



1401 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005-2148, USA
202/326-5800 www.ici.org

January 8, 2021

Ms. Vanessa A. Countryman
Secretary
US Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20549-9303

Re: Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Amending Its Rules Establishing Maximum Fee Rates To Be Charged By Member Organizations for Forwarding Proxy and Other Materials to Beneficial Owners (File No. SR-NYSE-2020-96)

Dear Ms. Countryman:

The Investment Company Institute¹ is writing to comment on the New York Stock Exchange's proposed rule change that would direct NYSE member firms that also are FINRA member firms to comply with FINRA Rule 2251's fee schedule that sets forth the maximum amount that NYSE member organizations may charge registered investment companies² for delivering proxy and other disclosure materials, such as shareholder reports and prospectuses ("fund materials") to any shareholder who holds shares in nominee name through an intermediary.³ The NYSE proposal also would eliminate the existing NYSE fee schedule that is the corollary of the FINRA fee schedule.

¹ The [Investment Company Institute](https://www.ici.org) (ICI) is the leading association representing regulated funds globally, including mutual funds, exchange-traded funds (ETFs), closed-end funds, and unit investment trusts (UITs) in the United States, and similar funds offered to investors in jurisdictions worldwide. ICI seeks to encourage adherence to high ethical standards, promote public understanding, and otherwise advance the interests of funds, their shareholders, directors, and advisers. ICI's members manage total assets of \$27.7 trillion in the United States, serving more than 100 million US shareholders, and \$8.3 trillion in assets in other jurisdictions. ICI carries out its international work through [ICI Global](https://www.ici.org/global), with offices in London, Hong Kong, and Washington, DC.

² For the sake of simplicity, we use "investment company" and "fund" interchangeably to refer to registered investment companies and their affiliated transfer agents and advisers throughout this letter.

³ *Self-Regulatory Organizations; New York Stock Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Amending Its Rules Establishing Maximum Fee Rates To Be Charged By Member Organizations for Forwarding Proxy and Other Materials to Beneficial Owners* (File No. SR-NYSE-2020-96) (Release No. 34-90677); (December 15, 2020), available at <https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro/nyse/2020/34-90677.pdf> ("NYSE Proposal"); 85 FR 83119 (December 21, 2020), available at <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2020-12-21/pdf/2020-28010.pdf>

Vanessa A. Countryman, Secretary
January 8, 2021

The FINRA fee schedule is almost identical to the NYSE's current fee schedule. According to the NYSE Proposal, the technical effect of the proposal therefore would not result in any "substantive change in the maximum rates NYSE member organizations may charge because all NYSE member organizations subject to these rules are also members of FINRA and, consequently, will be subject to the fee schedule set forth in FINRA Rule 2251."⁴

Given the technical nature of the change and NYSE's lack of interest in reforming, or even examining, the current fee system, we support the SEC approving the proposed rule change.⁵ But it is imperative that the Commission not stop there. It must take this opportunity to reform the current processing fee system for distributing fund materials. This system is broken, providing a near-monopoly for intermediaries' predominant vendor with little to no incentive to reduce processing fees. The result is unnecessarily high costs for fund shareholders.

In fact, funds pay three to five times as much to distribute materials through intermediaries as they pay when they can distribute materials directly—an excess cost caused by lack of competition and lack of incentives to control costs.

The Commission must take on an integral role in reforming the system, especially considering that FINRA is the brokerage industry's self-regulatory organization. It will be essential for the Commission to independently arbitrate the differences between funds' and intermediaries' viewpoints on how to reform the current processing fee system.

One important, incremental step we strongly urge the Commission to take is to affirmatively state in any approval order that neither the NYSE fee schedule nor the FINRA fee schedule obligate funds to pay the exact fees that appear in the fee schedule. Rather, each of the fee schedules sets forth *maximum* rates for what constitutes "reasonable" delivery expenses (*i.e.*, "processing fees") that funds must reimburse intermediaries.⁶ This statement is essential because funds almost always are charged this maximum rate, as intermediaries lack the incentive to negotiate a lower rate for funds. In fact, in situations where an intermediary has negotiated processing fees that are lower than the NYSE maximum processing fee, the vendor typically does not charge the fund the negotiated rate. Instead, the vendor invoices the fund for the maximum NYSE fee rate, and then "remits" the difference back to the broker. The concept of "remittances" entirely ignores the fact that the intermediary is negotiating the price on behalf of the

⁴ NYSE Proposal at 7.

⁵ See Self-Regulatory Organizations; New York Stock Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Adopting Maximum Fees Member Organizations may Charge in Connection with the Distribution of Investment Company Shareholder Reports Pursuant to Any Electronic Delivery Rules Adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission, Release No. 34-78589 (Aug. 16, 2016), available at <https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro/nyse/2016/34-78589.pdf> (where the NYSE stated that it "may not be best positioned to take on the regulatory role in setting fees for mutual funds."); NYSE Proposal at 4 ("[g]iven the significant evolution of the securities industry during the period in which the NYSE has taken the lead in establishing proxy distribution reimbursement rates, the NYSE does not believe that it is best positioned to retain this responsibility going forward.")

⁶ Separate and apart from these fees, funds also must reimburse intermediaries for actual out-of-pocket costs, such as printing and mailing.

Vanessa A. Countryman, Secretary

January 8, 2021

fund. When funds negotiate with vendors on behalf of their direct-held accounts, the fund pays the negotiated rate.⁷

The ICI has urged the Commission to reform this and other aspects of the intermediary process for delivering fund materials for the past ten years.⁸ We were hopeful that changes would be made following the Commission's 2018 request for comment on the framework regulating fees that intermediaries charge for distributing fund materials. We responded to the request, strongly advising the Commission to resolve the longstanding problems with the current framework that has over time resulted in fund shareholders paying hundreds of millions of dollars more than what is "reasonable" and thus permissible under Commission rules. We also worked closely with our members to identify the problems with the current framework and develop several potential solutions.

The Commission subsequently directed funds, intermediaries, vendors, and other interested industry members ("processing fee working group") to work together to examine the intermediary process for delivering regulatory materials and try to jointly agree on how to improve the system. The ICI and its members actively participated in this initiative. After spending a considerable amount of time and energy trying to work towards a joint recommendation to present to the Commission, unfortunately, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the processing fee working group doing so is likely to be impossible, given the strongly held, irreconcilable views of the participants. We maintain that only the Commission can independently assess, and make the judgments necessary to reform, the current system consistent with the public interest and investor protection.

The NYSE Proposal notes that "[t]he current fee schedule has been in place since 2013 and a comprehensive review of fee levels may be necessary in the near future to respond to the continuing evolution in both technology and the securities ownership patterns of investors since that time."⁹ We agree. The ICI strongly recommends that the Commission review the ICI's 2018 letter, which details recommendations for change, supported by data gathered through an extensive survey and ICI member engagement. We provided the Commission with two distinct paths: facilitate greater competition or reform the processing fee system. We summarize those recommendations immediately below.

The SEC should facilitate greater competition. The SEC should permit funds (rather than intermediaries) to select who will deliver fund materials on their behalf and negotiate the price for their distribution. This will realign incentives and reintroduce market competition, eliminating the need for a regulator-set fee schedule and allowing vendors to compete for funds' business.

⁷ See Letter to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, US Securities and Exchange Commission from Susan Olson, General Counsel, Investment Company Institute, dated October 31, 2018, for a comprehensive discussion of the current system and recommendations for reform, *available at* https://www.ici.org/pdf/18_ici_processing_fees_ltr.pdf.

⁸ ICI's Processing Fees Resource Center sets forth extensive information on our advocacy and is *available at* <https://www.ici.org/pfrc>.

⁹ NYSE Proposal at 4.

Vanessa A. Countryman, Secretary
January 8, 2021

If the SEC is unwilling to do so, it should reform the processing fee schedule, including:

- Creating a fee schedule tailored to fund disclosure delivery obligations;
- Replacing the existing layered fees with simple flat fees that reflect actual costs, using cost for direct-held accounts as a guide;
- Creating a robust regulatory oversight framework; and
- Mandating regular independent review of fee rates and vendor billing practices.

We fully support efforts to reform the system for distributing fund materials and stand ready to assist the Commission as it moves forward. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments in detail, please feel free to contact Dorothy Donohue at 202-218-3563 or (ddonohue@ici.org) or Joanne Kane at (202) 326-5850 or joanne.kane@ici.org.

Sincerely,

/s/

Dorothy M. Donohue
Deputy General Counsel, Securities Regulation

/s/

Joanne Kane
Senior Director, Operations and Transfer Agency

cc: The Honorable Elad Roisman
The Honorable Hester Peirce
The Honorable Allison Herren Lee
The Honorable Caroline Crenshaw
Sarah ten Siethoff, Acting Director, Division of Investment Management
Christian Sabella, Acting Director, Division of Trading & Markets