NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON NASAA'S PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ITS MODEL RULES ON INVESTMENT ADVISERS AND INVESTMENT ADVISER REPRESENTATIVES

Request for Public Comment

NASAA's Investment Adviser Regulatory Policy and Review Project Group ("Project Group") is soliciting comments from the public on a proposed set of investment adviser model rules written to reflect the organization and content of the 2002 Uniform Securities Act ("USA 2002"). The Project Group is also seeking public comment on proposed revisions to the existing investment adviser model rules ("1956 Act Model Rules") with respect to examination qualifications. The proposed rules are in two groups. The first group relates generally to investment advisers ("IAR's") and investment adviser representatives ("IAR's"), under the USA 2002. The second group relates specifically to examination requirements for IA's and IAR's, under both the USA 2002 and the Uniform Securities Act of 1956, as amended ("1956 Act").

The comment period begins on Friday, July 18, 2008, and will remain open for 21 days. Accordingly, all comments should be submitted on or before Friday, August 8, 2008. Comments should be directed by email or in writing to:

Kenneth Hojnacki Wisconsin Dept. of Financial Institutions Division of Securities PO Box 1768 Madison, WI 53701-1768 kenneth.hojnacki@dfi.state.wi.us,

with a copy to:

Stephen Hall
Deputy General Counsel
NASAA
750 First Street, NE, Suite 1140
Washington, DC 20002-4251
sh@nasaa.org

Background and Purpose of the Revised Model Rules

The Project Group has created model IA rules that comport with the USA 2002. This new set of rules ("USA 2002 Model Rules") will serve as a helpful template in those states where the USA 2002 has been, or will be, adopted. At the same time, the existing model rules (the 1956 Act Model Rules), patterned after the 1956 Act, will continue to serve as an important guide in those states where the securities statute is based on the 1956 Act. Having model rules organized around each of the uniform acts will assist the NASAA members in their rulemaking efforts, promote uniformity, and advance the cause of investor protection.

The new USA 2002 Model Rules represent primarily a reorganization of the existing rules. They do contain some substantive changes, however, particularly in the area of qualification

examinations. All of the changes, both organizational and substantive, are highlighted in the summary below.

With respect to examinations, the Project Group is also proposing that identical revisions be made to the 1956 Act Model Rules. Examination requirements have undergone significant change over the years, even in states that have adopted a version of the 1956 Act. Accordingly, to reflect that evolution, the 1956 Act Model Rules are also being updated with respect to examinations. The Project Group anticipates that in the future, other revisions will be made to the 1956 Act Model Rules, so that they reflect all of the substantive changes now being proposed in the USA 2002 Model Rules.

Summary of Proposed Revisions

1. The existing 1956 Act Model Rules would be reorganized and renumbered as follows:

Current 1956 Act Rule	Proposed USA 2002 Rule
102(a)(4)-1 Unethical Business Practices 102(e)(1)-1 Custody 102(f)-1 Agency Cross Trades 102(f)-2 Principal Transactions 102(f)-3 Performance Compensation Exemptions 102(f)-4 Assignment of Contracts 202(a)-1 IA Registration Requirements 202(a)-2 IA Representative Registration Requirements 202(a)-A Electronic Filing Requirements 202(b)-1 Notice Filing Requirements 202(d)-1 IA Minimum Financial Requirements 202(e)-1 IA Bonding Requirements	502(b) 411(f)-1 502(b)-(m) 502(c)-(l) 502(c)-(a) 403(a) 404(a) 406(e)-1 405(a) 411(a)-1 411(e)-1
202(e)-1 IA Bonding Requirements 203(a)-2 Recordkeeping Requirements 203(b)-1 Brochure Rule 203(c)-1 Financial Reporting Requirements 203(d)-1 IARD Transition Requirements 204(3)-1 Withdrawal of IA and IAR Registration 204(b)(6)-1 Examination Requirements 401(n)-1 Late Payment Remedy 401(g)(2)-1 Investment Adviser Representative Definition	411(c)-1 411(g) 411(b)-1 406(e)-2 408(a)-1 and 409-1 412(e)-1 410

2. Investment Adviser Registration Requirements

- A. Proposed Model Rule 403(a)-(b) contains new language that permits the Administrator to accept a PDF version of Part II filed electronically via IARD or to continue to require a paper version.
- B. Proposed Model Rule 405(a)-(b) provides similar treatment for federal covered investment advisers with regard to submitting a PDF version of Part II, while maintaining the 1956 Act provision authorizing the Administrator to waive any filing if the federal covered investment adviser agrees to provide a paper copy upon demand.

3. Withdrawal of Investment Adviser and Investment Adviser Representative Registration

A. Proposed Model Rule 408(a)-1 preserves the existing language of 1956 Act Model Rule 204(e)-1(b), but adds a directive that the withdrawal be filed electronically via IARD and that the filing be made within 30 days of the termination of the investment adviser representative.

4. Late Fees

- A. The primary version of USA 2002 sets out the fees for each category of registrant in separate subsections of the Act: investment advisers in subsection 410(c), investment adviser representatives in subsection 410(d), and federal covered investment advisers in subsection 410(e). The alternate version of USA 2002 gives the Administrator authority to set the fees by rule: investment adviser authority in subsection 410(a)(3), investment adviser representative authority in subsection 410(a)(4), and federal covered investment adviser authority in subsection 410(a)5).
- B. To reflect this structure of the USA 2002, Proposed Model Rule 410 addressing late fee payment remedies also includes bracketed language should the state choose to utilize the rulemaking option for setting fees.

5. Prohibited Conduct

- A. The word "unethical" is not included in the USA 2002, so the title of the Proposed Model Rule dealing with such behavior uses the term "prohibited conduct" rather than "unethical."
- B. Two prohibitions that exist in the 1956 Act were not included in the USA 2002. Those prohibitions have been added to the Prohibited Conduct rules.
 - i. Proposed Model Rule 502(b)-(L) addresses principal trading by advisers.
 - ii. Proposed Model Rule 502(b)-(p) addresses misstatements or omissions of material facts in soliciting advisory clients.
- C. The existing Agency Cross Transactions Model Rule 102(f)-1 is incorporated into Proposed Model Rule section 502(b)-(m).

6. <u>Investment Adviser Contract Provisions</u>

A. Proposed Model Rule 502(c) consolidates all rules related to performance compensation and assignment of contracts. It also mirrors new financial thresholds in the federal rule under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 for performance fees by changing the net worth threshold from \$1 million to \$1.5 million and the assets under management threshold from \$500,000 to \$750,000.

7. Investment Adviser and Investment Adviser Representative Examination Requirements

- A. The existing 1956 Act Model Rule on investment adviser qualification examinations was created before the Series 65 examination was formulated. As a result, its provisions are not in synch with the current requirements of the states. Therefore, in addition to proposing a new model rule under the USA 2002, the Project Group is also proposing amendments to the examination requirements under the 1956 Act Model Rules. Proposed USA 2002 Model Rule 412(e)-1, and revised 1956 Act Model Rule 204(b)(6)-1 are identical in substance.
- B. Waivers from examination requirements have also been added to both model rule versions.
- C. An optional waiver has been added subsection (g) of each version, for use where an administrator does not wish to require solicitors to qualify by examination.

8. Citation of USA 2002 Model Rules

A. Because a large number of states will continue to apply rules based on the 1956 Act, the Project Group devised a labeling system that would clearly differentiate the USA 2002 Model Rules from the 1956 Act Model Rules. This is not intended to suggest that any state adopt the USA 2002 or the USA 2002 Model Rules. The rules are intended merely as a template for states to use in adopting their own rules, as they see fit. The citation of the USA 2002 Model Rules should be as follows, for example: Rule USA 2002 411(f)-1.

Contact Information

Project Group Chair

Kenneth Hojnacki Wisconsin Dept. of Financial Institutions Division of Securities PO Box 1768 Madison, WI 53701-1768 kenneth.hojnacki@dfi.state.wi.us

Project Group Members

Kelvin Blake
Maryland Office of the Attorney General
Division of Securities
200 St. Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202-2020
kblake@oag.state.md.us

David Swafford Colorado Division of Securities 1560 Broadway, Suite 900 Denver, CO 80202

david.swafford@dora.state.co.us

David Finnigan
Illinois Office of the Secretary of State
Securities Department
Jefferson Terrace, Suite 300A
300 W. Jefferson Street
Springfield, IL 62702
dfinnigan@ilsos.net

Hugo Mayer Kansas Office of the Securities Commissioner 230 E. William, Suite 7080 Wichita, KS 67202 hugo.mayer@ksc.ks.gov

Lisa Muller
Vermont Department of Banking, Insurance, Securities & Health Care Administration
89 Main Street, Drawer 20
Montpelier, VT 05620-3101
lmuller@bishca.state.yt.us

Paul Schwartz
Pennsylvania Securities Commission
Eastgate Office Building
1010 North 7th Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17102-1410
pschwart@state.pa.us

David Smith
Arkansas Securities Department
Heritage West Building
201 East Markham, Room 300
Little Rock AR 72201-1692
david.smith@securities.arkansas.gov

Jackie Walter
Nebraska Department of Banking and Finance
PO Box 95006
Lincoln, NE 68509-5006
jackie.walter@bkg.ne.gov

NASAA Corporate Office Liaison

Stephen Hall
Deputy General Counsel
NASAA
750 First Street, NE, Suite 1140
Washington, DC 20002-4251
sh@nasaa.org