

SEC Takes A Closer Look at Proxy Advisory Firms

The SEC has signaled that they are actively reviewing how investment advisers use proxy advisory firms' recommendations. The SEC has set a November 15th date for a roundtable to review requirements for investment advisers. As we highlight in this alert, this may ultimately force investment advisers to rely more on internal analysis; thus, diminishing the role of the duopoly that proxy advisory firms presently enjoy.

Recent History

The SEC has ramped up its scrutiny of proxy advisory firms. When we state proxy advisory firms, we refer to Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS) and Glass Lewis. The following summarizes the recent activity:

- **No Action Letters**
 - Earlier this month, the agency made the unusual decision to rescind the findings from two No Action Letters that were issued by SEC staff in 2004.
 - The No Action Letters allowed an investment adviser to vote proxies based on the advice of a proxy advisor, even though the proxy advisor may have conflicts of interest that could taint their research.
 - The letters asserted that investment advisers could rely on proxy advisory firms' maintenance of policies and procedures to alleviate conflicts, without consideration of potential conflicts on a case-by-case basis.
- **Roundtable**
 - At the same time the letters were revoked, the SEC noted that a previously announced [roundtable about proxy advisors will be held in November 2018](#).
 - This roundtable would offer stakeholders the opportunity to weigh in on the potential impact of the rescission of the letters, in addition to other potential reforms.
 - The SEC last held a roundtable on the role of proxy advisors in April 2014. Following that meeting, the agency released [Staff Legal Bulletin No. 20 \(SLB 20\)](#), which strengthened investment advisers' responsibility to oversee their proxy advisors. However, SLB 20 also reaffirmed the No Action Letters by indicating that investment advisers should not examine potential proxy firm conflicts on a case-by-case basis, but instead on a business/policy level.

What does this mean?

The revocation of the letters implies that investment advisers must now review any votes cast on the advice of proxy advisory firms on a case-by-case basis. As a result, we think it's likely that investment advisers who currently rely on the advice of proxy advisory firms — either in whole or in part — will depend less on proxy advisors, bringing more of their proxy voting operations in-house. If this occurs, we could expect the influence of proxy advisory firms over corporate governance to wane over time, as investment advisers would be expected to adopt their own substantive corporate governance standards (to the extent they are not currently). This result becomes more likely if the SEC places proxy voting on its annual exam priorities list — a topic that is likely to be addressed at the upcoming roundtable.

There was mixed reaction in Washington following the news. A representative for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce lauded the move, as did House Financial Services Committee Chairman Jeb Hensarling, who stated, “The proxy advisory firm duopoly is in serious need of reform and SEC attention.” However, Hensarling added that it is fortunate that the move is not legally binding because “regulation through enforcement and staff guidance hinders innovation and confidence in accessing our capital markets.”

For their part, ISS and Glass Lewis said the revocation of the letters won't change the way they operate. “It has always been the law that an investment adviser, as a fiduciary to its clients, is required to take steps to avoid having a conflict of interest influence its decisions on behalf of clients,” Glass Lewis said in a statement.

We will continue to update our clients on this issue as we closely follow roundtable discussions in November. In the meantime, if you have any questions or want to learn more, please [contact our team](#).

Author Contact Information

Gayle Appelbaum

Partner, McLagan

Aon

1.952.886.8242

gayle.appelbaum@mclagan.com

Katrina Gerenz

Associate Partner, McLagan

Aon

1.952.886.8247

katrina.gerenz@mclagan.com

Laura Wanlass

Partner, TRP

Aon

1.847.771.6263

laura.wanlass@aon.com

Mark Behnke

Partner, McLagan

Aon

1.203.602.1203

mark.behnke@mclagan.com

Bryan Lemke

Principal, McLagan

Aon

1.952.886.8272

bryan.lemke@mclagan.com

Kevin Wells

Director, Corporate Governance

Aon

1. 202.969.3295

kevin.wells@aon.com

Greg Camarco

Associate Partner, McLagan

Aon

1.203.517.3804

gregory.camarco@mclagan.com

Todd Leone

Partner, McLagan

Aon

1.952.886.8254

todd.leone@mclagan.com

About McLagan

McLagan provides tailored talent, rewards, and performance expertise to financial services firms across the globe. Since 1966, we have partnered with the largest and smallest financial services firms to help them make data-driven decisions to hire, retain, and engage the top talent for keeping the global economy running. Our compensation surveys are the most comprehensive, in-depth source of rewards data covering over 150 countries from more than 2,500 clients. Our consultants work with hundreds of firms annually to design total rewards programs and benchmark financial performance for boards of directors, executives, employees, and sales professionals. McLagan is a part of Aon plc (NYSE: AON). For more information, please visit mclagan.aon.com.

About Aon

Aon plc (NYSE:AON) is a leading global professional services firm providing a broad range of risk, retirement and health solutions. Our 50,000 colleagues in 120 countries empower results for clients by using proprietary data and analytics to deliver insights that reduce volatility and improve performance.

For further information on our capabilities and to learn how we empower results for clients, please visit <http://aon.mediaroom.com>.

This article provides general information for reference purposes only. Readers should not use this article as a replacement for legal, tax, accounting, or consulting advice that is specific to the facts and circumstances of their business. We encourage readers to consult with appropriate advisors before acting on any of the information contained in this article.

The contents of this article may not be reused, reprinted or redistributed without the expressed written consent of McLagan. To use information in this article, please [write to our team](#).

© 2018 Aon plc. All rights reserved