ALSTON&BIRD LLP

One Atlantic Center 1201 West Peachtree Street Atlanta, GA 30309-3424

> 404-881-7000 Fax:404-881-7777 www.alston.com

Mr. Ashley Gillihan Direct Dial: 404-881-7390

Email: ashley.gillihan@alston.com

September 27, 2012

Submitted electronically via Notice.comments@irscounsel.treas.gov and e-ohpsca-er.ebsa@dol.gov.

Internal Revenue Service
Ben Franklin Station
P.O. Box 7604
Room 5203
Washington, DC 20044

Attn: CC:PA:LPD:PR (Notices 2012-58, 2012-59)

Office of Health Plan Standards and Compliance Employee Benefits and Security Administration Room N-5653 U.S. Department of Labor 200 Constitution Ave., NW Washington, DC 20210

Re: IRS Notices 2012-58 and 2012-59

On behalf of many of our clients, Alston & Bird, LLP ("A&B") commends the agencies for the guidance set forth in the above mentioned Notices -- guidance that is reflective of the agencies' ongoing willingness to work closely with stakeholders to develop rules and regulations that are both consistent with the applicable statutory requirements and administratively feasible for stakeholders. In particular, we applaud the clarifications made in Notice 2012-59 regarding the application of Section 2708 to employees whose eligibility for a group health plan is otherwise tied to accumulated hours of service.

Example #4 in Notice 2012-59 indicates that a plan's terms of eligibility that require an employee to accumulate no more than 1200 hours of service before becoming eligible are not designed to avoid compliance with Section 2708 as long as coverage (if elected) begins on the 91st day following the satisfaction of the cumulative hours requirement. We firmly believe that this clarification in Example #4 appropriately gives employers flexibility -- flexibility that will incent employers to continue offering coverage to part-time employees in the future -- in a manner that is fully consistent with the requirements and underlying policy purposes of Section 2708.

Internal Revenue Service Office of Health Plan Standards and Compliance Employee Benefits and Security Administration September 27, 2012 Page 2

We are pleased that we can rely on this guidance at least through the end of 2014. If, however, the agencies issue additional guidance or regulations on Section 2708 in the future, we wish to encourage the agencies to incorporate a rule that is *no more restrictive* than the guidance set forth in Example #4. Many of our clients believe that any rule that is more restrictive than Example #4 would inappropriately discourage coverage and would not be consistent with Section 2708.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. If you have any questions or wish to discuss this issue further, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely

Mr. Ashley Gillihan

AG:del LEGAL01/13440402v1