

EFFECTIVE JANUARY 24, 2022

The Entire Keightley & Ashner Team Has Joined  
**THE WAGNER LAW GROUP**

[Click to visit our website](#)

You can view this PDF by advancing to the next page.

Keyword search: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_

Daily News E-Mail

[SIGN UP HERE](#)

Subscriptions

[aphillip@msm.co.uk](mailto:aphillip@msm.co.uk)  
+44 (0)207 378 4470

Advertising

[dmotum@msm.co.uk](mailto:dmotum@msm.co.uk)  
+44 (0)207 378 4404

[HOME](#)

NEW FEATURES

[click here](#) to view this month's features

[ABOUT US](#)

[ADVERTISING](#)

[EVENTS CALENDAR](#)

[CIRCULATION](#)

[EDITORIAL FOCUS](#)

[SERVICE DIRECTORY](#)

[CONTACTS](#)

[USEFUL LINKS](#)



## US funding reform warning

US - Tighter funding obligations being considered as part of the US single-employer pension funding reform proposals could have the reverse effect of forcing "borderline" companies onto the federal insurance programme, industry experts have claimed.

The new rules are intended, in part, to reduce the exposure of the federal insurer, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC), to future losses from financially weak companies.

Harold Ashner, a partner with the law firm Keightley & Ashner LLP and the PBGC's former assistant general counsel for legislation and regulations, said: "Dramatic increases in funding obligations may not help the PBGC if the increases push employers who otherwise could have survived over the edge, thereby creating claims on the insurance programme that could have been avoided."

Jim Keightley, also a partner at the firm and the PBGC's former general counsel, added: "There could be sponsors that with more moderate funding could have maintained their plan long-term and never been a loss for the PBGC."

Funding proposals under discussion include significant reductions in companies' ability to smooth year-to-year fluctuations in their pension funding obligations; limitations on their ability to use previous "extra" contributions to satisfy obligations; and sharply increased funding requirements for a possible new class of "at risk" plans.

James Klein, president of the American Benefits Council, said many of the proposed changes would inject instability into the funding obligations that would exacerbate the trend away from the sponsorship of defined benefit plans.

He pointed to the inability of companies to use so-called credit balances built up during periods when they contributed more to the plan than was required, and noted the sensitivity of the new rules to minor fluctuations in interest rates, affecting the amount companies would have to contribute to their pension plans on a year-to-year basis.

"These are all aspects... which would make it simply more unpredictable in terms of companies knowing what their financial obligations would be to their pension plans over the next few years," he said.

A spokesman for the PBGC directed all inquiries about the proposed pension reform legislation to the US Department of Labor (DoL). The DoL said a system allowing systematic underfunding by some plans created a moral hazard, driving

## CONTENTS

[FEATURES](#)

[COUNTRY PROFILES](#)

[ROUND TABLES](#)

[SURVEYS](#)

[SUPPLEMENTS](#)

[INTERVIEWS](#)

[GLOBAL MOVERS](#)

**FREE SUBSCRIPTION!**



Sign up for 1 year's  
**FREE SUBSCRIPTION**  
of Global Pensions Magazine.

[Click here to sign up NOW!](#)

responsible and well-funded plans out of the system. Rather than putting more pressure on the insurance system, reform was essential to preserve it, the department added.

By Lisa Haines

---

MSM International

-----  
Copyright MSM International Ltd, Thames House, 18 Park Street, London, SE1 9ER,  
Tel: + 44 (0)20 7940 7231 Fax: + 44 (0)20 7234 0702 E-mail: [scott@msm.co.uk](mailto:scott@msm.co.uk)

All rights reserved. No part of this web site may be reproduced in any form by any means without the written permission of the publisher. Such written permission must be obtained before any part of the site is stored in any retrieval system of any nature.