

Proposal: 1629 (AF22) Standardized Approach for Calculating the Exposure Amount of Derivative Contracts

Description:

---

Comment ID: 133537

From: Charity Colleen Crouse

Proposal: 1629 (AF22) Standardized Approach for Calculating the Exposure Amount of Derivative Contracts

Subject: R-1629 Standardized Approach for Calculating the Exposure Amount of Derivative Contracts

---

Comments:

Date: Mar 14, 2019

Proposal: Standardized Approach for Calculating the Exposure Amount of Derivative Contracts [R-1629]

Document ID: R-1629

Revision: 1

First name: Charity Colleen

Middle initial:

Last name: Crouse

Affiliation (if any):

Affiliation Type: ()

Address line 1:

Address line 2:

City:

State:

Zip:

Country:

Postal (if outside the U.S.):

Your comment: Public Comment to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors on Recommendations to Policy Changes Regarding Use of Derivative Contracts

March 14, 2019

R-1629 and RIN 7100-AF22

When it comes to the use of "derivative contracts" any policy changes first need to address outstanding matters in regards to disclosure of terms regarding and types of intangible property that can be used. Additionally, the role of personal private information that is sold as "information" (previously referred to in policy as "data" but to be distinguished as "information" after the updates to Medicare policies on use of "human subjects" that were proposed on Jan. 21, 2019 for a final comment for implementation by October of 2019) after anonymization needs to be evaluated in regards to potential use as and for derivatives and in "derivative contracts." In the last ten years there were substantial changes in on-the-ground (or "at-the-front") policy implementation--including violations of policy in the actual application of policy--without attendant enforcement or remuneration responses to attempted reporting efforts. These matters are especially important in regards to reports from the Veterans Administration and fraud regarding Medicare and Social Security.

A federal report from early 2018 said that backlogs in investigating Medicare policy breaches went back to 2013, however, there were substantial changes to the billing procedures for Medicare that took place in 2013 that increasingly impacting policy implementation. In fact, I believe there was a premeditated effort to obscure reports of fraud and their implications in a recommendation to instead "express risk in terms of revenue" that was proposed in September of 2018 and was reported in an Advanced Alternative Payment Model (APM) Incentive proposal. Where is the "public comment" on what this entails? Furthermore, Executive Order 13782 of March 27, 2017 "Revocation of Federal

Contracting Executive Orders" revokes requirements in previous Executive Orders to require federal contractors to report on past charges of fraud for the previous three years when attempting to apply for a federal contract. Subsequently, there is a lag in terms of time frames for reporting policy breaches versus requirements for disclosing the results of investigations into policy breaches and adequately addressing the severity of the breaches of concern.

It has also been seven years since the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. By law clinics and providers are required to provide any patient with records for up to seven prior years worth of treatment. Advances in medical treatment and policy changes mean that data from past patient information may not be available for years after the requirement for patient record by the patient or a approved representative. At the onset of the Affordable Care Act there was no disclosure on the role that "biometrics" or "biometric" data played in monetization of financial processes, however, now medical providers are offering patients incentives to monetize their biometric data. How the systems for this to be accomplished and what happened to past biometric data has never been disclosed. Neither have the results of past clinical trials that may have been engaged regarding patients who were signed up early via the Affordable Care Act to obtain MediCare and Social Security Disability Insurance. In fact, no disclosure has EVER been provided regarding what having "Social Security Disability Insurance" means regarding use of people's intangible property. Social Security was a federal trust; it was NOT an insurance program. Changes in policy development without accounting for past theft of intangible property via deceptive contracts engaged around medical service provision needs to be addressed prior to any efforts at expansion of or alteration of these policies for effecting changes to monetary or financial policy. These violations are human rights violations and need to be addressed as such.

What is going on with using "public comment" periods as a way of providing a forum for individuals to submit information to federal government departments to be culled for later use in developing policy without "crediting" the contributor? This is more than "civic participation" as literally people's efforts to seek legal redress for fraud and other crimes is diverted into "human asset pools" that are then used for financing federal projects and even setting policy that may or may not actually address the previous criminal activities to which that individual or even groups of individuals have been subjected. I contend that the use of derivative contracts is intentionally aimed at effectuating this and is a form of undermining civic participation while dispossessing people of their personal private property in the form of their intangible property and human capital assets. It also serves to cover up for crimes committed by individuals who are supposed to be representing the people of the United States, if not altogether providing kickbacks in giving credit for policy implementation to assignees in the government when the "policy" was itself a cover-up for crimes that the individual had no legitimate forum through which to address as a CRIME.

Addressing these matters as crimes as opposed to "public comments" gives them a completely different risk factor as well as a different currency. "Policy makers" in government offices and departments that appropriately address them as "crimes" and appropriately compensate and acknowledge those who report them also provide different valuations for considering and responding to risk, hence providing a different currency. Concerns regarding deficit and debt, as well as "security" and stability have different standards and provide a significantly different basis for calculation when CRIMES are addressed ad CRIMES rather than "embezzled" through public comment periods.

"Marketing" only does so much to whitewash a cover-up.

Let us consider also that this "public comment" is being provided before a March 20, 2019 conference in Russia regarding clinical trials as well as a March 20, 2019 conference in Washington, DC by United Nations bodies concerning marijuana legalization policy. This is one month before the one-year anniversary of a World Bank announcement regarding the development of a "joint" data bank regarding information gathered on the movements of refugees and displaced persons. I personally have tracked the "metrics" used by the United Nations as well as federal and local municipal and state operators in three states actively for over...three years...and understand that the "model" has been refined for what now appears to be application on a global scale. Also, after years of a "Russian hacking" scandal, what does it mean to see a "co-location of services" between the U.S. and Russia at THIS time without any disclosure of what has happened with at least the past 10-years worth of biometric data culled from U.S. citizens that is being monetized for global banking policy? Did the Federal Reserve in the form of the Foreign Open Markets Committee's Feb. 4, 2019 policy changes portend a future reality when it

discussed "revising" past indices and also allowing for a one-year-long transition wherein Venezuela was to be replaced by Vietnam but while using information for Venezuela for a year during the transition?

I first attempted to address "MediCare" fraud via the federal reporting processes for various agencies beginning in March of 2016. But through "testing" I ended up being used in February of 2019 as a "derivative" for an Executive Order supporting a change of leadership in Venezuela. It's called "securities fraud"--"LARGE SCALE SECURITIES FRAUD." In other countries not listed in the Foreign Open Markets Committee report its called "portfolio switching" and it is illegal. In America, if we "market" it appropriately it is called treason.

What happened to the 2016 Milwaukee Federal Reserve's "public comment" period on a federal "public banking system?" Because that is NOT what this is.