

Summary of the Corporate and Financial Institution Compensation Fairness Act of 2009

The House Financial Services Committee will mark up H.R. 3269, the Corporate and Financial Institution Compensation Fairness Act of 2009 (the “Bill”), on Tuesday, July 28. Attached as [Appendix A](#) is a copy of the current version of the Bill. The Bill is expected to go to the House floor by Friday, July 31. The Bill reflects certain proposals on which the Chairman of the Committee, Representative Barney Frank, has spoken frequently in the past, two of which were also addressed in Treasury Secretary Geithner’s recent statement concerning compensation principles.¹

Specifically, the Bill addresses the following topics:

1. Advisory shareholder votes on executive compensation on an annual basis (“say on pay” votes) and in connection with certain acquisition transactions;
2. Compensation committee independence; and
3. Financial institution incentive compensation plan design.

The provisions have different proposed effective dates. The shareholder vote provision is proposed to be effective six months after the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) issues final regulations implementing the provision. The SEC is directed to promulgate those regulations within six months after enactment of the Bill into law. Accordingly, it seems unlikely that the Bill’s new requirements concerning annual say on pay votes would be effective for the 2010 proxy season. The provisions concerning compensation committee independence and financial institution incentive compensation plan designs require regulators to issue rules or regulations that would implement those provisions not later than 270 days after the enactment of the Bill into law.

¹ The statement can be found at <http://www.ustreas.gov/press/releases/tg163.htm>. See also our memorandum entitled “Treasury’s Take on Executive Compensation: It’s a Matter of Principles,” which can be found at http://www.cgsh.com/treasurys_take_on_executive_compensation_its_a_matter_of_principles/ (the “Principles Memorandum”). The statement included proposals concerning “say on pay” and compensation committee independence. Treasury then followed up on July 16, 2009 with fact sheets and proposed legislative language with respect to these issues, which are available at <http://www.ustreas.gov/press/releases/tg218.htm> and <http://www.ustreas.gov/press/releases/tg219.htm>.

This note briefly summarizes the provisions of the Bill. Following the summaries, we discuss the potential applicability of the provisions to companies other than U.S. public companies, including “foreign private issuers”² and the U.S. operations of non-U.S. financial institutions.³

1. Advisory Shareholder Votes on Executive Compensation

Section 2 of the Bill, concerning advisory shareholder votes on executive compensation, has two parts. The first part would mandate annual say on pay votes. Under the provision, companies would be required to give shareholders an annual opportunity to cast a separate non-binding advisory vote to approve the compensation of executives as disclosed pursuant to the SEC’s compensation disclosure rules (including the compensation committee report, the compensation discussion and analysis, the compensation tables, and any related materials).

The second part of Section 2 also mandates a separate non-binding advisory vote on compensation, in the context of acquisition transactions. Specifically, the second part mandates a vote on certain acquisition transaction-related compensation (colloquially, “golden parachute payments”).⁴ The provision requires disclosure in a clear and simple tabular form concerning each item of such compensation that has not previously “been subject to” a say on pay shareholder vote, and the “aggregate total of all such compensation that may (and the conditions upon which it may) be paid or become payable.” The provision raises a host of technical and interpretive issues, as well as obvious questions about the potential practical impact of such a vote. Any assessment with respect to the latter question would seem largely futile until further interpretive clarification becomes available.

² Generally, a “foreign private issuer” is a non-governmental entity formed under the laws of a non-U.S. jurisdiction, unless more than half of its shareholders are U.S. persons and either the majority of its executives are U.S. persons, a majority of its assets are located in the U.S. or its business is principally administered in the U.S. See Rule 3b-4 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”).

³ See also our note entitled “Frank Bill Purports to Regulate Incentive Compensation of Fund Sponsors,” concerning the potential impact of the Bill on managers of private investment funds, which can be found at http://www.cgsh.com/frank_bill_purports_to_regulate_incentive_compensation_of_fund_sponsors/ (the “Fund Sponsor Note”).

⁴ The Bill requires such a vote in connection with any proxy or consent solicitation for an annual meeting of the shareholders (or a special meeting in lieu of the annual meeting) that concerns an acquisition, merger, consolidation, or proposed sale or other disposition of all or substantially all the assets of an issuer. The type of compensation covered by the Bill is “any type of compensation (whether present, deferred, or contingent) that is based on or otherwise relates to the acquisition, merger, consolidation, sale, or other disposition of all or substantially all of the assets of the issuer,” payable to “any principal executive officers of such issuer (or of the acquiring issuer, if such issuer is not the acquiring issuer)” if there is any agreement or understanding between the person making the proxy or consent solicitation and such executive officer concerning such compensation.

2. Compensation Committee Independence

Section 3 of the Bill directs the SEC to require the national securities exchanges and national securities associations to adopt new listing requirements relating to compensation committee independence. The new rules would largely (and intentionally) parallel the independence requirements for audit committee members imposed by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, as amended (“SOX”). As noted in the Principles Memorandum, most U.S. public companies are already subject to four separate sets of rules concerning compensation committee independence,⁵ and the marginal benefit that could reasonably be expected to result from a fifth set of rules seems quite small.

Section 3 also provides that:

- compensation consultants, legal counsel and other advisors to compensation committees must meet such standards for independence as may be established by the SEC⁶;
- compensation committees must have exclusive discretionary authority to retain and obtain the advice of compensation consultants, counsel and other advisors meeting the standards for independence promulgated by the SEC, as well as responsibility for the appointment, compensation, and oversight of the work of any such independent compensation consultants;
- annual proxy statements must include disclosure concerning whether compensation committees obtained advice from independent compensation consultants, with an explanation of their failure to do so if that is the case;
- issuers must provide funding for such independent consultants, counsel and advisors; and
- the SEC must conduct a study concerning the impact of its new independence standards, and report on the results to Congress within two years.

While a definitive assessment of the impact of these additional provisions will have to await additional guidance from the SEC about the standards to be imposed, it seems likely that the

⁵ Listing standards, state corporate law, standards imposed by Rule 16b-3 under the Exchange Act, and standards imposed under Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended.

⁶ See also our memorandum entitled “SEC Releases Proposed Disclosure Rule Changes for Compensation Program Risk, Compensation Consultant Independence and Equity-Based Compensation Awards,” which can be found in the News and Publications section of our website at: www.cgsh.com. The rule changes proposed by the SEC on July 10, 2009, and described in that memorandum impose new disclosure requirements, but not specific qualification requirements, relating to the independence of compensation consultants.

import of these additional provisions will lie less in the substance of the new independence standards than in what their inclusion in the Bill suggests about the current regulatory focus on the issue of executive compensation.

3. Financial Institution Compensation Plan Design

Section 4 of the Bill provides for regulatory review and oversight of incentive compensation plan design for financial institutions. The regulators to which authority and responsibility for such review and oversight is granted are the Federal Reserve Board, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Directors of the FDIC, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, the National Credit Union Administration Board and the SEC. The types of financial institutions subject to such review and oversight include depository institutions and depository institution holding companies, broker-dealers, investment advisers⁷, credit unions and any other type of financial institution that the regulators determine.

More specifically, Section 4 requires that the regulators jointly prescribe regulations to require each covered financial institution to disclose to them “the structures of the incentive-based compensation arrangements for officers and employees of such institution” so that the regulators may determine whether the compensation structure “(1) is aligned with sound risk management; (2) is structured to account for the time horizon of risks; and (3) meets such other criteria” as the regulators jointly may determine to be appropriate to “reduce unreasonable incentives for officers and employees to take undue risks that (A) could threaten the safety and soundness of covered financial institutions; or (B) could have serious adverse effects on economic conditions or financial stability.”

Section 4 also requires that, taking into account the foregoing factors, the regulators jointly prescribe regulations to prohibit any compensation structure or incentive-based payment arrangement, or any feature of such compensation structure or arrangement, which they determine would encourage such destabilizing undue risks by the institutions, officers or employees.

* * * * *

Among the significant ambiguities in the Bill is the question of whether its provisions would apply to non-U.S. issuers. The considerations related to this question are different for each of the different substantive provisions of the Bill, as follows:

- Foreign private issuers are generally not subject to the rules concerning the solicitation of proxies that apply to U.S. public companies. Among other things, the executive compensation disclosure requirements applicable to

⁷ As drafted, this provision would apply to all investment advisors, whether or not registered under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. See our Fund Sponsor Note.

U.S. public companies generally do not apply to foreign private issuers. It is therefore incongruous, and in our view likely an oversight, that the shareholder approval provisions contained in Section 2 of the Bill would appear to apply to foreign private issuers.⁸

- As noted above, the compensation committee independence provisions of Section 3 of the Bill parallel the independence requirements for audit committees imposed by SOX. The SOX rules were made applicable to foreign private issuers, and it seems likely therefore that the requirements of Section 3 of the Bill would also apply to foreign private issuers, if the Bill were to be enacted substantially as proposed. In our view, however, the analogy between audit committees and compensation committees in respect of independence issues is less than persuasive, and we believe that the extension of the proposed compensation committee independence requirements to foreign private issuers is unnecessary and unwarranted.
- The mandate to regulators concerning review of incentive compensation plan designs does not address whether oversight should extend to non-U.S. institutions. We note that non-U.S. institutions may be subject to extensive home country “safety and soundness” regulation, and that U.S. regulatory oversight of the U.S. operations of non-U.S. financial institutions is generally substantially more limited than for U.S. institutions. We do not believe that the specific issue of incentive compensation design raises concerns of such critical importance, relative to other regulatory concerns, that would merit the high level of regulatory oversight suggested by Section 4 of the Bill on the U.S. operations of non-U.S. financial institutions.

* * * * *

Please contact any of the lawyers listed in the Corporate Governance or Employee Benefits section of our website (www.cgsh.com) or any of your other regular contacts at the firm for further information about the matters discussed above.

CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

⁸ Rule 3a-12 under the Exchange Act exempts foreign private issuers from listed subsections of Section 14 of the Exchange Act. The list of exclusions does not, of course, include proposed new Section 14(i) that would be added by the Bill if it were to be enacted in its current form.

CLEARY GOTTLIEB Office Locations

NEW YORK

One Liberty Plaza
New York, NY 10006-1470
1 212 225 2000
1 212 225 3999 Fax

WASHINGTON

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1801
1 202 974 1500
1 202 974 1999 Fax

PARIS

12, rue de Tilsitt
75008 Paris, France
33 1 40 74 68 00
33 1 40 74 68 88 Fax

BRUSSELS

Rue de la Loi 57
1040 Brussels, Belgium
32 2 287 2000
32 2 231 1661 Fax

LONDON

City Place House
55 Basinghall Street
London EC2V 5EH, England
44 20 7614 2200
44 20 7600 1698 Fax

MOSCOW

Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP
CGS&H Limited Liability Company
Paveletskaya Square 2/3
Moscow, Russia 115054
7 495 660 8500
7 495 660 8505 Fax

FRANKFURT

Main Tower
Neue Mainzer Strasse 52
60311 Frankfurt am Main, Germany
49 69 97103 0
49 69 97103 199 Fax

COLOGNE

Theodor-Heuss-Ring 9
50668 Cologne, Germany
49 221 80040 0
49 221 80040 199 Fax

ROME

Piazza di Spagna 15
00187 Rome, Italy
39 06 69 52 21
39 06 69 20 06 65 Fax

MILAN

Via San Paolo 7
20121 Milan, Italy
39 02 72 60 81
39 02 86 98 44 40 Fax

HONG KONG

Bank of China Tower
One Garden Road
Hong Kong
852 2521 4122
852 2845 9026 Fax

BEIJING

Twin Towers – West
12 B Jianguomen Wai Da Jie
Chaoyang District
Beijing 100022, China
86 10 5920 1000
86 10 5879 3902 Fax

111TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3269

To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide shareholders with an advisory vote on executive compensation and to prevent perverse incentives in the compensation practices of financial institutions.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 21, 2009

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KILROY, Mr. WATT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HINOJOSA) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services

A BILL

To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide shareholders with an advisory vote on executive compensation and to prevent perverse incentives in the compensation practices of financial institutions.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the “Corporate and Finan-
5 cial Institution Compensation Fairness Act of 2009”.

1 **SEC. 2. SHAREHOLDER VOTE ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSA-**
2 **TION DISCLOSURES.**

3 Section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
4 (15 U.S.C. 78n) is amended by adding at the end the fol-
5 lowing new subsection:

6 “(i) ANNUAL SHAREHOLDER APPROVAL OF EXECU-
7 TIVE COMPENSATION.—

8 “(1) ANNUAL VOTE.—Any proxy or consent or
9 authorization for an annual meeting of the share-
10 holders (or a special meeting in lieu of the annual
11 meeting) occurring on or after the date that is 6
12 months after the date on which final rules are issued
13 under paragraph (3), shall provide for a separate
14 shareholder vote to approve the compensation of ex-
15 ecutives as disclosed pursuant to the Commission’s
16 compensation disclosure rules (which disclosure shall
17 include the compensation committee report, the com-
18 pensation discussion and analysis, the compensation
19 tables, and any related materials). The shareholder
20 vote shall not be binding on the corporation or the
21 board of directors and shall not be construed as
22 overruling a decision by such board, nor to create or
23 imply any additional fiduciary duty by such board,
24 nor shall such vote be construed to restrict or limit
25 the ability of shareholders to make proposals for in-

1 elusion in such proxy materials related to executive
2 compensation.

3 “(2) SHAREHOLDER APPROVAL OF GOLDEN
4 PARACHUTE COMPENSATION.—

5 “(A) DISCLOSURE.—In any proxy or con-
6 sent solicitation material for an annual meeting
7 of the shareholders (or a special meeting in lieu
8 of the annual meeting) occurring on or after
9 the date that is 6 months after the date on
10 which final rules are issued under paragraph
11 (3), that concerns an acquisition, merger, con-
12 solidation, or proposed sale or other disposition
13 of all or substantially all the assets of an issuer,
14 the person making such solicitation shall dis-
15 close in the proxy or consent solicitation mate-
16 rial, in a clear and simple tabular form in ac-
17 cordance with regulations to be promulgated by
18 the Commission, any agreements or under-
19 standings that such person has with any prin-
20 cipal executive officers of such issuer (or of the
21 acquiring issuer, if such issuer is not the ac-
22 quiring issuer) concerning any type of com-
23 pensation (whether present, deferred, or contin-
24 gent) that is based on or otherwise relates to
25 the acquisition, merger, consolidation, sale, or

1 other disposition of all or substantially all of
2 the assets of the issuer that have not been sub-
3 ject to a shareholder vote under paragraph (1),
4 and the aggregate total of all such compensa-
5 tion that may (and the conditions upon which
6 it may) be paid or become payable to or on be-
7 half of such executive officer.

8 “(B) SHAREHOLDER APPROVAL.—Any
9 proxy or consent or authorization relating to
10 the proxy or consent solicitation material con-
11 taining the disclosure required by subparagraph
12 (A) shall provide for a separate shareholder
13 vote to approve such agreements or under-
14 standings and compensation as disclosed. A
15 vote by the shareholders shall not be binding on
16 the corporation or the board of directors of the
17 issuer or the person making the solicitation and
18 shall not be construed as overruling a decision
19 by such board, nor to create or imply any addi-
20 tional fiduciary duty by such board, nor shall
21 such vote be construed to restrict or limit the
22 ability of shareholders to make proposals for in-
23 clusion in such proxy materials related to execu-
24 tive compensation.

1 “(3) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 6 months
 2 after the date of the enactment of the Corporate and
 3 Financial Institution Compensation Fairness Act of
 4 2009, the Commission shall issue rules and regula-
 5 tions to implement this subsection.”.

6 **SEC. 3. COMPENSATION COMMITTEE INDEPENDENCE.**

7 (a) STANDARDS RELATING TO COMPENSATION COM-
 8 MITTEES.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15
 9 U.S.C. 78f) is amended by inserting after section 10A the
 10 following new section:

11 **“SEC. 10B. STANDARDS RELATING TO COMPENSATION COM-**
 12 **MITTEES.**

13 “(a) COMMISSION RULES.—

14 “(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective not later than
 15 270 days after the date of enactment of the Cor-
 16 porate and Financial Institution Compensation Fair-
 17 ness Act of 2009, the Commission shall, by rule, di-
 18 rect the national securities exchanges and national
 19 securities associations to prohibit the listing of any
 20 security of an issuer that is not in compliance with
 21 the requirements of any portion of subsections (b)
 22 through (f).

23 “(2) OPPORTUNITY TO CURE DEFECTS.—The
 24 rules of the Commission under paragraph (1) shall
 25 provide for appropriate procedures for an issuer to

1 have an opportunity to cure any defects that would
2 be the basis for a prohibition under paragraph (1)
3 before the imposition of such prohibition.

4 “(3) EXEMPTION AUTHORITY.—The Commis-
5 sion may exempt certain categories of issuers from
6 the requirements of subsections (b) through (f),
7 where appropriate in view of the purpose of this sec-
8 tion. In determining appropriate exemptions, the
9 Commission shall take into account, among other
10 considerations, the potential impact on smaller re-
11 porting issuers.

12 “(b) INDEPENDENCE OF COMPENSATION COMMIT-
13 TEES.—

14 “(1) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the com-
15 pensation committee of the board of directors of the
16 issuer shall be a member of the board of directors
17 of the issuer, and shall otherwise be independent.

18 “(2) CRITERIA.—In order to be considered to
19 be independent for purposes of this subsection, a
20 member of a compensation committee of an issuer
21 may not, other than in his or her capacity as a
22 member of the compensation committee, the board
23 of directors, or any other board committee—

24 “(A) accept any consulting, advisory, or
25 other compensatory fee from the issuer; or

1 “(B) be an affiliated person of the issuer
2 or any subsidiary thereof.

3 “(C) EXEMPTIVE AUTHORITY.—The Com-
4 mission may exempt from the requirements of
5 paragraph (2) a particular relationship with re-
6 spect to compensation committee members,
7 where appropriate in view of the purpose of this
8 section.

9 “(3) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the
10 term ‘compensation committee’ means—

11 “(A) a committee (or equivalent body) es-
12 tablished by and amongst the board of directors
13 of an issuer for the purpose of determining and
14 approving the compensation arrangements for
15 the executive officers of the issuer; and

16 “(B) if no such committee exists with re-
17 spect to an issuer, the independent members of
18 the entire board of directors.

19 “(c) INDEPENDENCE STANDARDS FOR COMPENSA-
20 TION CONSULTANTS AND OTHER COMMITTEE ADVI-
21 SORS.—Any compensation consultant, legal counsel, or
22 other adviser to the compensation committee of any issuer
23 shall meet standards for independence established by the
24 Commission by regulation.

1 “(d) COMPENSATION COMMITTEE AUTHORITY RE-
2 LATING TO COMPENSATION CONSULTANTS.—

3 “(1) IN GENERAL.—The compensation com-
4 mittee of each issuer, in its capacity as a committee
5 of the board of directors, shall have the authority,
6 in its sole discretion, to retain and obtain the advice
7 of a compensation consultant meeting the standards
8 for independence promulgated pursuant to sub-
9 section (c), and the compensation committee shall be
10 directly responsible for the appointment, compensa-
11 tion, and oversight of the work of such independent
12 compensation consultant. This provision shall not be
13 construed to require the compensation committee to
14 implement or act consistently with the advice or rec-
15 ommendations of the compensation consultant, and
16 shall not otherwise affect the compensation commit-
17 tee’s ability or obligation to exercise its own judg-
18 ment in fulfillment of its duties.

19 “(2) DISCLOSURE.—In any proxy or consent
20 solicitation material for an annual meeting of the
21 shareholders (or a special meeting in lieu of the an-
22 nual meeting) occurring on or after the date that is
23 1 year after the date of enactment of the Corporate
24 and Financial Institution Compensation Fairness
25 Act of 2009, each issuer shall disclose in the proxy

1 or consent material, in accordance with regulations
2 to be promulgated by the Commission—

3 “(A) whether the compensation committee
4 of the issuer retained and obtained the advice
5 of a compensation consultant meeting the
6 standards for independence promulgated pursu-
7 ant to subsection (c); and

8 “(B) if the compensation committee of the
9 issuer has not retained and obtained the advice
10 of a compensation consultant meeting the
11 standards for independence promulgated pursu-
12 ant to subsection (c), an explanation of the
13 basis for the compensation committee’s deter-
14 mination that the retention of such an inde-
15 pendent consultant was not in the interests of
16 shareholders.

17 “(e) AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE INDEPENDENT COUN-
18 SEL AND OTHER ADVISORS.—The compensation com-
19 mittee of each issuer, in its capacity as a committee of
20 the board of directors, shall have the authority, in its sole
21 discretion, to retain and obtain the advice of independent
22 counsel and other advisers meeting the standards for inde-
23 pendence promulgated pursuant to subsection (c), and the
24 compensation committee shall be directly responsible for
25 the appointment, compensation, and oversight of the work

1 of such independent counsel and other advisers. This pro-
 2 vision shall not be construed to require the compensation
 3 committee to implement or act consistently with the advice
 4 or recommendations of such independent counsel and
 5 other advisers, and shall not otherwise affect the com-
 6 pensation committee's ability or obligation to exercise its
 7 own judgment in fulfillment of its duties.

8 “(f) FUNDING.—Each issuer shall provide for appro-
 9 priate funding, as determined by the compensation com-
 10 mittee, in its capacity as a committee of the board of direc-
 11 tors, for payment of compensation—

12 “(1) to any compensation consultant to the
 13 compensation committee that meets the standards
 14 for independence promulgated pursuant to sub-
 15 section (c), and

16 “(2) to any independent counsel or other ad-
 17 viser to the compensation committee.”.

18 (b) STUDY AND REVIEW REQUIRED.—

19 (1) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Ex-
 20 change Commission shall conduct a study and review
 21 of the use of compensation consultants meeting the
 22 standards for independence promulgated pursuant to
 23 section 10B(c) of the Securities Exchange Act of
 24 1934 (as added by subsection (a)), and the effects
 25 of such use.

1 (2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2
2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the
3 Commission shall submit a report to the Congress
4 on the results of the study and review required by
5 this paragraph.

6 **SEC. 4. ENHANCED COMPENSATION STRUCTURE REPORT-**
7 **ING TO REDUCE PERVERSE INCENTIVES.**

8 (a) ENHANCED DISCLOSURE AND REPORTING OF
9 COMPENSATION ARRANGEMENTS.—Not later than 270
10 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the appro-
11 priate Federal regulators jointly shall prescribe regula-
12 tions to require each covered financial institution to dis-
13 close to the appropriate Federal regulator the structures
14 of the incentive-based compensation arrangements for offi-
15 cers and employees of such institution sufficient to deter-
16 mine whether the compensation structure—

17 (1) is aligned with sound risk management;

18 (2) is structured to account for the time hori-
19 zon of risks; and

20 (3) meets such other criteria as the appropriate
21 Federal regulators jointly may determine to be ap-
22 propriate to reduce unreasonable incentives for offi-
23 cers and employees to take undue risks that—

24 (A) could threaten the safety and sound-
25 ness of covered financial institutions; or

1 (B) could have serious adverse effects on
2 economic conditions or financial stability.

3 (b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN COMPENSATION
4 STRUCTURES.—Not later than 270 days after the date of
5 enactment of this Act, and taking into account the factors
6 described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a),
7 the appropriate Federal regulators shall jointly prescribe
8 regulations that prohibit any compensation structure or
9 incentive-based payment arrangement, or any feature of
10 any such compensation structure or arrangement, that the
11 regulators determine encourages inappropriate risks by fi-
12 nancial institutions or officers or employees of covered fi-
13 nancial institutions that—

14 (1) could threaten the safety and soundness of
15 covered financial institutions; or

16 (2) could have serious adverse effects on eco-
17 nomic conditions or financial stability.

18 (c) ENFORCEMENT.—The provisions of this section
19 shall be enforced under section 505 of the Gramm-Leach-
20 Bliley Act and, for purposes of such section, a violation
21 of this section shall be treated as a violation of subtitle
22 A of title V of such Act.

23 (d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

24 (1) the term “appropriate Federal regulator”
25 means—

1 (A) the Board of Governors of the Federal
2 Reserve System;

3 (B) the Office of the Comptroller of the
4 Currency;

5 (C) the Board of Directors of the Federal
6 Deposit Insurance Corporation;

7 (D) the Director of the Office of Thrift
8 Supervision;

9 (E) the National Credit Union Administra-
10 tion Board; and

11 (F) the Securities and Exchange Commis-
12 sion; and

13 (2) the term “covered financial institution”
14 means—

15 (A) a depository institution or depository
16 institution holding company, as such terms are
17 defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit In-
18 surance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

19 (B) a broker-dealer registered under sec-
20 tion 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
21 (15 U.S.C. 78o);

22 (C) a credit union, as described in section
23 19(b)(1)(A)(iv) of the Federal Reserve Act;

24 (D) an investment advisor, as such term is
25 defined in section 202(a)(11) of the Investment

1 Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–2(a)(11));
2 and
3 (E) any other financial institution that the
4 appropriate Federal regulators, jointly, by rule,
5 determine should be treated as a covered finan-
6 cial institution for purposes of this section.

○