

October 27, 2010

PLEASE DON'T CAP COMMISSIONS AND ONGOING SERVICE FEES! "ONCE AN ACCOUNT IS OPENED, THE RELATIONSHIP DOES NOT END!" THANK YOU FOR READING THIS MESSAGE. I WANT TO DRAW SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE ANCILLARY FINANCIAL ADVICE WE CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNERS GIVE. AGAIN, ONCE A RELATIONSHIP IS STARTED WITH A TYPICAL CLIENT THE RELATIONSHIP DOES NOT HAVE AN END DATE! I AND MANY CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNERS, SPEND COUNTLESS HOURS DISCUSSING: RETIREMENT, EDUCATION PLANNING, LIFE EVENTS (DIVORCE, DEATH), AGING PARENT ISSUES, ESTATE PLANNING, AND GENERAL FINANCES WITH ALL OUR CLIENTS. WHY WOULD A CAP BE CONSIDERED ON THIS RELATIONSHIP? RATHER THAN CHARGING HOURLY FEES, MY BUSINESS MODEL, AFTER A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF COST ANALYSIS, REGULARLY IMPLEMENTS C-SHARES AS THE LOWEST COST ALTERNATIVE JUSTIFYING THESE "LIFE LONG" CLIENT RELATIONSHIPS. CAPPING ONGOING COMMISSIONS AND SALES CHARGES WOULD BURDEN THIS MODEL, POTENTIALLY FORCING CLIENTS INTO HIGHER PRICED PRODUCTS OR ELIMINATING SMALLER ACCOUNTS ALTOGETHER, WHO NEED AND DEMAND THE SAME ATTENTION. C-SHARES ARE LOWER PRICED TO THE CLIENT THAN ANY TYPICAL WRAP FEE PROGRAM. OUR CANDID, COMPASSIONATE LIFELONG CONSULTATIONS WITH CLIENTS DO NOT GO AWAY IN 5, 10 OR EVEN 20 YEARS. I'VE BEEN IN THIS FIDUCIARY ADVISORY CAPACITY FOR 24 YEARS AND STILL TALK WITH CLIENTS REGULARLY WHO HAVE BEEN WITH ME FOR MY CAREER. I'M 45 YEARS OLD WITH TWO YOUNG CHILDREN. THESE CHANGES COULD BURDEN NOT JUST MY CLIENTS, BUT MY CAREER AND FAMILY.

Mutual funds are often the most appropriate investment option for my clients as they typically only have small amounts to invest. As a result, I am extremely concerned about the SEC's proposal to replace current Rule 12b-1 with a new Rule, 12b-2, and make other changes to the securities laws. I understand that the proposal is attempting to address four primary objectives: 1) improve transparency through disclosure; 2) cap ongoing sales charges; 3) encourage retail price competition; and 4) modify the oversight role of fund directors. My thoughts on these issues is covered in detail below.

#### . Improve Transparency Through Disclosure

- o I support the adoption of the terms `marketing and service fee` and `ongoing sales charge` as common sense improvements to the language used to describe mutual fund distribution fees.

- o I support the proposed changes to mutual fund disclosures of the `marketing and service fee` and `ongoing sales charge.` These disclosures are prepared by the mutual fund sponsors who are in the best position to report the information accurately. In addition, the prospectus places this fee and expense data in the appropriate context along with other information my clients should consider before investing.

- o I oppose the adoption of confirmation statement disclosure of specific mutual fund fee details as overly burdensome, prone to unintentional error and without clear benefit to my clients. It is unreasonable to burden my affiliated broker-dealers with the duty of providing detailed post-transaction fee and expense data on confirmation statements when the mutual fund company controls this information and the disclosure will not influence my client's decision-making.

#### . Cap Ongoing Sales Charges

o I oppose the Proposal's cap of ongoing sales charges. My clients are in need of my ongoing support and service, including incidental investment advice. C-shares allow me to provide small account clients with services by outsourcing the expense of fee debiting, invoicing, and other costs associated with investment advisory accounts. In addition, my clients enjoy the benefit of putting their entire investment to work in the market and avoid capital gains taxes that would be incurred if positions were liquidated to pay me an advisory management fee. If ongoing sales charges are capped, many of my clients who currently own C-shares may find that they are no longer able to obtain my service and support.

. Encourage Retail Price Competition

o I oppose the Proposal's effort to encourage retail price competition through a share class offered at Net Asset Value. I believe the proposal will alter the distribution model from one based upon relationships to one focused on transactions and costs. In addition, I believe this portion of the proposed rules has the unintended consequence of being an anti-competitive measure likely to result in pricing advantages for large mutual fund families, broker-dealers, and/or financial advisory practices.

I appreciate this opportunity to share my thoughts on the proposal. While I support efforts to improve disclosure of marketing and service fees and ongoing sales charges, I urge the SEC to reconsider its ill advised efforts to cap sales charges and encourage retail price competition.

Sincerely,

Douglas Rowan  
CFP, CMFC  
Financial Network