



# AMERICAN ACADEMY *of* ACTUARIES

---

May 9, 2005

The Office of the Secretary of the Treasury  
C/o Ms. Heather Dostaler  
Office of the Associate Chief Counsel  
Internal Revenue Service  
1111 Constitution Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20224

Dear Sir or Madam:

On behalf of the members of the American Academy of Actuaries<sup>1</sup> Pension Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the recently finalized revisions to Circular 230, which raise questions among pension actuaries regarding how Sections 10.33 and 10.35–10.37 apply to their work. In particular, committee members are concerned over the extent to which a pension actuary's work product may constitute a "covered opinion." Mr. Edward E. Burrows, a member of our committee, spoke recently over the telephone with Ms. Heather Dostaler of the office of the Associate Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) about some of the profession's concerns.

Ms. Dostaler suggested that a certain number of the committee's questions would require some thought before receiving a detailed response. The purpose of this letter is to confirm our understanding of the responses Ms. Dostaler offered, and provide a list of those questions for which she indicated more consideration would be required.

## **Impact of the qualified plan exception**

We note written advice that "[c]oncerns the qualification of a qualified plan" would not constitute a covered opinion.

As a threshold issue, we understand that this exception applies to advice regarding the qualification status of a plan *that the practitioner believes to be qualified*, even if it is later determined that the plan was not qualified. Ms. Dostaler confirmed that this understanding is correct.

Additionally, we would appreciate confirmation that the establishment or maintenance of a qualified retirement plan is never a transaction, "the principal purpose of which is the avoidance or evasion of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code (IRC)."

---

<sup>1</sup> The American Academy of Actuaries is the public policy organization for actuaries of all specialties within the United States. In addition to setting qualification standards and standards of actuarial practice, a major purpose of the Academy is to act as the public information organization for the profession. The Academy is nonpartisan and assists the public policy process through the presentation of clear actuarial analysis. The Academy regularly prepares testimony for Congress, provides information to federal and state elected officials, regulators and congressional staff, comments on proposed federal and state regulations and legislation, and works closely with state officials on issues related to insurance. The Academy also develops and upholds actuarial standards of conduct, qualifications and practice, and the Code of Professional Conduct for all actuaries practicing in the United States.

With respect to this second threshold issue, one must examine the principal purpose of establishing any qualified plan. One could argue that most of the benefits of a qualified plan, other than favorable tax treatment, could be obtained by a plan that does not satisfy qualified plan rules. Thus, according to this reasoning, the principal purpose of establishing that the plan is qualified is to avoid or postpone taxes — for the plan sponsor, for participants, or for invested assets. However, we believe that contention misses the mark. The primary reason for the provision of pensions to most participants is to provide them with the financial ability to retire. Policy-makers have supported that objective by providing tax incentives to do so. The wording of Subparagraph 10.35(b)(2)(ii)(B)(1) (the exception) suggests that in at least some cases the drafters agree that the principal purpose of a qualified plan is not tax avoidance. We believe that if, in general, the principal purpose of a qualified plan is not tax avoidance or evasion, then the principal purpose of *any* qualified plan is not tax avoidance or evasion. We seek guidance as to whether you agree, and if not, what criteria should be used to differentiate.

### **Activities that appear to be covered by the exception**

A number of activities appear to be covered by the exception for qualified plans. However, we feel we need confirmation that they are, indeed, covered. These activities covered by the exception include written communications regarding:

- The rules governing the extent to which the use of insurance company contracts and various other investments will adversely affect a plan's qualified status.
- The rules governing the extent to which honoring a judicial domestic relations order will adversely affect a plan's qualified status.
- The rules respecting benefit distributions and rollovers that must be followed in order to avoid adversely affecting a plan's qualified status.
- Nondiscrimination testing under IRC Sections 410(b) and 401(a)(4).
- Any rule whose incorrect application would cause an otherwise qualified plan to lose its qualified status.

### **Unaddressed activities that would logically be covered by the exception**

Another important issue involves other written results and advice pension actuaries often provide in the normal course of their activities. Often, this information has nothing to do with conclusions regarding a plan's qualification status. Rather, this information is typically related to maintaining a plan's compliance with ERISA and various tax related laws of the sort found in the following list:

- The rules for calculating minimum funding requirements.
- The rules for calculating maximum deductible contributions.
- The rules for calculating excise taxes and similar miscellaneous taxes incidental to the establishment, administration, and termination of qualified plans.
- The rules for determining the extent to which plan participant loans are taxable as current distributions.
- The tax rules related to group life insurance, uninsured health plans, cafeteria plans, fringe benefit arrangements, dependent care plans, cash or deferred arrangements embedded in qualified plans, non-qualified deferred benefits, VEBAs, ESOP loans, and other compensation and benefits issues.
- The rules for determining whether distributions constitute a series of substantially equal payments for the purposes of Code §72(q) and similar sections.
- The timing and content rules of reporting and disclosure requirements related to qualified plans and the other employee benefit plans we have mentioned.

In the balance of this letter, we discuss some of the pension actuary's work involving the items we have listed. We seek guidance as to whether written advice related to this work constitutes "written opinions."

### **Inability of most actuaries to practice law**

Pension actuaries, who are not attorneys, are not authorized to practice law. Even those few actuaries who are licensed attorneys are generally functioning as employees of firms that are not law firms and thus do not practice law. Consequently, pension actuaries do not opine on interpretation of tax law.

Our primary activity related to the items we have listed involves making calculations and measurements based on our understanding of the law. In order to perform this activity, we must be broadly familiar with applicable legal concepts. For clarity, our written advice often discusses these concepts in addition to communicating the results of our computations. These discussions may touch on areas where attorneys differ in their views. However, this does not alter the fact that a pension actuary's responsibility is not to render opinions respecting application of tax laws. Instead, it is to make those calculations that must be made in order to apply these laws.

For this reason, if for no other, we do not believe performing computations related to any item on our lists — and communicating, in writing, the results of these computations — constitutes the rendering of a covered opinion. We seek guidance as to whether you agree. Ms. Dostaler indicated that this was a good question but one on which she would be unable to offer a response without further consideration.

We do acknowledge that our clients often expect to rely on our calculations for their tax purposes. For example, we would not expect to tell a client that our calculation of the amount to be contributed and deducted could not be used for the purpose of avoiding penalties that may be imposed in the event of a challenge. Nevertheless, we see a significant distinction between this form of reliance and reliance on a covered opinion. To a great extent, our clients' reliance is simply reliance on the accuracy of our mathematical calculations and the exercise of our professional judgment in selecting actuarial assumptions — an exercise that is required by tax law.

### **Other Activities of Pension Actuaries and their Associates**

In addition to the activities this letter has already described, plan actuaries often become involved in day-to-day plan administration. It seems clear to us that such administrative activities do not approach the level of preparing covered opinions.

We also find ourselves drafting provisions for inclusion in plan and related documents. However, these provisions typically include the warning that only an attorney acting in the role of a practicing attorney can opine on the appropriateness of such document language.

### **Limits on enrolled actuary's authority to practice before IRS**

An enrolled actuary's authorization to practice before the IRS is limited to well defined sections of Title 26 of the United States Code. Many of the activities we have listed fall outside this well defined authorization. We do not believe that computations and their written communication involving issues falling outside this area of authorization constitute covered opinions. We seek guidance as to whether you agree. This, too, is a question that Ms. Dostaler indicated had merit, but on which she would be unable to offer a response without further consideration.

### **Summary**

To summarize, we seek guidance on:

1. The meaning of the exception regarding the qualification of a qualified plan.
2. Treatment, in general, of tasks apparently not covered by the exception.
3. The status of the actuary not authorized to practice law.
4. Applicability of the circular to issues in areas where the enrolled actuary is not authorized to practice before the IRS.

### **Follow-up guidance**

If your guidance indicates that some of the normal activities of the pension actuary do involve covered opinions, we would appreciate being able to follow up with additional implementation questions.

Some of these questions will be quite mechanical, involving such rules as the placement of a caveat on a document, the requirements of type size, or any information required to be added to standard actuarial communications, such as the annual valuation report.

Others will be more substantive, such as the steps that practitioner A might need to take to control the work of practitioner B when practitioner B is a direct subordinate of practitioner A.

However, we would prefer to hold off on addressing solutions to these situations until we have a more complete understanding of the scope of the issue.

### **Best practices**

In our follow-up guidance request, we also expect to seek clarification of the provisions of Section 10.33 outlining “best practices.” These provisions seem subject to a broad range of interpretations. For example, one observer might describe a given instance of client interaction as reflecting very clear communication. Another might describe the same instance as reflecting a significant lack of communication. Especially with a subject as complex as taxes, it will often be impossible to demonstrate that one observer is right and the other wrong.

We do understand that practitioners will not be subject to discipline by the IRS for real or perceived failure to follow the regulatory definition of “best practices.” However, we have great concerns over the impact of these regulations on civil court actions. Plaintiffs’ attorneys will interpret the already mentioned requirement of clear communications in the way that best serves their clients’ interests. Where the regulations lend themselves to such a broad range of interpretation, it will be difficult (and expensive) for defendants to protect themselves against potential self-serving interpretations.

The inevitable result could be costly, inappropriate settlements and increased legal costs. In turn, these could lead to higher liability insurance premiums, resulting in higher fees to our members’ clients. Employer-sponsored retirement plans already constitute an area beset by extremely complex rules and the high fees associated with compliance with the rules. The imposition of still higher fees could discourage the formation and maintenance of these plans.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments, and we look forward to hearing from you. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this further, please contact Heather Jerbi, the Academy’s senior pension policy analyst (202.785.7869; [Jerbi@actuary.org](mailto:Jerbi@actuary.org)).

Sincerely,

Kenneth A. Kent, MAAA, EA, FCA, FSA  
Vice President, Pension Practice Council  
American Academy of Actuaries

Cc: Mr. Richard Goldstein Office of the Associate Chief Counsel, IRS  
Ms. Heather L. Dostaler, Office of the Associate Chief Counsel, IRS  
Mr. Brinton T. Warren, Office of the Associate Chief Counsel, IRS  
Ms. Carol Gold, Director of Employee Plans, IRS  
Mr. Martin Pippins, Technical Guidance and Quality Assurance Manager, IRS  
Mr. Cono Namorato, Director of Office of Professional Responsibility, IRS  
Mr. Mark W. Everson, Commissioner of Internal Revenue  
Mr. Patrick W. McDonough, Director, JBEA  
Office of Benefits Tax Counsel