 121 331:22 121 331:22 1277:9 78:9 13 104:8 107:8 13 113:6	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15 7:19,22 1:18 247:1
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 365A 287:6 288:19 255 300 307 343:12 24 311:2 24 115:5 117:9 300 307	19 119:19 17 129:22 19,13 14,15 16,8 193:14 16 212:6 11 290:17 121 301:4,22 121 331:22 124 351:22 1277:9 78:9	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6 ss 45:9 60:15
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 65A 287:6 288:19 8 343:12 24 311:2 117 122 117 122 176 208 307 333 able 2	19 119:19 12 129:22 19,13 14,15 16,8 193:14 16 212:6 11 290:17 12 1 301:4,22 12 301:4,22 12 331:22 12 32 accellation	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18 pting 158:6
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 322:10 350:2 328:19 255 8 343:12 333	19 119:19 17 129:22 19,13 14,15 16,8 193:14 16 212:6 11 290:17 121 301:4,22 121 331:22 132 accellation ac	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3 9:18
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	19 119:19 12 129:22 19,13 14,15 16,8 193:14 16 212:6 11 290:17 121 301:4,22 121 331:22	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10 pted 253:3
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 176 288:19 177 208 208 255	19 119:19 12 129:22 19,13 14,15 16,8 193:14 16 212:6 11 290:17 12 accellation accel	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8 0:10
348:17 131:17 132:13 322:10 350:2 365A 287:6 288:19	19 119:19 12 129:22 19,13 14,15 16,8 193:14 16 212:6 accel	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21 0:9 ptable 308:8
348:17 117 131:17 132:13 157 322:10 350:2 176	19 119:19 12 129:22 19,13 16 16 16 17 19:19 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	9:1 pt 139:5,14 0:20 205:21
348:17 117 122	119 119:19 12:7 129:22	9:1
249.17	:19 119:19 acad	
2 1 · 11	Y 2.12 102.12 1	
00 349.13	abus	ively 136:2
24.20	160.20	
	.2 101.5 abus	ive 290:18
		es 310:2
163:5 349:15 AAR		e 136:17
281:13	\overline{A} 32	4:12 361:10
96 23	0) 0 1	1:20 322:20
122.12	21	1:12 171:20 1:15 230:7
240.20 97-16		lutely 101:15
6 283		lute 348:6
96-1	19:3 255:8	6:17 300:11
219:1 341:18 95 90	abse	nt 47:17
· ·	00:9,20 abse	nce 334:14
122	* *	9:12
00.		1:20 322:11 8:19 363:15
	88: 123 96:11,12 914 10 95 90: 6 326:11 349:20 122:13 98 230 122:13 99 230 98 230 14 10 15 1	346:12

accompanied 26:7	121:13 159:19	achieved 6:2 80:15	81:3,7 86:14,21
206:7	160:1 163:22	128:20 168:21	89:13 99:1
accomplish 32:5	accountant 228:19	248:2	166:17 169:1
103:7		achieving 137:17	174:13 175:12
	accountants		195:10 198:1
accomplishes	169:19 188:11	acknowledge	200:13 207:13
10:18	251:2,8	145:4 167:10	251:6 261:22
accomplishing	accountholders	226:10 227:2,20	307:16 320:21
370:18	315:3 343:13	256:11 297:2	336:8 337:14,20
accordance 12:1	accounts 17:10	315:12 356:11	338:9 363:21
233:20	33:2,5 44:16	363:3	acting 20:6 22:20
	45:22 75:11 85:8	acknowledged	24:21 30:7 63:7
according 265:21	88:5,10	195:10,19 204:3	171:15 205:15
287:15	90:9,15,16,18,19	acknowledgement	274:5 284:22
accordingly 3:13	106:16,18	227:18	292:12 297:3
89:4 141:12	112:17 121:6,7	296:15,16	312:7,15 316:15
200:18	194:16,20	311:16 312:12	317:9,11 324:1
	194.10,20	317:10 312.12	329:11 331:1
account 26:6 33:19 41:2 44:7	198:6,9 222:20		
	224:3 241:8	acknowledges	action 34:11 86:12
45:2 49:13 60:10	259:7,9	250:15	133:7 141:22
63:22 78:13	262:6,12,15	acknowledgment	177:8 237:3
80:11 88:14	263:2,4,9,12,15	113:11	284:15 304:20
90:10 91:6	266:19		305:11 374:9,13
97:17,18,20	298:20,22	acknowledgments 296:8	actions 28:1 37:2
108:1,2,5 112:16 121:1 202:1	336:10 339:6		135:19
	347:2,3 352:7,11	ACLI	136:14,21
210:10 237:10,18	353:16 369:22	289:10,17,22	167:11 188:12
/	370:2,3	290:15 299:13	193:22 229:3
243:12,19 244:6	ŕ	acquired 219:7	283:6 290:17
260:21,22	account's 90:22	-	348:2
261:3,12 262:8,10,16,19	accrue 20:14	acquiring 121:20	active 58:11
262:8,10,16,19	accumulate 370:8	across 40:18 52:11	334:12
266:3 282:14		58:6 83:1 119:4	
302:14 304:3	accumulated	164:19 178:15	activities 27:4
302:14 304:3	59:5,10	184:1 188:8	29:9,12 35:21
	accumulation	199:6 236:16	45:13 58:12
344:4 345:8,14 346:10 349:17	112:13 351:4	260:6,12 272:21	87:22 101:21
369:9	accurate 80:6	369:19	134:16,17,19
	218:6 219:2	act 5:15 32:15	140:1 142:3,4,21
accountability		33:3,5 36:10	159:12,20
146:12	achieve 140:10	39:21 42:19 71:4	164:9,16 176:16
accountable	181:1 190:7	72:8 77:19	204:7,18 207:22
		12.0 11.17	259:2 282:21

	ع ۲ م	,	
283:6 286:19	20:2 46:15 87:5	256:11	advance 12:11
292:12 308:5	89:11 107:7	adds 72:3	29:9 67:17
activity 116:20	143:18 198:9		302:21
159:13 176:22	207:19 297:18	adequate 276:21	advancements
202:8 207:21	341:13 342:6	306:14	76:6
284:18 310:9	additional 11:6	adequately 31:11	
313:15 324:7,8	36:4 85:10 91:1	110:6 190:14	advantage 46:12
actors 10:4 17:3	92:8 93:3 105:3	adhere 72:11	118:16 168:5 310:13 311:2
	115:16 130:6	194:8	310:13 311.2
acts 195:9 249:13	186:15 198:10	adheres 290:21	333:6 358:11
285:2	200:1 220:5		
actual 39:18 62:19	254:1,16 264:8	adjourned 373:5,8	advantages 242:10
190:8 221:19	268:1 270:2	adjusting 116:16	247:11,17
244:12 276:6	280:19 288:10	adjusts 344:19	283:13 319:21
actually 12:12,13	297:7 298:10	•	320:7 355:16
42:13 44:2 50:2	308:7 322:2	administer 336:10	adverse 19:13 21:7
54:21 62:7 67:17	344:21	administering	22:17 24:14
77:10 103:16	Additionally	240:16	34:20 36:2
104:15 105:2	190:3 288:18	Administration	66:1,11,13,16
120:12 122:2	300:17 303:2	1:2 2:5	80:6,14,17 113:4
123:11 129:14	address 2:12 23:10		127:20 135:2
132:16 147:9	24:13 29:18	administrative	148:7 205:17
153:16,22	84:15 105:7	23:4 30:6 226:22 227:5 240:18	206:4 252:4
160:15,16 163:5	109:22 110:6,8		293:4,6 329:5
165:12 169:16	155:8,10 160:18	administratively	339:15 340:3
170:3 173:7	189:6 202:21	115:11	359:2,5 360:5
180:19 193:3,12	206:14 226:8	administrator	364:14,21 365:2
209:8 218:12	239:7 241:1,20	228:20	adversely 169:1
224:6 227:13	249:3 254:18	administrators	adversity 293:11
260:21 268:21	256:7 264:6	92:4 201:4	advert 99:9
276:7 309:2	273:17 291:13		
326:18 327:9	294:18 295:22	admit 164:4	advice 1:4 2:7
330:9	330:15 356:6,8	Admittedly 328:21	7:13,15
actuaries 188:11	357:19 364:5	adopt 87:1 270:5	8:1,4,6,14,17,22
adapted 199:22	addressed 66:18	371:21	9:2 10:16,20
1	69:8 120:1 188:6	adopted 7:18 9:12	13:7
add 46:14 52:14 182:18 340:18	201:3 279:11	13:4 31:21	14:1,4,6,7,8,10,1
363:17	357:19	335:18	5,21 15:4,17,20 17:18
	addresses 9:16		
adding 11:3,4		adopting 264:18	18:1,5,8,11,15,1 8
111:11 254:1	addressing 189:15	265:3,9	8 19:8,10,15,17,19
addition 13:10	190:18 206:22	adults 132:3	20:1,18
			20.1,10

	1 α g	, , ,	
21:1,15,18,19	136:5,7	247:1,4,13 248:3	341:9 351:20
23:5 24:18 25:7	137:2,5,11	249:6,19,20,21	353:7
26:10,22 28:6,20	139:21 140:15	250:3,7,10,21	354:10,12,13,22
30:18 31:9,17	141:5	251:1,2,4,7,22	355:4,8,9,13,14
32:4,7 33:3,13	142:2,17,18	252:10,14 253:8	356:9,11 360:18
34:3,15,16,18,22	143:3	254:2,5,14,21	363:8 371:11
35:1,6,11,12,14,	144:2,6,17,19	255:2 258:8	
15 36:9,20	145:1,16,19	265:15,16,17	advise 8:11 58:9
37:10,12 38:8,10	147:2,6,12 148:9	266:10,21	170:21 178:5
40:11 41:1	149:5,6,7,12	268:1,19	187:18 236:11
42:18,19,21	154:22	269:7,9,15	251:4 337:3
43:3,5,6,8,14,22	155:2,5,15,17	271:19 275:1,10	advised 120:8
44:3,4,6,7,15,21	157:18 160:22	276:9	advisee 124:16
45:5,21	162:17 163:22	282:3,7,13,22	
46:2,3,4,8,10,12	164:3 165:13,22	283:15,18,19,21	adviser 8:8,13
47:3,13,21 48:6	166:2,4,5,8	284:20	19:6,7
49:12,15	169:16,22	285:1,2,13,17	20:5,7,9,11 30:1
51:17,18,22	170:18,22	286:19	32:3 40:11 42:8
52:3,4,20 53:2,8	171:2,5,7,18	287:1,4,9,11	47:4 58:14 62:20
54:3 55:20 57:19	172:7,16 173:1,2	288:17	63:1 65:21 66:17
58:2 59:3 64:14	174:9 176:14	290:4,14,20,21	67:4 68:11,19
65:3,13,19,22	177:7	291:17 293:2	78:6 80:16 120:8
66:2,7,14	181:10,13,20	295:6,14	124:17
67:8,9,14,16,18,	184:5,11,12,13,1	295.6,14 296:5,12 297:4	125:1,2,22
19	7	298:3 302:10	141:17 142:2
68:1,3,5,8,9,10	185:3,4,10,14,15	303:13	148:16,17
	,19 187:7,17		151:14
69:1,5,6,11,13,1		309:11,19,20,22	157:13,17,18
7,22 70:1,5	188:5 189:7	313:1 316:7	166:16,21 167:5
72:14,19,21	192:7 193:8	318:9,10	172:18,20
73:11,14,20,22	199:21 201:9,10	319:17,19	182:22 183:5
74:2,3,4,5,6,8,11	202:4,6 203:11	322:16,18	192:6 194:15
,16 77:2 79:13	205:17,19 206:6	325:13,20	195:9 205:22
82:16 83:5 85:20	207:16 211:22	326:4,9,12,13,16	225:14,16,18
86:18,20	217:8 226:6	,18	243:1,3,5 244:13
95:4,12,15	227:22	327:5,8,10,11,12	245:3,17,19
96:14,17 97:1	228:9,10,11	,13,16,17,21	250:18 263:17
98:12,16	229:7,9,11	328:1,6,8,21	264:8 265:13
105:11,12	231:10	329:9,11,13	269:14 270:10
120:11 121:13	232:5,6,7,15,16	330:16,20	277:1 295:2,18
126:5	233:14 241:3,18	331:2,10 333:10	296:18 298:18
131:9,13,15	242:13,21	335:19 336:15	326:3,5,9,15
132:2,9 133:22	243:4,22 244:14	337:7,17 338:13	327:1
134:4,6,10,12	245:1,10	339:11,13,17	329:3,10,18
135:1,2,6	246:2,3,6,15	340:10,15,19	,,

		,	
330:2,4,19,21	advises 142:2	297:20	215:1 217:13
336:15	advising 17:20	affiliate 29:22 91:3	229:2 231:3,4
337:14,20	69:2 126:4	95:9 114:2 204:8	305:5 321:13
338:4,7 345:11	150:17 178:4	250:19	age 45:20 152:7
358:15,16	201:5 266:4	337:13,19	163:5 176:2
361:12 370:15	340:19,21	ŕ	275:13 349:1
adviser/advisee	341:11	affiliated 292:18	
161:22		339:22	age-appropriate
171:11,17	advisory 10:12	affiliates 67:4 82:2	344:18
ĺ	23:19 63:7 79:11	183:22 250:12	agencies 5:21
advisers 9:17	81:22 85:9 91:15	294:10 338:7	87:11 88:17
17:15 33:5 41:14	138:21 185:17	affiliation 3:20	102:20 110:16
65:1 74:19 86:16 88:22 91:18	195:7 198:7	82:6	133:8 153:12
	201:3 204:5		210:2 213:7
92:7,9,10 100:20 101:20 107:18	224:19,21 226:21 244:21	affirm 201:2	214:3 284:6
125:16 129:16	258:19	affirmative 209:14	agency 13:9 88:13
138:22 139:16	263:4,9,14	214:12 241:5	91:3 107:8,10
141:4 142:8	264:10,21	279:13 355:1	109:4 197:20
164:19 169:17	273:11 274:5	365:20	210:11,13
186:18 187:9	279:5 287:5	affluence 261:4	212:17 332:9
192:11 195:9	288:19 289:3	afford 186:14	368:13
200:18,21 210:9	298:22 335:18	302:16 304:14	agenda 2:18
250:11,12 254:8	336:5 337:9		3:4,17 325:2
255:4,5,11,17	338:5 340:22	afforded 3:9 140:7	ŕ
259:3,4,17,21	343:4 371:1	141:10 187:17	agent 65:20 195:1
261:7 269:18	372:12	255:18 329:12	198:5 295:2,17
277:20 292:19		AFL-CIO	323:7,12 339:14
296:19	advocacy 84:7 210:1	183:20,21 184:6	agents 92:16 259:2
298:2,5,14 299:1		185:16	292:15,18
304:5 305:13	advocate 71:5	Africa 286:10	298:14 299:1
307:20 310:3	Aetna 79:11 81:21	afternoon	311:2 324:2,15
325:7 327:18	204:5	***************************************	339:20
328:4,15,18	Affairs 281:12	183:14,16,18 188:16,19 191:2	ages 344:20
329:1 338:1		240:10 248:8	aggregate 190:21
342:1,7 360:3	affect 69:22	257:8 289:6	66 6
371:4	116:21 186:4,6,8	299:17	aggressively
adviser's 10:16	203:14 209:15		168:15
20:16 185:22	282:16 301:15	after-tax 262:10	aging 344:13
202:3 251:6	affected 43:22	against	ago 3:22 31:20
296:4 329:13	81:4 329:16	16:11,13,21	55:6 75:22 86:13
337:14,20 338:9	360:21	31:14 88:14 98:4	127:15 184:8
advisery 23:14	affecting 242:17	127:21 170:21	201:12 260:9
auvisci y 23.17	g = 1=1=1	174:1 175:15	

	rag	GE 7	
310:20 350:5	135:15 140:22	139:11	amendments
agreed 158:8	239:12,15,16	alternatives 72:17	253:1
159:22 213:4	344:20 345:19	89:5 255:12	America 281:10
agreeing 103:12	349:9,12 369:21	285:11 301:3	American 10:2
153:14 302:5	allocations 134:14	am 39:2 46:22	13:1 129:14
agreement 14:17	allotted 3:22	58:10 124:8	147:22 248:15
36:5,6,8 68:8	allow 39:1 45:13	131:3 167:6	289:8 303:1
98:14,16	67:3 98:10	175:18 183:18	331:15 353:19
155:14,16 156:8	108:13 127:18	188:20 191:3	369:17
158:7 166:16	303:3,10	192:1 199:11,12	Americans 46:9
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	210:5 213:6,12	
170:17 171:21	306:13,19 314:2	215:22	240:20 241:9,12
172:9,12 203:10	335:8	216:19,20	259:16 266:17
225:11,15 238:3	allowed 3:1 116:19	217:11	335:14 342:17
301:9,12 330:7	140:2 259:6	221:11,14 223:3	352:5 353:17
338:5,12	330:6	225:16 226:7	America's 350:13
agreements 68:16	allows 109:16	228:12 230:9,13	Ameriprise 257:9
98:21 104:19	353:12	231:11 232:14	258:12
120:20		233:13,14	
ah 316:14	alluded 153:5,20	240:11	amicus 16:20
	alone 87:9 92:15	248:10,11 257:9	among 90:15
ahead 122:10	122:6 196:17	269:19 273:8	107:21 134:2,15
175:3 273:16	241:15 253:20	276:12 278:5	144:22 183:8
aimed 47:20		280:9 281:10	272:12,22
317:9,10 324:4	alongside 44:15	289:7 299:13,18	295:10
ĺ	226:21	306:8 309:6	
aims 84:15	already 10:20		amongst 323:19
Alan 2:2 5:4 11:5	72:2,11 73:17	310:18,22	amount 55:8
12:5 150:20	99:17 117:10,12	311:13	113:10 117:12
365:2	122:11,22	315:10,11,13	119:6 121:19
	128:12 183:4	321:12	157:19 159:10
algorithms 27:16	187:16 191:17	343:3,4,18	179:4 186:8
aligned 101:10	197:3 200:2	352:12,13 354:1	221:5
252:6 344:3	201:22 239:22	356:2 362:10	310:15,17,21
alike 291:6	244:16 276:14	363:3 368:1,3	311:4,6 316:1
	304:1 329:20	371:16 374:7,10	329:15,17 344:9
allergies 64:15	333:12 351:15	ambiguity 62:18	360:21 361:1
alleviate 350:4	358:9	81:20	
all-in 198·7		amhiguous 76.9	
	85:12 120:21	8	
	152:14 298:21		-
	Alternatively 35.8		
allocation 85:1	111011111111111111111111111111111111111	203.4	13:14
all-in 198:7 allocate 339:6 allocated 198:17 allocation 85:1	alternative 64:12 85:12 120:21	ambiguous 76:2 ambit 267:14 amended 189:11 285:4	amounts 136:15 198:16 ample 11:11 anachronistic 13:14

	rag	56 0	
analyses 191:21	annuity 21:12	238:4 315:21	246:12
286:6,16	54:11 75:7 81:12	363:2	applies 20:18
analysis 23:18	111:17 163:10	anyway 168:18	156:7 199:20
27:8,21 92:3,7	238:19 257:17	224:12 368:2	271:16 288:22
93:19 102:1	263:16,18,20	anywhere 196:1	298:13
190:14 216:7,8	264:7 289:12	367:3 368:9	apply 14:6 25:11
218:3 225:4,10	299:7		27:5 28:11 34:7
231:3 268:13	answer 84:1 94:1	Aon 240:11,14	35:6 53:1 58:6,8
286:13	102:14 105:21	241:4 245:20	82:22 86:9
341:14,17	120:5 127:10	274:13	101:20 156:6
348:21 349:6	137:4 139:11	apart 236:3,12	200:12 228:7
analyst 172:20	151:21 156:14	297:14	231:6 233:21
•	170:1,17 172:10	apologize 12:11	250:9 251:22
analysts 47:19	173:9 174:2,17	226:8	252:7 258:14
95:6	176:6 177:14		284:12 290:13
analytic 27:10	182:16 188:17	apparent 136:6	297:1 325:15
28:5,8	199:9 229:13	appear 3:17 30:19	331:8,13 333:9
analyze 91:22	241:5 250:14	70:16 86:11 87:3	334:7 338:6
157:9	257:2 268:3	110:12 127:1	367:16
ancillary 181:9	279:6 299:13	195:22 211:21	applying 229:18
_	314:8 345:1	appears 27:5	230:18 282:6
and/or 291:8	350:6	35:20 81:10	296:7
295:2,17	answered 42:13	245:14 332:11	
and-a-half 347:18	answering 23:20	374:4	appraisal 71:4 136:9 207:2
anecdote 54:9	49:22	appetite 69:19	232:20 233:20
angry 6:12	answers 139:9,10	applaud 31:4,7	287:1,14
angst 170:6 171:1	346:22	146:8 151:1	appraisals 71:12
172:5	anticipate 219:10	applauds 22:2	135:18,20
Anne 12:8 31:1	246:11	Applause 7:7	136:5,9,20
	anxiety 350:4		288:15
announced 6:16	1	applicability	appraised 136:6
12:2 96:9 287:4	anxious 349:21	24:16 260:9	
annual	anybody 120:4	290:6	appraiser
106:17,19,21	127:8 173:15	applicable 25:21	71:1,3,7,17,20 72:5,7 136:19
annually 107:12	232:21 233:5	119:8 200:20	287:20
136:10	anyone 306:6	282:4 294:10	
annuities 111:20	334:5	332:8	appraisers
112:13,14,16	anything 6:12	application 7:19	70:12,16,21
115:6 259:10	61:13 85:14	25:9 27:15 245:8	71:7,9 72:1,8,10
260:12 263:14	109:7 150:21	325:16 334:13	92:17 208:3
298:19,21	154:7 178:14	applied 187:15	appraiser's 136:16
270.17,21	10 17 0.11	арриса 107.13	

	1 48	, ,	
287:16	114:4 140:17	364:11	asserted 131:8
appreciate 30:19	143:20 144:5	arguments 216:1	132:22 312:7
47:15 83:22 84:9	184:12 187:4,6 202:4 249:8	arise 67:6	assertion 312:12
96:11 102:7	251:8 263:19	arm 175:22	358:1
109:8,10,14 110:15 117:2	296:15 299:8		assertions 317:13
118:5 124:6	328:10 342:12	arming 212:18	assess 275:10
146:10 148:1	appropriately	army 368:13	assesses 84:11
184:2,8,12	67:5 103:9 185:6	arrangement 82:4	
188:15 199:16	332:1	128:9 134:3	assessing 190:10
216:11 232:2	approximately	145:5 159:6	assessment 57:16
248:5 289:20	194:16 196:15	160:10 225:11	143:12 222:13
346:8 351:18	259:15	285:12 286:2,4	assessments
353:3 356:5	April 374:21	304:17 313:18,19	143:19
364:8	_	ŕ	asset 45:14 88:11
appreciated	architecture 76:7	arrangements	91:6 107:4
195:16	80:1	87:21 88:11	134:14 135:15
appreciates 36:22	area 59:14 60:21	114:16,17	140:21 190:21
290:15	118:7 133:7	115:6,21 116:4	191:6 229:22
appreciating	162:14 163:19	117:13 128:8 129:17 161:1	232:5,8 236:6
279:20	255:15 256:8	208:6 283:8	238:14,15
	334:12	289:15,16	239:12,14 268:7
appreciation	areas 110:9 118:10	300:10 307:2	345:19 349:9,12
346:18	140:12 159:17	360:15	369:21,22
appreciative	aren't 47:20 59:11		asset-based 85:9
128:10	73:3 110:9	array 89:5 260:6	88:15 97:17,20
approach 68:21	118:12 214:22	art 320:1	106:18 107:6,14
69:1 88:4 89:15	315:2	articles 347:16	109:3 258:19
141:2 143:14	arguable 15:13	articulate 77:7	260:15 263:5
158:5 203:6	arguably 70:5	articulated 23:13	assets 15:2
204:12 315:8,19 318:6 360:13	262:19		17:6,8,9 21:3
365:18		aside 39:4 357:12	28:19,21 30:17
	argue 72:1 74:11 119:17	aspect 18:9 79:22	50:12 61:7,9 74:5 75:12 81:10
approaches		227:7	83:16 85:13,15
116:13 354:12	argued 136:13	aspects 33:9 227:3	90:8,9 111:8
approaching 38:4	328:1	294:21 357:7	121:2
145:22 333:16	arguing 16:21	ASPPA 325:5	137:5,10,13
341:8 362:3	167:15 326:13	357:21	138:10 139:7
appropriate 9:4	argument 318:4		140:21
19:17,18 23:15	argumentative	assert 166:19 315:6	155:15,17
25:10 42:3 75:21	ai guiiitiitative	513.0	164:15 175:19

08:6
ilable 4:9,13
:15 16:13,19
5:22 26:3 32:18
5:22 46:16
0:1,8 51:10
2:14 57:20
8:19,21
9:10,11 60:21
2:1 70:4
2:15,18 74:15
7:17 78:1 85:3
4:21 118:15
32:10 138:19
86:2 197:1
99:2 204:20
24:20 229:19
47:4,15 253:7
55:13 259:8
63:10 285:9
86:2 293:2
95:7,10 301:2,3
06:16 313:8
24:13 333:20
39:7,19,20
45:4 347:4
51:15 352:9
70:8
enue 1:11
rage 346:10,15
49:8 369:17
id 18:11 29:13
5:10 61:7 67:16
8:14 83:13
46:14 259:11
03:19 315:8
26:3,6 328:5
42:8
iding 18:13
66:2 291:10
rded 32:1

	rag		
awarding 221:14	base 41:22	106:15,19,21	begins 144:20
aware 43:9 58:10	based 8:7 19:21	107:8,9,10,11	begs 276:2
186:17 191:17	25:16 27:11,20	109:4 111:16,21	behalf 12:20 30:20
awareness 353:14	28:2 29:2,11	113:21 120:19	36:7 63:19 82:19
	30:15 34:11 39:9	126:4 134:5 143:11 146:1	93:16 147:21
away 91:8 93:4 109:3 140:3	49:2 52:7,15	150:15 174:4	199:13 248:12
158:11 159:2	85:20 87:2 90:15	177:22	281:9 289:8
176:9 177:21	91:15 92:11	178:12,13 185:5	308:12 325:5
178:7,12 197:5	97:18 107:20	195:3 198:6	353:2
226:3 334:9	111:12 121:4	203:3 228:17	behave 55:21
	127:2 131:10,22	231:7 249:21	
awfully 311:20	135:1 136:8	250:1,9	behavior 217:6,10
	143:5 165:15	250:1,9	361:19
В	231:12 242:6	256:20 281:21	behind 98:2 123:7
baby 349:14 368:4	253:18 258:20	289:17 293:3,21	130:4 158:13
background 7:8	287:18 298:17	296:4 303:14	belief 20:9
	309:12 311:11	316:17 322:11	142:7,18 143:1
bad 69:1 105:12	314:6 318:18	356:10,16,17	159:18 296:2
166:4 234:6	321:14 329:19	366:18,20	
334:10	337:12,22	367:16 372:17	beliefs 248:20
baffles 70:15	348:21 349:5		believe 10:11
baked 358:10	352:21	bear 247:8 302:20	19:16 21:17
	bases 238:19,21	beautiful 105:22	22:13 23:6 24:14
balance 115:14	basic 23:17 41:5	become 16:4 29:16	25:8 28:3,16
121:8 202:1	65:10 66:3 132:5	91:13 95:10	44:12 52:17
255:20 340:13	160:20 174:22	156:5 160:21	55:10 56:1,3,5
346:11,16 348:9	205:7 223:11	178:9,13 208:4	57:4 70:16 73:20
balanced 247:14	325:13 361:18	215:19 227:8	76:13,21
balances 263:11		250:7 251:21	77:10,21 79:4
331:22	basically 62:14	320:12	80:5,14 81:7,14
	96:16 151:10		83:17,19 84:14
bald 69:20	158:11 159:17	becomes 13:6	85:5 90:1 96:19
ball 273:1	173:15 212:17	73:13 83:4	103:18 104:15
bank 195:2 299:22	238:8 250:22	227:16 243:16	105:1 107:1
	323:1 362:8	265:20 306:18	108:11 110:17
banking 298:20	371:17	311:19 348:6	122:3 124:2
banks 61:19	basis	becoming 24:11	139:20 140:2,4
92:3,16 208:19	8:3,5,11,14,15	80:3 300:13	141:13,18 144:2
257:20	14:18 25:3 28:15	begin 349:16	156:17 159:10
Barney 188:21	44:1 79:20	beginning 6:6	185:10 186:12
194:14 219:7	85:20,22 86:7	52:19 79:19	189:11 190:6,13
177,17 417.1	88:13 91:1,6	218:3 346:6	194:7 195:15
	98:13 104:9	210.3 340.0	196:6 197:14,16

_	1 46		
198:11,15 204:9	115:12 132:21	100:2,13,16	110:1 112:6
207:17 224:11	133:13 135:8	101:15 106:5,13	160:3 235:11
242:12 246:8	136:1 246:10	108:11 109:6,8	271:9,17
247:16 248:1	247:9 248:1	110:7 114:8	ŕ
			bias 121:14 243:1
249:14 250:8	281:22 284:13	116:10 117:15	245:15
251:14 252:4,15	beneficiary 18:3,5	118:22 119:3	biased 121:14
253:19	43:16 66:15	120:14 122:10	242:6 269:22
254:15,22	98:3,4 135:3	123:3,9,11,17	
255:9,17,20	181:11 246:16	124:2,4,20	bid 221:15
256:4 258:9	282:14	125:13 126:16	bigger 222:2
282:2,17 288:9		127:1	366:21
291:19 293:16	benefit 2:4,8	Bernie 69:14	
302:3,21 305:17	4:16,20,22 13:13	96:3,11	biggest 266:5
307:18 308:3	15:17 17:7 22:3	ŕ	bill 32:1,5 189:2
325:14 326:16	75:14 84:22	Bernie's 106:2	190:19 194:12
328:21 329:8	85:4,17 98:2	besides 10:22	198:8
330:14 332:4	119:15 136:15		
335:6 337:8	162:22 181:22	best 59:9 64:14	billed 198:6
352:20	186:7 196:17	77:11 121:12	billion 17:8 75:12
358:3,6,18	201:4 206:1	147:9 169:6	90:17 138:10
361:7,10 363:10	214:22 216:7,8	182:16 218:6	194:18
ĺ	246:20 247:7	229:19 230:8	
believed 55:9	250:13 282:17	239:14 248:2	bit 57:18 101:3
182:9	287:3 289:14	249:14 261:22	106:9,11 125:20
believes 23:1	297:11 305:19	263:18 265:12	129:21 152:4
36:17 67:12	306:5 312:6	295:12 322:7	162:12,15
137:3 280:17	316:12 336:1	332:12 342:17	168:14 182:19
282:3,5 283:3	345:21	372:16	194:12 226:11
284:17 286:18		Bethesda 364:16	237:15 277:3
	benefits 1:2 10:3		278:9 280:3
below-basic 132:5	20:14 76:17	better 21:21 22:17	310:12 320:19
benchmark 27:17	128:7 132:19	37:2 65:12	323:10 366:4,11
	136:11,22	102:6,11 126:3	blind 361:17
benchmarking 52.17	147:22 183:19	133:11 157:22	
52:17	186:9,10	179:3,8 185:11	blow 71:21
benchmarks	216:3,11,17	206:11 218:21	board 58:7 272:21
230:22 231:5	242:7 246:5,9,19	230:4 257:15	273:7,11 274:6
beneficial 66:22	264:13 265:3	273:2,20 284:13	ŕ
109:13 115:14	284:9 288:11	298:16 321:20	Bob 6:13,16,20,21
	340:4,14	365:22	7:3,5 278:17
beneficiaries 2:9	Bentsen 63:11		body 215:15
18:7 19:14,20		better-suited	283:11
22:4 31:7 33:21	84:4,5,6	80:16	boilerplate
34:10 37:3 63:21	94:7,9,15,18	beyond 40:6	-
69:7 74:15 84:22	97:6 98:20	47:9,12 54:5	362:6,8
1 1 1 1		,	

	1 46	<u> </u>	
bond 49:10 50:22	bought 55:5	73:8 78:11 95:13	brokerage 155:1,4
52:13,14 59:8		97:9 115:9	194:20 224:18
, and the second	boxes 62:15	117:11 119:4,5	258:20
bonds 260:12	branch 270:18	135:4,15 155:11	262:6,7,8,9,15,1
346:1	353:10	207:3 293:11	6,19 263:2
bones 317:11	branches 347:9	300:15 339:19	298:20 343:7
book		352:17	347:3
152:10,12,14,20	brand 205:21		
215:13	Brazil 286:11	broaden 204:17	broker-dealer
	h	205:7 207:8	93:5 96:1 98:10
boomers 349:14	breach 16:12,16	broadened 145:11	120:7 219:9
368:4	71:20 166:20		broker-dealers
boring 64:12	234:7 237:2	broadens 290:13	62:5 66:21 70:10
	285:3	broader 17:13	86:16 90:21
Borzi 2:12 4:17	breaches 200:8	84:14 119:9	92:15 118:11
5:3,4 12:9	breaching 261:21	146:11 160:10	154:12
37:7,17		171:22 197:6	brokers 16:1
38:13,18,21	breadth 187:2	broadly 32:18	
39:15 40:9 41:8	188:1	54:7 95:5 102:4	88:7,21 89:1 91:17 100:20
42:10,12	break 183:12	148:7 168:15	101:20 106:6
94:2,12,17	218:20 220:8	173:15 174:21	125:16 127:18
100:12,14,22	Bremen 130:15	181:6	191:6 200:18
101:6 102:16	138:4,5,6 156:20	broker 69:14 70:2	
156:17 157:21	157:7		251:2,7 258:14 263:1 265:7
158:2,16,20,22	158:1,15,18,21	88:20 90:22 91:7	266:2 305:13
159:15,22	159:3,18 160:3,8	95:1,2 96:3	327:18
160:5,11 178:22	162:8,10,20	100:6 191:8	327.18
179:11,15,20 180:14	164:7 176:7	192:10,12 194:15 195:7	329:1 371:2
208:11,17,20	Brian 324:20	200:12,21 210:8	broker's 262:4
209:1,14,17 210:20 211:15	325:2 360:2	252:8,16 257:20 258:12 259:2	266:1
210:20 211:15 212:15 213:5,17	365:16	261:11	Brokers 264:17
212.13 213.3,17	brief 12:15 154:21	262:2,10,13,20	brother 38:3
214.12,13 215:22 216:5,13	briefs 16:21	263:4	
217:5,16,19,22		265:2,4,19,22	brought 172:8
217.3,16,19,22 218:11 223:1,15	bright 315:7	276:14,18	189:1
227:10 228:6	bring 41:21	277:2,5 278:14	Buffett 268:18
235:19 267:7	109:16 199:4	292:18 295:2,17	build 61:1 222:13
268:14,18	200:7 247:8	298:2,5	
269:6,10 270:6	290:17	326:3,5,9 327:1	building 1:10
271:5,18,21	bringing 42:1	329:3,10,13,18	40:19 278:7
, ,	52:14 229:2	330:2,3,19,21	333:15
bottom 64:22		340:1 371:1	builds 40:21
134:19	broad 33:18 44:11	5 10.1 5/1.1	

		·	
built 61:9 112:19	278:6,8,18,22	candidly	carve 266:14
182:7,12 205:22	311:21 318:10	224:13,18	carve-out 181:15
bulletin 33:12	326:11,17,21	capable 236:12	case 41:15 76:14
255:8 283:6	327:1,7,16 335:21 336:21	capacities 141:19	86:1 100:6 126:8
284:11	356:1 361:11	-	136:1 144:12
bunch 222:2		capacity 19:11 22:21 24:21	177:8 178:22
bundled 81:21	businesses 109:19	34:18 36:20	228:14 255:9
82:4,7	191:10 198:18 214:19	141:19 166:18	331:13 363:10
		198:2 235:5	372:9
burden 35:9 220:13,14	buy 48:5	273:11 274:5	cases 23:19 27:21
302:20 311:14	69:15,16,18	285:7 292:13	72:17 104:12
314:22 315:8	70:3,19 95:6	302:17 324:1	106:20 107:18
362:14	124:22 125:3	339:14	121:6 139:16
	237:21 238:4	capital 17:12	143:3,7 154:21
burdens 42:14	243:10	88:16	159:8 202:2,6
buried 172:20	buyer 35:19 206:2	198:2,17,19	204:4 205:2
330:6	buyers 206:1	199:5 286:8	228:2 242:6
business 17:19	buying 124:21	continues 224:15	253:13 254:10
22:12 29:11	247:7	captives 324:15	264:22 265:3
52:10 55:7	_ ,,,,	capture 104:8	268:5 272:7
58:4,9,20 87:19	bye 42:12 160:12	323:12	305:2 342:4
108:10,15		captures 113:4	346:4
125:22	C	car 55:5,6,8,10	cash 266:7 319:10
126:1,2,14,22	C(2)(i 187:3	182:9	346:2
127:6 128:18	c)(2)(I 284:18	care 59:14 71:10	cashed 54:17
129:10 136:6	285:4	72:2 80:12 86:20	cash-outs
145:19 154:7	c)(2)(II)(B 285:8	87:19 88:2	202:12,14
178:5 190:21		101:19 119:12	ŕ
191:6,17 194:13 195:2 205:22	c)(2)(II)(C 285:14	125:15 186:10	cast 174:21
207:6 210:9	cab 359:8,9	200:12 298:1	casting 173:14
212:4 220:15	364:12,15,18	305:12 318:9	324:9
222:15,19 223:5	365:2	349:18 350:8,17	casual 149:10
233:5 236:13	cabbie 364:19	career 59:6 341:7	categorical 154:6
237:9,21	calculating 81:16	343:15 355:11	S
238:14,15	Ü	369:18	categories 218:20
239:22 256:19	calculation		232:6
257:11 258:4,18	111:5,8	careful 145:21	categorize 218:18
259:13 260:14	calendar 101:14	carefully 11:17	category 229:22
264:14	calibrated 190:6	88:4 249:15	238:17 306:11
270:13,21	canceled 217:14	297:8 340:6	345:12
276:14,22 277:1	canceled 21/.14	carry 70:6 71:19	

		1	
caught 269:11	263:13	Chairman 195:18	324:11
cause 29:15	285:13,18 303:9	challenge 146:17	characteristics
108:21,22 109:2	310:3 312:22	159:4 371:16	50:9
194:9 197:7	313:1 323:22		characterization
208:2,3 250:6	326:20 328:20	challenges 43:20	
303:21 309:13	331:5	85:19	321:13 360:9
313:20 321:4	certainly 101:21	241:10,14,15	characterize 240:2
357:20	102:3 108:12	challenging 146:9	318:11 340:2
caused 16:12	112:5 114:1,6	chance 130:12	characterizing
causes 167:6 357:9	116:6 121:16	change 17:5 21:21	206:3 207:20
	130:7 132:6	45:19 55:18 80:3	charge 53:10
causing 212:13	176:7 177:9	86:8 87:12 146:3	139:13 141:13
caution 127:21	187:5 211:1	184:21 190:16	146:15 188:21
caveat 80:8 318:14	212:18 249:13	202:12 220:15	207:5 221:3
355:22	252:16 326:7	255:15 267:1	260:15 261:12
	334:5 356:10	288:11 295:16	302:13 304:11
celebrates 362:5	357:5 360:11	297:17 320:14	345:14 348:3
center 12:21 19:20	372:8	325:12,19,22	charged 91:9
22:2 23:16	certainty 77:4	349:11	186:5 299:5
49:2,21 58:14	93:14 300:10	changed 7:1 9:10	
59:22 60:6 61:2	326:1	127:21 131:19	charging 91:8
69:9 99:12	CERTIFICATE	132:11 165:18	223:10
270:9,13,20	374:1	335:15	261:13,14 264:9
337:3 347:12			304:3
348:2 362:2,18	certify 374:3	changes 8:20 9:10	Charles 63:10
centered 49:21	Certner 130:20	15:11 31:15	75:5
343:16	131:1,2,3	32:8,11 79:21	chase 22:10 221:8
	165:10,17	85:5 87:5,14	
centers 40:16	182:18	88:2,16 93:17,21 132:18 202:15	chasing 221:6
41:6,9 99:15	cetera 4:8 149:21	210:6,7 247:21	cheap 322:3
central 170:5	195:2 212:6	249:10,15 250:5	cheaply 322:4
200:16	234:13 253:18	287:11 288:4	check 62:15 64:20
Cerner 130:15	271:15	291:6 297:19	124:4
certain 18:4 33:19	CFTC 5:18 6:4,5	300:6,15	
52:12 80:18	93:20 100:15	305:8,9,18	checks 217:12,15
81:11 107:3	153:21,22	306:10,14	chicken 64:11
133:2,19 136:3	189:17	335:14 353:6	Chief 289:7
159:20 169:18	191:11,15,17	changing 92:21	child's 344:12
175:14 181:22	193:11 209:5	127:21 349:19	
186:19 189:19	211:18 212:3,11	channel 328:17	chill 340:11
197:7,19 198:15	213:21		chilling 305:5
204:2 224:7,20		channels 292:17	

308:5	46:17 60:2	28:4 81:1,4 82:3	227:1 267:17
chin 64:18	166:16 181:5	97:1 140:13,18	268:3 276:7
	225:14 275:12	161:21 204:12	283:16 292:7,12
China 286:11	364:20	205:5,11 253:3	294:15 300:7,11
choice 64:14 66:4	circumstances	283:10 286:21	301:17 314:12
121:4 152:16	13:5 19:9 21:16	289:2 294:20	323:21 326:20
166:3 190:16	34:17 45:2 181:7	338:11 339:9	330:5,13 331:4
196:2 198:10	227:17 229:8,10	clarifying 25:20	335:16 339:18
231:19	232:7 251:9	103:20 145:22	342:18 347:6
259:15,18	254:4 285:5	170:12 188:7	348:5 371:22
260:18 270:4	287:20 290:16	300:3	clear-cut 321:16
295:6 308:17	294:4 303:9,16		
331:21 332:1	372:1,18	clarity 28:6 34:9	clearer 166:12
361:10	, and the second	62:14 97:10	288:13
choices 45:11	Cisco 69:16,18	98:6,9 99:6,7	clearly 23:3 44:12
65:10 73:1,3,9	70:3	116:12 140:9	49:4,15 63:5
80:1 83:10 85:9	cited 129:3 195:22	258:7 285:3	133:15 146:18
88:6 152:13	251:5	326:1,2,5 335:7	151:6,11,17
221:17 238:9	Citigroup 219:8	357:8	159:6 162:20
241:21 261:6	· .	class 115:2,10	165:8 214:6
284:8 301:1,21	claim 139:18	117:9 142:1	249:12
320:7 345:4	142:20 144:8	146:2 164:9	254:12,22
352:17 369:14	158:13 164:21	304:20 336:20	267:22 290:4,18
	165:1,4 190:11	classes 45:14	294:8 303:14,16
choose 73:9 121:4	348:13	169:18 370:1	308:8 309:17
141:16 144:22	claiming 35:10		358:12 361:21
146:14 205:20	78:10 296:2	classified 142:21	client 41:13 70:18
313:14 333:3	claims 30:16 48:11	clear 5:22 28:17	80:14 89:2 96:1
344:15 369:12	176:12	29:8 30:12 37:20	107:20
chooses 333:9	296:18,21	56:5 66:9 71:17	107.20 124:17,21 126:9
	316:17 317:13	73:16,19 76:22	190:16 196:7
choosing 108:2,3,4 124:22 125:2,6		77:7 78:15 104:4	190.10 190.7
126:20 368:5	clarification 26:11	113:10 119:18	224:19 225:14
	74:10 82:9 89:1	127:5 131:16,18	239:2,7,8 240:1
chose 82:21	284:11	140:3,6 142:9	262:1,4,6,11,16,
chosen 123:16	clarifications	144:9 145:20	18 263:18
127:2 352:22	74:10 249:5	146:18 151:15	265:20 266:4
CIKR 325:7	clarified 23:3	157:11 160:9,17	
	73:17 151:3	168:2 169:2	client/adviser
circumscribe 13:5	186:22 252:21	171:10 177:11	124:14
circumscribed		180:17 189:20	clients 41:11 57:22
16:18	clarifies 78:21	194:2,7 195:20	69:18,19 70:5
circumstance	clarify 18:21 25:5	204:17 212:3,18	78:14,18 80:9,11
CHCHINIAIICE			, , ,

		i	1
158:5 188:22	colleague 66:18	153:3 162:6,14	289:4,22 291:9
195:10 197:20	360:2 368:5	170:8 189:6,10	298:10 304:9
198:3,8 222:7,9	colleagues 5:10,17	191:12 218:1	306:9 307:9
226:3 259:4,6	6:3 9:21 12:15	242:11 249:4	325:21 331:9
263:3,5,10,21	100:14 102:19	255:22 256:5	342:11
265:12 274:20	160:14 102:19	281:9 303:2	commercial
329:3,5 338:3		313:4,7 318:19	151:15,20
client's	collected 90:11	319:4 320:4	· ·
262:9,12,14	color 88:7 89:3	342:16 361:22	commercials
263:19 265:19	96:2	371:3	371:6
266:3 370:4	Columbia 374:18	commentary	commission 16:15
		308:22	54:18 55:7 85:10
close 343:14	combination 16:22		86:15 87:1 89:10
350:21	346:17 352:6	commentators	90:14 91:4,8
closed 182:22	369:7	48:7 136:13	99:2 100:7
183:1	combined 201:7	190:13 266:9	102:9,10 106:17
closely 5:11 81:10	282:11 309:9	328:1,14	133:22 195:3
185:8	comes 70:9 114:3	commenters 35:16	198:6 258:19
	159:5 177:2	47:17 77:8	264:22 278:15
closer 276:19	194:6 238:11	112:21 142:20	297:22 341:21
closes 11:13 64:10	302:15 318:10	146:20	342:1 374:21
closing 247:20	321:8 324:21	commenting 69:10	commission-based
coast-to-coast	349:9	comments 4:7	87:20 88:10
351:7	comfort 127:22	11:10,11,14	90:18 97:18
		20:21 37:21 43:1	106:7,14 107:13
co-counsel 176:6	comfortable	44:1 65:11 73:20	108:1 114:16
189:1	228:12 268:9	77:9 84:11 94:6	115:6,21
co-counsel's	316:5 358:6	103:5	117:13,20 121:7
177:14	coming 5:9 11:15	114:11,12,13,14	258:17 259:9
code 83:13 87:10	57:5 104:18	116:2 118:7	260:22 263:2
199:22 200:3,5,7	127:13 130:4	137:1 138:15	264:14 277:6
258:22 290:13	183:5 226:7	160:17 161:13	278:12 279:4
	230:14,16 320:6	168:14,19	328:14 330:12
codifying 323:1	364:17	170:10 172:14	358:14,16
co-fiduciary 71:19	commend 75:15	185:13 188:7	361:13
84:17 139:6	251:12	191:12 199:17	commissioned
co-founder 31:22	comment 10:21	206:20	90:11
coin 341:10	11:10 35:14 37:1	208:13,14 211:3 216:11 249:11	commissions 74:7
cold 307:21	76:17 77:1,6	254:18	88:15 93:3,6
	101:12 107:2	256:2,11,17	115:3 128:3
collaboration 5:13	109:11,13 123:4	257:3 274:2	223:2,4 292:4
collateral 132:12	128:16 145:10	280:9 284:6	commitment
		200.7 204.0	

	8		
226:3 248:22	314:11	compensation	complexities 9:14
committed 273:1	companies 61:20	7:15 14:11 146:5	59:7 138:19
committee 149:18	81:14 92:4,17	176:21 177:4	146:10 301:5
273:12 274:8	111:18 163:13	197:1,8 206:8,9	complexity 16:5
	208:19 257:20	238:17 260:13	116:12 132:10
committees 141:1	270:14 272:6	276:21 277:7	190:3 301:19
committing	273:8 281:14	292:5 294:10,12	353:12
261:17	289:10,17	299:4,5,6 300:9	compliance 5:22
common 53:20	299:21,22 310:3	307:17	92:2,14 102:22
78:5,20	311:21	310:15,17,22	123:22 189:3
126:14,22 127:6	company 22:10	311:6 329:16,17	198:14 211:11
145:17 262:18	54:12 60:22 75:7	330:12 331:3	213:9,10 306:14
286:5,13 295:8	81:6 111:2,14	338:6 341:22	332:21 335:5
298:13	112:7 136:8	359:17,21,22 360:21 361:2	367:5
	148:20 155:18	360:21 361:2 364:16	
commonly 281:10	163:10		compliant 211:12
291:4	270:14,19,20	compensations	complicated 59:4
commonplace	277:22 278:17	277:10	160:22
335:8,17	339:21	compete 151:9	226:11,19 239:8
common-sense	company's 71:13	competing 163:14	243:17
66:4	- ·	189:20 344:9	complimentary
communicate	comparable 308:7		298:7
147:3 161:17	comparables	competition 82:12	compliments
178:17	236:5	competitive	210:18
	compare 231:4	197:19 198:12	
communicated	_	333:6 367:11	comply 77:11
104:22 114:5	compared 25:4 186:1 247:3	complete 7:3	142:22 193:1 205:13 214:19
communication		197:3 341:14	205:13 214:19 225:4 260:7
30:17 76:9 104:8	comparing 27:16	completed 328:3	306:21 332:22
178:19	comparison 56:12	*	333:3 342:2
communications	318:20	completely 45:6	
193:9 247:6	comparisons	91:14 94:11	complying 79:10
283:16	27:14 78:19	97:17 114:17	88:20 91:21
291:16,18	143:19	137:14 167:16	196:9,19
community 5:21		170:3 213:6	212:4,11
11:19 58:11 77:4	compelled 13:8	215:22	component
213:8 215:12	compensate	complex 8:12	112:4,7 226:22
217:2 248:17	146:15	117:7 197:11	components 93:11
288:3 303:22	compensated	256:12 260:8	<u> </u>
304:13	151:18 311:3	306:15 345:9	composition 134:8
305:6,15,19	329:14 359:13	complexion	compounding
306:20 310:9	360:19	272:13	111:19
	2 2 3 . 1 /	. =	

	1 46		
comprehensive	82:15 83:3 89:11	137:21 185:17	359:14 360:1
113:2,8 259:7	94:19 108:17	266:12	conflicted 20:2
332:10 334:12	129:20 150:13	conclusions	54:2 65:13 122:8
comprised 90:12	193:14,19	3:13,14	131:14 187:17
242:16 243:7	195:13	condition 14:3	205:22 252:6
	206:18,22		254:14,21
computer 260:7	207:4,19 213:5	conditioned 80:22	266:10 275:2
concede 118:17,22	239:7,21 250:5	conditions 115:4	285:2 315:11
232:17	251:21 258:22	116:4,9 118:20	conflict-free
conceded 189:22	265:14 291:1,6	122:7,11 250:9	147:11
	296:17 300:20	252:11,13	
conceivably 159:8	301:4 303:20	conduct 9:17	conflicts 10:5 14:1
conceived 170:22	313:15 316:11	31:10 77:4 86:15	15:7 20:3,16
concept 173:21	319:15 323:14	87:12 106:22	21:17 31:14
204:5 233:3,9	concerning 43:15	154:7 189:15	52:21 53:8 55:1
290:14	134:13 135:20	191:18	105:6,10,13,14
363:12,13	137:2,16 201:10	200:6,17,20	113:9 118:11
concepts 45:1	241:11 243:20	212:4 251:19	119:12 126:6,7
135:15 350:8	287:1 361:20	287:21 296:13	128:21
369:20 370:5	concerns 11:17	315:5	129:1,5,10
	24:5 36:16 63:2		131:11 139:1
concern 31:10	65:11 75:20	conducting 154:11	144:9 145:15
43:4 44:8 81:9	76:20 77:14	319:12	146:12 166:9 175:15
95:4,11 98:5	83:1,18 103:6,8	confer 93:19	175.13
110:11 112:2	104:13 109:17	conference 177:4	189:19 223:12
114:20	114:11 116:20	confession 323:14	252:18 275:4
116:17,22	139:3 148:6		279:11 294:19
117:3,4 138:22 155:10 187:22	162:3 165:15	confidence 292:1	359:15 371:12
192:16 199:19	186:21 187:14	336:6 337:10	
211:18 225:2	209:12 261:10	362:9 370:14	confront 120:16
270:15,16	266:9,11 273:18	371:20	confused 33:16
275:7,19 285:1	279:10 283:1,3,4	confident 6:1	242:3 327:21
290:15 294:18	288:2 290:1,5	108:14	confusing
320:16	304:8 305:16	confined 65:5	154:15,18
323:15,19 350:2	306:10 307:20		207:10 326:7
357:9 361:18	concise 56:6	confirming 31:8	confusion 70:8
363:18	conclude 199:7	conflict 63:6 86:12	259:21 260:1
366:16,17,21	203:3 256:9	113:2,9,11	323:19 327:17
367:8		120:9,11 121:22	330:15 370:20
concerned 29:20	concluded 332:2	122:2,5,6 128:1	
33:18 48:7 73:15	conclusion 3:7	137:7 176:3	conglomerates
76:3 78:15 79:15	36:18 51:6 87:9	238:2 261:1	281:16
70.5 70.15 77.15		312:4 313:22	

	1 46	1	
congratulate	297:6,8,16,19	consistent 14:20	constructing 62:11
334:21	298:9 300:5	66:4 153:11	construction
Congress 10:1	301:18 303:17	167:9 188:9	196:21
86:12,14,22 87:3	307:20 338:14	288:6 296:12	
89:13 119:17	340:7 341:5,18	333:19 334:13	consult 173:2
125:17 335:20	359:12	367:16	consultancy
338:8	considerable 15:5	consistently 131:8	221:16
congressional	331:20	132:22 246:13	consultant 58:11
13:10 15:1	consideration 38:8	337:21	78:6
	76:18 118:1	consisting 2:21	176:17,19,20
conjunction	128:15 129:7	_	177:1 228:15
284:15 286:1,4	256:16 328:2	consists 71:1	253:9
320:14		conspicuous 330:6	consultants 92:17
connection 67:20	considerations	constitute 25:6	129:16 164:22
72:6 81:5 112:18	21:13	28:6 33:13	208:18 219:3,15
114:18 225:8	considered 14:8	184:11 201:8	221:18 248:18
270:8 307:6,7	19:5,7 26:9,22	202:8 245:1	272:5
318:12	29:15 30:18	246:2 250:4	
cons 298:18	34:14 67:20	282:12	consultant's 177:6
341:11	78:21 80:14 82:5	283:15,21	consultation
	89:13 95:14	285:12,17	191:21
conscientiously	133:16 134:16	286:19 287:11	consulting 138:8
372:20	135:16 136:14	309:10,19	199:15
consensus	137:12 148:14	354:21	201:16,21
272:12,22	149:4 173:17	constitutes 34:9	202:17
273:22	184:4 190:15	143:3 207:16	
consequence	193:5,10,13	282:19 287:3	consumer 12:21
236:20 242:22	247:11 249:16	351:19	86:14 128:20 129:14,19
333:8	259:5 282:22		241:22
consequences	288:16 302:8	Constitution 1:11	241.22
24:6,10 61:5	313:14 319:2	constrained 283:2	consumers
76:16 137:20	326:4 327:12	constraints 93:6	126:12,15 368:7
201:19 249:17	329:15		consumer's 129:22
256:14 258:9	354:8,9,13	constrict 13:18	Consumers 333:7
266:13 300:16	considering 99:4	117:18	
306:17 314:21	119:17 247:14	constriction 85:12	contacting 23:15
consider 26:17	256:10 289:4	construct 224:5,14	contacts 340:12
37:17 75:17	297:11 341:2	239:5 253:11	contained 206:15
95:12 108:17,20	352:12 363:20	345:2,5	
205:3 249:18	consistencies	constructed	contains 27:22
203.3 249.18 254:1 266:21	306:5	116:19	70:3 200:3
267:1 282:8	consistency 140:9	110.17	contemplating
207.1 202.0	10.5		

	Pag	C 21	
284:2	continuous 28:15	157:8,13,15,17,2	copiously 189:17
	346:18	0 367:13,14	core 243:11
contemporaneous 86:5	continuously	controversial	248:19
	146:6	357:7	
contend 70:10			corner 371:7
content 275:10	continuum 344:14	convenience 28:16	cornerstone 75:14
276:8	contract 54:17	convenient 168:7	corporate 188:22
context 7:8 9:18	68:3,4,20 81:16	conventional	corporate-defined
10:19 24:19	92:21 98:11 140:3 155:19	169:21	346:9
26:13 42:22 44:4		conversation 49:7	
46:5 47:21 51:5	159:5 226:10,12	127:11,15	corporations
54:6 116:4,7	227:3,8,9	162:17 362:19	89:20 198:2
161:2 182:20	228:5,13,15 234:7 251:19		350:14
194:13		conversations 162:18 194:4	correct 50:4 55:3
203:14,16	contracted 163:9	275:6 298:17	56:16 271:20
204:19 212:3	contracting 68:7		274:6,8 276:16
247:11 269:16	Ü	converse 230:19	311:13 366:2
275:2 279:19	contracts 39:13	conversion 79:7	correctly 57:18
291:16 339:18	81:13 111:4	319:12	237:14
362:20 371:18	226:19 289:13		269:12,20 272:1
372:8,18	contractual 98:21	conversions 319:6	358:19
contexts 35:18	103:19 129:17	convert 97:16	correlated 239:17
continual 217:19	208:5	conveyed 361:8	
	contrary 97:22	convince 223:7,9	corresponding
continually	109:17 306:2	304:6	82:13
346:11,14	contrast 81:12		cost 64:18 76:7,15
continuation 57:3	137:13 332:7	convinced 110:4	85:8,11 87:8
continue 6:7		128:3	88:5 89:21,22
11:2,18 17:16	contribute 257:16	coordinate 87:11	90:4,9
22:22 89:16	346:5	133:5 200:10,19	91:1,16,19,20
133:5 143:20	contribution	209:4,9 211:8	93:1,9,11,13
146:1 166:12	15:19 17:7 24:8	coordinating	97:21 102:1
226:2 295:18	27:6 32:17 138:7	195:20 209:7	106:17 107:9
301:10 305:14	141:21 164:8		116:8 119:15
314:3 349:12	165:20 196:16	coordination 5:13	128:15 150:8
353:18 358:9	248:13,16,17	102:11,18	196:6,7,13
361:12	273:19 295:8	110:15	214:21
continued 346:4	346:9	153:10,11,15	216:7,8,17 217:8
	contributions	154:13 194:8	218:7 220:13
continues 146:1	346:18	209:4 210:2	225:2 239:3
continuing 137:22		256:1	253:17 256:1
255:15	control 141:12,16	copies 130:11	288:7 302:22
	142:1,4,15		322:2,18 341:18

rage 22			
349:3 357:21	counterparty	232:6 250:21	321:15
cost-effective 82:8	89:14	251:2 293:1	critical 17:11
	counter-party	324:3 343:13	93:11 137:17
costs 36:13,14,16	191:8,19,22	covers 115:2,5	140:4 147:5
42:14 72:4 76:4	192:14 193:13	194:3 294:21	186:16 195:20
90:2 92:13,18,19	212:7 251:16	311:1	270:4 291:20
106:8,10 123:22	269:3		330:5
128:7,13 137:20		crack 166:15	
190:1,8 196:8,19	counter-	crafting 180:17	critically 325:15
197:8,10 198:13	productive	cramped 15:14	332:7
199:5	207:4	-	cross 169:15,21
216:2,4,6,10	country 92:15	create 10:18 17:2	171:6,16 210:19
218:13,14,19	138:8 184:1	20:8 25:3 26:2	crossed 40:13
220:13 222:1,14	couple 12:14 46:20	43:20 83:20	171:12 231:7
246:5,8,10	104:9 106:13	92:14 105:14	363:16
259:20 288:3,11	124:8 153:9	118:19 243:1	
291:9 305:5	168:8 267:8	245:7,14 249:16	crosses 40:12
320:22	270:7 309:5	258:13 259:20	181:14
341:14,20 342:6	346:20 347:5	271:2 273:20	cross-examination
349:18 350:8		280:13 287:12	99:10
358:9	coupled 113:8	325:16 336:14	crossing 49:5
Council 147:22	course 10:22 68:3	337:9 359:13	230:12 342:8
281:10 289:8	86:8 99:16	created 62:19	
325:8	175:10 211:17	81:20 220:14	cross-purposes
counsel 22:9 31:2	249:22 277:8	creates 30:12 39:5	13:14
131:3 248:21	278:4 284:4	84:17 97:11	crucial 77:1 300:8
257:9 273:9	292:1 325:14	116:22 259:22	crystal 227:1
289:7 299:18	326:16 363:4,14		·
374:8,11	372:4	creating 7:19	culpable 236:22
counseling 76:9	court 16:9,18 39:5	121:2 178:10	237:2
82:16 83:4	132:15 136:16	273:2	cure 105:1
224:18 307:4	204:3 227:14	credit 252:3	currency 88:11
308:4,8		credits 208:16	93:1
ĺ	courts 48:10 337:21	crew 149:22	
count 47:9,10,12			current 7:10 9:12
52:3 173:4	cover 13:16 259:1	crises 286:9	13:4,17,19 15:4 21:14 31:11 39:4
counter 191:18	280:14	crisis 198:19 286:8	52:16 57:4 61:21
counterparties	coverage 74:11	crisply 44:22	68:13 74:6,8
115:1	151:12 324:13	- v	75:20 77:20 85:3
	covered 15:4 77:5	criteria 8:9 27:14	101:13 109:19
counter-parties	83:14 137:3	52:12,15,16	110:5,7 114:17
191:7 192:8	151:7,10,13,14,2	143:5 253:19	117:19 131:21
251:13	1 152:1 169:14	314:3 318:18,22	133:11 137:8
	1 134.1 109.14		133.11 137.8

	1 46		
141:8 142:11	customers 118:12	196:9,18 306:19	272:4
161:3,12 162:3	119:14,20	337:5,7 344:16	dead 213:20
185:1 193:7	293:13	David 130:15	
220:11 225:22	298:4,14,15	131:3	deal 65:1 85:7
234:15,16,17	299:10 306:22		99:3 102:12
236:20 242:18	338:16 345:7,9	Davis 4:18 42:17	119:10,12
243:10 255:19	347:5 348:3	43:18 44:17	132:18 150:19
256:18 261:15	350:6,7,9 351:16	45:18 46:13,19	182:10 224:10
290:16 295:12	364:7 369:9	103:4,13 104:11	239:11 280:5
297:17 307:8		105:5 106:5	288:1 336:3
325:22 326:2,7	customer's 20:10	108:7 109:5	dealer 85:12
327:5,13 330:15	Customers 108:1	147:17 160:15	88:12,14 91:10
332:17 335:12	customized 34:11	162:8,11 164:2	182:9 192:12
345:16 353:6		165:10 166:13	340:1
	cut 7:18 96:9	218:12 220:10	
currently 24:15	148:5 350:14	225:6 237:8	dealers 92:5
27:3 60:16 108:8	cuts 148:6	271:22 272:3,19	93:7,10 153:22
110:2 165:12		274:4,10,13,15,1	169:1 191:18
190:2,5 197:12	cycle 78:7	6,19,22 276:8,10	192:10
274:7 285:22		281:5,7 289:5	200:13,21 210:8
330:17 331:7	D	299:15 308:14	257:20 258:12
332:9 358:8	D.C 1:12 199:12	309:1 312:20	259:2 292:19
curtail 342:7	249:1 251:19	314:17	298:2,5 371:2
		324:16,18,20	ŕ
curtailing 76:8	daily 74:20 111:21		dealing 65:20
curveball 94:9	120:17 191:22	325:1,4 334:18	93:10 120:6
	192:18	342:22 343:2	133:8 152:17
custodian	darned 171:7	354:3 358:22	172:17 189:8
194:15,20	data 25:11,16	364:10 373:2,5	338:16 352:18
custodians 28:18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	dawn 15:10	358:15
207:5	27:7,12,14 44:10 78:20 87:8 90:11	day 89:6 100:21	360:14,17
custody 195:8		177:14 238:6	363:5,14 364:8
244:7,10	91:15 92:11	262:4 280:1	366:9,11 371:5
,	94:21 97:19	309:16 349:15	372:4,19
custom 268:11	119:14 121:4	353:9,19 373:5	dealings 118:20
customary 291:3	123:5,21	, i	S
	126:18,19	days 4:5 11:6	dealt 65:2 119:10
custom-build 78:6	146:22	190:5	196:1 234:2
customer 20:8	152:10,11 157:9	DB 9:12 132:1	death 186:10
87:6 118:16	190:8 219:16,20		368:1
196:2 344:3	253:14	DC 9:13 76:6 78:5	debatable 187:3
347:14,19	285:15,22	132:1	
358:15 360:12	341:18 348:4,14	DCIIA	debate 89:12
372:13	date 78:6 132:12	248:12,14,21	331:14
	151:6,9,17 190:4		debt 132:12 286:8
ı	, ,		

	1 46	i	
344:10	decision-making	deep 304:22	93:18 133:11
decade 166:11	247:1 249:22	deeply 76:2 100:1	134:22 137:3
346:14,15	335:11 356:17	default 198:22	140:15 142:16
decades 16:6	decisions 8:5 15:6		146:9,11,16
59:18 260:9	38:2 41:7,22	defend 305:5	148:4 150:12
	42:3 56:7,10	defendant 16:11	156:10 161:2 199:20 200:11
decide 165:14	57:11 67:21 68:6	defendants 304:22	204:16 207:11
243:9 244:1,4 318:15 321:3,6	76:11 82:19 83:7	defense 75:19	220:12 240:21
358:17 367:13	85:22 132:15		242:13 246:6
	137:16,18	defer 24:4 189:12	247:13 248:3
decided 38:5	140:22 141:6,15	210:2	251:3 259:1
134:21 354:19	149:13,19,20	deferral 211:8	262:21 266:21
decides 39:5,7	157:9,20 171:20 185:6 242:5,16	349:8	300:4,7 320:15
64:13 332:18	243:8,10	deferred 370:2	325:13,20,22
deciding 307:11	244:15,18		326:1,2,7 327:6
339:6 352:16	284:14 295:15	define 10:7 20:22	331:10 333:9
decision 38:2 39:8	301:7,8 303:8,15	37:10 66:6 146:17	335:19 337:15
42:6,9 51:8 59:4	307:18 311:5		338:9 353:6
84:9 129:19,22	320:11 338:14	defined 15:17,19	definitively 215:20
130:1 133:10	339:5 352:21	17:7 27:6 32:17	degree 58:22
134:6 141:12	declaration 20:10	36:9 44:12 49:15	104:21 105:20
150:9 163:17	66:16	77:3 138:7	128:10 132:4
164:1 174:5		141:21 164:7 165:20	139:14 282:7
182:3,5 184:7	declares 66:13	196:16,17	
186:2,11,16	declined 346:5	190.10,17	delay 133:6
201:22 231:12	declines 345:17	248:12,16,17	deletion 150:15
233:12	declining 345:17	273:18 289:14	deliberate 71:2
234:4,11,14,19	decoupled 27:2	295:8 303:16	deliberations
235:4,22 242:15 243:7,16,20	<u> </u>	337:14	352:18
244:8,10,11	dedicated 248:14 257:14 329:2	defines 308:8	delineation 30:13
245:12 250:4		defining 2:6	deliver 46:5
254:15 266:5	deem 88:19 308:4	131:18 184:3	
282:13 284:21	337:11	definite 310:2	delivered 41:6
286:16 314:6	deemed 26:5 88:8		296:12 347:6
319:22 340:22	90:19 95:3 96:17	definitely 50:19 184:22 268:8	delivery 196:3
355:5,7	108:19,21	184:22 268:8 327:19	demand 302:2,13
decision-maker	138:22 193:4		demonstrate 19:8
235:1,3	201:15 203:11 204:7 207:6	definition 1:4 7:19	34:16
decision-makers	262:20 312:3	13:18 14:5 17:14	demonstrated
236:10	202.20 312.3	23:13 29:21 31:5 43:17 52:18	262:22 339:12
		73.17 32.10	202.22 337.12

		İ	
demonstrates	158:9 168:22	departments	60:1 80:6 224:12
294:5	170:9 176:15	332:21 367:5	293:10
denigrate 212:22	177:7 185:16	Department's	described 23:1
J	189:4,5,11,14,22	2:6,16 31:4,6	27:4 33:12
deny 25:17	190:9,10,12	35:13 37:2 65:14	189:10 194:4
denying 89:18	194:4 195:15	66:3 73:18 76:21	231:16 315:22
	196:13 200:9,19	80:15 81:22 84:9	334:6 365:17
depart 86:4	201:5,12,13	85:1 86:4 88:19	
department 1:1,9	202:15,22	89:21 92:10	describes 292:14
2:17 6:17 7:17	203:5,8,13	106:19 110:15	describing 97:2
8:19 13:2,11	204:4,12 205:5	114:15 116:1	289:22
16:20 18:21	206:18 207:18	133:10 140:8	description 102.2
20:17,21 21:15	209:10 211:4,22	148:3 184:3,7,18	description 192:2 355:21
22:2 23:14	212:4 234:2	185:13 188:9	333:21
25:5,10,19 28:3	238:11	192:3 195:12	Deseret 201:1,3
29:5 30:4	240:12,13,21	192.3 193.12	202:16
31:8,19 32:10	241:1,5,9 242:12	204:9 206:17	deserves 13:2
34:5 35:4,18	244:22 248:6	247:20	133:3
36:12 37:4 39:7	258:11 260:10	258:2,6,20 260:4	
42:20 45:19	265:21	265:14 281:18	design 29:10 79:21
56:13 57:16	266:14,20 267:1	284:4 288:5,18	designate 72:16
59:16 65:10 66:6	280:17 282:9	290:15,17,19	209:10 285:10
67:5,12 71:17	283:3,10	290:13,17,19	designated 27:14
72:9,13 74:1,13	284:5,15 285:19	335:12 341:17	<u> </u>
75:15 76:13	286:18 287:4,16	351:18	designed 67:10
77:7,15 78:16	289:2,21 291:15		114:22 191:21
81:1 82:3,21	294:20 296:1	departure 204:11	328:12 337:4,6
83:12,17	297:5,7,11,13,15	depend 20:8 68:1	351:12
84:11,21 85:16	,19 298:8 299:11	185:7	designing 240:15
86:6,10 87:8	309:7 314:10		desirable 256:3
90:1 91:20 93:17	320:9 323:17	dependent 238:10	313:22
96:14,20	328:2,11 329:20	depending 128:20	
102:1,8,9	330:7 331:19	277:7 294:12	desire 148:3 175:9
103:6,9 104:16	332:1,4,18 333:9	depends 10:2	258:7 261:7
105:7 107:2	334:21 335:13	188:12	351:18
109:21 115:8	336:12 337:20		desired 198:3
116:2 133:4,6	338:11,22	depressed 346:8	despite 20:10
134:21 137:1	339:9,18	depriving 198:3	54:16 77:14
138:18,21	340:6,18 341:13	Deputy 2:3 4:18	350:2
140:11	342:10 351:1		
142:14,17,22	353:3 356:7,22	derive 107:12	detail 72:22 118:2
143:1 144:12	357:4 359:12,18	derives 341:17	280:21 323:11
145:21 146:8	363:4,15 371:22	describe 7:10 35:9	detailed 191:19
147:22 151:2		46561156 7.10 55.7	

details 159:14	dialogue 11:2,18	322:13 323:20	280:9
247:18	61:15 161:10	328:7 331:18	direction 61:22
determination	162:7 180:16	332:6 347:2	86:4 87:2 104:4
51:11 136:15	216:9 316:9	351:13 352:21	119:22 161:20
287:17 311:10	350:9	355:12	166:6 174:8
	dictates 197:20	369:19,22	320:20 342:14
determine 29:9	296:10	differential 107:13	374:6
126:18 136:10 263:18 292:8	differ 295:20	196:4	directions 102:11
303:4 306:21	299:6	differentiating	
		245:5	directly 36:7 84:22
determined 10:11	difference 8:16		95:16 106:2
125:17 203:8	18:7 37:22 91:18	differently 55:21	116:19 133:21
244:22 338:15	107:6 128:19	152:4 174:14	253:13 328:9
determining 7:12	258:16	222:4,22 245:12	339:21 372:9
22:16 29:7 79:7	differences 159:4	352:11	director 4:21 22:9
143:21 185:2	different 13:20	differing 141:19	131:4 188:20
302:4 337:17	32:21 33:17	260:13 261:13	189:3
detriment 325:18	41:15 50:9 53:10	277:7,10 307:9	directs 11:10
	56:18 57:22	difficult 35:15	disadvantaged
devastating 306:17	59:10 60:14 71:5	83:5 85:18	367:6
	82:17 87:3 101:4	102:21 268:16	
develop 5:12 25:1	102:10 107:4	369:20	disadvantageous
231:14 277:15	125:5 128:7	difficulty 121:17	120:13
307:7 328:11	129:13 133:9	•	disadvantages
developed 41:13	134:17	diligence 322:8 334:22	242:10 283:13
49:13 109:16	139:10,12,19		319:21 320:8
256:20 351:2	141:2 142:7,9	dilute 135:5	355:16
developing 3:12	161:6 165:7,22	dimension 128:15	disagree 42:7
25:6 59:13	172:3 177:3	dining 64:10	43:21 48:20
development	182:14,20	Ü	212:19 237:4
49:11 276:22	183:5,8 188:13	dinner 65:4	307:13 328:6
282:9 284:16	196:3 203:15	direct 7:15 14:11	disagreement
291:20	209:18,19	17:3 45:17	47:9,12,15
343:17,19	210:13 215:18 218:18 222:6	118:10 127:9	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
ŕ	234:16 238:22	208:5 257:22	disallowing 296:8
developments	239:2,3,20 240:3	305:11 321:19	disallows 292:3
13:12 16:8	245:13 253:7	directed 9:5 18:16	disastrous 96:10
devil's 159:14	262:2 272:9,10	43:3,15 45:1	disbursement
devote 264:15	273:5,17	61:2 69:13 108:5	58:17
devotee 64:2,9	274:2,11 292:21	200:11 275:3,5	
ĺ	299:2,3 305:17	directing 179:5	discern 18:7 20:1
diagnostic 78:18	319:20 320:19	un comig 179.5	disclaim 65:21

	<u> </u>		
72:21 78:7	173:4 174:3,20	339:3	44:4
159:17 174:6,13	175:9,11 176:8	discouraged 205:9	disinterested 59:3
194:1	177:9,10,20	discover 362:19	65:4 70:13
disclaimer 24:20	178:9,13,19,20		296:12
26:8,20,21 30:10	179:3,6,19 180:3	discovered 304:20	disjointed 83:1
39:1,10,18 55:22	182:2 183:6 186:20 187:21	discretion 27:13	· ·
187:10,14 226:9	196:10,12,22	29:4 83:13	dispositive 174:13
227:13 228:3,15	206:7	136:17 302:4	dispute 6:22
362:6,8 372:17	207:7,13,15	303:12	296:20
disclaimers 39:12	210:15,17 219:6	discretionary	disrupt 335:21
55:15,18 57:7	222:6 247:6	28:5,8 33:1	disrupted 356:1
disclaims 72:18	266:11 277:9	121:1 139:13	disruption 291:11
227:15	279:10,11,17,20	140:13,18	358:20
disclose 72:22	280:5 310:12,16	141:3,10,11,17 142:6 156:22	
139:1 140:2	329:6,22	157:2,7,20 165:5	disruptive 303:21 304:12
176:9,12 205:16	330:5,9,13	, ,	
210:12 240:1	331:20 332:2 359:17	discuss 33:9 50:6	disseminate 93:7
303:7 311:3	362:1,3,13,21	65:10 131:5 246:5	dissertation 94:15
331:1	368:12,16		distinct 182:4
disclosed 73:5	370:16 371:13	discussed 119:14	distinction 35:21
111:12 151:15	372:3	155:2 187:1 242:11 278:21	44:20 150:16
254:12	disclosure-based	281:19 286:11	156:22 178:3
310:13,22 329:9	280:8 310:21		distinctions 86:17
361:21	disclosures 22:19	discusses 135:15	185:7
discloses 63:5	56:4 57:4,6	discussing 51:1	
176:11,17,19	205:12	83:9 191:3,4	distinguish 23:4 35:15 66:7
disclosing 114:1	285:13,18	333:13	267:10
311:6	328:20,22	discussion 7:9	
disclosure 20:3,7	discomfort 310:8	49:17 100:8,21	distinguished 148:8
25:8 40:1	discontinue 28:7	104:2 216:16	
55:3,16	302:12 304:2	225:13 270:6,8 279:14 354:15	distinguishing
56:2,5,6,19,21			182:13
62:13,14	discontinued	discussions 37:19	distortion 71:2
80:19,22 94:20	313:1,3	149:10 201:14	distribute 243:22
98:21 103:17,18 104:11 109:22	discount 247:3	210:22 283:13	322:15 333:4
113:8,9,13,15	discounting	dishonest 70:17	distributed 137:14
120:1,3,10,19,22	111:12	71:4	distribution 21:2
122:2 129:16	discourage 128:9	disincented 44:6	23:7,12,18,21
146:12	202:9 336:9	disincentivized	24:5 35:15 49:12
161:16,18,20			

	1 ag		
50:12,13	District 227:14	209:18	drafting 160:19
51:2,7,9	374:18	DOL 1:10 137:22	168:12 169:5
60:3,14,17 61:4	dither 361:4	154:16 210:4	170:4 171:4
76:9,12 81:17		212:12 298:6	252:20 306:11
82:16 83:4,9	divergent 272:8		323:15
136:12 137:9	diverging 192:15	dollar 258:3	dramatic 8:20
185:15,20,21	diverse 260:6	dollars 8:12	30:14 86:8
186:1,3,11,14	266:17 280:20	152:16,21	347:21
201:6,8,16,21		194:18	
202:5,6,17 239:4	diversification	196:14,18	dramatically
241:4	45:15 135:16	197:12 217:9,12	76:4,13 131:19 290:9 306:15
242:14,16,19,21	diversified 257:10	219:2,5,14,16	
243:2,7,16,17,18	344:18 345:2	220:1,8	drastically 82:11
,22 244:5,8,12	346:2	221:14,19 222:1	draw 42:20 44:21
245:1,4,11,16	dividends 350:14	247:12	49:20 52:4
246:8 247:10,18	divining 258:21	DOL's 87:4,7	371:13 372:16
248:5 266:5	Ü	dominant 16:4	drawing 49:20
269:16 274:17 276:6	division 4:20	126:11 127:6	56:11 229:5
	270:13,19		306:11 318:8
282:10,12,14,19 283:12,14,17,20	divisions 343:22	dominated 272:14	320:2 371:17
284:2 291:3,22	divorce 100:17,19	dominates 272:15	drawn 3:14 17:1
292:5,17	ŕ	done 102:1,4,7	51:22 314:2
307:3,12 308:4,8	doctor 38:3 125:10	106:15 174:21	
309:8,10,19	document 172:21	179:10,12	dream 167:22
323:1,9 328:16	178:18 317:21	215:13,17 217:1	drive 216:2
331:11 340:10	372:17	219:19 220:7	driven 198:20
distribution-	documentation	260:1 316:12	
related 201:14	172:21	317:3 320:13	driver 359:10
	documented	322:3 329:20	364:12,15 365:2
distributions 14:7	104:20	333:15	driver's 364:21
21:18 24:10 35:14 50:10 61:8	documenting	doorstep 56:4	driving 260:13
137:2,16	103:20	doubt 338:17	drops 215:16
162:12,18	documents 47:20	360:1 372:21	dry 217:8
185:18 201:20	194:19 370:16	Doyle 6:13	•
241:8 249:7		dozen 313:13	dual 154:14,16
254:17 255:2,9	Dodd 193:16		192:9
275:2,15 307:6	Dodd-Frank	draft 342:12	dually 107:18
333:10,11 354:7	5:15,19 86:13,21	drafted 24:15	due 28:14 29:13
distributor 339:22	89:13 93:21	108:8 114:19,21	82:22 137:19
distributors	100:10 102:22	172:4 197:14	266:12 322:8
129:15 293:4	119:17 192:19	252:9 323:7	331:3
147.15 475.7	193:1 200:11		

during 25:2 80:7	131:16 224:12	283:19 308:9	258:13 297:21
89:12 161:13	264:3	319:20 320:10	298:6,10 307:4
188:1 343:15	EBSA 2:11	339:1,3 344:12	eight 32:16 148:11
348:5,6	4:18,21 5:6 6:14	345:13 348:12	160:17 168:11
duties 10:13 31:18	9:18 300:5	350:18 351:7,8	373:6
65:18 80:13	301:17 303:9,17	educational 283:2	
87:17 208:8	304:6,9	344:22 347:16	either 25:20 44:7
211:19 212:20	305:10,14,19	351:9 352:1	72:15 96:6 97:14 102:22 106:2
290:10 292:8	306:3,19	Edward 281:11	113:16
326:6 327:22	307:8,19 308:6		116:15,19
330:22 336:15	EBSA's 2:19 4:10	effect 21:4,8 52:21	133:21 173:11
duty 16:12 70:12	302:21 307:4	75:17 88:16 89:1	205:5 207:5
71:21 78:9 80:12		91:3,12 114:14	215:1 221:17
89:14 139:21	economic 13:11,20	148:7 154:5	222:21 223:5
140:5 147:7	16:4 57:16 93:19	237:13 267:4	233:14 244:14
152:13,15	190:15 239:20	286:8 305:6	260:5 270:2
152.13,13	286:6,9 297:9,17	308:5	275:11 330:21
200:8 246:22	341:17 348:5	effected 92:22	331:13 336:19
261:22 288:7	359:7,16	effective 21:22	341:10 347:12
338:2	economically	87:13,15 178:20	352:4
	21:11	180:17 190:4	
dynamics 239:20	economics 32:2	195:16 224:9	elaborate 237:14
	265:8 279:3	305:22	277:3 280:3
E			elderly 366:22
earlier 41:15	Ed 281:3,7	effectively 17:1	Electric 38:1
119:14 148:8	educate 42:2	132:17 137:19	
161:13 164:3	45:8,11 49:2	175:15 178:17	electronic 297:2
174:12 256:6	255:12 306:22	223:10 325:16	element 180:1
314:6 316:10	351:3 370:5	329:22 333:22	203:12 231:8,9
369:13	educating 263:21	effects 53:18,19,20	234:4
early 276:21	265:2 283:11	56:22 202:14	eligible 348:15
earn 106:4	education 19:1	254:21 283:20	eliminate 22:14
	23:7 33:11,14,19	efficiencies 76:7	80:1 104:12
earth 128:6	34:3,6,9 35:16	efficient 21:11	202:22 328:16
easier 86:6 223:6,9	42:21	58:5 64:9 85:1	
224:12 334:3	44:10,14,20	88:6 219:12	eliminated 39:21
368:17	45:14 49:4 51:5	370:3	eliminating 76:5
easily 53:13	66:8 76:9 135:14		88:5
266:11 279:11	148:10 165:22	effort 10:11 140:8	elimination 26:11
317:22	195:6 241:19	307:8	85:11,14 185:3
East 286:10	247:17 255:14	efforts 74:13	281:20
	261:6 271:19	189:15 214:2,3	else 68:6,7 99:19
easy 44:21 102:17		249:12 256:10	CISC UO.U, / 33.13

127:8 232:21 233:5 236:7	240:17	85:1,17,19	onguein ~ (1.6
233:5 236:7		05.1,17,17	ensuring 61:6
	264:14,15,17,20	86:2,9,10	entail 339:11
elsewhere 21:4	265:5,7,9 369:18	100:5,6 135:19	357:8
	employer's 262:7	290:17 291:10	
embrace 336:2	340:17 341:2	332:8,10,11,17	entailing 293:11
embracing 46:16		333:2 334:13,14	entails 335:2,3
emerging 286:10	employer-	366:14 367:16	341:1
	sponsored 59:11	368:17	enter 58:12 98:10
emphasis 62:13	employment 2:4	engage 39:21 50:5	170:20 228:4
90:3 132:8	63:19 136:11	89:16,18 119:16	238:3
255:15	275:11	206:21 253:10	
emphasize 3:2,11	emptor 80:9	298:14 305:14	entered 98:13
153:13 195:14	· 1	314:11	301:12 350:11
197:9	enable 22:21 29:8	engaged 5:13	entering 154:1
emphasized	77:6 114:22	66:11 80:8	193:3 260:20
310:11	enacted 16:3	291:21 292:6,11	enters 166:16
	enacting 10:1	324:7,8 336:9	
empirical 126:19		·	entire 92:12 104:5
employed 366:15	enactment 131:17	engages 176:22	196:14 221:8
374:8,11	encompass 21:1	engaging 40:17	301:15 335:5
employee 1:2 2:8	241:3 323:8	129:4,11 300:14	342:11 366:22
4:16,20,22 6:14	encompassed	321:6	367:1
13:12 75:14	101:21	engines 31:3,21	entirely 238:10
287:3 333:20	on accurage 45:12	32:2,4,22	239:3
335:22 341:4	encourage 45:12 122:3 128:8	36:17,22	entities 84:18
374:10	166:2,5,6 251:17	·	132:17 134:12
employees 40:17	325:14 333:16	enhance 57:8	135:14 142:9
49:1 58:19 81:15	334:14 351:21	enhances 296:3	209:21 216:18
149:22 152:6	372:1	enhancing 248:15	230:22
258:5 265:6,10		<u> </u>	entitled 16:10 65:4
278:4 281:17	encouraged 77:15	enjoyed 177:16	315:14
289:19 326:22	305:10 306:8	enlarge 290:9	
333:16 334:1	encouragement	enormous 150:16	entity 13:6 67:7
338:8 348:15,17	166:11	178:2	133:16,17,20
368:14	encourages 307:6	enrollment 348:20	134:1 135:13
employer 81:11	<u> </u>		137:5 211:20 213:11
183:2,3 247:8	encouraging 46:18 306:3,12 314:10	ensue 93:13	
262:9 265:2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ensure 29:6 34:10	337:11,13,16
270:21 278:5	endorse 113:18	61:3 77:12	entrust 244:9
287:10 289:18	energy 262:17	137:22 163:3	enumerated
340:20 344:1	enforcement 9:20	250:22 290:3	197:10 211:20
	21:22 72:10	334:13 353:4	environment
employers 32:19	41.44 /4.10		CHVII UHHICHU

	1 46	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
10:20 13:20	212:20 213:2	escapes 74:11	217:3,10
161:3,6 165:17	220:18 227:4	ESOP 136:12	estimation 218:6
183:9 198:13	233:1,2,8 235:7	287:7,9	
241:17 286:14	243:3 245:8,18	, , ,	et 4:7 149:21 195:2
297:20 345:16	246:3 250:7,11	especially 5:8 52:2	212:6 234:13
349:18 350:12	257:9 258:8,22	104:17 186:16	253:18 271:15
envision 59:1	259:5,18 261:15	342:5 370:20	ethics 71:7
envisioning	262:20 263:2	essence 204:8	ETS 195:1
181:18	266:22 280:8,11	361:8	evaluate 11:17
	289:1	essential 21:17	
episodic 14:16	290:4,11,12,22	152:21 292:22	20:16 26:4
equally 307:19	292:6,11 296:2	298:6 338:21	51:3,9 139:9
	297:4		275:10 306:21
equals 220:7	312:8,12,16	essentially 111:5	evaluates
equate 239:1	315:15	172:22 202:17	305:11,16
equipped 241:14	316:15,22	315:9 318:2,12	evaluating 276:8
	324:10	362:6	293:21
equitable 16:17,19	326:4,10,13	establish 61:1	
equities 346:1	327:13 328:7,12	119:11 171:16	evaluations 136:2
equity 50:22	329:11,12,20	200:6 265:4	191:22
194:21 221:2	330:17,18,22	278:20 287:7	evaluator 351:11
261:13 319:11	331:1 332:6,8	established 24:1	event 69:4 187:11
	335:5,21	63:4 75:22	207:7 347:12
equivalent 142:10	337:18,21 338:9	109:10 110:18	356:12
237:12	353:6 358:8	173:12 203:6	
era 15:10	360:17	288:21,22	events 351:9
ERISA 5:16 7:11	ERISA-covered	335:21	eventual 262:12
10:1,3 14:9	327:9,10 331:18	establishes 225:15	everybody 3:5
15:10 16:3,11	ERISA-like 87:17		63:13 124:13
17:1 21:16 28:20		establishing 86:19	154:10 177:11
30:4 31:9,18	ERISA's 7:22	101:18 264:16	216:9 228:20
33:4,13 34:5	24:11 31:12	278:3 287:7	236:7
71:15 82:18	34:12 65:18 75:13 82:20	estate 81:11	everyday 129:11
83:14 87:10		estimate 76:15	215:7 259:2
102:22 131:7	87:22 131:9,17 177:20 282:4	196:13 216:22	
138:1 145:8	296:13 326:6	217:14	everyone 32:7
149:8 155:19			43:11 191:2
167:8 175:10	erode 242:2	estimated 197:1	198:18 273:1
189:4,9 193:2,8	eroded 260:10	estimates 89:21	306:1 361:14
195:11 197:16	erroneous 296:20	92:11,13,18	everything 58:7
198:22 203:7,21		93:2,6,12 190:9	199:1 220:19
208:4,6,7	escape 78:9	196:6 256:1	221:9 227:9
209:18,22		estimating	230:9
		Community	

	1 46	+	
everywhere	151:4 153:18	338:20,22 339:7	339:12
359:15	164:6 246:19	excess 196:18	exemption 37:8
evidence 85:6,7	261:9 262:22	ovek over 96.15	39:1 67:9 91:4
,	294:4 309:13	exchange 86:15	108:13,15
evidenced 283:4	313:6	98:5 99:2 100:7	115:2,10,18
evolving 59:13	excellent 42:15	175:1 200:13	134:22 135:4
exacerbate 202:20	162:4 333:15	297:22	144:10,12
		exchanged 79:20	145:9,13 187:18
exactly 47:14	except 29:1 68:19	exchange-type	194:2 234:2
68:15 99:2 113:4	306:6	112:1	358:4,11
115:20 121:22	exception 24:14,16		, and the second
151:22 153:2	25:9,11,17,19,20	exchanging	exemptions 67:6
209:5,7 211:21	26:13 27:2,3,4,5	113:21	80:21 87:15 93:2
213:15 272:2	28:9,11 35:5	excise 9:21	104:3 115:10
314:7 370:18	77:16,22 78:3,16		116:7 117:9
examine 220:22	79:9,14,16,18	exclude 23:3 252:5	118:19 140:16
	80:18 81:8 108:8	334:15	144:5,11 197:7
examining 35:18	112:19	excluded 135:4	199:2 260:9
example 8:10	113:1,6,14	266:4	267:4 310:20
47:16 51:22	114:21 115:8	excludes 72:14	exercise 29:4
56:12 71:12 81:6	117:10 127:17	251:7	215:10 246:21
85:4 96:1 132:11	150:14,22 152:2		307:22
137:7 141:21	156:6 161:14	excluding 224:7	
148:15	169:15 178:11	exclusion 33:18	exercises 303:12
155:12,13 159:9	181:8 187:2	34:6 72:19 73:7	exerting 142:1
164:8 167:21	251:17,22	187:4	exist 31:22 117:10
168:20,21	252:7,21 253:3	exclusively 274:18	129:5 144:9
169:8,14 170:19	254:16 269:1,3	292:20	145:15 220:6
196:8 200:16	271:12,15 301:5		287:9 330:3
207:4 236:4	312:5,7,10,15,19	excuse 26:20	
249:17 251:19	315:7	execute 197:22	existence 256:18
255:7 261:10	316:13,17,21		288:20
262:3 264:13	317:13,19	executed 88:12,13	existing 15:9 23:6
265:11	323:21	executing 299:5	25:13 58:4,22
267:17,19 286:7	324:10,13	executive 9:5 11:9	73:19,22 74:3
288:4 294:3,7	339:10,19 340:1	22:9 84:7 94:4,6	83:18 91:22
295:6 300:20	370:17 371:14	153:11 189:3	108:10 185:3
301:2,8 303:12		273:12 274:8	202:15 232:12
332:15 336:22	exceptions 65:18	343:3	261:1 267:3
339:20	67:2 140:17		287:9 333:12
354:10,11 357:3	144:5 168:16	executives	exists 36:5 220:6
examples 104:10	203:2	149:18,22	282:1 336:6
105:6 111:15	251:5,11,12,15	exempt 328:19	
103.0 111.13	271:9 300:18		exit 207:5 233:5

103:8,11 106:9 164:5 207:10 285:20 306:7 expanded 23:2 114:19 127:17 151:3 259:1 350:18 expanding 200:10 248:2	19:21 53:19 54:5 156:21 158:2,3,17 196:9 204:20 217:4 236:2 240:15 242:2 253:5 254:3 260:3 309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	exposure 159:11 225:3 express 20:2 65:9 expressed 114:11 138:22 272:10,11 expresses 81:22 296:2 expression 361:17	
164:5 207:10 285:20 306:7 expanded 23:2 114:19 127:17 151:3 259:1 350:18 expanding 200:10 248:2 expansion 184:10	156:21 158:2,3,17 196:9 204:20 217:4 236:2 240:15 242:2 253:5 254:3 260:3 309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	express 20:2 65:9 expressed 114:11 138:22 272:10,11 expresses 81:22 296:2	eyeballs 65:7 eyes 64:10 361:9 F face 45:11 241:9 faced 187:13 320:5
285:20 306:7 expanded 23:2 114:19 127:17 151:3 259:1 350:18 expanding 200:10 248:2 expansion 184:10	158:2,3,17 196:9 204:20 217:4 236:2 240:15 242:2 253:5 254:3 260:3 309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	expressed 114:11 138:22 272:10,11 expresses 81:22 296:2	eyeballs 65:7 eyes 64:10 361:9 F face 45:11 241:9 faced 187:13 320:5
expanded 23:2 114:19 127:17 151:3 259:1 350:18 expanding 200:10 248:2 expansion 184:10	204:20 217:4 236:2 240:15 242:2 253:5 254:3 260:3 309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	138:22 272:10,11 expresses 81:22 296:2	eyes 64:10 361:9 F face 45:11 241:9 faced 187:13 320:5
114:19 127:17 151:3 259:1 350:18 expanding 200:10 248:2 expansion 184:10	236:2 240:15 242:2 253:5 254:3 260:3 309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	138:22 272:10,11 expresses 81:22 296:2	F face 45:11 241:9 faced 187:13 320:5
151:3 259:1 350:18 expanding 200:10 248:2 expansion 184:10	242:2 253:5 254:3 260:3 309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	expresses 81:22 296:2	face 45:11 241:9 faced 187:13 320:5
350:18 expanding 200:10 248:2 expansion 184:10	254:3 260:3 309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	296:2	face 45:11 241:9 faced 187:13 320:5
expanding 200:10 248:2 expansion 184:10	309:12 327:6 352:10 354:6 357:4	296:2	faced 187:13 320:5
248:2 expansion 184:10	357:4	expression 361:17	
expansion 184:10		expression 501.17	
			350:10
l 199·22 282·21 l	experienced 215:6	expressly 79:10,17	facetious
	218:14	extend 109:11	180:12,15
284:10	experiences	331:10 332:3,18	facilitate 21:22
expect 10:15 139:2	138:15	extended 323:21	facilitating 302:22
287:16 288:10 301:10 337:6	expert 124:17,18	extending 162:16	facing 59:4 350:12
360:6 363:6	125:11 149:2	246:7	fact 20:12 54:3
expectation 41:3,4	163:19 233:13	extends 338:2	72:4 86:11
145:16	expertise 7:3,4	extension 162:5	95:11,14 102:8
295:13,20 296:5	10:16 121:20,21	extensions 252:2	109:8,10,15
315:5 370:13	233:8	extensive 115:19	115:16 117:3
371:10	expires 374:21	240:15 315:22	119:20 121:13
expectations 33:20	explain 51:20	322:9 332:21	122:1 134:9 142:4 160:4
185:9 247:22	54:13 123:15	extent 16:18	167:14 168:5
266:16 314:15	211:16 293:6	20:16,22 106:6	171:1,12
expected 35:1	298:18 366:5	118:13 142:15	192:6,7,9,13
	explained 248:1	204:1 206:18	193:5,11 194:5,9
352:19 361:2	explaining 323:17	209:20 229:3	197:4 211:21
ovmoota 225.10	explains 123:17	241:2 271:16	224:3 239:8
expenditure 8:11	262:13 340:13	280:16 318:16	272:22 304:19
-	explanation 85:4	320:8 361:19	311:3 316:1 317:11
100.11 222.0	· 1	external 196:19	332:10,15
239:4,5 340:4	explicit 184:19 203:9 225:11	extra 156:13 257:6	346:15
expenses 252:18	explicitly 284:12	extraordinarily	359:12,21
350:17	296:2	168:17 186:11	366:18 371:18
expensive 79:2	explore 350:21	extreme 145:2	factor 203:1 225:9
197:21 222:11	<u>-</u>	extremely 280:12	250:4,10 321:7
200.10,22	exposed 333:7	310:4 316:18	356:18
321:12	334:2		factors 253:16

	1 ag	C 0 I	
367:15	74:18	321:5 331:19	fewer 85:9 265:9
facts 181:18	far-reaching	332:2 342:2	fictitious 296:20
226:16 227:16	197:11	fee-based 88:11	Fidelity
371:22	fashion 358:4	106:7 116:7	343:4,5,10,15
factual 23:17		feel 159:8 212:19	344:13 345:7,12
56:21 57:6 85:18	fashioned 358:18	214:9 349:21	348:1 351:10,11
fail 13:21	fat 69:20	feeling 170:7,8	352:2,4,10
fails 8:8	favor 70:18 258:18	feels 42:5 160:8	Fidelity's 343:19
failure 242:20	favorable	206:2	344:17
	126:12,15	fee-only 264:19	fiduciaries 10:3,14
fair 66:12 69:12	FCC 213:21	265:8 279:1	15:6,18 20:20
81:4 98:4 107:15	FDA 96:10		25:17 34:5 37:9
111:15 131:16		fees 20:14 25:4	53:4 58:2,10
177:11 287:17	fear 48:11 71:9	29:18 52:17	65:17 66:21
316:1 329:7 334:10 342:15	98:18 266:3	53:11 54:13 56:14 85:9 93:3	67:14 68:2,17,22
	fearing 45:15		70:7,11,12,21
fairly 106:17	fears 97:5	105:12,14 113:8,10 115:16	72:3,8 73:6
113:1 134:9		129:17 139:14	74:4,14 81:15
224:12 278:13	feasible 32:14	141:13 142:5	88:1,8 91:2
359:7	115:11	146:15 163:1	92:6,10 93:9
fairness 135:18,20	feature 111:19	186:5 219:17	97:4 105:17
207:2 287:1	features 24:8	221:3 242:2	115:1 134:16
288:15	79:22 175:11	252:18 260:6	135:17
faith 129:14	299:3 348:20	261:13,14,15	139:1,2,20
287:18 338:16	federal 2:14 80:9	263:7 275:22	140:10,19 141:5
371:10	193:1 210:11,13	276:1 277:10	142:14 143:4
	213:14 216:14	280:6 302:13,21	146:13,15,19,22 147:1,5,10 150:5
fall 29:21 52:12,18 268:13 306:10	227:14 332:9,17	304:3 315:11	154:2 155:20
	ŕ	333:21 342:4	156:1 157:3
falling 132:4	fee 7:15 13:7 14:11	358:10 367:10	165:9 184:20
317:19	68:2 87:19 88:15	Feldman	185:9 186:14
falls 184:17	91:15 103:17,18 106:4 114:17	183:16,17,18,19	187:5,8 188:4,11
false 166:3	115:14 169:18	fellow 94:8 109:18	200:6 201:16
falsely 78:9	181:21 192:7	felt 309:20 332:16	204:21 205:2
familiarity 58:22	198:7 222:19		207:6 208:4 233:2,8
ľ	237:13 247:6	Ferrigno 281:3,6,8,11	253.2,8 250:8,11,13
families 13:2	258:19	309:6,15 310:2,6	253:13 259:5,18
family 151:5,8,16	260:11,15 263:5 264:10,21	322:14,20 354:6	268:10 269:5
family's 151:17	276:22 279:5	,	282:2 286:7
fancy 64:1,6 65:5	290:14 313:18	fertile 304:21	292:10 300:13

	1 ag		
303:4 304:15	81:3,7,21	176:10,12	287:8,12,16,22
308:11 312:3	82:1,2,5,6,21	177:1,12 184:4	288:7,20
315:2	83:4 84:16 87:17	185:2,6 189:8,16	291:14,19 292:3
330:1,17,18	88:20 89:4,9,14	192:8,12,20,22	294:16 295:1
336:4,10 339:4	90:19 91:5,6,14	193:6,9,20,22	296:3,7,13,19,21
341:22 354:8	92:8 93:18	194:1 195:11,21	297:3
358:8	95:10,14 96:17	197:6,10,16	300:4,11,19,22
	98:18 101:19	199:20 200:8,10	302:1,6,8,15,17,
fiduciary 1:4 2:7	103:21 107:7	202:8	18,19 303:6
7:12,14,20,22	108:19,21	203:4,7,11,17,20	304:4,5,11,19
8:9,13 10:4,8,13	113:16 114:7	,21 204:1,16,19	305:12 306:8,18
13:6,18	116:21 124:16	205:10,21	307:8,15 308:4
14:3,5,10,15	131:6,9,18,22	207:1,9,11,13,21	311:4,10,15,16
16:11,15,17	133:11,17,18,19	208:1,7 211:22	312:8,12,16
17:14	134:1,5,8,11,22	212:19 213:1	313:15,21
18:1,3,4,13	135:13	220:12 224:3	314:20
19:5,7,18 22:20	136:14,20	225:17,19	315:5,13,18
23:13 24:1,11	137:3,12	226:4,10,18	316:15,22
25:7 26:9 27:8	139:6,12,14,16,1	227:2,6,7,8,15,2	317:3,7,10,14
29:7,10,12,16,21	9 140:3,14,19	1 228:1,12	320:12,15,21
30:2,3,8,9,12	141:20 142:19	229:1,10,11	321:5,9 322:5,18
31:5,10,13,17	143:6,8	232:8,15 233:12	324:10 326:6,15
32:15 33:4	144:3,7,15,18,22	234:1,3,10,19	328:4 329:11
34:12,14	145:1,4,14	236:10,18 237:2	330:11,22 331:2
35:10,20	146:9,19	240:22 243:3	335:2,6
36:4,11,20	147:4,6,8 148:4	245:8,17	336:4,8,14
38:1,9	149:5,6,7,8	246:21,22	337:12,22
39:2,6,8,22 40:8	150:7,8	247:19	338:1,10,12
41:22	152:13,15	249:13,14	341:1 342:9
42:10,11,19	154:4,9,11	250:16,18	351:19 353:7
44:15 45:6,16	155:2,5 156:5	251:3,22 252:17	354:13 360:18
49:6,14 52:3,18	157:5,12	253:15,21	362:11 363:3,12
53:6 57:19	158:6,8,12,14	254:3,4,6,8,11,1	•
65:18,21	159:1,7,9,12,17	3 255:1	fiduciary-making
66:12,17	160:6 161:2	258:7,14,21	82:18
67:3,16,22	164:3,16,22	259:11	fiduciary's 20:3
68:11,14,19,20	165:2,4	261:15,16,22	285:16 286:16
69:3	166:18,20	262:20 265:20	field 13:12 17:2
70:1,6,14,16	167:6,11,14	266:22	40:2 56:7 313:12
71:3,10,15,18,20	168:1,2,6,16	267:3,13,18	314:4 318:18
72:4,14,16,20	170:6 171:2,5,20	268:1 269:9,15	325:17 330:16
73:9,13 75:13	172:5,15	271:8 280:13,16	333:7
77:2,19 78:8	173:16,18	282:4,6 284:20	
80:4,20	174:6,14 175:12	285:1,2,10	fifth 14:7 153:8
	111.0,17113.12	202.1,2,10	

	1 46		
306:13	79:4 80:8,10,17	fine-tuning 35:17	210:22 219:11
fight 334:11	84:8 120:7,8	finish 163:4	229:6 232:16
_	121:20 123:5		235:14,21
figure 17:9 217:2	124:22 131:12	finite 344:9	242:14 243:8
221:8 240:4	132:6 135:9	FINRA 87:5 93:20	261:10 263:16
322:6	144:14,21 145:4	100:7 122:13	277:5 291:13
figured 105:20	146:7 169:16,22	132:7 198:8	300:7 304:1
238:18	172:17,19,20	277:9 363:22	308:15 309:5
filed 16:20 325:21	174:7,10 175:20	firm 40:20 41:21	325:2 336:14
	176:1 182:3,4	42:4 49:6 91:8	339:18 345:18
final 11:22 18:19	186:17 192:15	147:17 154:22	354:4,17 367:9
20:22 23:8 25:5	198:18 201:15	155:1,4 159:6	369:5 371:15
28:4 44:8 73:16	233:18 238:7	195:9 199:12	fiscal 368:14
82:22 201:2	243:5 245:19	218:14 233:16	
204:16 205:11	247:21 254:20	234:13 235:5	fit 227:3
241:6 242:21	255:4,11	234:13 233:3	five 13:16 191:14
256:22 265:11	257:10,12	273:9,10 293:4	192:2 201:12
283:11 285:20	258:13,15	338:8 340:12,13	221:6 232:3
286:20 297:15	259:3,4,14,17	372:10	263:8 300:5
303:16,18 314:5	260:5 263:17		320:4 355:10,12
342:18	265:4,6,13,18	firms 107:18 109:2	366:20 369:17
finalizing 200:22	285:15,21 291:5	138:8 198:8	five-part 7:20
306:4	292:8	232:3,20 257:21	158:13 167:1
finally 4:11 23:6	293:8,10,16,18,2	281:16 332:21	185:1 225:22
29:20 36:12	2 303:7 304:5	333:3,5 336:21	235:20 327:5
73:15 79:9 81:7	305:13 316:8	343:10 352:5	356:3
82:15 93:12	330:3	firm's 70:2,4 294:2	
132:14 165:10	335:8,17,22	first 3:18 5:6 8:1	fix 116:15 117:5
193:21 206:14	340:12 342:1,7	12:7 13:17 23:10	207:18
307:3 342:10	343:7,10 345:11	32:4 40:19 52:22	fixed 90:17,20
345:9 347:19	346:22 347:1	61:3 63:4 64:1,9	91:5 92:22 105:4
	348:11 351:22	75:16,18 79:16	107:5,10 111:20
finance 175:17	355:9 360:15	81:1 118:22	112:16 118:8
252:3	371:4	123:6 124:11	119:6 194:21
financial 9:16	financially 17:21	128:4 140:13,18	197:18 224:1
15:22 17:15	225:3 374:12	148:5,14	237:21 260:15
31:3,15,21		151:5,16 160:16	298:21
32:2,4,8,22	finding 150:6	165:22 167:9	flat 54:13 181:21
33:17 36:16,22	289:3 349:4	176:8 177:9	222:19 237:13
40:11 46:9 51:13	finds 142:22	180:6 183:15	260:11 276:22
61:17,21 66:8	fine 64:10 74:17	189:14 190:19	
67:4,7 71:14	185:7 359:11	192:5 194:12	flexibility 301:21
72:22 78:17,22	363:10	192.3 194.12	302:4 331:21
,	303.10	175.15 200.1	

			1
355:17	foregoing 374:3,4	347:11	351:8 364:15
flexing 221:18	foremost 40:19	forward 7:5 52:14	freedom 344:17
flip 236:15	61:3 63:4	101:18	free-range 64:11
flow 221:1	forever 338:17	117:13,19 137:21 151:1	frequency 134:3
fluctuation 241:12	362:16	161:15,20	205:12 237:19
	forfeited 312:11	162:2,6 188:16	347:15
focus 76:19 81:10 89:21 110:9	Forgive 334:10	197:9 211:4	frequent 111:16
140:11 190:19	form 21:12 50:11	213:22 223:13	frequently 24:22
191:13 192:3	55:15 77:2 92:11	273:1 312:21	197:21 198:9
257:22 278:7	108:1 137:9	355:16 357:1	204:21 239:19
290:1 325:11	196:11 202:12	foster 140:8	283:22
345:11 354:17	206:11 218:15	146:11	fretting 148:21
370:12	244:7 249:21 276:6 296:16	foundation 56:8	frightening 150:9
focused 103:9	317:5 327:14	fourth 14:4 75:7	155:11
117:8 253:11,12 261:8 313:4	341:18 344:19	152:3 193:16	fringe 48:11
329:2 346:3	362:5 363:2	264:13 305:7	front 112:21 183:4
	formal 68:16	340:6	228:18,19 263:8
focusing 9:1 271:18	76:17 350:3	fractional 332:14	278:20 362:2
	formally 332:20	366:12	Frost 224:9
foie 64:16 101:3	333:1	frame 150:1,11	fulfill 27:8
folks 45:7 49:21	format 112:1	360:8	
116:5 138:12 163:8 165:5	Formed 248:14	framework 330:9	full 3:4 68:4 113:9 129:10 138:1
209:10 229:7		352:20 353:18 365:7	152:10 161:17
232:22 270:16	former 262:9		174:17 192:1
323:22 363:21	formerly 88:12	frameworks 189:21	194:21 219:6
364:1	forms 145:18		259:8 342:15
follow-up 59:21	146:4 292:4	FRANCIS 1:10	fully 3:12 38:9
104:17 128:14	296:4	Frank 193:17	75:16 141:6
food 64:15	formula 111:12	frankly 70:15	195:16 242:9
force 163:5 198:14	forth 124:17	136:18 264:22	function 39:22
forced 243:19	142:17 143:5	323:19 355:11	40:7 173:13
263:3 275:16	163:2 187:2	358:6 360:8 361:6 366:22	203:8 362:5
302:11,19	219:4,13,18 221:4 224:8	367:10	functional 39:5,20
forces 205:20	239:6,18 255:5	Fred 4:22	204:2 228:8 337:22
forcing 29:16	321:15		
350:12	Fortune 32:20	free 198:19 212:19	functioning 53:15
forecasts 286:7	forums 215:3	214:9 333:5 345:13 348:3	205:9
101 Clasts 200./	101 ums 213.3	JTJ.1J JTU.J	functions 23:22

	<u> </u>		
29:15 49:16	244:3,5,12	79:4 81:8 112:16	152:7 276:3
154:1 159:21	245:18 253:11	132:3 133:15	315:5 326:15
160:1,4 204:2	259:10 260:12	211:13 247:16	327:4 359:11
fund 25:1,6	261:12,13,14,20	255:13	365:15 370:15
26:2,19 49:10	262:2 263:1	285:15,21	371:10
50:22 51:1,19	264:2,5 298:20	299:18 301:9	giant 219:18
52:2,13,14 61:19	301:2 313:8,13	324:15 332:5	Č .
78:7,20 79:21	318:22 344:17	336:19 368:20	Gila 64:16
80:1,2 92:4	funnier 148:13	generality 29:14	given 8:14 14:6,17
106:3 111:15	funny 232:9	generalized 66:8	19:2,19 20:19
114:2,3 143:10	•		35:1 51:22 52:20
148:17	furnish 123:8	generally 2:21	53:2,4,8 59:15
151:5,6,8,16,17	furnishing 18:22	15:18 16:10	67:8 74:3 95:15
164:10,12,15	Furthermore	23:16 25:9 41:16	115:18 132:2,18
179:9 221:1	241:22 243:16	45:13 48:2 52:9	146:4 171:19
224:11 228:22	263:13	60:12 61:2	190:3 197:13
229:8 231:19		106:18 135:21	227:19 230:8
238:5,20 262:12	fuss 112:3	175:10 183:3	234:9 256:12
285:11 286:5	fussed 112:8	192:11 195:3	269:18,19
299:21 318:13	future 21:10 82:15	200:4 224:4	270:17 279:14
319:11 337:4,5	146:4 176:1	239:9 261:13	312:9 316:19
339:21,22 340:3	186:3,4 244:7,19	263:10,14	317:1 327:11
344:19 362:18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	287:21 288:16	328:6,8 329:11
372:10	futures 89:5,9	321:22 325:12	342:5,15 353:1
fundamental	FX 92:4	333:19 367:11 368:20	367:7,15 369:7
144:18 249:15			giver 162:1
fundamentally	G	generate 105:13	gives 25:7 72:8,14
181:10 238:22	gain 45:8	341:20 351:14	127:22 170:18
	Ŭ.	370:9	177:16 337:17
fund-based 261:12	game 340:4	generated 237:11	giving 21:15 43:6
funded 262:8,10	GAO 54:1,6,21,22	generation 27:19	49:3,9 67:15
funds 16:1,2 25:14	129:2 202:10	239:12 344:8	69:22 105:11,12
50:13,21 52:1,12	gap 217:4 364:6		121:1 156:13
53:10 59:8	gaps 46:8	generic 33:22	163:21
60:9,15 79:12	0 1	229:14 250:7	169:9,10,11,13,1
81:6 92:4	gather 104:5,6	271:13 318:16	6,21 172:22
111:15,17 115:7	335:10	generically 105:8	181:12 206:6
132:13 146:4	gazillion 217:9	genuine 218:5	267:2 269:14
151:9 191:6	gee 148:20 171:6	336:5	318:10 333:6
195:1 204:20	S	gets 99:18 226:11	glaze 65:7
229:15,16,19,21	general 22:9 28:10 31:2 34:3 38:1	0	
230:2,7,8 242:19		getting 55:19 96:3	glide 268:11
	47:20 78:17,22	122:1 150:7	

goal 5:19 6:1 40:1	64:16	guaranteed 239:17	guy 122:3
49:8 61:5 213:17	gratuitous 360:7	257:15 263:22	152:15,20
247:20 317:22	gravity 312:9	264:2,12	guys 46:1 150:11
goals 15:1 121:2	· ·	guard 175:15	230:5 232:11
248:2 264:6	great 59:14 75:6	guess 54:4 55:15	236:17 274:19
293:16 298:15	85:7 162:2 173:8	57:20 60:4 62:7	281:5 308:16
302:22 344:6	176:8 177:9	95:4 98:7 99:9	334:9,10 359:3
346:3 352:13	178:6 179:9 208:17 209:1	111:2,6 114:9,17	364:5 368:2
353:20	218:10 254:19	115:19 117:7	
gold 337:1	260:17 280:5,15	118:6 120:2	H
Goldbrum 281:4	333:8	121:15 123:6	H.R 148:19 149:1
299:16,17,18		125:4 128:13	half 96:9 180:15
308:20 312:20	greater 46:2 76:6	167:3,6 168:9	219:22 347:11
313:4 318:7,14	77:13 85:2,8	172:10 175:7	
319:18 321:1,18	140:9 141:9,15	180:12 181:17	halfway 309:2
	146:11 147:8 165:19 166:11	221:13,22 280:6	hall 149:10
gone 148:17 223:22 280:17	198:16 242:4	317:16 320:18	hampered 333:13
	255:18 280:20	321:10 322:13	367:5
goose 64:21	305:3 307:22	334:22 359:6	hand 7:2,8 73:10
gotten 184:22		365:19 371:12	130:12 146:11
governed 91:13	greatly 90:2	guidance 9:7 23:7	261:19
	117:18 246:10	44:10,14 49:3,4	
governing 23:7	305:19	51:5 106:20	handful 145:3
131:14 305:22	Great-West 75:6	175:19,20	handling 319:5
335:6 352:20	groping 173:10	184:19 201:4	happen 5:7 216:19
government	grounds 304:21	241:18 242:6	257:7 321:2
3:8,11,15 135:19		253:4 256:6	332:19
governments	group 81:12 205:5	260:10 280:19	happens 141:22
198:3	206:22 208:12	300:12 301:18	223:18 238:12
Graff 324:22	231:4 270:14	307:7 308:7	259:1 262:3
325:2,3,5 334:18	272:14 273:3 287:13 318:21	320:9 343:7,20 345:21 347:22	
357:11,14,16,22	349:2	348:2,12,22	happy 6:6 84:1
358:3,22 360:10		349:3,5,7 350:19	94:1 97:1 117:21 212:1 257:2
363:17 365:5,20	groups 172:14	351:9 353:8	293:13 299:13
366:2,5,7 367:20	306:3 307:13		334:16 354:1
grant 115:10,18	growing 353:14	guide 164:1	
116:6	grows 171:10	guidelines 27:18	harbor 113:16
	S	40:6 254:22	255:3,5 303:3,18
granted 127:16	growth 17:5 36:17 257:14	guiding 41:6 300:5	317:4,21
gras 101:3		305:7 306:13	hard 5:7 64:21
gras-encrusted	guarantee 213:13	guns 334:9,10	174:18 280:12
Ŭ		5 uns 33 1.7,10	296:20 359:18

	1 ag		
366:8	124:3,6 168:8	11:5,12,16 12:12	helped 350:10
harder 79:1	172:8 175:2,5	75:2,15 84:10	helpful 84:11
	177:13 181:3	109:15 148:1	184:19 190:10
hardship 24:10	182:6 229:4	162:5 184:2	218:9 251:15
hard-to-value	230:13,21	248:10 288:12	255:10 256:5
28:19 81:10	231:16,22	299:12 334:21	276:10
111:8	314:18 317:2,15	368:10 374:6,9	helping 42:1 51:1
hardware	318:2,7 319:16	hearings 256:17	85:18 153:5
152:5,18 153:6	320:17 370:11 373:1	heart 121:12 122:4	164:11 263:22
harm 55:3	haven't 11:8	heavier 268:15	307:17 318:17
303:20,21 304:8	223:17,18 275:9	heaviest 335:4	327:1 350:7
367:17	·		351:3
Harman 147:18	having 23:11 47:10 49:7 98:13	hedges 239:5	helps 139:21 147:6
harmful 154:15,17	108:4 120:21,22	heinous 176:16	hence 125:16
304:12	121:3 154:14	held 7:21 17:6,8,9	hereby 374:3
harmonization	168:3 181:17	39:22 40:7 72:2	here's 149:17
212:17 213:18	270:7 280:1	81:11 95:15	152:10 156:2
225:1 256:2	291:7 354:19	141:20 142:12	
308:18	368:13	163:22 188:10	hereto 374:11
harmonize 5:19	he/she 145:6	250:16 287:6 343:16	he's 6:16,18
210:21 213:17	head 110:14,16		69:17,20 71:16
280:13	· ·	he'll 6:11	172:17
harmonized 298:7	headed 6:15 337:2	help 33:14 34:8,10	Hewitt 240:15
305:8,21 308:16	heading 349:21	58:17,19 59:9	241:4 245:20
ĺ	health 186:10	83:22 88:4 104:1	274:13
harmonizing	308:6 349:18	128:12 140:10	Hewitt's 240:11
153:17 211:5	350:8,17	142:14 144:22	
harsh 328:22	healthy 161:10	150:10 164:14	hey 96:8 127:18
360:11	, and the second	221:16 230:12	149:2 150:18
hat 203:20	hear 12:13 213:20	240:5 253:14	152:6 222:16
hats 203:19	310:15	254:20 256:7	238:18
	heard 11:18 53:17	259:3,22 261:6,7	Hi 325:3
Hauser 4:19 46:20	151:13 228:20	263:12 266:18	hid 158:12
47:8 48:13 49:19	253:7 256:6,20	284:7,13 301:1	
50:15 51:16	267:11 306:9	306:5 307:14	hidden 73:3,4
110:19,20	327:5 359:2	314:4 319:9,14	high 13:3 36:19
112:9,18 114:8	361:17	320:6 336:10	44:2 45:20 69:19
117:6 118:5	hearing 1:3	340:12 344:22	72:11 132:4
119:2 120:2	2:5,10,13,19,22	345:5 347:7	165:13 198:13
121:10 122:19	3:17 4:4,5,11,12	348:8 350:4,5,20	301:13 333:20
123:2,10,13,19	5:5,7,10 10:10	351:12,13	346:13 370:1
	2.2,7,10 10.10		

		ı	
higher 36:16 91:16	hits 64:11	horrendous	52:13 83:17
132:4 133:3	Hm-mmm 39:14	176:16	105:2 284:10
139:13,14	122:19	host 241:20	304:8 320:4
141:13 142:5		hosted 347:10	357:1
146:15 183:9	hodge-podge 332:12		identify 3:19 208:7
198:12 212:20		house 221:8	253:16 368:17
213:2 242:2 261:14 263:7	hold 66:12 84:10	household 278:1	idly 71:22
276:1	90:7,14,16 95:7 139:15 259:6	households	ignore 92:12,13,19
302:13,14,20	263:5 297:14	90:12,14 107:22	93:3,6,12
304:3 342:4	319:10 369:22	259:16 331:16	, , ,
		Hueler 163:12	ignoring 92:16
highest 149:8 212:20 233:3	holder 181:12		I'll 52:8 55:9 124:4
335:2	holders 82:16	huge 96:18 97:11 106:4 117:12	128:13 155:3
	90:1,10 190:17	162:20	160:12 175:3
highlight 199:17	331:20		176:5
261:9	holding 10:4,10	hundred 48:14	208:9,15,22
highlights 264:13	47:2 71:9 74:5	hundreds 40:17	219:1 237:6
351:6	75:15 148:1	49:1 92:19	249:3 276:15
highly 82:20	198:4 228:2	144:20 281:16	354:3
239:22	263:2,6 264:5	hypothetical	ill-advised 355:11
high-quality 32:6	299:12 334:21	125:21 126:17	illegitimate 105:21
	holds 57:21 119:5	145:18	illustrate 151:4
hindsight 292:2	262:6 345:15		
305:3	hone 354:11		illustrated 132:6
hire 42:7 141:4	honest 70:22	IB-96-1 308:7	illustrates 210:21
236:11	71:1,5 122:4	I'd 4:15 5:6 64:19	341:8
302:16,19	ŕ	94:5 114:9	I'm 2:2 6:6
304:14	honestly 372:20	117:21 118:5	12:10,17,19,20
hired 71:16 141:11	hook 234:10	156:14 174:19	19:6 22:8,10
hires 8:10 72:5	hope 18:20 45:9	182:18 191:2	31:2 39:2,19
177:1	70:22 84:10	236:15 295:22	42:4 47:14 54:4
hiring 140:7	87:11 186:22	331:6	55:7 56:18
O	214:3 323:5	idea 145:12 161:16	57:2,18 63:18
historical 152:11	hopeful 288:12	216:5 264:18	75:3,5 84:6
190:8 318:20	•	278:4,11 280:2	94:10 96:7 98:17
historically 163:8	hopefully 117:4	326:8 327:10	101:1,3,9 106:8
280:10	hopes 37:13	341:12 357:20	122:5 125:5
history 36:17	hoping 265:4	359:20 368:12	127:3,6,9,14,18,
179:9	277:15 278:15	ideas 89:3 262:5	19 128:3,4,10 138:6
hit 155:6			147:17,18,21
mit 133.0	horizons 345:19	identified 35:17	147.17,16,21
			170.11 177.4

	1 ag		
150:18,19	impartial 17:18	328:6	imposing 207:1
152:3,5 153:14	19:15 20:1 22:16	implicit 116:1	imposition 197:5
154:20 155:13	24:14 34:22	170:2	•
156:3,15,17	35:3,12 66:2	implies 207.12	impossibility 341:3
160:6 167:11,16	67:9 72:19,21	implies 207:12	341.3
170:7 171:7	73:3 74:15	importance 3:3	impossible 36:19
172:22 173:8,17	144:16,19	8:22 153:10	77:3 89:17
174:14,15	145:16 205:19	195:19 196:3	115:22 190:7
175:5,16 176:5	254:14 282:3	290:2 301:18	215:19
177:22	290:21 293:7	353:1	impressive 308:17
178:8,15,21	294:2 295:14	important 8:16	-
179:1	296:6,11 316:7	10:4,7 17:5	improper 13:9
181:3,17,19,21	329:13 331:2	31:13 32:13 46:4	improperly 13:17
198:20 199:17	339:17 360:19	67:22 72:10	improve 46:10
322:11 368:1	361:4 363:8	74:19 75:16	148:4 338:20
imagine 346:20	impartiality 10:15	81:19 89:19	
368:14	139:2 288:6	91:11 131:5	improved 147:11 161:11
immediate 4:19	impede 335:7	133:8 153:5	
349:3		161:14 163:15	improves 349:5
	impeded 14:22	186:16 202:9	improving 31:6
immediately	imperative 131:13	244:17 248:10	161:7
323:18	impermissible	249:10 255:14	imprudent 228:4
impact 17:3 23:11	312:3	256:12 258:16	229:3
56:10 84:12		266:20 270:4	
89:12 90:4	impinges 290:16	283:22 307:19	inaccurate 206:4
136:21 186:3	implement 29:10	309:21 311:20	inactive 163:6
190:13,15	79:21	325:10,15	inadequate 86:7
197:17 210:8,9	implementation	328:12,16 329:9	135:21 187:16
216:14 218:3	190:1,8 196:7	331:14 332:7	279:18
258:1,3,10 267:1	215:20	351:1,2 358:12	
286:9,15 288:13		361:7,14 364:5,9	inadvertent 49:16
297:9,17 305:12	implemented	369:11,14 370:7	inadvertently 49:5
306:15	335:20	importantly 65:19	81:20 191:5
impacted 261:2	implementing	87:16 90:2 135:7	207:22
impacts 55:2	195:21	197:13 250:8	inappropriate
190:20 291:11	implicate 87:9	346:13	206:4 242:5
328:9	212:5	impose 116:4	246:15 293:10
		-	
impair 176:14	implicated 171:16	imposed 9:21	inaudible 61:2
impaired 177:5	implication 108:6	290:22	224:18 230:22
impairing 198:2	215:11	imposes 84:15	271:5 277:19
	implications 51:8	92:8	incentive 133:1
imparted 24:20	60:13,18 126:7		

	ı ag	-	
238:7 239:1	inclusion 136:20	349:7 357:21	14:11 146:4
incentives 18:10	184:13 232:2	increases 30:15	197:1 276:5
73:1 265:6	inclusive 142:18	increasing 45:20	indirectly 106:3
incentivize 372:19	246:6	76:4 88:5	116:20 133:21
include 17:10	income 15:8 21:12	incredible 207:16	individual 15:20
26:19,20 38:7	52:22 90:17,20		17:10 18:12
79:5 92:3,7	91:5 93:1	incumbent	19:19 34:22 35:7
144:20 145:2,12	107:5,10 118:8	308:2,10	40:14,21 43:10
,	119:6 186:7	incur 93:4	49:8,17 53:3
185:15,18	194:21 197:18		55:20,21 60:8
192:20 196:2	224:1 237:22	indeed 20:7 67:12	62:20 63:1 66:14
237:1 241:6	240:20 255:16	71:6 74:9 96:18	69:6 70:8 73:14
242:12,20 246:7	257:15 263:7,22	336:20	78:14 83:11
248:3,18 252:21	264:2,12	independent	95:16 105:11
254:7,8 267:14	284:6,14 345:3,6	32:3,6 57:19	121:2 132:9
273:4 283:16	348:1,14	58:5 70:13	137:12,15 183:2
286:20 295:4	350:3,5,22	131:13 138:10	184:4 188:22
351:6	351:5,11,14	143:6 147:2	202:1 236:21
included 55:17	352:9,14	166:5 187:9	241:19 242:1
77:15 123:5	369:4,6,11 370:9	198:5 240:17	247:3 260:19
130:10 216:15	· · ·	253:10 254:11	277:8 289:16
249:4 303:2	income-plus 33:6	267:12,18 269:3	295:1 296:11,14
313:6 372:8	incompatible	292:17 311:4	303:13 338:13
includes 33:6	203:6	325:7,8 345:10	341:6 360:20
207:22 232:4	incomprehensible	independently	362:20 363:6
244:6 300:15	180:10	28:21 71:13	individualized 8:6
351:8	inconsistencies	independents	14:4,19
including 8:21	259:22 328:5	324:14	18:2,6,8,18
9:10 15:21 23:17			26:1,6,12,17
32:19	inconsistency	indeterminate	31:9 42:18
50:10,12,15 51:3	169:4 245:8	190:5	43:5,13,17
55:20 74:4 129:3	inconsistent 70:14	indicated 146:21	47:13,14,18 49:9
149:19 186:7	135:21 245:14	194:5 323:6	67:15,18 68:10
219:3 246:17	increase 9:13	326:12 354:9	69:5,11,17 70:5
247:12 249:5	29:18 36:14 72:4	indicates 91:16	78:2,11 96:14
251:12 252:18	82:13 259:20		97:2 98:12,16
257:19 258:12	347:21 348:19	indicating 329:6	134:7 154:22
259:9 283:12		indication 294:15	249:19 250:10
289:14 298:19	increased 8:21	299:8	252:10,14
299:21 303:17	16:6 138:20	indicators 45:22	253:12 271:15
306:1 308:10	288:3 291:8 305:4 321:7	indifferent 181:20	336:16
333:10 341:7	346:16 347:9,15		individuals 56:6
	570.10 577.7,15	indirect 7:16	

ı	1 46		
107:19 132:2	372:13	339:1 342:8	inquire 100:1
142:12 144:11	information 10:17	357:17 361:8,20	inquiries 347:5,20
157:1 163:22	23:5,11,17,20	informational	•
166:1 184:16	24:3,7	96:16 283:1	inquiry 284:5
187:7 237:1	26:5,7,14,17,18		290:6
263:11 265:15	27:11,22 28:2	informed 76:11	inside 270:2,10,11
275:14 289:15	33:11,21 35:16	83:6 129:19,22	324:9
291:12 297:10	38:15 41:5,21	241:22 242:9	insight 347:15
328:9 338:4	42:1 44:11,13	284:14 319:22	S
343:9	48:4 52:7,11	327:8 359:20	insist 70:12
individual's	53:12 55:19	informing 65:22	insisted 99:11
282:16	56:20 57:6 76:10	informs 133:17	instance 40:10
industries 257:18	77:17 78:17,22	ING 289:7	94:22 95:6 107:5
286:15 372:8	79:5,19 83:6,8		119:8 145:1
	88:8 95:2 96:13	inherent 296:18	188:14 265:18
industry 23:11	99:12,14 113:22	inherently 82:17	267:12 299:5
31:16 32:8 33:19	120:9 128:11	inhibit 174:22	328:8
52:16 56:2 59:15	143:22 148:10		instances 55:15
76:3 84:8 88:21	162:1,2 175:1	inhibiting	107:3 143:9
131:14 132:19	176:3 191:20	148:9,10	144:8,13 302:9
142:6 172:14	192:21	initial 164:11	329:8 341:22
196:15 209:3	193:2,4,12,18	199:19 216:22	
217:13 247:22	201:19	252:21 294:21	instead 69:1 203:8
256:11 257:21	202:13,19 205:1	295:21	263:3,7 308:6
275:18 289:12	206:11 207:2		Institute 257:13
299:19 320:16	212:6 218:8	initiated 349:11	299:19 300:3
332:20 334:6	230:2,3 233:11	initiative 22:3	307:4 308:12
363:22 367:22	234:1 235:4	103:7,10 184:9	
industry-wide	247:17 252:17	334:11 351:8	instituted 354:15
197:2	253:4,14 255:6	initiatives 195:17	institution 51:14
inevitable 236:19	259:7 266:2	220:11 249:1	61:18,21 225:3
	268:2,4 271:13	256:3 281:18	226:20 233:18
inexpensive	280:1,2	305:9	institutional 93:11
278:13	283:19,22		190:20 192:9
inferences 3:13	284:7,12	innovate 349:12	223:19 224:22
inferior 214:2	285:15,22 286:1	innovation 59:17	248:13,18 273:7
	288:10 291:8	innovative 350:19	ŕ
inflation 241:11	293:20 294:6		institutions 195:8
350:8	295:4 300:22	in-plan 366:21	201:15 292:9
influence 15:5	301:11	input 11:12 12:4	335:22 338:3
255:18 286:16	313:9,12,20	143:15 211:3	343:9
296:4 307:17,22	314:3 318:11,17	273:13 335:11	instructed 60:6
inform 35:22	321:3,22 330:1		instructional 97:7
11101 III 33.22	L		

	rage		
instruments 59:8	intent 13:10 62:22	316:8 329:3,5	240:2
	72:18,21 78:3,4	337:1 342:17	
insulated 171:13	98:1 110:13	349:18 350:13	interpret 56:20
insurance	204:10 335:20	359:14,15 360:1	124:10 126:10
54:12,17 75:7		365:3 366:13	139:9
81:9,12,13,14	intention 39:17		interpretation
92:16 111:2,18	40:3 80:15	interested 2:15	21:14 73:18
112:6	168:22	3:12 20:9 62:4	131:22 286:21
122:14,15,20	intentions 88:9	96:7 103:21	
150:7,9		290:3 342:14	Interpretations
163:10,13	interact 122:8	374:12	5:2 6:16
183:19 199:15	189:21 191:16	interesting 111:13	interpreting 25:16
208:19 233:7	337:17 344:15	177:19 271:10	159:5
257:19 259:2	interacting 335:22	367:21	interpretive 33:12
272:6 273:8	interaction 93:20		255:8 283:6
277:9 289:7,12	95:22 96:15	Interestingly	284:11
292:17,18,20	99:16 337:18	330:8	
299:22	345:12	interests 19:12,13	inter-related
311:1,21,22	362:15,18	20:6 21:7 22:17	244:17
311:1,21,22	ĺ l	31:12 34:20	intersect 5:16
	interactions	63:20 66:1	
insured	203:15 335:8,17	115:11,13	intersection
257:12,13,17	336:21 337:9	121:12 122:4	209:21
insurers 289:9	interacts 338:8	133:12 138:11	intrigued 309:6
292:9		174:7 180:19	364:12 370:11
intellectually	inter-agency 368:19	192:15 205:17	introduce 4:15
69:21		214:21 299:20	264:17 320:22
	interest 10:6 14:1	307:5 339:15	
intelligently	15:7 21:17 31:14	364:13,20	introduced 143:10
175:18	62:2 66:16	365:12 367:2	introducing 2:10
intend 11:3 29:11	67:4,8 80:17	interfere 66:22	143:22
58:6 95:18	102:20,21		introduction 9:11
286:18	118:11 126:7	interferes 291:2	150:22 161:14
intended 30:12	131:11 144:9	interim 82:22	351:11
40:4,7 41:2 58:8	146:7 174:10	103:16	introductory 2:11
76:21 77:5 88:21	175:21 182:3,4	intermediary	•
96:12 171:3	186:18 205:17	343:10	Intuitively 142:8
254:13 269:4	219:6 243:5		invest 21:4 49:10
303:14	245:20 252:6,19	internal 9:22	50:3 105:17
	261:22 290:19	196:19 199:21	137:10 164:18
intending 314:21	293:3,5,8,10,11,	224:17 290:12	175:18 181:13
intends 203:14	12,18 294:1,19	internally 310:8	185:20 244:8
intensive 351:7	299:8 303:8	interplay 195:16	245:6,7 262:2
1110115110 331.1	307:16 312:4	21101 play 175.10	278:22 282:15

	1 46		
353:14,20	49:15 50:7,17,21	221:3 226:12,21	341:9 343:6
invested 50:22	51:19 54:2 56:15	227:22 228:14	344:18 345:3,16
201:8 245:2,21	65:1,6 66:7	241:2 242:13	347:4 349:10
263:20 282:12	67:16,18,20	243:10,11,13,15	351:13,20
309:10 344:4	68:3,6 69:1	244:18	352:16,17,21,22
346:4,11,14	72:16 73:21	245:1,10,13,19	353:7 354:9,21
352:2	74:2,8,16 76:8	246:2,6 247:3,13	355:4,18
	77:19 79:12,13	248:3,13,18	356:9,11,16
investible 261:4	80:4 81:6,13	250:11,12,18	359:22 360:20
investigate 158:9	82:9 83:4	251:1,6,14	361:3 363:8
investigation	85:11,22	253:2,9,17	366:20,21
166:19 287:19	86:16,18 88:8,22	254:7,15 255:12	investments 13:12
	89:3,8 91:17	257:20 258:8	21:6 25:18
investigations	95:4 107:17	261:6,12,16,17	26:3,16 51:10
39:7	111:14 120:16	262:5 266:21	60:16 65:16
investing 243:14	125:2,16	267:20 272:5	74:19,20 77:17
278:5 332:14	131:9,10,15	273:7 275:21	78:18 79:9
334:4 367:2	132:2,9 133:20	282:13,20	90:13,14 120:12
investment 1:4 2:7	134:13,18	284:21 285:11	131:19 132:10
	135:6,14 136:5,7	286:5 289:13	133:4 134:15,20
7:13,21	137:11	290:14	135:12 144:14
8:2,5,10,12,22	138:12,13,19	291:2,8,22	163:1 171:8
9:2,14,17 10:20 13:7	140:20,22 141:1	292:19	173:16 184:16
	142:3 144:17	293:17,18	197:19 198:4
14:1,4,8,10,15,1 8,21	145:3,5 148:10	295:1,2,3,9,12,1	202:5 242:18
15:2,4,12,17,20	149:13,20 150:2	5,18	243:4,10,20,21
16:5 17:4,15,18	152:9 157:8	298:2,3,5,19	244:2,3 259:19
18:1,10,17	162:17 164:22	299:22 300:21	260:6,20
	171:19	301:1,7,8 302:9	263:5,13 276:4
19:1,2,5,7,15 21:1,10,19 23:18	176:17,18,20,21	303:13,15	277:8 286:17
25:1,7,13,15	177:1,3,6	309:11 316:7	288:1 294:13
26:10,22	184:5,12,17	319:17,19	295:6,7,10,11
27:16,18,19	185:3,5,10,14,19	325:13	298:21 323:9
28:6,13,20	,22 186:4,5,18	326:4,13,16,18	329:19 331:12
30:1,18 31:9,17	187:17 188:5	327:3,10,13	335:9 336:11,20
32:3,7	189:7 191:9	329:15,16 330:4	339:2,5 340:14
33:1,2,5,11,13,1	192:6,10 193:8	331:3,10	342:6 343:5
4,18 34:6,7,9	194:15 195:5,7,9	333:10,19	344:21
36:9,20 37:12	199:14,15,21	335:19	355:14,15
41:19 42:7,17,21	200:18,21	336:7,18,19	360:22 369:19
43:3,5,8,15	201:9,11 203:11	337:4,7,13,14	
44:6,10,20,21	204:22 205:19	338:5,14	investor 20:5
45:5,7 47:3 48:6	207:16	339:1,10,17	41:18 90:16
75.5,7 77.5 70.0	208:18,19 210:8	340:10,15,19	120:6 175:17

	1 46		
181:13 260:2	354:7	53:2 58:13 76:14	153:8 154:10,19
261:19 262:1	involves 201:21	82:17,18,22	162:21 163:15
343:17		85:13 86:9 90:7	170:5,17 171:22
344:10,14,20	involving 54:9	93:4 97:16,19	190:19 202:22
345:15	94:20 111:5	106:16 115:5	204:13 206:19
347:10,12,15,17	116:5	124:9 194:17	221:20 222:2
348:5 349:5,13	IRA 9:15,17	224:19 259:16	227:15 229:19
351:7 352:15	50:14,16 51:13	261:2 266:14	238:11 274:17
353:4,10	53:3 58:1,21	290:6 292:7	280:19 308:6
investors 9:15	60:19,20	297:6,13 298:13	327:19 342:12
32:22 33:15	61:1,16,22 82:16	325:16	354:18 357:1
46:11 118:21	83:9,16 84:19	331:7,8,14,16,18	362:1,4 363:19
121:4,10,16,17	90:1 92:12 97:14	332:5,6,10,14,16	367:9 368:19
126:19 179:10	101:21 102:3	,19	issued 10:9 15:20
260:17,18,20	110:11 114:9	333:5,11,18,22	54:1 56:13 57:17
267:9,11,15	117:21 119:4	334:4,8,15 339:8	184:7 204:6
336:3 341:15,19	124:17 181:11	340:7 341:16	260:9 297:12
342:4 343:20,22	190:17 224:18	343:11 352:3,7	298:4 309:16
344:4,7,20	258:3 259:13,19	353:15 369:2	310:20 327:20
345:1,13,18	260:13	IRI 257:16	332:13
346:21	261:1,5,11	ironic 74:9 198:7	issues 5:16,19
347:7,8,11 349:2	262:7,14,19		11:14 18:1 35:17
350:15,20 351:3	263:3 264:11	Ironically 68:13	40:15 67:6 69:8
352:11,19	265:16,22 266:7	irrespective	76:18 94:20
353:2,8,11,19	268:19,20	260:16 363:9	108:20 112:5
369:7 370:21	280:10,14 291:7	irreversible	131:5 138:17
invests 277:8	297:7,16	137:19	148:11 150:1,11
	331:12,20,21,22		155:8,9 160:19
invitation 2:15,17	332:11 333:14	island 220:21	168:12 170:16
invite 362:9	334:7,12 336:3 337:2 338:16	isn't 6:18 47:4	189:5 200:16
invites 362:11	341:15,19,20	115:22 118:13	206:15,22
inviting 299:12	342:2,4,5,6	122:6 128:1	255:13 256:12
Ü	343:13 352:18	175:10 179:3,6	272:7 296:17
invoke 247:18	357:12 365:17	209:6 211:13	304:8 305:16
involve 27:12,13	366:20,22	234:15 255:1	306:10,15
201:9 231:2,3	367:10,12 368:6	277:1 366:18	307:15 328:6
291:17 322:8	369:9	issuance 256:22	354:19 355:3
involved 56:9	IRA-based 332:3	issue 11:22 70:8	357:12 366:9
131:15 134:11		77:22 81:19	It'd 112:12
157:2 190:4	IRA-holders	118:9 119:9,10	items 103:11,14
273:10,11 295:3	209:22	146:9,10	104:1 118:1
323:8 332:16	IRAs 9:19 24:6	149:13,15 152:3	
		ŕ	it's 10:7 31:19

	rag	C 10	
35:14 38:4 41:2 44:21 53:3,15	286:5 308:17,20 312:18 313:10	joke 48:16 Journal 45:10	128:8,13 227:22 231:5
54:17,18 55:19	315:6 321:15	journalism 66:8	kitchen 64:20
57:3 59:21 61:10	322:2,7,8,10		knew 189:1 359:9
62:2 63:2 64:7,20 70:7	323:5,14,15 327:13	JP 22:9,22 30:20	
91:11 95:3 97:3	328:10,12	40:16 60:10,20 61:11 62:1	knowingly 16:14 141:11
100:5,6 101:6	336:13 342:19	99:11,19 153:4	
102:4,17 104:7	349:2 355:3,8,9	·	knowledge 193:18
112:4,7 113:7,22	356:6,8,14 357:7	judge 235:14,18	knowledgeable
120:16,22	360:7,11	judgment 21:4	20:13
123:11 124:5	361:14,16	111:10 336:1,12	known 16:22 19:9
125:21 126:8	364:4,8 365:10	jurisdiction 88:17	35:11 281:10
127:1,5 128:15	367:21	justification 15:13	335:3,4
129:12 131:18	369:11,14 370:7	131:20 264:9	Kornilova
139:17 140:4	371:19 372:14		374:2,17
141:8 142:18	I've 54:16 96:7	justify 85:5 265:1	Kreindler 240:8
143:1,7 145:17 146:18 147:5	101:4 103:1	juxtapose 321:13	248:8,10
151:14 152:21	120:3 148:15,21		267:7,16 268:17
154:4,12 162:20	151:13 155:13	K	269:1,7,21
168:6 169:2,15	160:5 175:19	Kansas 332:13	271:1,6,20,22
170:11	179:12	Karen 12:7 22:8	272:2,16,20
171:4,5,22		Karin 183:16,18	274:7,11
172:3,6 174:18	J	· ·	
177:19 179:2,7	January 2:14	Kelli 163:12	L
180:18 183:8,22	200:14 298:4	Ken 63:11 84:6	labeled 190:2
187:3,12 191:14	Jim 183:16 188:20	101:8	Labor 1:1,9 16:20
208:18 212:18	191:1 194:11	Kent 130:16	359:11
213:2 215:9,13	job 42:16 71:16	147:16 160:12	
216:6 217:5,19	178:5 202:12	166:14 188:22	lack 28:6 93:14 98:6,9 116:12
220:7,17	234:6 278:18	191:15 225:13	135:9 332:17
222:4,11,13,20 224:14,15	280:15 333:15	Keogh 297:16	357:8
226:12,18	340:12 359:11	Keoghs 261:3	
230:3,16,18	jobs 266:8 369:16	9	lady 99:11
231:17 232:9	Joe 4:20 175:2	key 197:18 231:8	laid 116:11 117:10
234:22 237:7	237:5	252:8 265:5 290:1	123:22
238:4,16 239:10	John 343:3		lambs 223:8
241:12 257:6		kick 5:5	landscape 15:12
269:14 271:13	join 6:6	kinds 45:12	349:19
272:17,18	joint 219:8 284:4	48:7,11 55:18	language 13:10
274:9,14 277:2	jointly 209:11	57:22 58:2	14:14 66:5 68:16
278:4,13 279:18	Jointy 207.11		17.17 00.3 00.10

77:21 78:3,11	later 79:22 104:18	layperson 330:20	276:3,4 334:9
104:4 112:2,8	147:19 167:15	lead 28:7 174:7	365:18 369:16
145:11,22	190:18 217:1	198:1 236:21	Lebowitz 2:2,3
168:22 188:7	225:18 226:14	240:12 298:7	12:6,18 22:7
228:13 285:4	250:14 262:18	312:19	30:21 37:6 59:20
324:5 341:16	281:19		61:10 62:7
large 36:21	laughter 7:1 37:15	leader 257:11	63:8,16 64:3
53:20,21 217:4,5	48:17 55:13	leaders 248:17	74:22 84:3 99:10
219:6,8 221:5	64:5,22 69:15	leading 32:19	109:6 110:4,19
241:16 253:6	75:4 94:13	343:5	130:3,13 138:3
268:6 275:14,15	147:20 156:16	leads 236:21	147:14 166:14
287:12	160:13 175:6		167:18 180:1,6,9
304:21,22	177:18 179:21	leakage	183:11,15
321:11	180:21 181:4	202:10,11,15,20	188:18 199:10
largely 17:2	launched 32:4	275:18 333:17	208:10 225:7
101:16	350:5	learned 198:18	234:15,21
		368:20	235:3,9,13,17
larger 350:16	law 7:10 77:20	learns 71:20	236:9,19 237:5
367:4 368:6	86:1 100:4		240:7 248:7
large-sized 240:16	147:17 149:9	least 14:21 18:14	257:4 267:6
largest 32:3,16	153:21 199:12 203:16	26:11 47:3 48:9	276:19
75:8 138:8	203.16 211:11,12 213:9	53:12 55:8	279:7,14,17,22
240:17	220:20	70:7,22 97:3	280:22 281:3
Larry 281:4	234:15,17	109:11,17	364:11
299:18	261:15 273:9	114:14 115:7	365:9,14,22
	288:22 335:3,4	117:8 118:12 119:21 149:12	366:3,6 367:19
LaRue 199:2	ŕ		368:22
last 10:9 16:6 33:7	laws 80:10 211:13	165:6,11 168:13 174:14 175:14	led 9:3 177:5
54:1 101:1 123:2	213:11,13,14	212:2 223:21	legal 13:11,20
155:6 165:18	261:1 298:1	236:22 250:3,10	16:7,10,12 80:12
166:11 169:8	338:2	256:21 279:18	138:16
175:8 179:11	lawsuit 229:2	303:22 309:20	169:9,10,11,13
187:1 188:1	234:22	315:1 357:6	170:18,22
219:21 220:3	lawyer 170:18	368:16	171:5,7,22 172:6
248:14	171:13		189:3 211:19
346:12,14,20		leave 12:14 60:15	212:21,22 220:1
347:5,10	lawyers 251:3,7	62:17 132:20	231:18 237:3
348:1,21 349:6	lawyer's 171:18	155:3 372:21	240:12 352:20
350:18 357:10	Lawyers 63:19	leaves 135:7	363:13
lastly 256:17 290:5	layer 123:1	340:11	legally 80:5
297:5	ř	leaving 6:17 50:12	· ·
late 130:5	layers 122:22	62:18 132:17	legislative 86:3
130.3			

	1 46	<u> </u>	
131:3,4	260:6,16 268:8	likelihood 198:10	367:2
Legislatures 369:7	273:12 310:8	likely 34:2 65:6	limiting 14:14
logitimate 75:20	311:15 328:7	79:1 82:10	15:1 78:16
legitimate 75:20	330:16 332:12	123:21 136:16	224:15 250:1
78:12 103:6	leveled 238:17	202:18 210:14	
lending 47:2		224:6 233:5	limits 85:13
length 187:1	leveling 56:7	263:6 264:11	197:19
_	levelization 238:11	303:21 304:2,12	line 40:12,13
lengths 362:7	levelize 238:9	like-to-like 143:11	42:20 44:11,22
lengthy 330:6	levels 132:5		49:5,19 51:21
less 15:8 88:6		likewise 74:3	52:4 134:19
191:15 198:12	139:19 140:10	100:19 297:13	145:20 146:17
215:2 224:6	142:7 146:14	limit 3:22 71:18	148:21 163:4
243:18 252:6	147:8,11 165:22	78:3 83:10 121:3	169:16,21
263:7 264:11,16	leverage 247:7	128:13 129:21	171:6,12,16
291:7 333:1,5	Levine 69:14	136:18 139:22	178:16 181:14
334:2 365:4		159:10 207:11	188:9 229:5
	liabilities 335:4	237:6 251:17	230:12 231:7
let's 7:7 12:4	338:18		271:16 301:15
148:15 166:22	liability 68:18	limitation 14:5	306:11
176:1 225:12	71:19 84:18	19:16 20:18	314:1,7,12,15
226:11 229:21	109:1 136:18	35:5,8 187:15	315:7,16 318:8
277:21 278:8	205:10 283:3	205:6,7 207:7,9	320:2 330:10
281:7 356:9		254:1 290:2	335:16 363:15
364:19	liable 72:6 142:12	291:14	371:13,17
letter 38:19 76:17	169:17 285:2	292:14,16	372:6,16,22
107:2 189:10	license 122:12	293:1,16 294:20	line-drawing
191:12 216:20	lie 137:5	296:9 298:13	232:1
242:11 249:4		299:7 310:11,14	
255:22 303:2	lies 9:21	311:19 323:6	lines 22:12 128:14
313:7 318:19	lieu 94:4	328:17	255:8 330:8
319:5 320:5	life 33:8 75:6 78:7	limitations 14:20	361:6
338:19 339:6	129:11 215:7	23:1 204:15,17	line-up 51:19
Letterman 148:12	289:9,11	205:14 283:5	148:17 164:10
	292:9,20 353:21	284:17 333:4	204:22 229:8,14
letters 10:21	lifespans 349:17	limited 37:9 76:19	313:11
145:10 170:8	<u> </u>	79:18 97:20	line-ups 26:2
371:3	lifetime 186:7	106:17 145:6	79:21 80:2
level 40:2 113:13	257:15 284:5	203:22 254:5	145:18
133:3	350:22	258:21 269:8	linked 223:22
143:9,15,22	light 31:15 177:2	285:22 302:17	
147:4 150:10	206:19 293:22	305:2 306:3	liquidate 202:1
168:19 231:19	335:14 342:11	327:19 366:13	242:18 243:9,21

	1 ag		
245:10,12 319:9	168:7 220:20	315:12 316:12	lowest 261:14
liquidated 244:3	347:10 350:7	losing 275:20	loyalties 290:11
liquidation 340:17	351:8	316:16 366:22	loyalty 70:22
liquidity 89:6	lives 120:18	loss 16:12 21:11	288:7 315:15
list 3:5 27:19 90:6	living 127:16 350:1	173:17 198:10 312:9,19 315:14	luck 152:12
168:12 208:15,22 236:4 253:11 273:4	loans 24:10 locate 224:12	316:19,21 317:12	Luisa 5:8 lump 50:13 51:8
listen 215:12	location 369:21	losses 142:12	60:3 61:8 275:19
216:21 223:10		lost 226:5 346:15	lunch 156:19
237:20 309:3 listened 182:8	logic 145:20 logs 262:18	lot 39:11 45:19 62:13,18 64:8	183:12
256:1 355:20	long 6:14 9:18	96:4,10	Machiz
listening 62:8	19:1 25:14 26:18	104:12,19 110:2	63:10,15,16,18
114:20 182:12,13	99:12 103:18 169:13 188:9 230:5,11 263:6	112:1 124:15 125:8 127:11 149:15 153:3	64:7 95:17 98:7 99:9 102:14
lists 143:14	273:4 283:15	154:20	105:5,9 115:9
literacy 15:22 46:9	293:19 359:18	160:19,21	127:9 130:11
132:3,5,6	362:19 366:8	161:15 162:3	Machiz's 147:19
literally 225:1,2	longer 31:11	164:4 167:17	Madam 63:16
366:14	131:20 137:15	168:19 170:4,5,6	211:14 233:4
litigation 29:13 30:15 39:7 77:13	202:7 264:4 277:15 349:17	207:5 221:17 222:9,15,17,19 223:13 224:17	Madoff 69:15 105:18
93:13 227:14	longevity 241:11	274:16,20,22	magic 68:15
305:4	350:9	275:7 278:6	magnificent 64:17
litigators 306:6	long-holding	357:20 370:20	magnitude 217:2
little 51:20 57:18	260:19	371:9 372:21	312:18 316:19
72:3 73:7 101:3	long-lasting	lots 58:13 255:15	magnitudes 288:7
106:9,11,16	265:12	362:11	
125:5,20 130:5	longstanding	low 148:15 163:1	MAI 233:21
152:4 162:12,15	204:11	348:9,13 349:18	mail 222:10
181:18 182:19 197:22 213:5 226:11 237:15	long-term 59:8 61:7 202:14	350:13 low-cost 64:12	mailings 222:9 mainly 313:5
250:14 264:15	264:6 265:4	lower 15:7 52:22	maintain 27:12
277:3 278:9	342:5 346:3	53:9 54:3 132:7	313:17 340:8
280:3 320:19	long-time 262:4	302:22	355:15
323:10 366:4 live 129:9 167:16	losely 52:9 lose 128:4 312:6	lowers 302:7	maintained 143:14

	<u> </u>	ı	1
maintaining	142:3,6 143:14	164:14	66:9 72:15,17
221:17 260:21	149:20 157:8,20	Marc 63:10,18	204:19 283:1,7
major 89:19	164:14 176:21	69:16 94:19 96:8	285:9
150:22 203:7	191:9 230:4	147:18	marketplace 8:21
349:4	253:9,17 267:20		9:16 41:19 44:13
	268:3	March 1:5 90:8	45:20 51:15
majority 88:10	managers 27:20	346:6	57:20 142:15
90:8 107:22	41:14 65:16	marginal 366:18	160:21 165:20
190:18 197:15	73:11,21 82:9	markedly 16:6	199:6 202:18
202:11 257:22	134:14 138:12	•	264:20 266:17
304:9,13 329:1	139:13	markers 46:3	267:2 273:14
maker 235:5	141:1,10,11	market	280:20 291:4
makers 150:10	143:13,18 145:5	17:11,12,16	297:16,18
366:17	150:2,4	32:17 36:15 45:8	325:17 327:17
	164:11,12,13	53:11,16 64:19	358:7,12,20
MALE 177:15	177:3,4 208:19	85:13 88:7,18	367:7 372:11
malpractice 72:5	231:3 248:18	89:3,6 96:2	
man 179:2	254:7 272:5	97:15 101:21	markets 84:8
	273:7 286:5	102:3,5 105:22	88:16 92:22
manage 41:4	299:22	106:2 110:11	120:19 129:5
53:10 139:7		111:11 112:15	196:3,17
184:16 241:14	manager's	114:9 116:12,18	286:9,11,15
242:19 244:5	27:16,18	117:21	288:16 297:8
268:8 331:17	manages 155:15	118:14,15	346:6 365:8
345:7	managing 188:20	119:4,5,9 126:12	marks 191:22
managed 33:1,5	283:14 369:19	166:6,10 186:2	192:18 212:6
41:2 44:7,16		189:15 190:15	markup 91:9
49:12 204:8	mandate 113:17	192:9 196:16	<u>-</u>
264:7 345:8	mandated 372:3	197:18 198:5,15	markups 88:15
management 33:1	manipulated	230:5 238:5	93:5
67:21 68:6 77:2	136:2	239:16	Marla 240:8
89:19 141:3		241:11,19	248:10
155:7,17 156:10	manner 24:7	242:1,7 247:4	Mary 195:18
184:14 190:21	244:6 296:12	258:3 261:14,20	•
199:16	336:20 368:20	279:2 280:10	Mason 130:16
238:14,15	mantle 174:16	286:6 334:7	147:15,16,17
243:12 246:1,12	manufacturer	335:10,17	160:16 161:4
257:20 284:8	151:20 239:19	336:22 342:2	167:3,20 168:9
343:6,17,19		345:17,20 346:5	170:1 173:7
	manufacturers	348:6 361:11	176:5 177:13,16
management-type	292:22	365:17 367:10	179:7,13,16,22
226:12	mapped 143:11	marketed 372:10	180:5,8,11,15
manager 89:8	mapping 79:6		181:17 182:7
	mapping / 7.0	marketing 26:4	189:1 191:15

	1 48		
225:13	174:7 175:20	166:14 167:15	181:6,15,17,22
mass 261:4	184:11 186:18	172:18 175:2	182:16 192:11
	191:4 192:20	177:15 180:12	209:5,7,18
match 219:20	193:2,9 195:15	181:6 218:17	211:13 213:19
295:12	197:4 199:9	225:19,20 226:4	217:6 225:21
material 126:4	203:17 206:9	228:6 235:17	234:21 236:9,15
180:3 191:20	216:19 221:11	245:9 271:4	267:16
matarials 22:12 22	223:6 225:19	275:1 276:15	270:15,21 277:4
materials 33:12,22 283:2	242:2,6,21,22	278:14,15 280:2	309:15 310:18
	243:3 246:18	321:16 322:13	315:18 317:21
matter 7:7 62:16	252:1,5	327:12	318:1,2,16
67:5 68:20 69:17	253:4,7,10,11	mccarthy 188:19	321:12 326:14
98:21 111:11	254:4 255:6	194:12 212:8,11	354:14 357:15
166:21 170:12	257:3 263:8	213:16	360:1 367:20
215:9 223:4	264:7 266:10	213.10 214:8,10,13,18	meaning 14:21
230:14,15	267:18,22 271:9	216:4,12,14	73:22 97:1
327:14 372:4	272:8 276:18,20	217:11,17,21	139:11 250:9
matters 2:13 9:9	285:2,10 286:16	217.11,17,21 218:10,22	288:21 297:3
142:15 254:9,11	288:3 291:17	220:3,17	
305:22	292:15 294:12	223:3,16 237:16	meaningful 77:9
	295:18 296:19	·	367:17
may 18:9 19:16	299:3,14 301:8	McCarthy 183:16	meaningless 26:16
20:8,15 25:4	303:8 304:10	188:18,20 211:9	meanings 139:12
26:5 28:6 29:21 31:11 33:19 37:5	311:8 313:21	218:13 237:7	<u> </u>
	318:14	meal 74:17	means 21:11 39:3
44:10 45:8,16	321:20,21	mean 40:10 47:14	69:12 140:21
49:10 58:3,4 59:6 65:21	329:13,16 331:2	51:22 53:1 56:11	143:12 171:14
67:16,19 68:5	341:7 342:3	60:10 62:10 77:8	192:22 220:18
71:18 72:6,16	345:20 348:13	105:10,14 111:8	222:4 326:19
74:16 81:20 84:2	354:21 355:2	112:9 116:6	334:1
88:10 89:1,8	357:11 360:18	117:15	meant 69:11 78:16
92:5 95:12 97:7	361:17,22	117.13	96:14,20 157:6
98:16 99:22	364:2,3 368:11	124:20 126:16	164:5 269:2
100:22 108:19	371:2,12	137:13 152:17	measure 53:13
117:5,11 120:7	maybe 10:21	157:13 132:17	
122:2 125:1	41:17 47:16	162:4 166:4,9	measured 305:8
130:5,8 132:2	51:20 100:9	167:3,11,18,20	measuring 217:6
130.3,8 132.2	110:20 112:22	168:20 170:1	mechanical
139:1,8,10,12	114:8 118:1	171:13 173:9	111:5,7
142:5,20 144:8,9	120:4 124:13,15	175:7,10	•
142.3,20 144.8,9	125:20 127:20	177:10,16	mechanically
149:4 164:21,22	128:5 129:21	178:18	81:16
165:1,3,4 173:16	130:7 159:13	180:11,19	medically 125:10
105.1,5,7 1/5.10			·

1	1 46	1	
meet 8:8 17:19	161:12 178:2	325:3	ministerial 23:22
27:18 32:21	245:15 304:1	mid 240:16	29:16 49:22
133:2 139:21	369:3	middle 31:22 75:3	minus 148:13
145:8 147:6	menu 51:19 52:2	101:1 150:4,10	minute 7:10
209:11 253:14	64:1,10,11 101:7	286:10 368:21	191:2,4 254:18
273:15 278:17	152:3 204:20		257:6
317:22 335:10 337:4 344:6	229:14 295:7,9	middle-level	
345:3 353:20	318:13 320:20	149:22	minutes 3:1 4:1 127:15
	336:11 339:5	mid-sized 241:16	190:20,22 273:6
meeting 20:4	372:13,14	migrate 106:6	309:3 331:6
228:16 337:15	menus 25:1,2,6	164:15	
352:13 373:8 374:3	merchant 89:6,9	mike 276:19	mischief 362:11
	mere 66:7 68:18	mileage 216:1	misconduct 22:1
meetings 11:15	122:1 135:11	<u> </u>	misinterpretation
meets 8:8 338:9	201:12	million 8:12 32:20	301:14
member 3:1 156:3	merely 28:12	75:11 91:21 92:1 184:1 194:16	misplaced 90:3
197:18	29:22 72:20	196:14,18	mispronounced
257:12,19	82:2,5 88:20	197:2,12	162:11
289:10,17	206:6 243:14	217:12,13	
members 2:22	merits 21:5 126:5	219:2,5,11,14,15	miss 6:20,21 7:4 156:19
3:8,11,15 93:16	305:2	,22 220:8	
96:18 97:13		221:13,19	missing 128:4
100:3 102:12	Mertens 204:4	222:1,6,11	mission 209:16
104:13 107:16	messages 347:6	240:19 259:16	mistake 266:6
118:21 123:16	met 6:21 35:9	343:8,13 346:10	mistaken 92:8
131:2 165:16 187:20 248:16	252:12,13	347:11,18 348:2 349:14 351:15	
272:22 273:5,10	metaphor 221:12	352:1	misunderstand 98:19
274:1,8 281:15	metaphorically		
311:20 315:21	334:8	millions 197:3	misunderstanding
323:19 327:6		218:15	282:5
344:7	meters 364:19	mind 111:7 153:12	mitigate 55:4
membership	methodologies	227:16 229:17	128:22
272:12,13	123:22	240:20 255:9	Mmm-hmm
men 184:1	methodology	mindful 364:2	209:14 214:12
	123:18 216:16	minds 370:21	279:13 355:1
mention 306:12 318:19	methods 60:14	minimal 246:9	365:20
	metrics 78:20	322:19 366:15	mode 351:4
mentioned 26:21	Michael 4:18	minimum 81:17	model 29:11 87:19
90:7 96:2 118:7 129:2 159:10	218:11 271:21	189:12 288:14	91:15 106:7
147.4 137.10	210.11 2/1.21		107:7
			10/:/

T	1 46		
126:1,2,11,14,22	285:16 286:17	move 7:4 88:10	339:21 340:3
127:6 128:18	322:9	101:17	344:19 362:18
151:8 179:20	monster 64:16	117:13,19	mutually 302:6
204:21 220:15		130:19 166:6	303:6,14 314:15
251:10 258:19	month 349:6	177:21 213:22	ŕ
260:11 264:14	350:18	222:19 237:5	myself 37:17
276:15 277:1,6	monthly 33:7	242:8 276:19	128:6,13 176:4
278:12 279:4,5	months 79:22	306:3 342:1	179:12 237:6
330:8	86:13 215:13	358:17 367:13	368:21
modeling 349:11	306:19	368:6	
G		moved 96:3,6	N
models 58:4	moonlighting	, and the second	N.W 1:11
106:14 108:10	147:18	movement 161:15	NAIRPA 325:6
moderate 348:14	Moreover 18:9	moving 119:22	
modifications 34:8	21:14 73:7 308:2	161:19 224:14	namely 241:2,6 242:17 328:9
185:1 188:7	338:11	240:21 273:1	
252:22	Morgan 22:10	275:15	330:11 331:12
modified 22:14	23:1 30:20 40:16	much-needed	narrow 77:22
23:8 194:5 297:1	60:10,20 61:12	21:20	146:16 156:9,10
305:20	62:1 99:11,19		197:8 199:1
	153:4 188:20	multiple 122:22 163:13 213:13	253:11 301:1
modify 35:4 307:1	189:3 194:13,14		313:12 314:4
Moi 180:14,15	196:17 211:17	multiplication	318:18 323:5
moment 6:8		199:3	335:19 354:14
	morning 2:2 5:5 12:19 22:6,8	multiplicity	narrowed 14:14
monetary 16:12	30:22 63:17 75:1	213:11	114:19
money 17:13	76:19 84:6 138:5	mutual 8:4 16:1,2	narrower 97:4
50:3,17 55:9	147:13,16 153:4	30:11 61:19 63:2	
64:8 65:15 133:1	182:8 270:7	85:21 93:14	narrowing 13:9
179:4,5,14,16	279:15 306:9	111:15 115:6	143:17
216:3 226:5	335:1	149:11	253:6,15,18
238:5 261:14,20		151:5,8,16	313:7 318:12
264:16 278:6	morning's 225:12	167:19 171:17	320:20
279:1 367:8,14	Morningstar	172:9,12 195:1	narrowly 16:18,22
368:6	318:21	201:4 203:9	25:16 168:17
monies 7:16 14:12	mortgage 344:10	221:1 224:11	Natalia 374:2,17
59:5,9	mostly 222:13	225:11 231:17	National 63:19
monitor 79:2		238:20 249:20	325:6
255:3 336:11	mother 15:21	250:3 252:10,14	
	motion 96:10	259:10 260:12	nation's 32:3
monitoring 4:2	motivation 128:6	261:11,12 263:1	natural 145:15
25:13,18		264:5 298:20	naturally 323:22
26:13,15 27:2,3	mouth 214:16	299:21 338:4,12	
		·	

	1 ag	-	
327:4	negotiations 156:1	267:10 289:16	281:13
nature 26:5 29:10	neither 36:18	300:21 302:17	non-public 192:21
30:12 33:22 68:1	208:13 307:15	non-aligned 33:3	non-qualified
72:22 113:4	374:7	non-conflicted	262:9,16
142:19,22 144:7	NELA 63:20 66:3	166:5	, in the second
164:3,17 208:1	67:12	non-discretionary	non-registered 326:3
210:22 222:21	Nelson 63:10	23:3 33:2	
254:6 290:7	74:22 75:1,5	140:14,19 141:4	nor 28:21 36:18
295:15,20 298:8	100:22 101:2,8	157:4,12	121:21 135:13
342:5 356:18	103:4,11,14	ĺ	200:6 208:14
navigate 51:2	104:15 110:21	none 102:20	307:16 374:8,12
260:7	111:13 112:12	226:13 252:12	Norm 66:18 69:8
nearly 89:17 347:9	113:19	non-employer-	normal 372:11
348:22 349:14	122:11,20 129:9	based 341:16	normally 6:10
necessarily 18:18	NEPC 138:7	non-ERISA	168:18 181:19
36:1 95:4 99:21		326:18	247:2
110:12 111:22	NEPC's 138:7	nonetheless	
121:21	net 154:4 173:14	368:15	Norman 12:7,19 182:8 267:9
126:11,13 148:9	174:21	nonexistent 215:1	
153:1 224:10	neutral 87:20		north 196:14
231:17 293:11	neutrality 126:2	non-Fidelity	notably 196:11
359:22 360:4	128:18	351:16	Notary 374:1,17
372:2		non-fiduciary	•
necessary 87:14	Nevada 366:10	16:13,14 19:1	note 4:11 35:13
125:18 140:10	nevertheless	24:21 83:7	91:11 134:21 136:15 196:12
147:11 205:8	67:8,16	103:22 142:21	206:5 252:20
206:20 360:7	news 96:5	143:3 203:17,20	308:16,18
necessity 348:6	newsletter 48:3	204:7 230:1	,
needlessly 216:2	155:1	302:2 303:11 304:18 319:2	noted 11:5 115:9
	newsletters 47:19		133:5 135:8 190:13 261:10
negative 254:21	155:4 286:6	non-impartial	
258:10 291:11	336:22	294:17	notes 15:3,15
negatively 212:5		non-important	36:12 87:7
261:2	nicely 329:19	8:17	189:14 194:21
negotiate 364:20	Nobel 32:1	non-	224:1 237:22
negotiated 192:20	nobody 167:22	individualized	291:15 294:8
257:5	178:14	18:8	nothing 7:1 71:15
	non 26:8 28:4,7	non-lawyer 172:2	132:20 326:20
negotiating 155:14	90:18 131:13,21	•	361:13
negotiation 155:19	141:16 204:18	nonprofit 12:21	notice 2:13 30:10
172:1	227:5 259:8	non-profit 257:14	174:15 179:20

	rag		
191:14 330:8	obligations 8:13	327:3 333:18	279:6 281:7
noticed 309:2	27:9 132:12	334:3 342:8	310:5,10
	140:4 292:8	344:16,22	322:5,12 323:3
noting 71:12	305:13 327:22	345:8,10 372:13	324:16,18 325:1
notion 127:12	335:3 338:17	offered 46:10	355:20
166:7 356:8	observation 53:1	59:16 60:16	356:13,20
not-traded 112:4	observations	200:3 262:2	357:10,16
notwithstanding	369:1	286:3 290:8	360:18
17:13 20:6		offering 36:2 41:1	old 74:12 83:21
105:19 228:3,13	obtain 23:16 68:8 72:19 296:14	45:5 77:18	176:2 221:7
Novy	335:9	144:13 194:20	319:7 335:13
240:8,9,10,11		199:14 286:1	340:16 355:14
274:14,18,21	obviously 3:3	296:8 333:22	Oliver 90:12
275:8 276:11	105:15 106:14	offerings 196:22	106:22 123:9
281:2 322:16	114:10,19 119:7 129:20 133:7	341:5	OMB 211:4
numerous 132:14	148:13 165:17	offers 30:1,6 60:22	omitting 68:7,15
nurtured 59:15	166:2 274:17,19	340:14	one-off 356:12
nuituieu 39.13	occasionally	office 5:1 6:15	
0	181:13	262:4	one-on-one 20:3
Obama's 342:14	occur 111:16,17	officer 374:2	351:9 353:11
	ŕ		onerous 36:18
objecting 250:15	occurred 8:21	officials 323:16	ones 83:21
objective 22:18	occurring 332:11	offset 224:8,13	one's 101:8 151:11
25:11 29:8 31:6	occurs 227:9	of-pocket 222:1	355:9
59:3 78:20 137:17 143:5	316:21	Oh 357:16	one-time 8:11,14
253:19 281:20	o'clock 335:1	okay 7:7 38:20	14:16
287:18 291:2,10	October 10:10	40:9 43:18	ongoing 5:13
314:3 318:18,22	32:5	48:13,21 63:8	79:20 104:7,8
321:14 337:5	oddly 95:18	98:15 112:18	113:21 146:1
objectively 338:15	-	118:5 119:2	198:14 203:9
objectives 195:21	odds 365:13	123:2,13,19	225:10 264:9
298:16	offer 32:18 33:14	124:6 128:5	294:22 356:10
	36:3 45:13 61:19	157:21 160:11	on-line 262:18
objectivity 231:14	77:9 78:18 79:1	167:18 198:21	349:10 351:12
objects 66:20	82:7 138:13 152:9 165:14	208:17 209:1 227:12 230:7	353:9
obligated 67:9	187:10 194:18	231:22 237:6	onset 40:2
obligation 21:16	195:4 196:9	269:6 271:21	oops 99:18
141:7 143:8	229:20,21 249:2	272:3	open 4:5 11:6 76:7
341:1	289:12,20	274:4,10,13	80:1 166:19
	292:19 298:10	276:10 278:8,10	00.1 100.17

	1 ag		
214:17 224:10	273:22	85:11 97:13	organized 2:21
270:4 361:9	opportunity 3:6,9	143:20 144:21	233:7
open-ended 81:5	4:8 11:9,11 22:5	145:3,7 152:9	original 13:7
111:14	30:19 31:1 36:22	186:1,6,7 205:21	<u> </u>
	37:4 44:13 49:11	241:20 245:6,7	others 68:13 76:3
operate 100:3	50:6 51:12 63:6	247:15 253:6	110:10 111:2
128:2 141:18	75:2 83:22 131:5	283:12 295:12	117:4 128:11,16
207:8 210:9	148:2 183:21	318:12 319:20	132:19 141:4
220:5 264:19	184:2 185:12	327:3 329:15	144:15 165:9
operated 120:18	188:15 189:6	333:14,19 341:4	194:7 225:13
operates 128:2	199:8,16 214:16	344:18 347:4	231:4 241:16
207:10 365:6	240:14 248:5,9	355:18	248:19 251:8
	249:2 257:1	369:12,15 370:7	252:7 300:1
operating 77:16	281:8 289:20	oral 68:9 194:3	321:19 359:19
252:12 270:19	298:9 300:1	296:18,21	otherwise 45:8,10
operational	308:13 325:9	ŕ	73:2 97:2 154:9
198:16 199:5	342:15 353:22	orally 194:5 296:3	178:14 200:5
220:5 222:8	356:6	316:15	250:5 274:9
Operations 2:4		order 3:16 9:5	296:20 297:2
_	opposed 50:2	11:3,9 16:4 86:5	340:9,10 374:12
operator 78:12	56:20 63:7	94:4,6 101:6	ought 47:2,12
79:10	97:17,18 138:16	130:21 153:11	51:21 113:1,5
operators 79:15	174:8,20 276:5	192:22 203:10	129:7 152:7
214:19	355:18 365:18 370:15	205:13 217:2	169:13 181:8
opined 201:5	370:15	238:2 266:19	187:13 229:9
1 -	opposing 154:8	296:15 298:16	230:18 312:18
opinion 23:14,19	opposite 47:4	302:13 310:13	314:22 317:18
70:22 71:2,5,18	66:10 168:17	313:12,17	363:4,15 370:12
79:11 81:22	169:2	ordinarily 291:18	ours 159:7 210:17
93:12 135:21	opposition 161:5,9	ordinary 68:3	
141:8 143:7		78:13 204:18	ourselves 58:12
185:17,22 201:3	option 50:17 56:22	292:1 336:20	312:2
202:3,16 204:5,6	186:8 243:15		outcome 147:9
206:11 207:2 244:21 287:1,6	245:14 260:17	Oregon 332:13	254:14 293:9
288:19 289:3	264:7 303:15	organization 3:20	304:7 314:1
288:19 289:3	352:16 369:8	12:22 203:19	374:12
	options 21:5	272:18	outcomes 273:2
opinions 70:14,17	23:12,18,21	organizations	349:5
93:8 135:19,20	41:19 50:1,7,11	139:18 257:19	
288:15	51:2 56:15 60:5	284:10 304:4	outlined 79:11
opponents 64:22	61:4 73:11 76:12	305:17 325:6	266:13
opportunities	77:19 78:19		outlook 46:11
opportunities	79:2,8 83:9	organize 219:16	out-of-pocket
			<u>r</u>

	<u>_</u>		
198:11	338:1	332:22 354:6	179:5 181:11
outset 170:3	owned 331:16	373:6	184:6 186:12
		panelists 94:5,8	187:13 195:6
outside 102:17	owner 152:6 153:6	109:18	201:5,22 202:2
185:21 200:2	261:11		243:2,9,19
216:18 224:10	277:16,21	panels 2:21 130:7	244:4,11 245:21
228:19 242:8	278:16 326:21	359:3	246:16 247:15
244:9 245:2,7	327:1,2,4	panicked 345:20	248:4 282:13
246:18 255:17	owners 53:3 58:1	paper 62:16	294:16
269:19 270:3	258:4 259:13,19	227:19	296:11,14
283:15 304:14	260:14 261:1,5		307:14,18
310:3 317:19	264:11 278:19	paperwork 362:14	309:21 332:2
outsource 141:3	291:7 326:11,17	363:9	336:17 337:16
outsourcing	327:7,16	paragraph 82:9	339:1 340:21
240:12	owner's 152:18	187:3 285:4	354:12,15
outweigh 246:10	oxymoron 157:5	paralleling 200:4	participant-
overall 106:8	oysters 64:17	parallels 95:19	directed 27:6
198:12 234:4	dysters 04.17	paramount 367:9	45:22
over-broad 249:17	———— Р	•	participants 2:8
328:22	page 178:18	paraphrase 57:18	13:22 14:6
	180:6,7	parent 344:13	15:6,20 17:12,20
overemphasize	, and the second	partially	18:6,14
153:17	pages 374:4	323:14,15	19:14,19,21,22
overestimating	paid 74:6 186:8	r	20:13 21:22
76:16	263:4 299:4	participant	22:4,18,21 23:22
overlapping 133:9	359:10 360:6	16:10,16	24:4 31:7,12
	365:3	18:3,16,19 19:2 21:7 24:2 35:8	32:14,19,21
overly 33:18 97:9	painfully 191:17		33:4,15,20
117:7 207:3	• •	36:7 40:10,13,15 41:16 42:4	34:1,10,21,22
overreach 129:21	palate 64:21 65:8	43:4,7,16 45:1	35:22 36:3,8,21
oversight 27:8	panel 2:10,22	47:5 49:8,18	37:3 39:3 40:18
29:19 100:20	3:1,8,10,11,15	56:4 60:13,19	41:5 44:15
	4:15	-	45:2,8,9
159:14 246:21	6:9,10,18,19	61:11,15,16,20 62:3 65:22 66:15	46:2,7,15 49:3
353:1	12:7 63:10,17		50:6 51:1,5
overstating 366:16	66:19 120:4	74:18 75:11	53:3,12 55:5,21
overwhelming	130:3,6,15 131:3	83:16 121:20	56:13 57:5,9
241:21	175:8 183:16	133:18,19	58:1,14,21 59:3
-	187:1,20 188:1	134:6,8 136:11	61:3,8 63:20
overwhelmingly	217:7 240:7	137:6,8,15	65:12,17 67:14
121:5	281:3 308:15	148:16,19	68:21 69:7 70:8
owe 208:7 290:10	322:16 324:20	161:17 167:4,13	72:9 74:14 75:18
		168:6 174:15	76:5,10

	1 ag		
82:14,17,19 83:5	participant's 21:9	202:9 226:5	patchwork 260:8
84:13,21 90:4	28:16 81:17	255:14 279:19	path 61:16 101:13
98:22 115:12,15	186:3 242:15,17	304:13 311:1	paths 268:11
132:15,20	243:6,12,19	326:20 327:16	-
133:12	244:19 246:1	361:10	pathways 5:22
135:3,7,22	268:14,22 317:5	parties 29:1,4	Paul 363:17
138:1,11 140:5	Participants 23:15	30:10 40:4 56:9	Pause 63:12
147:10 154:15,18	254:19	57:8,11 66:9	130:14,17
154.13,18	participate 5:9	74:7,9 85:21	•
163:2,5,16	348:16,18	88:9 93:15 99:5	pay 142:5 152:15
163.2,3,10	ŕ	103:21 120:20	260:13 263:8
185:11	participates 155:18	122:8 141:3	264:21 267:22 269:8 278:19
186:15,17		142:11 147:2,3	
187:6,7,15	participation 12:4	163:20 165:3,7	279:5 344:10 350:14 359:9
190:17 200:7	particular 5:10	203:10 208:2,3,5	
201:14,18	6:21 8:7,17	252:5 254:2,6	paying 152:20
202:13,20 234:8	14:19	268:12 290:3	263:8 365:4
240:19	18:12,16,17,19	292:6,22	payment 74:7
241:7,17,22	38:9 43:3,9,12	323:8,11 338:15	133:20 134:10
242:3,9 244:1	45:21 47:21 54:6	342:15 363:5	186:6 292:3
246:9,13	56:22 73:1 76:20	374:9,11	payouts 33:7
247:9,22	96:6 112:11	partner 138:7	
255:4,7,12,19	115:14	147:17 199:12	pays 261:16
261:5 266:6,10	123:15,16 146:3	248:11	Peagram 204:4
270:12 273:3	148:19 163:19	partnerships	peer 231:4 318:21
276:2 281:22	191:14 192:3	366:13 367:2	-
282:2 283:12	201:10 211:19	party 88:14 89:8	penny 220:2
284:1,8,13	228:22	139:11 141:7,15	pension 12:20 22:1
290:20	229:17,21	143:6 151:19	69:8 140:21
291:5,7,11 293:5	231:4,19 236:6	154:8	148:12 185:21
302:20	240:22 243:11	157:14,15,17	289:14 352:8
307:5,10,21,22	262:17 269:2	191:19 236:22	pension-related
315:3 325:18	274:2 275:13 282:20 289:3	252:4 268:6	5:15
328:10 333:13	282.20 289.3 297:21 298:15	pass 101:4 111:3	pensions 350:15
334:1 339:5,16	309:20 322:6,7	123:14 126:13	•
341:11 343:14	337:4,7	169:20 212:8	people 11:10 15:3
346:10,11,14	, and the second	232:14	38:4 45:13 48:11
348:10 349:1,7 350:20	particularized		55:18 59:22 60:2
350:20 351:12,16	182:2	passing 81:2	61:12 62:15
351.12,16	particularly 31:15	past 6:15 109:11	65:15 73:5 105:11,16
371:5 372:4	38:22 79:3 95:11	122:6	114:22 120:15
3/1.3 3/2.4	97:16,19 106:15		127:22 120:13
			141.44 149.4

Γ	1 46		
130:4,22 149:1,3	perception 114:14	117:12 200:7	personnel 155:18
150:6,8,10	327:15	permits 87:20	persons 14:15 31:8
151:13,14	perfect 173:9	91:2,4 115:3	67:15 134:17
154:19	174:2	·	199:20 207:1
155:19,20,21,22	- ,	permitted 141:6	254:9 258:11
156:18 159:10	perfectly 53:15	permitting 93:22	290:10 296:7,10
161:21 166:8	114:4 155:9	person 6:9 7:14	297:1 327:22
168:4 169:19	perform 82:10	8:6 13:6 14:3,10	
173:4 175:14	154:1 160:2	16:16 17:22 18:4	person's
182:20 183:8	performance 17:4	19:5,6,8,10,14	203:2,14,15
199:4 213:10,20	21:10 27:17	20:4 21:6,15	231:18 337:12
215:6 216:10,21	39:19 52:17	22:16	Persons 291:21
220:5 222:16,18	115:16 129:6	34:14,16,18,21	336:2
223:22 238:22		43:6 47:21 67:7	novenostivo 22:12
269:15 270:17	143:18 229:18	72:17,20 73:2	perspective 32:13 48:22 50:20
310:7 315:1	230:15,16 253:17	82:6 99:18	48:22 50:20 70:15 144:17
322:21,22 334:6		121:11 125:8	70:15 144:17 151:4 166:1
337:6 349:10	performed 81:2	148:19 149:1	
354:7 357:19	136:10 253:16	148.19 149.1 167:7 170:9	220:22 221:12
358:5,7	performing 82:10	183:4	222:12 243:6
363:11,13	159:20,22 160:4		267:21 298:15
366:22 367:22	ŕ	203:1,3,10,17,19	341:2 346:3
369:3,11,15	performs 204:1	,22 205:15,16	357:6
371:9	perhaps 48:19	226:14 228:2,20 249:12 250:19	perspectives 249:3
372:2,7,19,20	104:13 109:17		256:5 272:11
people's 114:20	127:17 158:7	285:6	pertaining 35:6
• •	184:21 187:1	294:4,8,9,16	• 0
per 263:9 349:15	275:4 280:19	316:4,13	perverse 18:10
perceive 34:2	306:6,9 313:2,13	337:8,19	ph 239:10 287:7
216:10	321:5 362:19	338:6,13	325:7 332:15
	perilous 74:16	339:13,16	ph)(the 325:6
perceived 146:16	-	358:13,17	- ' '
215:2 304:22	period 9:1 109:11	360:17 363:7,11	philosophically
percent 48:14	162:6 256:21	370:13	311:6
90:12,13,14	periods 260:19	personal 16:14	phone 20:4
132:3 196:15	263:6 264:5	45:17 54:5,8	152:10,12,14,20
219:1 259:15	PERKINS 1:10	95:3	353:9
261:3 263:8,9		personalized	phrase 80:16
289:11 326:11	permanent 296:16	41:10 86:17	245:9
331:15 346:12	permissible 36:3	298:3	
347:9 348:15,17	45:6 85:13 197:9		Phyllis 2:12 4:17
349:9,10,20	201:6 340:9	personally 355:10	153:8 156:15
350:2		366:8,10	166:15 174:12
	permit 68:14		180:12

	rage	. 02	
physically 190:7	plaintiffs 168:18	92:1,20 93:8	242:1,8,14,15,17
215:19	plan 2:8 4:22 7:17	97:3 103:22	243:7,11,14,15,2
Piacentini 4:21	8:7,10,18 9:17	104:20,22	1
52:19 53:14,17	10:4,14 14:13,19	105:17 108:16	244:5,7,9,13,16,
_	, ,	112:15 124:16	17,18
54:4,20 55:12	15:2,6,11,16,18	133:1,21 136:22	245:2,5,6,7,13,2
56:11,17 57:13	16:12 17:3,16,20	137:4,6,10,13,15	2
59:19 124:7	18:2,5,6	,16,17 138:9,11	246:1,12,14,16,1
125:4,19 126:21	19:13,18,22	139:4,20	9,21,22
127:3 128:5	20:19	140:5,19,21	247:5,10,15,22
175:4 237:6	21:2,3,5,7,18,21		248:4 249:19
240:6	22:11,18,21	141:5,9,13	
276:12,17,20	23:7,12,17,20	142:4,13 143:4,5	252:1,19 253:13
277:11,14,18	24:5,8,17	144:15,18	254:4,10
320:18 321:10	25:1,12,17,18	145:3,14	255:2,3,17,19
322:12 323:3	26:1,6,15,18	146:12,15,18,21	258:4 260:14
	27:11,14,15,17,2	147:1,5,10	261:4
pick 149:21	0,22 28:15,19	149:15,17,19	264:16,18,21
320:18	30:13,17	150:12	265:1,3,20
picked 47:22	32:16,18 33:4	152:3,8,19 154:1	266:6,7,8,9,19
48:1,3	34:20,22 35:7,14	155:15,17,22	267:2 268:6
picking 164:9,10	36:2,7 37:9	161:17	269:14,18,19
1	38:1,3 40:17	162:12,17,21	270:3,5,10,11,21
226:13,16	,	163:1,2 167:4,13	272:6,14 274:4
picks 124:11	41:4,5,8,10,15,2	176:1,22 182:21	275:2 276:4
picture 149:20	0 42:2,5 46:16	184:5,6,16,20	277:12 278:3,20
308:21	50:1,8,10,12	185:9,11,15,18,2	279:6 281:22
	51:1,7,12	1 186:1	282:1 283:15
piece 118:1 227:19	52:10,15 53:4,6	187:4,6,7 188:3	284:1,2,20,21
309:20	56:3 57:5,9	190:17 191:6	285:1,10,15
pieces 62:15 81:11	58:1,10,15,18	193:17 194:19	286:7,16,17
-	59:12 60:15,17	195:4 199:13	287:3,8,22
pig 96:17	64:8		
pin 324:4	65:12,16,17,20	201:5,6,11,19 202:2,7,9	288:1,3,19 291:7 293:5 294:16,22
pitches 65:6	66:1,11,13 67:14	202:2,7,9 203:4,15,18	295:14
182:12,14	68:2,17,22		
,	70:7,8,18,19,20	204:8,21	296:10,11,14
placed 368:18	71:2 72:4,9	205:1,2,12,18 207:15 213:1	299:20 300:22 301:2,7,9,16,19
places 189:19	74:3,5,14,18	216:2 227:18	302:3,12,15,19
355:12	75:8,9,10 76:5,8	228:4,9	303:4,8,10,15,22
placing 353:9	78:2,5,7,14,18	229:17,20	304:11,13
	79:3,6,8 80:2	230:6,18,21	305:1,6,15,19
plain 14:20	82:1 83:3,13,15	233:18 236:10	306:1,20
plainly 169:5	84:16,19 85:22	240:19	· ·
	86:3 89:7		307:6,10,15,17,2
		241:4,7,8,17	1 308:1,10,11

		-	
309:18,21 310:9	21:21 22:3 25:14	327:20	213:19 244:19
311:4,15 313:6,9	27:6,7 32:9,14	328:7,12,17	played 16:2
314:4,5,11,14	35:22 36:2,21	331:18 332:3,6,9	
315:2 318:13,17	37:21 40:18 53:2	335:9 336:1,3	players 16:4
319:6,8,13	63:21 65:1,16	338:16	332:19
320:6,10 321:2	66:22 67:13	343:11,14 344:2	playing 17:2 40:2
322:6,7,9 325:7	68:2,22 69:2	346:9 348:18	56:7 325:17
326:8,10,11,12,2	72:3 74:14,17	353:15 355:10	330:2,16 333:7
2 327:2,3,9,15	75:18 76:6	359:19 360:5	please 3:19,22
328:8 329:22	79:2,20	plan's 25:13 26:16	12:7 63:13 124:9
330:4,15,20	82:8,14,18 84:12	51:9,19 249:22	130:21,22 214:4
331:11	86:2	250:4 254:15	315:17 357:13
333:10,11,20	89:2,14,16,18,19	295:12	
336:10,11,16	,22 90:4		pleased 77:18
337:16	91:12,13 92:5	plan-specific	156:14 248:11
339:4,5,16	93:3,9 97:14	143:17	plenty 363:21
340:16 341:5	112:14 124:9	plate 167:5	364:1
348:13,16,20,22	131:19	platform 25:9 26:4	
349:1 350:3	132:1,9,18,20	27:2,5 52:11,15	plugging 111:11
351:16 352:3	133:12 137:22	72:18	plus 88:15 346:18
355:14 359:19	138:19 140:21	73:2,8,10,12	369:9
360:12 361:9	154:5 163:4	73.2,8,10,12	pocket 304:22
366:19 372:5	165:20 169:2	78:1,4,10,12,17,	-
plan/client 225:17	185:11 186:9	78.1,4,10,12,17,	point 67:22 79:18
-	191:6 192:15	79:5,8,9,10,14	91:16 94:12
planet 127:15	194:17 199:21	134:15 140:16	97:7,11 99:6
222:12	200:2,7 202:11	144:4,10,12,19	100:3,8,16
planner 120:8	205:9 208:4,6,7	145:2,6,13	102:16 104:6
172:19 348:1	209:22	163:12 219:11	106:18,21
350:5	240:16,18 247:8	223:19 251:14	110:22 113:3,22
planners 264:19	248:16 249:1	253:2,5,9,20	116:13 119:3
265:8 279:1	251:19 253:5,8	271:12 283:8	138:14 150:21
371:4	262:11 265:10	285:11 286:2,4	154:12 161:7
	270:5 274:20	300:21 301:3	168:12 169:12
planning	281:15 286:3	313:9 319:1	170:14 172:7,9
257:12,18	287:14	320:21 339:2	190:6 216:9
343:4,6,19	289:1,14,18		225:1 226:9
344:22 345:10	290:11,19	platforms 72:15	227:13 230:11
355:8	291:5,7,11 292:7	76:8 144:20	250:17 271:1
plans 9:11,13,15	295:8 297:12,14	219:7,9	273:6,21 291:19
10:2,19 13:13,22	302:2,18	play 32:9 57:22	293:17 311:9
15:17,19 16:3	304:14,20	58:7 121:22	312:8 326:19
17:6,7,8,11	306:7,16	142:10 149:12	328:12 341:6
, . , . , - ,	326:15,17		348:8 359:6

245:15 247:11 282:1 286:14	38:16,17,18,19 39:14,17 40:14
I I	
• 1	,
1 295:9 296:17 1	41:12 42:11,16
8:20 303:20 304:8	43:19 44:5
2:1 313:21 316:19	46:13,14 47:7
1 340.3 330.10 1	48:13,19,22
1 2740.14	50:4,19 52:6
1 4 4 - 1 (0.17	55:14 56:1,16
212.12 220.1 245.10	57:2 59:20 60:12
20.13	61:14 62:21
29 I I	159:16
262.12	nmo 240:20
13,14	pre 349:20
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	preamble 13:11
88:18 Powernoint	15:3,14 18:21
10.7 12 I - I	45:19 73:16 81:9
10:8,20 BDA1 125.6	87:7 110:8 155:7
70:14 PPA's 135:6	241:2 251:5
16·21 practical	283:10 287:15
215:7,8,11 258:1	291:14 296:1
320:3 333:2	324:6 331:19
0:16 nracticality	367:12
	precariously
300:19	239:13
1 - 1	
.12 50.2	precedence 251:4
1 700.14	preceding 322:16
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	precise 300:8,11
477.7	301:18
131:15 138:7	
158.4 222.15	precisely 35:9
9 11:1 237:9 275:9	67:10 220:8
328:2 329:4	precision 51:21
nent practices 33:20	preclude 114:16
1 -	119:18 328:14
256.10.201.2	330:12
ICALIOII I	
	precluded 333:22
23:10 practitioner 158:3	precursor 243:15
9:13 practitioners	predecessor
5:3 91:11 138:16	342:19
119:12 praise 13:3	
3 <i>7·7</i> l ⁻ l	predicated 52:6
188:2 Prange 12:8 22:8	357:3
	106:3 172:18 01:11 212:12 26:15 29:1 13,14 32:10,17 38:18 09:7,12 40:8,20 70:14 16:21 13359:2 16:6,7 299:9 30:11 13359:2 16:6,7 299:9 30:11 179:16 115:14 131:15 138:7 158:4 222:15 237:9 275:9 328:2 nent practical single p

	_I		
predominantly	presented 86:22	29:15	principles 128:4
112:14	presenting 130:8	prey 368:7	131:10 300:6 336:2 361:6
preemption 17:1	presents 30:2	price 64:19 70:4	
preexisting 36:4	preservation	107:13 108:3,5	prior 2:10 3:19 66:19 79:8 190:9
134:2	196:2	118:15 127:2	244:11 340:17
preface 124:7	preserve 108:9	136:3 222:22	
prefer 18:15	291:9 301:21	322:10 337:1	priority 351:1
210:20	President 75:5	priced 195:3	pristine 106:1
preference 90:15	84:7 257:9	198:13 247:2	private 39:11 92:4
271:2	277:21 281:11	prices 82:13	135:19 156:21
	342:13 343:3	111:11	158:4 196:16,17
preferred 143:14		pricing 81:4 85:14	privately 93:8
prelude 243:14	pressure 150:16 178:3 350:15	111:9,16 196:4	Prize 32:1
premise 128:1		primarily 20:9	
160:20 175:13	presumably	110:9 118:8	probably 6:11
265:11	115:13 354:18	181:12 195:13	38:11 54:15
premiums 289:11	presume 96:13		55:10 67:21
*	216:18	primary 8:5 14:18 63:1 85:22 90:22	118:9 124:13
preparation 28:10	presumed 30:9	98:13 134:5	127:6 183:1 188:6 191:17
207:20	68:5 192:7,12,22	150:15 174:4	209:9 210:14
prepare 17:20	presuming 224:4	177:22 178:12	219:11,22
prepared 94:11	·	185:5 242:14	221:19 227:17
352:12	presumption	249:21,22 250:9	268:20 278:2
preparing 207:12	193:21	252:10,15	320:3 321:19
344:13	pretty 37:20	281:21 303:14	366:16 371:9
	118:10 127:5	331:16 348:11	
prepping 232:11	131:18 157:11	356:16	problem 96:18 99:14 115:19
pre-retirees	169:5 171:7	principal 65:19,20	117:6 172:15,16
350:2,19	234:20 272:21	87:20 88:13 91:6	179:18 202:20
prescriptive	321:15	92:22 107:9,11	203:12 212:13
198:22 220:18	prevailing 80:12	108:14,22	215:5 224:6
presence 52:21	287:19	116:5,22 117:20	226:17 227:6
126:6 128:21	prevent 18:22	118:6,9	228:2 229:2
	30:14 259:13	119:13,16,19	230:6 232:19
present 3:2,6	333:17	127:17 151:18	308:3 323:2
115:5 157:14		192:14 196:5	324:9 371:14
183:21 343:18	preventing 76:22	197:17 224:1	problematic
presentation 94:16	83:8	principally 62:12	150:7,8 316:18
presentations	previous 165:10		ŕ
205:8	354:5 359:3	principle 305:7	problems 83:20
	previously 26:21	306:13	110:5,8

		i	
116:14,15 133:9	239:15 257:18	product's 295:7	67:1,2 84:17
215:1 319:5	273:20 292:21	profession 72:12	87:10,14,18,22
370:19	293:8,18	-	89:10 109:1
procedural 2:13	294:13,14	professional 8:10	154:4 156:8
-	295:5,17 298:16	70:13 71:3,6	170:19,20
procedures 115:10	299:4 336:7	72:2,11 188:8	187:18 200:4,8
proceeded 168:19	339:10 359:22	254:8 259:14	225:5 266:1
proceeding 101:13	365:11 370:22	261:7 265:16,18 266:18 268:4	290:11 310:19
	products 9:14 16:5		321:6 341:21
proceedings	17:15 35:2,19	329:1 371:11	342:3
240:14 374:7	44:15 46:5,15,16	professionals 7:21	prohibition 91:7
proceeds 185:20	49:13 51:15	33:17 92:20	•
202:6 307:13	53:16 59:17	173:2 188:3,10	prohibitive 192:16
process 9:8 25:2	60:20,22 61:12	258:15 260:5	260:8 261:18
29:2 57:4 60:4	62:1,2,4 81:9,12	351:10	267:3 300:14
67:6,10 75:16	83:2 87:21 88:3	professions 188:4	project 217:1
77:12 79:11 84:1	92:5	professor 54:10	projects 196:10
99:3 104:2,5	111:3,7,18,20	-	promised 290:20
109:9,16 110:17	112:7,10 129:15	profiles 216:18	-
114:5 162:4	138:13,19 156:7	profit 16:15	promote 13:1
194:6 206:21	163:14 175:21	270:13	promulgate 86:19
212:16 216:21	194:19,21,22	profit-sharing	promulgated 8:19
217:18,20	195:2 196:4,5	281:9,14 310:4	13:19 15:9
220:22 221:1,2	206:8,10 223:21	·	
234:3,5 264:3	224:7,14,16,20	profoundly 282:16	prong 189:8
301:6 314:10	242:4 255:14	program 2:3 85:17	pronounce 162:9
321:14 322:1	257:16 258:18	215:12 260:7	271:22
335:11 340:11	259:8,10 264:4	332:10 350:20	proof 296:17
processes 145:19	284:6 289:13	351:14	proper 41:7
produced 237:19	290:7 291:22	programming	200:20 205:8
_	292:20,21	221:20	353:1
produces	293:14,15		
238:19,20	294:9,11,14,17	programs 260:15,17 290:7	properly 80:13,19
product 34:19	295:4,19	310:4 333:15	337:21
35:7 44:7,8	297:10,20 298:20 299:9		properties 14:12
49:12 54:15	300:9	program's 351:6	property 7:17 8:2
118:14 122:15	301:16,19,22	progress	19:12 25:22
129:12 151:7,21	304:18 306:16	104:16,18	184:15 198:4
163:12,21	311:22 312:1	prohibit 71:11	207:3
182:16 206:12	316:3 321:7	88:1 169:1	233:14,19,22
223:15,16	343:8,18 344:14	258:17 341:21	251:18
224:11	351:13 368:8		285:10,17 287:2
238:5,7,16	221.12 200.0	prohibited 9:19	

	1 ag		
299:1	103:17 117:17	341:11	provide 7:8 17:17
proponent 101:11	135:5 139:9,15	prospective	18:9,15 19:4,15
	144:9 148:5	191:19 204:22	24:3,7 27:10
proposal 11:4 31:4	165:12 173:14	205:3 348:3	30:5 31:13 32:6
36:13 67:15	184:3,10 185:8		34:8,22
76:1,15,17,22	186:22 187:2,15	prospects 345:13	36:6,9,19 37:4
77:14,18 79:17	188:1	protect 13:1 21:21	44:4,6,9,11,12,1
81:7,19 82:3	189:7,12,18	31:12 37:2 61:6	3 45:7 52:11
83:2,19 84:10,12	190:1,14 191:16	65:12 67:13	53:11 59:1,2
89:17 99:8	192:5 195:12	120:11 133:12	61:18 66:2 67:9
100:18 129:4	196:1,13 197:6	135:22 173:4	68:17 70:13,21
142:18 145:9	200:16 203:5,12	176:4 185:11	72:19,21 73:1
148:6 193:7	204:10,15	249:1 258:11	76:6 78:12 79:6
197:10 199:19	205:14,15	280:18	83:7 88:7 95:1
200:22 203:2	206:16		96:12 97:12,14
284:19,22 285:6	207:17,21 211:2	protected 85:8 131:11 353:4	98:11,16,17,22
288:14 300:15	214:22 249:6,11		99:12,13 107:20
302:7 303:21	250:22 251:12	protecting 10:5	108:15 135:14
304:10 305:18	252:9	protection 68:21	143:4,22
306:4 336:13,17	256:10,14,16	77:13 86:14	144:10,16
338:20	258:2,20 260:4	133:3 186:15	145:7,18 163:10
341:15,19,20	262:21 266:14	200:2	165:1,3,21 166:8
342:11	282:22 283:5,21		188:3 191:18
proposals 26:4	285:8 286:22	protections	193:12 201:16
88:19 342:16	287:5,15	31:6,13 34:12	203:17
nyonosolis 75:17	288:4,9,11	72:3 85:2 138:1	205:1,4,19
proposal's 75:17 341:16	289:21 290:5,9	140:6 141:10	209:22 229:14
	291:1,15 296:6	187:16 200:2	233:6 243:3
propose 24:16	297:9 298:11,12	234:8	249:9,12 254:22
proposed 2:6,16	300:18 305:9	246:17,18,20 326:10 329:12	258:7 259:6
6:22 7:9 10:9	306:14 312:5,22	320.10 329.12	262:13 270:1
11:20,21 13:3	325:12,19	protective 82:20	286:6 287:13
14:2 15:3,15	328:3,13,18	85:7 115:12	288:8 294:3,15
17:22 19:4 22:13	329:6 331:7,9	246:20	298:2,8 300:21
23:2 25:1,2,6	339:11 365:18	protects 10:3 69:2	301:10,17,20
28:16 29:14	proposing 86:8	proud 248:20	302:1,17
33:10 34:13 35:5	101:12 206:6	-	304:5,18 306:8
37:1 43:20 44:1	313:18,19	proudly 238:12	310:21 313:20
64:22 65:14	ŕ	prove 356:16	314:3 320:9
72:13 83:15	proprietary 87:21 195:1 238:13	proverbial 344:8	321:3 322:22
85:6,16 86:1	195:1 238:13 258:18	-	326:2,21 330:7
87:4,5,7 90:20		proves 359:16	335:7 336:10
92:6 93:17	pros 298:18	364:22	338:5 339:4,17
			344:18 350:21

	1 48	-	
351:5,22 352:9	234:6 240:17	299:20	146:14 160:9
356:9 363:8	253:2,20 254:2	300:8,12,20,21	164:21 165:7
provided 19:17	282:3	301:13,22	184:5,19 187:7
24:18 26:7	295:1,11,17	302:3,11 303:4	188:5 192:7
28:14,22 29:3	302:8	304:2,16 305:1	193:2 199:20
33:21 34:8 56:20	303:7,10,12	306:22 308:2,10	201:17 202:13
65:19 67:19 68:2	306:17	313:16 314:2	205:16 207:1
69:6 70:7 84:20	314:13,14 316:7	320:5 321:2,20	226:20 227:22
85:4,20 91:19	319:7,8 322:5	330:4 331:4	228:8 230:2
97:3 123:4	329:14	333:12,14,22	233:11,22
128:11 129:18	331:21,22 337:2	341:15,19	252:17 255:1
139:17 146:22	343:6,11 362:17	346:22 347:1	258:8 266:2
185:4 205:14	366:19	351:22 360:3,20	285:6 297:4
245:3 249:20	provider/plan	361:3 366:15	302:12 304:2
251:2,7 255:6	80:7	367:4,5	313:16 318:16
266:16		provider's 27:21	326:4,9 327:22
271:10,13 283:7	providers 18:10	30:17 295:3,10	330:16 337:7
284:1 285:21	22:19,22 27:9	301:4,15 302:5	338:13 339:13
286:1 287:9	28:7,17,20	303:5	343:12 344:1
288:12 293:20	29:3,8,17 32:16		347:1 353:17
296:18,22	34:3 36:19 40:16	provides 7:11	360:4
301:11 308:9	41:20 44:3 51:14	14:3,9 27:22	provision 21:1
322:1,2,3 328:20	78:4,8,22 79:3,6	30:6 32:22	23:5,11 26:10
348:1 354:10	80:2,8,10 81:21	33:6,11 34:13	34:15 55:16
357:18 359:21	82:7 83:7 86:3,7	48:4 50:1 68:21	86:20,21 95:7,12
	89:22 91:22 92:2	73:8 200:1	156:2 172:2,3
provider 24:17,21	104:20 130:1	241:19 244:14	185:14 193:4
25:12,14,21 26:14 27:13	139:5,22 140:2 141:18 142:20	246:16 271:7	212:6 247:16
		285:14 303:13 326:1,5 330:19	283:1,21
29:7,21 30:1,5,14	143:4,7,15,21 144:1,7 145:17	336:15 344:13	284:7,12,19,20
36:10,14,15	146:5,13 147:1,8	345:13	285:12,17,21
39:12,19 40:5,6	152:22 163:9		286:19,22
41:1 50:14,16,20	164:4 165:14	providing 7:13	287:3,11 288:17
52:7 63:5 73:10	185:10 195:5	10:6 13:6 15:4	365:11
78:10 80:13	198:15 199:13	19:10 23:20	provisions 5:15
92:21 102:5	205:13 250:7	28:19 31:8 34:18	9:20 50:10 51:9
137:8,11 140:7	251:14 253:5,10	71:1 75:9 77:16	75:13 76:1 82:21
143:10	255:19 257:21	78:17,19 79:13	117:12 118:2
144:13,14,16,22	267:21 273:8,13	83:9 85:2 86:17	128:21 135:6
145:7 146:6	274:9 282:1	89:14 95:9 126:6	168:16 200:4
152:5 158:5,11	287:13 288:1,8	133:22 134:12	283:4 285:19
163:10 205:3,20	291:5 293:12	137:5,11,18	286:20
227:20 233:11	295:9 297:10	142:2 144:1	200.20
227.20 233.11	275.7 271.10		

	1 46		
proxy 134:13	90:17,21 264:6	152:8 170:12	69:4,12 73:8
prudence 296:10	294:13 346:7	174:15 175:22	89:13 90:3 94:8
315:15	purchaser 19:11	224:5 316:5	95:17,20 98:7
	20:14 34:19	357:12	101:1 102:15
prudent 15:2	285:7 291:16,17	puzzled 64:19	110:21 111:6,13
17:17 74:16	ŕ	•	114:18 115:19
140:20 141:5	purchases 252:2	PWC 221:14	117:7 118:17
202:4 235:22	262:19 293:20		120:3,14,15
287:19	purchasing 47:1	Q	123:6 124:11
prudently 336:11	233:15 242:4	QDIA 46:17	125:5 126:17
,		268:10	127:10 144:18
PSCA	pure 171:4 172:6		160:16 166:15
281:10,13,18	purely 120:22	qualification	169:6
282:5,9 283:3	purpose 10:18	133:2	170:2,15,18
284:9,17 285:18	18:12 25:13	qualifications	172:10 173:8
286:18 287:20	26:15 27:9 42:8	236:2	174:12,18
PSCA's 281:11,15	67:10 81:17	qualified 17:6,8	175:4,7,16
PTE 91:2	251:10 254:7	241:17 242:1	184:15 209:2
	370:18 372:1	247:17 242.1	211:7 220:17
PTE-8424 311:1		263:12	229:13 232:1,10
public 1:3 2:5 3:12	purposefully 44:6	289:14,17 329:2	237:7,8 240:1
4:10,13 11:5,12	purposely 344:3	·	241:1,5 244:15
77:1,6 84:7		qualify 42:18 74:2	245:4,9 250:14
101:12 103:1	purposes 2:7,22 207:15	qualifying 71:12	252:22 269:17
123:12,15	207.13		271:3,10,19
130:10 215:3	210:19 258:8	qualifying-type 230:3	271:3,10,15
282:17 298:8			276:1,2,13,14
374:1,17	285:3	quality 36:20 44:2	279:8 309:11
ĺ	pursuant 8:4	45:21 165:13	314:19 317:16
publicly 7:6 12:2	14:17 167:8	333:21	320:19 321:10
85:14 93:8 94:21	283:6 284:22	quantify 321:21	322:13 323:4
publish 341:14	pursue 72:5	· · ·	350:6 354:4
published 2:14	143:13 176:15	quarrel 312:16	357:10,11
306:20 323:18	177:8	quarter 219:22	365:16
		345:18	
pull 157:10	pursued 146:17	quarterly 228:17	questioning 127:7
pumping 70:20	pursuing 22:2	question 9:2,3	193:19
purchase 18:17	pursuit 291:1	37:14 40:18	questions 3:10,14
133:19 134:18	push 163:20	42:13 45:18	23:20 46:21 48:8
136:7,8 182:21	-	51:17 53:1,6	49:22 58:14,18
206:12 251:18	puts 30:10 150:16	54:22 56:18	60:2,7 84:1
261:20 311:5	159:1 177:10	57:14,21 59:21	85:18
purchased	213:9	61:11 62:8 66:15	94:1,5,20,21
par chascu	putting 122:7	01.11 02.0 00.13	108:18 111:9

	1 ag	-	
123:3 124:8	273:18 288:5	reached 185:17	230:20 235:4
130:6,8,9 139:8	305:16	reaches 341:16	236:22 269:4
156:15 168:8	raises 98:5 144:17		270:9 271:1,6,12
169:7 188:17	271:17 282:22	reaching 32:20	273:1,21 275:17
193:20 199:9		346:13	276:1,2 278:7,10
215:6 229:5	raising 198:2	reaction 167:3	279:1,2,3,18,20
234:12 235:8	randomly 64:11	reactions 129:8	280:10 311:14
236:18 256:7	range 73:9		314:22 317:8
257:2 267:8	194:18,21	readily 81:13	319:14 324:4
270:9 271:17	256:16 281:15	118:15	326:8,19
288:5 299:14	335:10 339:19	reading 12:17	354:10,14 357:2
308:15 309:5	341:3 343:17	45:10 73:19	365:15 370:22
319:13 324:16	344:22 347:3,17	149:5 170:7	371:9
334:17 345:1	354:19	ready 11:2,22	reason 7:13 55:7
350:12 352:12		58:16 199:9	69:22 125:14
354:1	rarely 72:5	281:5	142:22 163:17
quick 168:8	ratcheted 229:15		211:6 213:6
quickly 306:4	rate 221:3 237:19	real 81:11 90:3	236:10 364:13
_ · v		192:17 261:9	reasonable 116:8
quill 239:10	rates 337:1 349:8	realistic 300:19	163:20 250:2
quite 62:9 87:3	350:13	reality 168:13	300:10 333:21
104:4 117:8	rather 8:14 14:16	266:5	337:8 356:7,15
133:17 135:9	22:15 27:13 34:3		363:6 370:13
136:18 210:13	43:4 77:7 80:17	really 39:3	
310:12 311:18	87:18 101:12	43:2,6,14 47:20 48:2 53:12 54:13	reasonableness
315:22 318:5	173:2 179:5		29:1
356:6,12 364:21	207:10 212:17	58:5 95:13,15 97:12 98:14	reasonably 34:17
366:11	231:13,18	100:19 101:2	285:5 294:5
quitting 310:7	259:12 266:22	100:19 101:2	329:18,22 361:2
	315:2 317:10	115:21 122:3	reasons 101:16
quo 75:20	327:7 330:13	124:15 128:1,19	106:13 165:14
quote 78:1	335:20 344:3,5 368:15	129:13 137:4	189:13 200:1
quoting 269:20		151:1 152:7	242:14 250:19
	rating 70:4	159:15 163:16	263:15 278:21
R	135:12,13	169:3,11	296:22 356:8
radically 132:11	ratings 318:21	170:12,13,14,16	362:3
_	rationale 86:9	171:3	reassess 93:19
raise 292:15		173:6,18,19	
306:15	re 101:11 237:9	178:7,11,22	reassuring 168:10
raised 11:14 65:11	256:15	181:7,9 188:12	rebounded
76:18 94:20	reach 40:21 136:3	191:3 211:8	346:7,12
117:3,4 256:7	149:16 202:19	216:11 220:17	rebuild 223:6
266:9 270:16		225:19,21,22	

	<u> </u>	i -	1
receipt 89:9	66:14 69:13	282:10,11,18,19	144:4 185:16
receive 10:14 24:4	135:1 149:13	283:17 294:2,6	reconsidered 88:3
34:1 119:15	172:16 180:3	295:13 303:3	
146:5 177:4	206:11 231:10	309:7,8,9,14	reconvene
241:18 246:18	282:8 293:2	322:15 336:18	183:13,15
247:6 254:5	294:5 328:20	340:9	record 3:12 4:5
263:11 265:15	338:14 339:12	recommendations	11:5,6,13 103:1
266:10 276:20	recipients 327:21	8:2 19:3,11	106:1,2 117:22
290:21 294:10	329:9	20:19 21:2 28:1	123:12,15
329:18 348:11		34:2,4,7,11,15	130:10
353:2,8,13	recipient's 65:7	43:11 47:1 49:10	308:15,19 374:7
received 2:17	296:5	50:2,5,16 89:5	recorded 374:5
10:21 37:21	recital 68:10	109:22 122:1	recordkeeper
206:2,9,20	recognize 35:21	150:4 157:14	204:22
256:17 299:6	79:17 91:18	184:11,13	
307:9 326:12	117:3 178:10	185:18	record-keeper
327:8 331:3	222:14 303:9	186:13,19	40:20 42:3 51:18
342:12 361:2	324:6 361:14	200:15	75:8 82:1,4
	recognized 10:1	228:17,18,21	114:2 141:21
receiver 162:1	23:19 35:19	241:3,7 242:13	164:20
279:19	288:16,22 324:1	246:7,11	recordkeepers
receives 133:1	ŕ	247:8,12 248:4	195:5 229:7
176:21 206:8	recognizes 32:10	249:7 262:14	248:19 272:6
receiving 22:22	77:18 80:19	291:17 292:2	273:8 299:21
68:22 133:20	185:6	295:5,18,20	336:9 339:4
135:2 276:4	recognizing	331:11 336:16	record-keepers
282:3 326:18	273:22 327:20	recommended	24:22 25:4 26:2
	recommend 35:4	87:1 119:21	92:17
recent 86:12 131:11 132:7	80:21 87:17	249:5 293:21	record-keeper's
202:10 206:20	175:21 178:4	recommending	23:16 26:3,8
286:7 326:10	245:18 299:2,9	65:16 105:16	, i
330:11 332:12	331:12 354:20	134:18 226:15	Recordkeepers
342:14	recommendation	293:19	325:8
	21:3,6,8 25:15		Record-keepers
recently 6:16	26:19 45:4 50:20	recommends	24:3
105:15 297:12	52:9 65:5 150:20	200:17 241:4	recordkeeping
327:20 349:19	174:2 185:19	261:16,19	199:15 204:7
receptive 318:6	201:7,10	265:19	226:22 227:5
recharacterization	243:1,17 244:22	reconciliation	343:12 344:1
305:3	245:4,6,16,22	219:19	360:4,5
	247:14 261:21	reconsider 29:17	, , ,
recipient 19:8	265:21	93:17 140:15	record-keeping
34:16 35:6,11			82:10,11,12,13

	1 46		
recused 6:18	296:6	175:9 177:20	7:9,18,21
redefine 197:8	Reform 86:14	178:10,13	8:15,16,20
307:8		187:21 211:6	9:4,12,16
	refuse 89:1	238:1,13	10:9,18 11:20,21
redone 222:5	refuses 205:4	280:8,11 332:8	14:2 17:1 20:22
reduce 44:2	reg 6:22 43:20	334:13 353:5	22:13 23:2 28:17
165:12 202:15	47:22 109:7	362:13 368:11	31:11,21 32:12
259:18 281:21	110:5,7 117:11	372:3	33:10 34:13
reduced 82:12	160:18,21	regimen 183:6	36:10 37:1,8
374:5	161:12 162:3,14	210:15 366:14	39:4 44:1,9
	165:12 171:2		62:11,13 65:1,15
reducing 76:10	172:6 173:14	regimes 169:4	68:14,16 72:13
re-engage 345:22		Register 2:14	73:16,17,19,22
re-engineering	regard 3:10 4:1	registered 29:22	74:3,6,9,11,12
198:14	20:5 25:22 73:20	81:5 107:17,19	75:21 77:21
	78:2 96:2 143:2	111:14 125:1,2	83:1,18 84:14
reexamine 31:16	217:13 258:12	192:6,10 200:13	85:3,6,17
138:20	283:9	250:11,12	87:7,13 92:6
re-examine 351:19	regarding 23:12	295:2,17	93:7,18 100:4
reexamined 10:13	24:8 26:8 28:1,9	ĺ	108:8 111:1,22
	35:14 78:20	registration	112:20 113:12
refer 164:13	81:20 87:8 189:7	192:13	114:15,18,21
212:16	244:18 249:6	Regrettably 197:3	129:21 131:17
reference 54:20	251:11 254:17	regular 8:3,15	133:7,14 148:6
57:15 360:9	257:3 263:21	14:16 85:20	149:5 150:5
referral 271:7	265:2 280:5	150:15 177:22	154:21 161:8
345:10	283:19	178:12 185:4	173:11
	284:7,8,21	281:20 356:10	189:7,12,13,18
referred 55:14	287:10 290:5		190:2,14
60:21 62:5 111:4	295:5,6,19 298:1	regularity 282:7	191:4,16
284:19 361:16	303:8 310:9	regularly 139:4	192:5,21 193:22
refine 11:19	325:19	213:10,11	195:13 196:1
276:13	regardless 22:19	regulate 9:19	197:6,14 200:16
refinement 217:19	28:13 88:9 89:7	regulated 5:21	201:2 203:5,13
	134:1 143:16	11:19 77:3 80:13	204:10,16
refining 217:17	169:20 183:6	213:8 239:22	205:11,14,15 206:16
reflect 37:22	282:6 286:3	332:20 333:1	
138:15 185:21	345:14 352:15	363:22 364:15	207:17,21 211:1 218:1,2,17
reflected 2:18 13:9	regards 204:15	367:4	232:3,4,12,18
73:18	210:4		236:20 241:6
reflects 28:12		regulating 59:14	242:21 246:7
185:8 207:15	regime 40:2 56:2	regulation 2:6,16	252:9 271:2
103.0 207.13	120:1,3,19,22	5:12,14	298:12 303:19
			490.14 303.19

	1 46		1
312:6,21 317:17	77:12 103:7	84:16 99:17	relied 204:4 291:4
323:17	184:19 189:15	103:20 104:7	relief
328:3,13,19	195:17 218:2	113:5 114:1	16:10,13,17,19
329:7 331:7,9,13	220:11 249:1	124:15 125:7	118:3 270:2
332:3 355:21	256:2 260:2	137:6 144:15	285:20 310:21
357:20	297:20,21 298:9	151:15,20	
364:3,4,18,22	305:11 334:11	161:21 168:1,2	relieve 66:17
regulations 7:5 9:3	342:16 353:5,12	171:10,17 177:2	68:11
11:22	355:3 372:3	181:10,11 193:6	relieved 160:12
13:3,4,7,13,17,1	reign 333:6	206:3 225:16	rely 10:15 27:7
9 14:13	8	265:5 270:11	125:11 146:22
15:3,5,9,15 16:8	re-invest 245:13	271:8 277:15	167:13 173:1
17:22	reiterate 144:6	287:8,12 288:20	234:5 241:15
18:9,15,20,22	153:10	294:22 295:16	295:15 301:4
19:4 21:18 22:17	rejected 89:15	302:6 303:6	
23:9 25:5 28:4	Ü	304:19 313:5	relying 124:18
29:6,14 30:5	relate 134:19	314:16,21	125:7 144:16
48:9 83:15 91:21	340:7	337:10 371:19	145:6 228:10,11
103:17 104:21	related 21:2 24:5,9	372:12	231:12 234:11
121:8 122:20	29:18 57:6	relationships	remain 11:6 51:11
131:21 139:15	79:6,19 94:21	10:12 41:13	244:12,15
144:10 154:6	116:22 186:9	57:10 92:1	345:21 346:3
170:13 194:9	201:13 207:7	138:21 144:21	remainder 135:5
198:11 256:18	241:3 246:5	195:4 206:1	261:8
258:2,21 260:5	292:5 313:7	265:13 301:17	
264:10 265:14	331:11 339:2	305:4 330:3	remained 346:4
266:15 268:10	374:8	333:12 335:18	remaining
274:3 297:12	relates 97:16	336:5	246:4,14
301:20 305:21	102:3,4 109:19	relative 21:5	remarks 3:22
328:18 329:21	145:9 202:7	103:22 260:1	190:22 199:7
331:20 332:18		367:9 374:10	317:9 323:16
334:8 364:19	relating 30:17		324:3
regulation's 15:14	185:18 201:19	relatively 16:2	
G	262:14 266:3 283:5	64:12 118:21	remedies 10:6
Regulations 5:1		120:6 322:4	72:6
6:15	relation 129:10	released 200:14	remedy 132:16
regulator 215:16	relationship 24:1	relevant 203:1	315:14
regulators 56:3	35:20 36:5	225:9	remember 54:22
194:8 198:20,21	40:3,20,22	reliable 345:5	remove 21:3
214:20	41:10,14 45:17		202:17 223:12
	56:8,19 57:7	reliance 46:1,3	238:2
regulatory 9:6 21:20 28:14	61:1,17 62:19,22	231:10,19	
21.20 28.14	63:3 79:19 80:7		removed 137:14

	1 48		
removes 197:18	30:7 158:12	requested 284:6	71:15 175:11
removing 25:20	294:7,15 316:22	requesting 2:20	180:2 205:15
79:12 85:19	representations	46:8	226:1 263:16
265:6 282:5	296:1,19 311:11		337:18 338:12
	, i	requests 2:17 3:18	requiring 22:18
render 8:1,6	representative	143:1 205:5	83:13 88:2
rendered 13:13	24:2 125:1	347:14	
15:18 115:22	193:17 303:11	require 65:15	requisite 47:10
296:5	337:3	70:17 71:10	293:21
rendering 2:7	representatives	80:10 153:22	research 4:21 45:7
14:15 67:1	107:17 272:9	163:18 191:18	70:3 93:8 94:22
131:15 185:2	292:10	193:12 203:9	95:2,5 129:2
290:14	represented 32:14	225:10 264:8	135:11,13
	89:7 254:10	329:6 330:13	150:2,3
renders 7:14 14:10	332:22	336:18 340:2	reservations
repeatedly 74:1		341:2 361:1	281:19
204:3	representing 3:21	required 17:17	
manlaga 12:4 95:10	22:10 183:22	90:21 93:2	resident 292:19
replace 13:4 85:10 164:12	281:14	104:21 113:13	resolve 85:18 98:9
	represents 91:17	143:16 145:17	346:21
replacing 79:12	257:17 299:19	154:7,22 183:10	resource 343:21
report 28:11,13	360:3	187:21 192:19	
29:3 54:1,6 95:2	re-price 321:7	193:8,16 194:3	resources 85:2
127:4 202:10,13	<u>-</u>	211:20 252:11	respect 7:3,16,22
reported 55:2	re-proposal	352:5	8:18 14:12 18:14
326:11	342:13		28:9 30:2,8,9
	re-propose 189:11	requirement 47:18	34:14 35:2 43:10
reporting	249:8	68:9 69:5 81:18	45:21 46:1 49:20
27:10,17,21	reproposed 305:20	193:1 205:19	51:18 55:5
28:5,8,18		252:4 316:20	103:10 115:4
80:19,22	re-proposed 22:14	317:3,18 356:15	117:8 118:6
207:7,13,14	re-proposing 77:5	requirements	149:19
reports 28:10	reputable	24:12 28:14	155:16,17
47:19 94:22 95:6	234:13,19	29:19 30:4 77:11	160:6,18,22
196:22 207:12	ŕ	85:19 92:9 93:21	165:21 167:11
286:10,12,15	request 35:13	103:19 122:16	173:6 181:20
represent 63:20	136:12 185:13	133:2 167:10	184:14
107:16 138:10	201:12	178:7 185:4	186:13,21 187:4
158:5 167:7	204:12,21 205:6	196:12,20	191:5 200:15
208:13 272:5	253:14,22	201:13 215:17	202:8 203:4
289:10 297:1	254:18 282:14	219:4 249:18	210:16 211:18
304:4	286:20 295:8	252:13	213:1 227:2,8,14
	296:22 297:6	requires 8:15	229:7 233:14,17
representation		requires 0.15	

1	<u>_</u>	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
241:10	157:19 158:6	342:4	133:1 135:22
243:4,18,22	159:7 166:20	resulting 93:5	137:14,18
244:14	176:10 236:18	105:11	140:20 186:4
246:12,22	302:14 321:8		188:21 195:10
262:15 263:12	responsible 95:15	results 97:12	202:11 232:22
265:19 266:4	140:20 141:14	105:3 128:20	239:13
297:4 307:3	189:4 293:12	260:13	240:12,16,18,20
332:5,7	303:4 333:3,5	retail 88:4 90:13	241:10,13,15,20
340:16,20	334:2 343:4,18	119:4,5,19	242:3,7 244:20
355:13,14 357:2	, and the second	194:13 195:21	248:15 254:19
370:17	rest 12:15 63:17	197:21 222:7	255:16
respectable 69:21	108:17 182:11	224:3,13	257:13,16,18
_	restate 271:4	238:14,15	258:4 259:17
respected 172:13	restated 237:12,17	241:19 242:1,7	260:14 262:12
respectfully 93:16	ŕ	247:4 297:18,20	263:7,22
253:22 256:15	restaurant 64:1,6	298:4 328:7	264:16,18
respects 67:13	65:2 74:18	343:22	265:3,10
181:22	147:19	retain 185:9	266:8,19 267:2
	restaurants 65:6	243:21 285:20	278:3 282:16
respond 32:10 185:13 270:22	restrict 351:21	338:22 339:9	283:14 284:9,14
185:13 270:22 349:13 353:18		retaining 196:3	287:14 288:2
354:1 365:1	restricted 130:1 353:5	249:18	289:1,16,18
			299:20 303:1,22
responded 166:10	restrictions 122:12	Retention 246:15	304:13,20
271:12	290:12	retire 337:6	305:6,15,19
responding 60:7	restrictive 181:8	retiree 186:10	306:20 313:1 314:11 325:7
165:21 251:20	result 13:21 15:7	367:13	314:11 325:7 326:22 327:19
response 2:16	53:9 54:3 77:12		326:22 327:19
237:8 284:22	80:12 82:5,11	retirees 10:5	331:14,17 332:20
324:17	91:7 105:3	331:17 334:3	332:20
347:10,14,19	119:15 131:20	349:21 350:15	335:11,16,17,18
, ,	136:3,19 142:13	368:8	342:18 343:6
responses 130:9	181:2 184:5	retirement 8:20	344:2,11,17
139:8 143:4 251:21	198:12 226:5	10:2,3,19	344.2,11,17
251:21	239:4 242:22	13:1,22	349:16,21
responsibilities	246:13 247:13	15:8,11,16 16:3	350:1,3,5,7,11,2
30:14 33:16 99:5	250:6 260:4	17:6,10,16,20,21	1,22 351:6,14
253:15 327:18	263:6 264:10	21:9,12 22:3,11	352:6,9,13,14
330:22	265:9,20 266:2	32:16 46:11	353:16 366:19
responsibility	288:4,14	52:22 61:7,9	367:1
68:12 70:6	291:6,19 300:16	75:6,8,10,11	369:4,5,6,8,10
139:15,19 140:1	302:11 305:21	76:3 83:1 90:5	370:10 371:8
142:8 147:9	334:5 340:16	112:14 131:18	2.3.13.371.0

	1 ag		
retiring 255:4,6	336:1 342:12	Roberts 281:4	Ross 130:15 138:6
368:4	revisiting 161:1,5	289:5,6,7 299:16	routine 204:18
retooling 92:13	rework 222:15	310:10,17	340:11
retraining 92:19		311:9,18 314:18	routinely 66:21
Ŭ .	re-write 201:13	315:20 317:8 318:1,5 323:5,13	251:19 268:7
retrospect 14:22	RFP 251:21	316.1,3 323.3,13	rudimentary
return 45:14	313:10		15:21
returns 15:8 52:22	RFPs 251:20	role 16:2 32:9 40:4	
53:9 54:3 186:5	rich 310:4	59:12 63:7	rule 10:13 31:20
318:20		142:10 144:3 149:12 150:6	55:17 56:12
reveal 21:16	ride 364:14	161:18 171:19	57:16 58:7
revealed 346:10	riders 263:19	173:21 174:5	77:6,8,10 78:21 86:1,11,19 87:4
	rights 12:21 22:1	244:19 302:5	92:8 95:5,10
revenue 9:22	24:4,9 69:9	303:5 330:2	98:2 99:4 101:12
114:3 199:22	246:17 315:12	346:1	108:17 110:13
222:4	rigid 7:20	roles 33:16 56:9	116:16,18
237:11,19,20	S	57:7 327:17	117:17 130:5
238:4,19,20	rigorous 290:22	343:16	133:15 134:10
290:13	rise 10:12 25:7		135:6 140:17
revenues 219:18	31:17 72:14	roll 50:17 58:16	142:13 144:5
reverse 86:1 282:9	193:20	60:18,19 83:16	150:16 154:6
309:7 315:6	rising 349:18	213:19 265:22	169:12 184:3,7
review 28:22	350:8	266:6 331:22	185:8 186:22
60:13 75:21	risk 29:18 45:14	333:17	188:2 191:13
77:1,6 92:3	69:19 89:19 99:7	rolled 50:18	247:21 249:6,11
101:12 136:16	108:20 134:7	275:21	250:22
138:16 200:19	135:16 198:17	rolling 50:13 59:5	256:11,14,15
219:17 335:13	199:5 242:4	340:13	282:22
346:9 347:22	300:12 302:14	rollover 24:6 51:4	283:5,11,22
349:11	305:3	60:3 61:16 83:10	284:16 285:8,20
reviewed 143:18	321:8,11,16	262:8 276:5	286:20,22
	333:8 345:20	310:9 337:3	287:5,15 288:9
reviewing 195:12	risk-based 225:4	340:15,19,21,22	289:21 290:9,16 291:15,21 294:3
revise 20:17 29:5		341:4	291.13,21 294.3 296:6
318:15 336:13	risking 80:3	354:7,12,18,20	297:1,6,9,15
revised 249:16	230:12	355:5,6,7	298:11
250:22 251:16	risks 97:11 146:16	rollovers 23:21	303:17,18
revising 77:5	191:20 200:4	340:7	305:20 306:20
92:20 101:11	241:10 304:17		318:2
	350:10	room 6:11 10:21	335:12,14,18
revisions 249:5	roadmap 98:22	372:15,21 373:7	336:1 337:11
		_	

	1 46	<u> </u>	
338:21 342:18	running 318:22	salesperson 99:18	235:2,7,11,15,21
356:3 357:8 360:8 371:21	runs 110:14,16	salesperson's 20:7	236:15 237:4
372:15	148:19	sample 26:2	scan 64:1
ruled 16:9	Ryan 189:2 191:1	204:21 295:9	scandals 131:12
	211:14,17	313:11	scared 156:15
rulemaking 87:11 116:16 206:21	212:10,14 213:4 214:6,9 220:2	sanctioned 198:8	367:22
rulemakings	223:20	sand 146:18	scares 120:12
216:15		sandwich 344:8	scariest 155:21
rules 5:20 67:3	S	sat 228:16 236:16	scenario
77:12 82:22	safe 113:16	satisfied 38:7	151:5,7,13
87:6,10,22 88:21	255:2,5 303:3,17	save 259:16 303:1	191:21
102:13 128:8	317:4,21	335:14	scenarios 268:5
131:10 153:17,21	safeguard 307:5	344:5,6,11,12	Schapiro 195:19
166:12	safely 38:11	345:1 353:14,20	schedule 3:3
171:14,15	sake 257:21	369:8	183:13
191:16 193:11	salary 179:11	saved 239:13	school 31:22 132:4
195:17 200:5	sale 80:7 87:21	savers 335:9	scope 14:14 15:14
225:5 245:9 249:8,15 250:20	104:6 136:7,8	341:20 342:7	29:14 47:15
249.8,13 250.20 251:13 256:22	145:12,22	348:14	71:18 184:11,17
258:9 267:4	181:7,9 206:6	saving 342:17	188:4 194:2
269:22 290:5	243:13 251:18	349:22 353:16	203:21 204:17
292:7 297:17	258:17 263:16 291:21 294:21	savings 76:7 90:5	207:9,11 211:21 254:5 269:8
298:7 300:6	295:3,16,21	242:3 244:20	297:15 300:17
301:14 306:21	340:3 365:11	261:3 262:10	
307:1 325:15	371:19 372:14	331:15 333:17	scores 93:1
327:13 333:1,2	sales 14:5	343:11 344:9 348:13,18 349:8	scratches 64:18
334:15 335:6 336:8,14 340:7	24:13,16,19 25:2	350:1	screen 231:13,15
341:21 342:3	26:4 38:22 63:7	352:4,13,14	screening 143:16
351:21 363:20	66:9 79:14,17,20	369:5 370:9	screens 229:18
368:16	104:2 140:16	Saxon 183:17	230:15,16,17
rule's 291:1	144:4 182:12,14 204:18 205:8	199:10,11	231:2,3 319:1
Rules 191:18	204.18 203.8 252:2 258:17	208:11,15,18,22	scribbled 269:13
211:18 212:5	284:19,22 285:6	209:8,15 210:3 225:7 226:7	sea 190:16 220:20
run 106:18,20	291:2	227:12 228:7	search 164:13
130:5 148:18	292:1,4,9,13	229:5,12 230:20	
367:18	324:1,11,13	231:2,21 232:9	seated 189:2
	salesman 55:6,10	234:17	seats 130:19

	1 ag	-	
SEC 5:11 6:4	208:2	13:1 18:17 19:12	116:1 148:15
86:18,22 87:2		21:9 22:11 34:19	149:3 151:6
88:1,4 93:20	Secretary 2:3,12	35:7 43:12 91:5	157:4 163:19
100:14,18	4:16,18 63:17	115:3 135:22	166:2 168:11
101:17 107:1	195:18 211:14	137:18 144:11	172:13 177:7
109:12,14	233:4	186:4 248:15	210:21 268:15
119:9,10,20	Secretary's 97:7	352:8	362:1 364:12,21
123:12 125:18	SEC's 258:13		365:12 370:19
		seeing 7:2 46:1,2	
133:5,7	259:12 267:2	109:14	seen 46:3,6
154:10,13,16,17	298:9	162:13,15	104:13,14
189:16 191:13	section 86:13	182:14 275:22	105:6,10 132:14
195:18,22 198:8	87:16	290:19 293:12	274:22 275:3
200:10,11,14,20	100:8,18,19	seek 70:21 174:8	309:12 310:1
209:5,11 211:1,2	123:17 191:13	253:8 283:17	347:21
258:16 260:1	207:12 288:21	290:20 291:9	segment 90:16
277:9 280:12	329:21	309:18 312:4	0
298:4,6 305:10	sections 187:18	314:22	segments 257:17
327:20 328:3			seismic 15:16
330:10 353:3	sector 156:21	seeking 37:2 41:19	select 50:8 79:2
363:21,22	sectors 262:17	202:2,4	91:2 164:12
second 3:21 13:19	secure 176:2	259:11,21	255:3 336:11
64:12 81:3	257:16 266:19	266:18 268:4	372:14
101:22 115:22	296:16	283:14 307:14 313:10	
119:1 140:14			selected 73:12
142:16 149:16	securities 20:15	seeks 35:10 83:16	141:1 183:2
151:11 189:22	25:21 35:2 48:5	84:15 295:14	236:6 294:14
192:18 196:6	84:8 86:15	296:11	329:17,19
203:12 215:8	88:11,18	seem 37:16 43:21	360:22
219:12 231:22	90:17,20 99:2	53:11 61:21 71:9	selecting 26:13
235:9,13,18	100:7 107:5,10	102:10 108:1	27:3 164:17
244:4 262:3	118:8 119:6	118:3 121:4	230:17 235:22
263:21 301:20	122:12 145:10	139:14,15 142:9	selection 27:1
304:16 311:9	146:6 155:7,20	324:2,3	73:21 134:13,14
337:11 340:1	164:17 184:14	,	142:1 146:3
345:12 348:8	200:13 207:3	seemed 112:3 160:19 168:14	184:16 195:6
362:13	226:14,15,17		285:16 286:17
second-guess	246:1 251:18	311:12 323:20	294:11
178:1 235:6	261:1 285:9,16	324:6	
Secondly 80:5	287:2,10 297:22	seemingly 304:7	selections 153:7
200:9 242:19	298:1,3 299:1,3 338:2 346:19	seems 46:22	self 108:4
		47:8,11 73:12	self-dealing 15:1
seconds 3:21 22:6	security 1:2 2:4	86:7 95:22 98:10	31:14 261:18
156:4,14 198:21	4:17,20 10:2	110:14 114:10	2 - 1 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 1
L		··-· - - · ··· ·	

self-direct 262:6	294:20 296:9	73:7 112:10	25:12,21 26:14
self-directed 15:19	298:13 299:7,8	113:1 114:13	27:9,21
90:9,18 121:6	301:5 310:11,14	115:15 118:3,12	28:7,17,20
132:1	311:19	146:6 148:22	29:2,7,16,20
	312:4,6,10,15	149:4 153:15	30:1,2,3,5,6,8,13
self-employed	315:7	166:9 173:9	,16 32:4 33:2,3,6
297:8,14	316:13,16,21	181:19 218:16	36:6,10,14,15,19
self-evident	317:13,19	275:20 276:21	39:12,19 40:5,15
282:18 309:17	323:6,21 324:9	309:16 321:21	41:1,2,20
self-interest 20:11	358:4,11 371:14	356:19	49:14,15,16
	Sellers 178:4	sensible 5:22	50:19 52:7 78:8
sell 18:17 54:11 91:5 92:5 95:7	selling 47:2 91:9	sensitive 215:20	80:7,8,10,13
96:17 150:18	118:13 122:15		81:21 82:4,7,8
178:14 181:14	127:19 144:11	sent 211:2,3	83:7 84:19
243:11 263:1	145:10 146:6	separate 112:17	86:3,6 89:22
282:19 309:18	150:17	206:21 269:2	91:19,22 92:2,21
	151:6,7,8,10,12,	separately	102:5 107:20
seller 19:12	19 152:1	297:6,11	124:22 125:3,6
20:15,17 34:19	178:3,21 179:1	ŕ	129:12 130:1
35:10,19 37:8	233:15 283:5	separation 275:12	138:9 139:5 140:7 141:18
38:7 70:20	284:18 291:16	SEPs 261:3	140:7 141:18
150:14,22 152:2	292:11 293:4	series 145:7	142.19
156:5,6 161:14	294:2 299:7		143.4,7,10,13,21
178:10 205:16	301:6 311:22	serious 17:12	145:7,17
206:3,5,8 251:16	316:2,4,14	110:11 241:9	145.7,17
269:3 285:7	324:7,8 336:7	seriously 179:22	147:1,7 151:11
293:7,17 294:7,9,17	339:10 366:12	196:8	152:5 158:5,10
301:10 315:10	368:8	serve 8:5 17:16	163:8,9 164:4
317:12 324:2	selling's 150:19	22:17 83:10	165:1,3,7 196:15
339:14 340:2	8	85:21 98:13	199:13
370:17	sells 151:16	134:5 139:6	205:3,12,20
	seminars 347:8	150:6 194:22	206:12 227:20
sellers 16:1 108:7	351:9	212:7 233:8	255:19 257:21
178:4 206:1	send 70:2 74:17	248:20 273:7,9	263:1 275:12
251:13 292:14	208:15,22 222:9	281:11 302:16	282:1 287:13,22
339:20 372:7	336:22 363:1	304:11 318:17	298:17 299:4,20
seller's 112:19,22		343:22	300:8,12,20
113:6,14 114:21	sends 95:2	served 102:6	301:13,21
117:10 181:7	senior 4:22	265:12 326:15	302:3,5,8,11
187:2 194:2	149:18,21		303:3 304:1
290:2 291:13	150:11	serves 194:14	305:1 306:22
292:14,16	sense 10:19 69:6	service 9:22 22:19	307:1 308:2,10
293:1,16,22		24:17,20	313:15,17

	1 46		
314:2,13 320:5	301:9,16,19	severity 215:4	shrink 36:15
321:2,20 322:4	302:1,2,9,12,19	shaded 70:18	shut 154:9
330:7 333:11,14,21	304:3,6,16,18 306:8,16 312:22	shame 308:20	shy 368:3
336:7 345:8	313:1,2 316:3	share 31:10 105:8	sidelined 345:21
359:21 362:17	338:5 340:12	125:12,14 139:2	sides 66:10 99:1
365:11 366:19	342:8	141:22 146:2	
services 9:14	343:5,8,12,18	164:6,9 165:15	SIFMA 66:20
22:11,12,22 23:4	344:1,14 346:22	196:16 248:5	68:13 86:20 90:11 91:17
27:11,12 28:5,8	347:1,2 351:22	288:2 290:18	93:16 95:21 97:5
29:17 30:10,11	353:2,4,13	300:1 308:13	98:8 101:11
32:8,17,18	360:4,6 371:1	322:19 359:4	114:11 123:4,16
36:2,4 41:19	serving 32:16	shared 343:21	127:13
51:4 61:12,19	194:20 212:13	366:17	128:11,16
75:6,10 78:13	240:18 304:11	shares 142:6 283:4	ŕ
83:10 97:14	SESSION 183:14	332:14 346:7	SIFMA's 68:20
129:18	sessions 351:10	366:12	114:12
139:17,20 145:12 151:9		sharing 256:5	sign 122:17 225:14
156:7 160:10	sets 5:20 40:2		signature 315:16
163:11	setting 56:8	Sharpe 32:1	317:6
169:10,11,12,14	settle 63:13 166:7	Sharpe's 32:5	signed 227:18
188:3,21 194:19	358:7	shaving 70:19	301:9
195:7 196:4	settled 148:18	shield 13:21 68:18	significance
199:14	settlements 304:21	shift 9:12 15:16	279:22
201:17,18	332:15 334:4	91:14 125:20	significant 9:10
203:9,18 205:1,4	366:13	132:1 351:3	15:11 16:7 32:8
209:22 223:22	seven 122:13	shifted 132:8	77:22 90:10
225:10 226:21 227:5 232:22	369:18,19	178:8 311:14	121:19 135:9
233:6 240:18	, ,		149:12 171:19
253.0 240.18	Seventh 154:19	shifting 198:5	173:21 174:5
253:18,20	several 33:9 35:16	319:7	176:13 184:21
254:13 257:10	40:18 46:7 55:15	shopping 183:7	186:12 189:18
259:8,19 266:16	76:19 190:1	short 133:10	197:4 204:11
270:3 280:6	264:18 268:20	221:11 367:18	242:16 243:8
287:14 288:9	283:8 284:9	371:12	244:10,19 247:3
289:13 290:8	298:21 299:2		250:4,6,10
291:5,22	313:13 338:19	shoulder 350:16	253:16 256:13
293:14,15	350:4 357:19	shown 119:14	288:2 304:17
294:9,11,17	severe 215:2	348:4	305:9,17 342:16
295:4,19 297:10	severely 7:18	shows 348:14	356:12 358:19
299:9 300:9	333:13		significantly 142:5
	l		

333:8 348:19	simultaneous	slightly 56:18	solicited 89:2
silk 64:21	189:14	196:14	Solicitor 4:19
similar 26:21	simultaneously	small 16:2 37:21	Solis 195:18
49:12 53:10 79:8	287:4	38:3 79:3 90:16	solution 38:21
92:18 122:21	single 8:12 141:22	124:16 258:3	163:11 215:4
139:16 141:19	154:13 163:9	259:13 260:14	233:9 234:9
143:13 145:13	203:18 213:11	263:10	250:2 308:3
148:22 149:3	sir 64:16	264:14,15,17,20	
232:1 255:7		265:1,5,7,9 277:11,22	solutions 214:22
268:13 281:15	sister 325:5	277.11,22 278:18 281:16	239:9
285:12 314:15	sit 42:4 63:14	304:14	273:2,13,21
322:17	130:22 170:11	326:11,14,17,21	solve 83:21 369:10
similarities 136:4	235:15 314:9	327:1,7,16	solved 266:11
similarly 59:2 74:6	sits 343:21	361:11	
79:4 83:12	sitting 224:18		solves 363:12
352:15	229:20	smaller 93:10	somebody 39:8
		97:19 112:15	45:16 53:8 54:11
simple 7:11	situation 40:15	243:8 278:15	99:17 121:18
66:8,16 134:10	149:1,17 151:22	Smith 188:21	158:20,22
186:20 187:9	158:19 160:9	194:14 219:7	161:16 169:9
193:4 229:13	173:18 181:16	309:2 310:1,5,10	172:17 173:5
359:7	252:16 312:2	311:8 316:10	176:11 181:12
simplest 344:16	317:10 319:15	354:5 355:1,6,20	183:7 278:19
simplify 260:2	366:11 368:15	356:5,13,20	314:20 354:12
1 1	situations 61:7	357:10,15,17	somebody's 39:6
simply 17:5,12	105:10 106:11	358:2,21	somehow 53:10
19:22 29:3 39:13	175:14 239:8	so-called 328:17	140:2 177:5
68:7 69:12 83:15	275:1 290:18		
89:1 92:9 96:12	309:13 310:1	social 183:19	someone 39:21
98:10 116:3	316:2 319:3	216:4 352:8	40:22 62:5 66:11
132:20 133:17	320:3 354:14	socialized 199:6	99:19 100:1
135:14 166:7	364:6	society 32:10	108:18 122:17
188:6 190:2	six 38:3 86:12	359:16	172:1 174:10
192:13 201:17	122:13 215:13		176:12 185:2
206:7 208:1	349:5	sold 54:16	227:15
213:19 270:20		206:9,10,13	250:15,17
313:16 317:4	size 215:4 268:7	238:13 263:14	252:12 271:7
320:14 321:2	281:15	339:21,22	302:16 309:17
334:11 336:6	sized 241:17	370:22 371:1	312:14 319:14
340:15 356:17 360:6 363:11	skills 231:6	solely 68:1 261:20	337:2,17 341:7
372:17		352:21	358:16
3/2.1/	sky 215:16	solicit 273:13	somewhat 17:13

		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
41:17 101:10	,17,19	163:8 250:13	165:2 344:16
151:19 155:11	174:5,7,9,11,15,	260:11 334:8	speculating 77:8
358:5 368:17	22 176:14,16,22	368:12	•
somewhere 52:4 95:18 127:14 172:21 236:5	177:17 178:12,16 179:8,18 180:17 181:15,18,19,21	special 64:16 74:20 269:18,19 270:1,11,17	spend 190:18 191:2 219:21 220:4 221:13,18 331:6
361:5	182:1,2,8,9,10,1	Specialist 5:1	spend-down 284:9
sophisticated 15:18 19:18	1,12,13,14,15	183:20	spending 197:2
20:19 37:9,13,18 41:17,18 42:6	211:20 276:13 279:4 280:11 314:21 315:3	specialized 247:5 specific 19:2 25:15	spends 121:19 265:2
53:7 254:2,4,6,9,11 267:9,10,11,14 268:12 269:5	314.21 313.3 317:21 318:6 319:11,19 320:2 326:2 355:4 372:2	26:19 34:1,4,7 38:7 41:12 42:19 43:3,15 44:9 45:4 47:1 49:9 50:5 52:1 60:7	spent 9:1 196:18 218:15 219:2,4,11,13,15 366:8,10
sophistication	sorts 48:1 49:22	61:10 79:18	spirit 94:3 308:18
135:9 268:8 sorry 19:6 38:18	168:12 229:5 230:17 337:8	111:6 134:18 142:11 143:2	spoke 255:22
42:5 122:10 162:11	355:3 370:16	148:11 170:17 184:13 189:19	sponsor 24:18 25:12
sort 42:19 47:18	sought 69:10 148:16 283:22	211:19 218:20	27:15,17,20,22
49:21 51:18 56:21 57:22 58:6	sound 131:10	228:21 253:14 275:5 286:20	28:15 30:13 41:10,15 42:5
59:21 113:2 114:16 115:8	sounds 319:16 321:15	299:2 313:2,3,12 336:18	52:10,16 56:3 93:9 103:22
123:21 124:14	source 202:19	specifically 60:19	142:5 227:18 228:4,10 229:20
128:14 148:11,18 149:10 150:1,3,6	sources 113:10 173:3 219:17	62:3 81:1 106:9 190:5 206:21 220:14 232:4	230:6 258:4 281:14 301:10
151:1,3,16,17,19	south 52:5 228:22	251:6 328:11	308:2,10 310:9
153:1,3,5 155:7 156:11 161:4,5,7,11,13, 18,19,20 162:5	space 114:15 162:13 224:3,21 232:22 SPARK 299:18	specifications 27:20 specificity 106:12	313:6,9 314:4,5,14 318:17 320:11 328:8 337:16 360:13 361:9
163:18 166:3 167:4,7,8,12,15, 16,21,22 168:4,7	300:3 307:4 308:12 speak 257:1	specifics 69:11 specified 253:16 specifies 285:8	sponsored 38:1 265:22 344:2 369:8
170:2,11,13,16,1 8	<u>-</u>	-	
8 171:1,4,10,11,13	speakers 148:8 155:3	specify 34:5 140:15 142:16	sponsors 22:18,21 25:1,17 26:1,15
172:5 173:8,9,12,13,14	speaking 147:21	spectrum 164:19	27:7,11 41:4,8 42:2 44:14 46:16

	1 ag		
57:5,10 58:10,18	88:2 91:14	173:5	statements 12:16
75:10 76:5 79:3	101:18,19		28:10 71:14
80:2 83:14	104:12 109:19	Stanley 188:21	316:18 336:19
104:20,22	110:16 119:11	194:14 196:17	
138:9,11 139:4	125:15 134:11	Stanley's 189:3	states 75:9 84:21
140:5 141:9,13	136:17 139:16	211:18	332:13,16
149:15 150:12	141:20 149:7,8,9	starkly 170:13	stating 206:7
255:3 268:7	154:13,16	•	statistics 127:4
270:5 272:6,14	192:11	start 12:4 75:18	
273:10 274:4	200:17,20	94:7 105:1	status 7:20
281:22 289:18	212:21 213:2	110:20 114:9	14:3,5,15 18:13
300:22 301:7	233:3 245:17	169:16,21 171:8	25:7 26:9 35:10
302:3,12,15	258:14,16	176:8 208:11	65:21 66:17
305:1 306:1	259:12 267:3	216:5 248:22	67:17,22 68:14
319:8,13 320:6	280:13,16 282:6	272:20 276:15	70:1,15 71:18
326:8,10 327:15	287:21 288:6	304:3 309:1	72:15,20 75:19
328:15 330:15	292:3 296:13	368:10 370:4	78:8 80:20 81:21
361:12 372:5	298:1 328:4	started 60:1 103:5	84:16 89:4 92:9
	330:11 356:1	168:1,3 281:7	116:21 139:6
spousal 246:17	371:21	325:1 355:22	140:13,18
spread 107:9		starting 47:16	154:11 167:10
195:3	standardized	120:5	174:6 185:7
spread-based	27:15 29:2		189:16 193:20
85:10	standards 7:22	starts 373:6	197:6 202:21
	10:4 22:15	start-up 265:1	203:1,2,7,12,14,
square 39:10,15	23:6,13 24:15	-	21 205:21
squirrel 361:17	29:6 31:10,13	state 62:3 79:10	207:1,9 225:8,10
staff 5:6 60:6	40:1,8 66:12	80:10 122:14	226:10 227:2,16
109:14 119:21	72:11 88:21	133:15 213:14	231:18 247:19
154:13 209:10	131:14 133:16	332:12 364:3	259:11 287:22
219:16 221:18	145:8 154:7,14	366:9,10	291:14,19
	167:8 189:8	stated 74:1 102:2	296:3,7,19,21
330:10	195:22 200:6,12	104:3 111:22	300:19 303:11
stages 276:21	212:22 233:21	138:18 294:18	311:10,16
stakes 301:12	250:17 282:4	statement 2:11	312:13 316:22
	290:22 305:12	13:16 28:12,14	317:14 335:2
stamina 334:22	328:11	48:14 52:8 58:6	336:4 337:12,22
stand 35:20 71:21	standing 147:4	95:19 113:2,9	338:12 342:9
199:8 342:19	S	164:2 194:7	statute 5:16
standard 17:19	standpoint 97:8,13	207:14,20	13:8,15 39:4
25:8 26:12 38:6	101:16 121:16	216:15 315:9	66:5 86:5 187:19
49:6 71:10 72:2	215:9 361:18	316:6 317:5,20	198:22
75:22 77:7 86:19	stands 163:17	318:3	
87:1,4,12,19		510.5	statutes 5:20 6:1
07.1,1,14,17			

209:19 212:22	371:15 373:4	stressed 349:22	208:4
213:3	sticking 3:3	strikes 46:21	subgroups 272:10
statutory 7:12,19 13:9,18 39:13	stock 81:11 96:3,8 262:18 299:6	121:15 168:20 strong 90:15 163:2	subject 24:11 30:3 31:9 36:8 65:17
131:22 169:4 187:17,21	stockmarket	212:17	80:20 83:14 100:5,6 122:14
213:22 215:10	349:17 stocks 96:6 260:12	strongly 20:17 86:20 133:10	126:4 131:9
stay 244:2 325:14 staying 130:18	stood 316:14	285:18 328:5 331:12 334:14	213:12,13 245:17 246:14
221:11	stools 369:4	338:21 342:10	280:11 289:1 290:4 304:17
steady 33:7	stop 68:4 82:10 97:15 201:17	struck 62:17	312:11 317:12
steer 322:22 steerage 246:14	222:21 313:16 363:1	structure 82:20 85:10 92:14	325:10 326:6 330:21 355:2
steered 99:18	stops 222:5	117:19 239:3 300:9 301:22	359:17 364:2,3 subjected 292:2
121:14 270:12,18	store 152:6,18 153:6	321:5 335:5 342:2 344:2	subjecting 88:14
371:11 Stein 12:7,18,19 37:7,12,19 42:17	stories 310:6 368:10	structured 221:3 224:1 237:22	subjective 22:15 143:15 144:2 231:7
43:1 47:16	story 96:5 364:12	238:5 structures 59:1	subjectivity 62:18
48:2,16,21 52:19 53:5,15,22 54:8	straightest 182:15	209:20 224:8 238:22	143:9 144:1 231:14
55:4 66:18 69:8 267:9	straightforward 66:5	structuring 155:16	submission 107:1
step 75:16 104:3 150:22 162:2	straightforwardly 14:9	203:4 355:9	199:18 submissions 4:9
177:9 351:2	strained 312:2	struggling 276:12 stuck 166:21	146:21
steps 109:21 167:5 188:8	strategy 341:12 351:11	studied 88:17	submit 4:7 submits 133:14
Steve 183:17	Strawn 248:11,20	266:15 studies 46:7 106:8	submitted 107:2
199:11	stream 345:5	275:16	109:12 289:22 304:9
Stevens 334:19,20 342:22 354:5,17	streamline 260:2	studying 280:19	submitting 371:3
355:2,7 356:5,14,21	streams 351:5 street 45:10 86:13	stuff 127:19 367:3 sub 207:11	subparagraph 284:18 285:14
358:22 359:6 361:22	152:15,21	subcomponents	284:18 285:14 subsequent 116:16
365:1,6,10	stress 198:17 351:20	272:8	194:3 294:22
369:13 370:11	JJ1.4U	sub-custodians	subsequently

		· ·	
108:18 166:18	325:21 330:7	supersedes 287:5	170:7 173:8
282:15	335:20 337:1	superseding 289:2	176:5 181:3
subset 197:8	371:6		193:17 211:5,15
	suggested 37:7	supplement 4:6	213:12 214:21
substance 218:2,5	38:21 43:2,13	318:15 352:8	216:13,19,20
327:14	90:13 112:22	361:22	217:16 218:22
substantial 17:3	113:5 145:11	supplied 26:14	220:19 229:6
21:8 179:4	165:11 181:5	supplies 25:12	230:13 236:1
202:11 263:17	306:2 328:14		267:16 269:12
300:12	330:10 362:22	support 31:5	272:3 276:11
substantially 76:8		36:17 37:1 42:2	277:5,13,20
258:10 290:13	suggesting 125:5 176:11 209:17	59:16 65:9 72:12	280:4,7 312:1
302:7,13	210:1 214:2	76:1 78:4 121:14	316:3 324:12
, and the second	210.1 214.2 227:11 231:5	133:10 136:19	338:1 342:14
substitute 39:13	330:14	140:8 240:20 247:20	356:2 357:14
success 20:7 305:2		247:20 248:19,22	359:18
successful 329:4	suggestion 112:20	249:12,13	361:15,19
sugainotly 122:15	216:12 311:12	258:13 264:8	369:14 372:5,19
succinctly 133:15	370:12	290:8 325:12	surely 156:18
sudden 95:10	suggestions 11:17	352:1	surface 230:6
suddenly 265:7	65:12 89:4 283:8	supported 86:21	surgeons 215:14
277:1	290:3	334:12 359:20	Ü
sue 16:16 86:6	suggests 13:11		surprise 206:17
234:6	85:16 91:20	Supporting	surprised 232:2
sued 158:10	142:6 144:12	255:11	327:7
	211:12 214:1	supportive 110:3	surrounding
suffer 85:8	245:20 338:19	259:12	131:6 247:18
suffice 294:8	suit 199:4 200:8	supports 184:6	survey 123:16
sufficient 23:8	suitability 38:8	281:18 285:19	217:1 326:10
53:11 66:17 99:7	87:6 122:16,18	287:20,21 300:3	
102:1 108:13	244:2	307:4	surveys 216:17 224:17
193:18 249:9	suitable 322:6	suppose 169:9	
298:9	341:6	supposed 99:15	Susan 5:8
sufficiently 18:5		100:5	suspect 96:20,22
143:13	suite 259:8		121:10
suggest 25:10 27:1	sum 21:20 50:13	Supreme 16:9,17 132:15 204:3	sustained 142:13
28:11 46:4 87:17	51:9 60:3 61:8		swap 89:12 153:22
129:4 242:20	340:3	sure 3:5 10:17	154:1 169:1
245:20 250:1,21	summarize 348:4	39:2 47:14 62:9	170:20
251:15 252:20	sums 275:20	89:16 127:3,9,14	191:18,20
255:2 256:15,21		157:7 162:20	ŕ
285:3 297:5	supersede 39:18	164:7 167:16	swaps 89:16,18

	1 46		
108:15 154:5,9	32:11 39:20	211:8 220:11	technically 252:2
192:19 256:6	46:12 50:13 51:8	232:21 233:4	technology 190:4
Sweeney 343:1,2,3	60:3 61:8 78:13	310:11 315:1	
354:3 368:22	109:21 117:22	323:6 331:6	Ted 240:8,11
369:2	143:8 144:2	355:4 357:12	telephone 96:11
sweep 168:15	174:16 178:7	talks 232:13	temp 219:16
_	184:8 185:15	target 70:4 78:6	temporarily
sweeping 85:5	227:6 241:4	132:12	319:10,12
swept 23:12	275:14 276:5	151:6,9,17	,
250:20 251:3	283:20 284:2	234:22 268:11	ten 3:1 4:1 22:6
336:21	311:2 331:11 334:9 362:1	310:3 337:5	127:15 148:13
switch 266:8		344:16	156:4 165:18
	talk 100:9,10	targeted 347:16	tenants 203:7
symmetry 340:22	110:10 135:18		tend 224:11 239:9
sympathetic 48:10	150:2 153:18	targets 156:11	tendency 168:14
215:22 371:16	162:12,15 176:1	task 66:5 141:2	237:21
sympathy 167:17	201:1 204:14 209:10 215:3	tax 9:21 21:12	
168:3	220:12 238:9	24:5,9 51:8 59:6	tends 183:3
syndicates 198:1	267:20 272:12	60:13,17 61:5	tenure 253:17
system 75:14	278:8 363:2	133:1,2 137:20	term 14:21 17:14
141:9 142:11	366:3 369:20	244:6 283:20	80:6 155:10
220:5 273:19	talked 43:19 45:19	349:19 355:8,16	209:3 275:17
333:18 362:14	57:15 103:4	370:1,2	277:15 323:7
	106:5 126:1	taxable 119:7	termed 177:11
systems 92:14 190:4 215:11	154:19 172:14	347:2 352:7	
218:19 219:3,14	189:17	370:4	terminate 136:11
220:15	191:11,12	tax-exempt	termination 50:11
221:15,20	218:14 222:8	119:7,8	275:11
256:19	223:17 230:14	taxicab 359:10	terms 7:1 10:7
	237:9 274:16		58:13,20 60:6
	276:17 277:11	tax-qualified	77:1 110:10
table 363:7	310:7 315:21	189:4	119:13,15
	316:1 319:4	tax-sheltered	142:10 155:8
tackling 146:8	322:14 354:6	275:21	171:11 180:16
tail 123:20	359:1	team 104:14	190:16 192:2
tailored 34:1 88:4	talking 38:5	240:13 343:21	217:17 218:22
247:5	102:8,19 105:9	344:2	219:3 221:19 224:8
tailoring 18:11	112:11,12	tear 223:5 236:3	234:8,21,22
<u> </u>	121:11 124:12		239:16 317:16
tainted 14:1	170:9 179:17	tearing 236:12	323:17 324:9
taking 21:2,11	191:15 209:6	technical 231:6	355:18 369:2

	U	1	
terribly 357:6	314:7 325:11	299:15 308:14	234:15,16
terrific 123:13	345:11 359:2	314:17 320:17	236:12,14,19,20
	374:4	323:3 324:18	240:3 247:4
territory 267:9	Texas 54:10,14	354:3 358:21	271:10 273:20
test 7:12,14,20	ŕ	373:2	274:14 276:10
29:1 39:5,20	text 11:20 76:22	thatch 272:1	278:12 280:13
43:2,14 92:10	thank 5:6,8,10		313:14,22 314:9
158:13 167:1,2	6:3,8,13 7:6	That'd 123:13	315:10 320:1
185:1 204:2	12:3,6 22:5,7	that's 11:21 38:10	326:13 331:4
225:22 227:17	30:20,22 37:6	41:5 48:16 50:4	334:10 349:15
228:8 232:4	42:15 43:18	56:16,20 58:7	358:11 360:1
235:20 281:21	46:19 55:12	59:13 62:16	361:1,4 363:9,10
337:22 342:19	57:13 59:19	66:18 68:4	365:7,14,21
testament 332:17	63:9,14 74:21	69:14,16 94:12	366:16
	75:1 84:3,5	95:3 96:5,13	368:18,19,20
tested 346:21	93:22 94:2 103:3	99:14 100:21	371:11,14,20
testified 11:8	123:19	102:2 104:17	373:2
51:17 274:1	130:3,4,13,19,22	107:12 112:1,19	thee 38:22
testify 2:15,20	131:2,4	113:19 114:10	the-fact 30:16
3:16 4:8 11:7	138:2,3,5	118:14,18 119:1	
31:1 63:18 75:2	147:13,14,22	120:14,15	themself 268:6
93:22 148:2	156:13 166:13	123:3,7,10,14	themselves 39:9
184:2 188:16	183:11,13,20	126:11,14,15,16,	45:11 68:17 89:3
199:8 240:14	188:18 189:5	22	91:3 105:16
248:9,12 299:13	191:1 194:12	127:5,11,12,18	125:9 137:16
325:9 353:22	199:8,10,11	149:5,6,13	141:14 233:1
testifying 3:18 4:6	208:9,10 225:6	150:19 155:2,16	258:5 320:1
12:20 250:14	240:6,7,10,13	157:3 160:14,15	328:19
289:8 325:20	248:6,7,8,9	164:13 167:18	theoretically 115:7
	249:2 256:3,9	168:18 169:5	327:11
testimonies 359:1	257:1,4 267:5,6	173:7 174:17	
testimony 3:2,7,19	272:16 279:7	178:4,5,18,19	theory 64:10 171:1
4:6 11:4 12:13	280:22 281:1,2,8	182:11,22	172:5
37:19 52:20	289:4 299:11,12	183:1,4,10	thereafter 92:2
55:14 62:9 69:9	300:1 308:13 324:19 325:9	189:17 198:21 210:13 212:16	374:5
75:19 94:3 95:22		210.13 212.16 214:3,16 215:2	thereby 136:18
98:18 130:12	334:16,18,20 342:21,22 343:2	214.3,10 213.2 216:15 217:9,22	372:19
165:11 178:2	353:22 364:10	218:7,9,12 219:6	
225:7 240:22	373:1,4,7	221:21 223:20	there'd 162:16
249:3 257:3	* *	224:8 225:17	therefore 28:3
258:1 261:8	Thanks 5:4 51:16	227:12 229:12	98:17 133:4
279:8 281:20	96:10 109:5	233:11	170:21 202:7
309:4 312:21	276:10 289:5	433.11	205:4 244:13

		i	
245:5 246:2	they've 59:5,9 61:9	throughout	116:18 138:6
262:1 264:9	148:16 171:11	59:6,17 351:5,14	139:4,10 145:16
there's 37:22 41:3	thinly 118:14	throw 197:5	147:3,21 164:18
61:10 63:6 95:17	third 14:2 28:22	thrust 65:14	165:6 184:3
96:5 99:6,7	29:3 74:7 88:14		189:6,17 199:13
102:17 105:3		thus 10:6 15:8	220:12 222:3
107:13 112:20	89:8 140:15	17:11 20:15,16	232:21 238:12
115:13 118:15	141:3,7 143:6	21:17 33:17	240:13,22
122:21 123:21	144:4 147:2,3	82:19 92:11	248:12 253:8
127:10	151:12,19	138:20 143:22	255:16 256:2
134:2,4,10,11	190:12 193:7	197:8 198:1	257:2 258:1
145:19 165:19	197:13 235:17	202:20 326:5	259:5 266:13,17
168:14,22 170:6	264:4 265:18	328:10,16	267:4 282:1
171:10,17	303:19 338:19	329:11 332:1	290:1 302:18
172:13,15 175:3	349:4	335:6	305:15 308:17
180:1 183:9	third-parties	ticket 221:2	314:7,9 322:1,21
	253:10		325:9,11,20
Theresa 240:8	third-party 228:19	tied 27:4	345:11,22
257:4,8 279:8	253:19	ties 329:19	349:15 354:1
they'd 97:1 111:3	Thirty-five 31:20	tigers 223:9	357:19
158:10	ľ	S	today's
they'll 139:6	thorough 77:1	tightly 13:5 364:14	2:10,13,18,22
349:15	332:8	Tim 4:19 124:12	4:4,11,15 7:9
they're 49:7 51:6	thoughtfully 11:16	170:14 174:18	10:19 56:1 249:3
52:13 55:19	351:19	179:20 276:11	256:17 301:21
58:16,17 59:4	thoughts 37:11	timeframe 215:18	350:11
60:12 61:14 62:4	248:6 359:4	timelines 190:9	tolerance 134:7
65:4 72:1			135:16 219:2
96:21,22 97:2	thousand	timely 31:16	
108:3 115:11	152:16,21	timer 4:2	tolerances 345:20
119:11 121:11	thousands 92:20	timetable 12:1	Tom 281:4 289:6
122:1,15	281:17 313:13	Tim's 320:19	tomorrow 3:4 11:8
125:2,6,10,11	353:19		12:11 373:6
126:4,5 139:5	threat 205:10	tip 65:3	tool 72:10 89:19
144:2 146:19,20	305:4 316:16	today 3:4,17 4:9	331:16 349:11
148:18	threaten 353:7	5:9 6:6,10 10:10	351:12
151:9,12,18,19		11:7 12:11,20	tools 25:18
152:19,20	three-quarters	13:16,21 17:11	
154:2,3 163:5,6	106:21	22:10 30:19	78:19,21 152:22
165:8	threshold 148:14	31:1,2 32:2 33:9	247:2 343:20 344:22 347:22
169:2,10,13	173:12,13	46:5 49:2 54:18	
171:12,13,14	252:11 302:7	63:18 75:19	348:22 349:7
		93:22 96:22	351:2 353:16

	O	C 07	
top 91:9 123:1 148:12	197:17,20 224:1 traditional 292:4	193:3,14 200:5,9 252:1,3,5 292:6	trigger 116:21 157:10
topic 101:4 125:8 286:13 307:9	traditionally 227:4	300:14 321:6 339:11 359:8	triggered 149:9,11 triggers 70:1
topics 249:4 347:17	train 49:2	transcribed 4:12 transcripts 4:12	trillion 17:9 90:7
total 237:19 243:18 275:14	trained 60:11,12 61:12,14 96:21 125:10	transfer 141:6 transform 352:14	trouble 100:1 181:18 233:2
totality 370:6 touched 153:9	training 175:17 218:19	transition 54:21 223:13 249:9	troubles 311:7 312:5
187:22 tough 229:12	transact 198:9	256:21 306:1 349:16,22	troubling 316:18
toward 279:9	transaction 47:4 66:10 67:2 71:4 72:7 85:11	transitions 223:15,17	true 58:3 78:4 107:7 118:18 119:1 125:21
towards 88:10 163:20 243:1 245:15 349:21 351:4	87:10,14,18,22 89:10 99:1 108:22 109:1 113:7 121:18	transparency 140:9 transparent	134:1 144:8 243:13 323:13 335:17 365:7 374:7
toyed 38:5 track 106:2	127:20 137:20 154:3,4 156:9	128:22 360:14 trap 73:4	truffled 64:17
tracked 221:5	169:3 170:19,21	Treasury 284:5	truly 56:3 111:10 114:22 187:9
trade 66:11 89:7 91:8,9 106:16 107:8 116:22 299:6	187:18 192:16 193:10 225:5 252:22 253:1 260:8,16 261:18 266:1 267:3	treat 21:18 74:19 188:2,5 315:17 352:11 treated 34:4 47:2	trust 92:3,16 155:16 156:8 167:7 170:16 171:21 172:18
trade-by-trade 106:15 traded 81:14	290:12 293:9,19,22 310:20 316:8 341:21 342:3	197:15 229:11 245:11 283:18 292:10 302:10 304:19 317:7	173:19 183:3 307:14 336:6 337:10 362:9 370:14 371:19
85:15 111:22 112:7 118:14	transactions 9:19 66:22 67:1,3	treating 186:13 treatment 317:4	trusted 40:11,19
237:18 288:15 trade-off 264:2	72:8 80:9 84:17 88:12 89:12	treatment 317:4 treats 302:9	trustee 64:2,7,9,13 71:16 133:18
trades 89:2 91:3 97:20 107:4	92:21 93:4 108:14 115:3,20	tremendous 99:6 104:16 105:12	155:13,14,15 233:13
trading 87:14,20 88:3,6 93:9	116:5,7 117:21 118:6,9 119:16,19	119:6 tried 276:13	trustees 28:18 63:22 65:2,3 74:17 228:16,18
107:10 119:13 192:9 196:5	127:12,13 129:12 192:14	311:11 321:21 tries 226:14	trusting 24:1

		•	
truthfully 224:22	255:6 260:16	unable 18:7 20:1	187:16
try 12:10 109:22	271:7 294:14	163:16 263:1	underneath
129:20 156:17	345:14 349:3	307:22 313:20	149:21
167:14 183:12	368:11	321:3	
192:1 238:22	types 9:13 10:12	unaffiliated 90:22	underpins 335:5
273:16,17,19	20:13 25:14	292:18	underscore 131:12
304:6 372:5	27:7,10 31:16	unamhiguaug	underscores
trying 45:10 49:20	53:7 58:4	unambiguous 292:7	116:11 265:11
52:4 83:20 99:3	60:14,22 61:18		understand 24:18
101:9 103:6	105:6,10 107:4	unanticipated	
	114:6 121:8	16:7	38:10 43:7 57:10
119:10,11 121:9 165:21 177:22	122:21 133:3	unarmed 235:4	60:4 61:4,6
194:8 211:5	138:18 190:1		66:20 75:3,17
225:4 258:11	205:12 209:21	unavailable 197:7	113:21 131:16
260:11 269:21	224:15 250:21	unavailing 318:4	142:15,17 148:3 155:9 156:22
278:22 312:8	251:1 252:1	unbiased 177:6	
316:10 321:12	259:19 263:13	241:18 247:1,14	157:1,21 173:22
324:4 326:21	273:5 274:12	287:17	175:8 177:20
344:10,11 370:8	275:22 287:14		210:16 212:15 213:18 218:21
ŕ	298:22 299:1	uncertainties 90:6	
Tuesday 278:9,10	347:2	292:15	233:1 237:14
turmoil 131:12	typewriting 374:6	uncertainty 29:13	264:1 272:4 276:2 290:4
turn 24:17 71:7		30:15 36:12	294:1 298:16
147:7 197:4	typically 28:22	57:15 250:6	317:15 320:7
308:14 349:2,14	201:21 259:4	281:21 306:4	330:1 350:7,10
354:4	304:5,22 315:4	unclear 187:12	351:13 353:11
	368:6	203:13	360:14 363:13
turning 114:8		300:15,18 349:2	364:9 369:15
249:11	U	· ·	371:16
turnover 370:1	U.S 1:1,10 259:15	unconflicted 175:12	
turns 99:15 126:10	289:8,11	1/3.12	understanding 8:4
137:4 161:15	ultimate 186:10	uncovered 22:1	14:17 24:19
	325:17 370:9	underestimate	30:11,16 63:3
Tuttle 12:8		304:7	84:18 85:21
30:21,22 31:2	ultimately 50:21		86:2,5 93:15
42:12,15 43:21	108:21 140:4	underestimated	126:3 134:4
44:17,19 46:6	141:14 147:7	76:14 90:2	140:6,11 145:14
47:6 57:14 58:8	157:14,16 216:3	underlying 81:5	149:11 165:19
two-thirds 170:10	290:21 302:20	111:3,14 127:10	167:19 171:18
326:14	305:20 314:5	239:5 346:19	180:2 203:22
type 21:19 40:22	319:22 329:4	353:12	209:12 210:6
108:2 114:5	369:6	undermined 15:12	225:12 228:9,11
	umbrella 104:9		231:9,11,17
125:3 206:10		undermines	

	1 ag		
233:3 249:21	64:21	unmindful 216:6	133:11 148:4
250:3 252:10,15	unfortunately	unnecessarily	184:7 240:21
257:15 288:13	55:9 78:5 227:17	252:5	updated 10:14
319:9 320:2	300:14 336:17	unnecessary 22:15	updating 161:7
345:19	uniform 25:3	291:10 356:4	247:21 300:4
understands	86:19 87:19		
216:10 316:4	101:18,19	unplanned 190:17	up-end 114:17
319:15 358:13	101.18,19	unprepared 94:14	up-front 263:17
understated 196:8	200:17 258:14	unprotected	upon 25:3 29:2,11
understood 57:17	259:12 280:15	132:21 135:10	50:10 97:19
62:9 187:10	368:16	unreasonable	107:20 121:4
254:12 291:4	unintended 76:16	316:20	127:2 241:15
317:17 346:1	242:22 249:16		258:10 275:11
	256:14 258:9	unregulated 17:2	291:4 295:14
undertake 66:1	266:12 300:16	132:17 360:2	337:22
372:10,12	303:20	unrelated 337:15	up-sale 65:5
undertaken	unintentional	unshielded 221:10	uptake 46:15
189:16 363:7	188:2 300:18	unsophisticated	_
undertaking 19:15	301:14	13:22 20:5	urge 20:17 29:5
34:21 205:18		118:21 120:6	30:4 81:1 82:3
339:17	unintentionally	121:17 175:16	133:6 200:18
underway 297:22	300:13 306:18	370:21	284:14 289:1
	United 75:8		298:8 300:5
underwriter	universal 352:17	unsuitable 261:21	301:17 303:17
194:22 198:1		unsure 345:22	305:14 306:19
underwriting	universe 92:12		308:6 338:22
197:22 224:2	115:20 143:17	unusually 48:10	342:10
undetermined	182:22 290:10	unveiling 350:19	urges 93:17
288:10	368:7	unwilling 17:18	185:16 282:9
	University	303:10	285:19
undisclosed 55:1	54:10,14		urging 54:16
294:19	unjustified 207:17	unwillingly 300:13 306:18	
undivided 290:10	· ·		usage 347:21
unduly 328:22	unknown 190:2	unwitting	useful 9:8 37:5
360:11	287:20 307:20	172:15,16	38:14 205:1
	unless 66:12 73:8	unworkable	206:5 293:15
unequivocal	78:20 99:22	127:14	usually 264:19
113:11	364:16		299:2
uneven 325:17	unlike 188:22	unwritten 316:17	
333:6	232:20 261:4	317:13	utilization 348:22
unexpected 206:16	unlikely 368:15	upcoming 196:11	utilize 59:9
unforgettable	annixely 500.15	update 31:5	utter 7:3
unioi genavie			

	1 46		
	301:18 364:22	vehicles 24:6	156:9 169:12
		59:11 74:5 85:12	172:11
vacuum 266:22	valued 81:13	298:19 350:21	184:10,18 185:8
	111:21 112:5	352:4 370:3	187:5,6 188:10
vague 24:15 97:9	136:6		197:11 224:15
valid 9:7 83:18	valued-but-are	vendor 195:6	227:4 272:12
valuable 22:22	112:3	313:5 314:13,14	296:7 302:10
25:18 28:7 33:14	values 29:3 111:4	vendors 17:14	317:3
82:7 83:8 320:13		334:2,3 366:12	322:14,17,19
353:13	valuing 111:2	368:7 [°]	329:7 340:8
	vantage 97:11	vendor's 313:8	351:1 357:21
valuation 70:19	99:5 100:2		364:7
81:2 110:21		venture 219:8	
136:9,17 192:18	variable 111:20	verboten 238:1	viewed 168:6
198:5	112:12,13 264:7 298:19		250:1 337:21
206:14,17,19,22		verified 71:13	viewpoint 280:6
207:12,20	variety 16:5	version 148:12	viewpoints 347:16
232:3,13,15,20	129:11 132:10	versus 107:11	•
233:11,16	159:12 195:4	140:14,19 190:9	views 3:6 4:7 11:4
234:4,5,11,13	199:14 292:21	212:12 215:4	183:21 249:6
235:5,10,14	343:16 356:7	238:7,20 239:17	272:8,10 279:18
236:1,3,11,12	various 5:14 11:15	271:19 320:11	289:21 300:2
287:13 288:8	23:1 25:4 27:10	366:21	304:7 307:10
357:3	48:5 105:15		308:13
valuations	142:21 165:14	viatical 332:14	violate 71:6 193:2
28:18,22	196:10,21	334:4 366:12	194:10
80:18,20 81:8	214:20 229:18	367:3	
112:6	231:4 273:17	Vice 84:7 257:9	violated 130:5
136:4,13,20	274:11 298:18	281:11 343:3	violating 9:20
287:6 288:14	323:16 324:11	victory 327:14	220:20
	370:16	-	violation 199:1
valuation's 29:1		view 13:8 17:19	301:15
Valuations 136:9	vary 206:9 216:8	19:22 48:10	
value 8:1 28:12,21	294:12 299:4	53:18 55:2,17,19	violations 10:6
70:14,17,22 71:5	varying 78:14	57:21 81:22	142:13 177:12
81:4,16 111:6,15	vast 88:9 90:8	90:11 97:9,13,22	Virginia 309:1
134:20 135:5	107:22 197:15	98:20 100:17	354:4 357:16
136:10,21 161:1	199:3 304:12	101:17 107:12	Virginia's 314:19
162:16 194:17	328:22	116:2 117:15	
206:2 207:3,15		124:20	virtually 17:11
232:5,8 233:22	veered 267:8	125:12,14	115:4 359:15
236:6 275:20	vehicle 146:3	139:18 144:6	vision 32:6 62:10
276:3	163:3 331:15	145:22 146:20	367:19
287:2,10,17	352:22	154:17 155:4	visiting 54:10
			Visiting JT.10

	1 ag	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
353:10	227:10 229:6	109:20 110:1	43:2,14,21 47:13
vis-the 370:15	wasting 61:9	126:18 129:11	50:22 53:6 54:5
	S	130:19	55:19 58:22 59:7
vital 79:14	ways 59:15 117:5 141:2 175:12	138:10,12,14	60:20 66:15 67:1
vitally 10:7 266:20	224:9 253:3,7	159:8 168:3	69:4,21 70:1
voice 7:4	275:16 302:22	170:7 173:9	89:7 103:21
volatility 348:7	303:22 338:19	174:22	105:2 108:18
349:17	354:16	178:11,15,20	120:16
		180:18	128:17,19 129:12
voluntary 75:14	wear 203:19	West 75:6 334:7	134:2,3,4,6
voting 134:13	website 2:19	365:17	134.2,3,4,0
vulnerable 254:20	4:10,13 11:1	wet 65:7	140:16 141:15
	196:22	we've 5:12 6:4	143:12,16,20
	we'd 93:22 167:17	10:20 104:7	164:9,10 168:21
wait 149:16	208:17	105:2,10 117:3	169:20 185:2,14
213:20	weeds 370:16	121:5 130:1,4	187:3 188:10
	week 6:17	132:14 149:15	193:19 202:3
waiter 64:13,14,18 65:3		150:11 174:21	206:12 213:14
	weeks 4:14 278:14	179:9,20	222:4 230:16,18
waiting 240:4	weigh 127:8	whatever 5:20	238:4,16 241:2
363:21	welcome 2:5 5:17	15:12 47:2 98:15	242:18 243:9,13
walk 61:14 63:22	37:3	125:22 126:2	286:3 288:5
148:11 151:3	welfare 20:10	177:5 194:6	292:20 300:10
159:2 226:2	297:11	223:11 236:13	302:5 303:6
walked 158:11		238:5,16 275:12	307:11 313:10
walks 262:4	we'll 11:22 177:14	316:8 318:21	322:10 324:14 326:8 331:9
	183:13 221:13	326:19 363:9	336:3
Wall 45:10 86:13	308:14 309:1	what-have 324:15	337:13,17,19
wardrobe 308:17	324:20 325:1	whatsoever 226:17	341:5 352:15
warnings 332:13	well-established	whereas 278:18	355:6 363:5,19
warranted 26:12	203:16		368:17 369:15
254:16	well-intended	whereby 216:21	370:13,21,22
Warren 268:18	156:11	Whereupon 373:8	whistle 71:21
	well-served 293:13	wherever 233:10	whole 77:15
Washington 1:12	well-taken 225:1	364:17	145:20 149:22
199:12 281:12	we're 6:1,20 10:10	whether 9:3,7 14:3	153:3 182:11
Washington's	11:2,13,16,18,19	20:4,8,21	208:15 222:2
286:14	39:19 58:9,20	22:16,20 24:17	223:6 313:7
wasn't 53:22 54:15	65:9 94:19	28:13 29:7,9,11	354:19
62:9 95:15 104:4	95:8,9,14 100:4	36:6,14,15	whom 5:12,18
160:16 225:19	103:12 108:16	39:6,8	

	1 46	T	
15:21 45:16	witness 374:4	350:13	wrap 223:12
92:5,18 135:8	witnesses 3:9,16	working 5:11,18	260:14,17,21
236:21 237:1	12:5,12 209:3,6	6:4 12:22 59:6	263:4,9,14 342:2
244:9 290:11	211:10 217:7	60:1 98:3 146:19	wrapped 111:17
316:4,13 338:4,7	270:7,16 276:13	184:1 210:19	222:20 224:5
374:2	·	213:7 230:10	
who's 3:5 6:9	woman 153:4	259:14 261:11	wriggle 167:14
19:10 38:2,3	women 184:1	267:19 277:6,22	write 113:12 219:4
41:1 170:6	wonder 241:12	280:12 305:10	writing 95:21 99:4
172:2,17,18	268:19 370:17	328:15 353:3	130:9 159:1
173:22 174:1		358:14	194:1 296:3,15
181:12 182:14	wondered 120:4		297:2 303:5
	wondering 122:5	workplace 261:2	312:13,18
whose 12:12,13	Wong 4:22 323:4	343:11 347:13	315:10 317:16
16:11 19:12	Ü	348:12,18,21	
34:20 252:6	wooden 372:2	349:6 350:20	written 12:16 16:9
260:9 339:15	wording 292:13	351:15 352:6	22:19 24:20 25:8
374:4	work 6:5,7 11:13	353:15 369:8	30:7 39:1,10,12
wide 194:18 195:4	32:15 37:4 51:7	workplace-	43:1 68:8 79:16
217:14 256:16	67:11 79:16	sponsored 352:2	83:19 95:5
343:17 347:16	83:20,22 105:6	works 148:20	110:2,8,13 111:1
widely 288:22	137:22 141:16	219:10 278:12	146:21 153:2
· ·	162:22 182:1		158:7,11 199:18
wife's 54:16	197:4,5 211:13	workshop 353:10	207:9 208:13
Wild 334:7 365:17	218:7 219:9,14	world 9:9 15:16	255:8 256:6
willing 32:15	237:10 260:1	128:2 129:9	289:22 292:13
113:17 123:7	263:17 265:7,8	164:8 178:9	294:7 295:22
139:5 264:21	272:18 273:19	182:7,11,21	311:11,15
324:7	274:19 279:3	183:7 212:21	316:5,22 317:20 331:8 358:5
	315:19 328:4	261:9 361:15	
willingness 288:8	333:15 338:21	363:1	362:22
window 262:7	358:17 361:12	worldwide 22:11	wrong 46:22
Winston	369:18	286:8	157:18 158:9
248:11,20			212:1,2 311:13
ŕ	workable 23:15	worried 47:17	361:13
wiring 221:6,8	291:20 342:18	worry 174:20	wronged 132:16
wish 3:10 4:6,7	worked 5:7 19:20	362:2	wrote 217:12
74:13 242:20	109:20 278:14	worse 115:16	
254:5	359:18		Wyman 90:12
withdraw 249:8	worker 340:11	worth 35:17	106:22 123:9
		217:12 220:2	127:4
withdrawn 102:7	workers 10:5 13:2	worthwhile 242:8	
256:15	83:8,11 248:15	would-be 65:21	Y
	303:1 348:10,14		

rage 95			
year-old 31:20 yesterday 232:11 316:14			
yet 15:6 32:1 58:20 165:8 176:6 197:2 256:12 273:16 287:8 288:19			
you'll 60:15,17 362:7,22 363:1			
younger 348:10			
yours 257:6			
yourself 3:19 118:14 120:11			
yourselves 357:1			
you've 49:5 104:13 122:17 133:5 153:9 178:8			
Z zero 340:3			