Dear DOL,

Last month, you proposed new rules that alter ERISA-governed retirement plan standards. The potential changes imply ESG criteria are non-financial in nature by isolating such factors from more traditional benchmarks, potentially affecting the calculus fiduciaries make when offering ESG options for their plans.

The ruling implies that ESG investing somehow impedes one's fiduciary responsibility when it comes to adding an ESG option in a 401(k) plan. This is at odds with the reality that 2019 saw nine of the biggest ESG funds outperform the S&P's 500 Index; seven of those beat their market benchmarks over the past five years.

See attached chart for a comparison of the S&P 500 and Vangard and iShares ESG funds.

Meanwhile you are permitting Private Equity funds in retirement plans. Private Equity funds are some of the most complex, non-transparent instruments to understand, often have high fees, and do not have a benchmark comparison.

ESG investing has become mainstreamed over the past couple of years: in 2018, ESG investing represented almost a quarter of the globe's professionally managed assets, over $20 trillion in assets under management (AUM). This implies that ESG is no longer a "fringe" investment, but rather seen as a core offering.
I consider this action to be unconstructive, and that the DOL's time and energy might be better spent focusing on the continuing conflicts of interest and lack of transparency pertaining to fees. I ask that this ruling not be enforced so we can continue to offer investments that meet the dual goals of increased profits and positive social impact.
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