

Please note that the comments expressed herein are solely my personal views

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System  
20<sup>th</sup> Street and Constitution Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20551  
United States  
[www.federalreserve.gov](http://www.federalreserve.gov)

Chris Barnard

20 April 2011

- **12 CFR Part 237**
- **Docket No. R-1415**
- **Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities**

Dear Jennifer Johnson.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on your notice of proposed rulemaking: Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities.

The OCC, Board, FDIC, FCA, and FHFA (collectively, the Agencies) are requesting comment on a proposal to establish minimum margin and capital requirements for registered swap dealers, major swap participants, security-based swap dealers, and major security-based swap participants (covered swap entities) for which one of the Agencies is the prudential regulator.

I generally support your principles-based proposal, which would apply to uncleared swaps entered into after the date the regulation comes into force. I will make some general comments on the main issues.

#### Capital requirements

I agree that a covered swap entity should continue to comply with the regulatory capital rules that already apply to that covered swap entity as part of its prudential regulatory regime. However I look forward to the implementation of Basel III, which looks to focus more regulatory oversight on uncleared positions, and which suggests that higher capital requirements should apply here.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see [www.bis.org/publ/bcbs189.pdf](http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs189.pdf) for further information.

Please note that the comments expressed herein are solely my personal views

### Margin requirements

I support the proposal to allow covered swap entities to use approved internal models to calculate the initial margining requirements, subject to the fallback option, which is based on a table of standardised initial margin requirements. This is very much the way to go,<sup>2</sup> and will surely spur covered swap entities to develop and use the more risk-accurate internal models compared to the standardised approach.

I also agree with the approach proposed for calculating variation margins, which would allow for aggregating transactions entered into with a counterparty under a qualifying master netting agreement. This is entirely appropriate.

Under proposed § \_\_.5 Documentation of margin matters, a covered swap entity would be required to maintain documentation on the “methods, procedures, rules, and inputs for determining the value of each swap or security-based swap for purposes of calculating variation margin requirements”. Although the proposal does not prescribe a specific valuation method, the agreed methods, procedures, rules and inputs should be required to constitute a complete and independently verifiable methodology for valuing each swap or security-based swap transaction entered into between the relevant parties. I believe that this would increase transparency, operational efficiency and assist in the early and objective resolution of swap and security-based swap valuation disputes.

### Summary

In summary, I welcome your proposal. I agree with the principles-based approach that you have taken here. I would only specifically recommend that you should require any swap or security-based swap valuation methodology to constitute a complete and independently verifiable methodology for the purposes of margining, and to assist in the objective resolution of valuation disputes.

Yours sincerely

Chris Barnard

---

<sup>2</sup> Similar to the approach adopted by Basel for banks, and e.g. Solvency II for European insurers.