Working with borrowers who are experiencing financial difficulties may involve formally restructuring their loans and taking other measures to conform the repayment terms to the borrowers’ ability to repay. Such actions, if done in a way that is consistent with prudent lending principles and supervisory practices, can improve the prospects for collection. Generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and regulatory reporting requirements provide a framework for reporting that may alleviate certain concerns that lenders may have about working constructively with borrowers who are having financial difficulties.

Interagency policy statements and guidance, issued on March 1, 1991; March 10, 1993; and June 10, 1993, clarified supervisory policies regarding nonaccrual assets, restructured loans, and collateral valuation (additional clarification guidance may be found in SR-95-38 and in the glossary of the reporting instructions for the bank call report and the FR-Y-9C, the consolidated bank holding company report). When certain criteria\(^1\) are met, (1) interest payments on nonaccrual assets can be recognized as income on a cash basis without first recovering any prior partial charge-offs; (2) nonaccrual assets can be restored to accrual status when subject to formal restructurings, according to Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) Statement Nos. 15 and 114, “Accounting by Debtors and Creditors for Troubled Debt Restructurings” (FAS 15) and “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan” (FAS 114); and (3) restructurings that specify a market rate of interest would not have to be included in restructured loan amounts reported in the years after the year of the restructuring. These supervisory policies apply to federally supervised financial institution subsidiaries.

2065.1.1 CASH-BASIS INCOME RECOGNITION ON NONACCRUAL ASSETS

Current regulatory reporting requirements do not preclude the cash-basis recognition of income on nonaccrual assets (including loans that have been partially charged off), if the remaining book balance of the loan is deemed fully collectible. Interest income recognized on a cash basis should be limited to that which would have been accrued on the recorded balance at the contractual rate. Any cash interest received over this limit should be recorded as recoveries of prior charge-offs until these charge-offs have been fully recovered.

2065.1.2 NONACCRUAL ASSETS SUBJECT TO FAS 15 AND FAS 114 RESTRUCTURINGS

A loan or other debt instrument that has been formally restructured to ensure repayment and performance need not be maintained in nonaccrual status. When the asset is returned to accrual status, payment performance that had been sustained for a reasonable time before the restructuring may be considered. For example, a loan may have been restructured, in part, to reduce the amount of the borrower’s contractual payments. It may be that the amount and frequency of payments under the restructured terms do not exceed those of the payments that the borrower had made over a sustained period, within a reasonable time before the restructuring. In this situation, if the lender is reasonably assured of repayment and performance according to the modified terms, the loan can be immediately restored to accrual status.

Clearly, a period of sustained performance, whether before or after the date of the restructuring, is very important in determining whether there is reasonable assurance of repayment and performance. In certain circumstances, other information may be sufficient to demonstrate an improvement in the borrower’s condition or in economic conditions that may affect the borrower’s ability to repay. Such information may reduce the need to rely on the borrower’s performance to date in assessing repayment prospects. For example, if the borrower has obtained substantial and reliable sales, lease, or rental contracts or if other important developments are expected to significantly increase the borrower’s cash flow and debt-service capacity and strength, then the borrower’s commitment to repay may be sufficient. A preponderance of such evidence may be sufficient to warrant

---

\(^1\) A discussion of the criteria is found within the corresponding subsections that follow.
returning a restructured loan to accrual status. The restructured terms must reasonably ensure performance and full repayment.

It is imperative that the reasons for restoring restructured debt to accrual status be documented. A restoration should be supported by a current, well-documented evaluation of the borrower’s financial condition and prospects for repayment. This documentation will be reviewed by examiners.

The formal restructuring of a loan or other debt instrument should be undertaken in ways that will improve the likelihood that the credit will be repaid in full in accordance with reasonably restructured repayment terms. Regulatory reporting requirements and GAAP do not require a banking organization that restructures a loan to grant excessive concessions, forgive principal, or take other steps not commensurate with the borrower’s ability to repay in order to use the reporting treatment specified in FAS 15. Furthermore, the restructured terms may include prudent contingent payment provisions that permit an institution to obtain appropriate recovery of concessions granted in the restructuring, if the borrower’s condition substantially improves.

2.065.1.3 RESTRUCTURINGS RESULTING IN A MARKET INTEREST RATE

A FAS 114 restructuring that specifies an effective interest rate that is equal to or greater than the rate the lending banking organization is willing to accept at the time of the restructuring, for a new loan with comparable risk (assuming the loan is not impaired by the restructuring agreement), does not have to be reported as a troubled-debt restructuring after the year of restructuring.

2.065.1.4 NONACCRUAL TREATMENT OF MULTIPLE LOANS TO ONE BORROWER

As a general principle, whether to place an asset in nonaccrual status should be determined by an assessment of the individual asset’s collectibility. One loan to a borrower being placed in nonaccrual status does not automatically have to result in all other extensions of credit to that borrower being placed in nonaccrual status. When a single borrower has multiple extensions of credit outstanding and one meets the criteria for nonaccrual status, the lender should evaluate the others to determine whether one or more of them should also be placed in nonaccrual status.

2.065.1.4.1 Troubled-Debt Restructuring—Returning a Multiple-Note Structure to Accrual Status

On June 10, 1993, interagency guidance was issued to clarify a March 10, 1993, interagency policy statement on credit availability. The guidance addresses a troubled-debt restructuring (TDR) that involves multiple notes (sometimes referred to as A/B note structures). An example of a multiple-note structure is when the first, or A, note would represent the portion of the original loan principal amount that would be expected to be fully collected along with contractual interest. The second part of the restructured loan, or B note, represents the portion of the original loan that has been charged off.

Such TDRs generally may take any of three forms: (1) In certain TDRs, the B note may be a contingent receivable that is payable only if certain conditions are met (for example, if there is sufficient cash flow from the property). (2) For other TDRs, the B note may be contingency-forgiven (note B is forgiven if note A is paid in full). (3) In other instances, an institution would have granted a concession (for example, a rate reduction) to the troubled borrower but the B note would remain a contractual obligation of the borrower. Because the B note is not reflected as an asset on the institution’s books and is unlikely to be collected, the B note is viewed as a contingent receivable for reporting purposes.

Financial institutions may return the A note to accrual status provided the following conditions are met:

1. The restructuring qualifies as a TDR as defined by FAS 15, and there is economic substance to the restructuring. (Under FAS 15, a restructuring of debt is considered a TDR if “the creditor for economic or legal reasons related to the debtor’s financial difficulties grants a concession to the debtor that it would not otherwise consider.”)
2. The portion of the original loan represented by the B note has been charged off. The charge-off must be supported by a current, well-documented evaluation of the borrower’s financial condition and prospects for repayment under the revised terms. The charge-off must be recorded before or at the time of the restructuring.

3. The institution is reasonably assured of repayment of the A note and of performance in accordance with the modified terms.

4. In general, the borrower must have demonstrated sustained repayment performance (either immediately before or after the restructuring) in accordance with the modified terms for a reasonable period before the date on which the A note is returned to accrual status. Sustained payment performance generally would be for a minimum of six months and involve payments in the form of cash or cash equivalents.

The A note would be initially disclosed as a TDR. However, if the A note yields a market rate of interest and performs in accordance with contractual terms, the interest rate on the A note would not have to be disclosed as a TDR in the year after the restructuring. To be considered a market rate of interest and performs in accordance with the restructured terms, the note would not have been brought fully current with respect to principal and interest and (2) it is expected that the full contractual balance of the loan (including any amounts charged off) plus interest will be fully collectible under the terms of the loan.4

2065.1.4.2 Nonaccrual Loans That Have Demonstrated Sustained Contractual Performance

Certain borrowers have resumed paying the full amount of scheduled contractual interest and principal payments on loans that are past due and in nonaccrual status. Although prior arrearages may not have been eliminated by payments from the borrowers, some borrowers have demonstrated sustained performance over a time in accordance with contractual terms. The interagency guidance of June 10, 1993, announced that such loans may henceforth be returned to accrual status, even though the loans have not been brought fully current. They may be returned to accrual status if (1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of all principal and interest amounts contractually due (including arrearages) within a reasonable period and (2) the borrower has made payments of cash or cash equivalents over a sustained period (generally a minimum of six months) in accordance with the contractual terms. When the federal financial institution regulatory reporting criteria for restoration to accrual status are met, previous charge-offs taken would not have to be fully recovered before such loans are returned to accrual status. Loans that meet this criteria should continue to be disclosed as past due as appropriate (for example, 90 days past due and still accruing) until they have been brought fully current. (See SR-93-30.)

2065.1.5 ACQUISITION OF NONACCRUAL ASSETS

Banking organizations (or the receiver of a failed institution) may sell loans or debt securities maintained in nonaccrual status. Such loans or debt securities that have been acquired from an unaffiliated third party should be reported by the purchaser in accordance with AICPA Practice Bulletin No. 6. When the criteria specified in this bulletin are met, these assets may be placed in nonaccrual status.3

2065.1.6 TREATMENT OF NONACCRUAL LOANS WITH PARTIAL CHARGE-OFFS

Whether partial charge-offs associated with a nonaccrual loan that has not been formally restructured must first be fully recovered before the loan can be restored to accrual status is an issue that has not been explicitly addressed by GAAP and bank regulatory reporting requirements. In accordance with the instructions for the bank call report and the bank holding company reports (FR-Y series), restoration to accrual status is permitted when (1) the loan has been brought fully current with respect to principal and interest and (2) it is expected that the full contractual balance of the loan (including any amounts charged off) plus interest will be fully collectible under the terms of the loan.4

---


4. The instructions for the call reports and FR-Y reports discuss the criteria for restoration to accrual status in the glossary entries for “nonaccrual status.” This guidance also permits restoration to accrual status for nonaccrual assets that are both well secured and in the process of collection. In addition, this guidance permits restoration to accrual status, when certain criteria are met, of formally restructured debt and acquired nonaccrual assets.
Thus, in determining whether a partially charged-off loan that has been brought fully current can be returned to accrual status, it is important to determine whether the banking organization expects to receive the full amount of principal and interest called for by the terms of the loan.

When a loan has been brought fully current with respect to contractual principal and interest, and when the borrower’s financial condition and economic conditions that could affect the borrower’s ability to repay have improved to the point that repayment of the full amount of contractual principal (including any amounts charged off) and interest is expected, the loan may be restored to accrual status even if the charge-off has not been recovered. However, this treatment would not be appropriate if the charge-off reflects continuing doubt about the collectibility of principal or interest. Because loans or other assets are required to be placed in nonaccrual status when full repayment of principal or interest is not expected, such loans could not be restored to accrual status.

It is imperative that the reasons for the restoration of a partially charged-off loan to accrual status be supported by a current, well-documented evaluation of the borrower’s financial condition and prospects for full repayment of contractual principal (including any amounts charged off) and interest. This documentation will be subject to review by examiners.

A nonaccrual loan or debt instrument may have been formally restructured in accordance with FAS 15 so that it meets the criteria for restoration to accrual status presented in section 2065.1.2 addressing restructured loans. Under GAAP, when a charge-off was taken before the date of the restructuring, it does not have to be recovered before the restructured loan can be restored to accrual status. When a charge-off occurs after the date of the restructuring, the considerations and treatments discussed earlier in this section are applicable.

2065.1.7 IN-SUBSTANCE FORECLOSURES

FAS 114 addresses the accounting for impaired loans and clarifies existing accounting guidance for in-substance foreclosures. Under the impairment standard and related amendments to FAS 15, a collateral-dependent real estate loan would be reported as “other real estate owned” (OREO) only if the lender had taken possession of the collateral. For other collateral-dependent real estate loans, loss recognition would be based on the fair value of the collateral if foreclosure is probable. Such loans would remain in the loan category and would not be reported as OREO. For depository institution examinations, any portion of the loan balance on a collateral-dependent loan that exceeds the fair value of the collateral and that can be identified as uncollectible would generally be classified as a loss and be promptly charged off against the ALLL.

A collateralized loan that becomes impaired is not considered “collateral dependent” if repayment is available from reliable sources other than the collateral. Any impairment on such a loan may, at the depository institution’s option, be determined based on the present value of the expected future cash flows discounted at the loan’s effective interest rate or, as a practical expedient, based on the loan’s observable market price. (See SR-95-38.)

Losses must be recognized on real estate loans that meet the in-substance foreclosure criteria with the collateral being valued according to its fair value. Such loans do not have to be reported as OREO unless possession of the underlying collateral has been obtained. (See SR-93-30.)

2065.1.8 LIQUIDATION VALUES OF REAL ESTATE LOANS

In accordance with the March 10, 1993, interagency policy statement Credit Availability, loans secured by real estate should be based on the borrower’s ability to pay over time, rather than on a presumption of immediate liquidation. Interagency guidance issued on June 10, 1993, emphasizes that it is not regulatory policy to value collateral that underlies real estate loans on a liquidation basis. (See SR-93-30.)

5. A collateral-dependent real estate loan is a loan for which repayment is expected to be provided solely by the underlying collateral and there are no other available and reliable sources of repayment.

6. The fair value of the assets transferred is the amount that the debtor could reasonably expect to receive for them in a current sale between a willing buyer and a willing seller, other than in a forced or liquidation sale.
The adequacy of a banking organization’s allowance for loan and lease losses (ALLL) (including amounts based on an analysis of the commercial real estate portfolio) must be based on a careful, well-documented, and consistently applied analysis of the loan and lease portfolio. The determination of the adequacy of the ALLL should be based on management’s consideration of all current significant conditions that might affect the ability of borrowers (or guarantors, if any) to fulfill their obligations to the institution. While historical loss experience provides a reasonable starting point, historical losses or even recent trends in losses are not sufficient, without further analysis, to produce a reliable estimate of anticipated loss.

In determining the adequacy of the ALLL, management should consider factors such as changes in the nature and volume of the portfolio; the experience, ability, and depth of lending management and staff; changes in credit standards; collection policies and historical collection experience; concentrations of credit risk; trends in the volume and severity of past-due and classified loans; and trends in the volume of nonaccrual loans, specific problem loans, and commitments. In addition, this analysis should consider the quality of the organization’s systems and management in identifying, monitoring, and addressing asset-quality problems. Furthermore, management should consider external factors such as local and national economic conditions and developments, competition, and legal and regulatory requirements, as well as reasonably foreseeable events that are likely to affect the collectibility of the portfolio.

Management should adequately document the factors that were considered, the methodology and process that were used in determining the adequacy of the ALLL, and the range of possible credit losses estimated by this process. The complexity and scope of this analysis must be appropriate to the size and nature of the organization and provide for sufficient flexibility to accommodate changing circumstances. Examiners will evaluate the methodology and process that management has followed in arriving at an overall estimate of the ALLL to ensure that all of the relevant factors affecting the collectibility of the portfolio have been appropriately considered. In addition, the overall estimate of the ALLL and the range of possible credit losses estimated by management will be reviewed for reasonableness in view of these factors. The examiner’s analysis will also consider the quality of the organization’s systems and management in identifying, monitoring, and addressing asset-quality problems. (See sections 2065.3, 2065.4, and 2128.08.)

The value of the collateral will be considered by examiners in reviewing and classifying a commercial real estate loan. However, for a performing commercial real estate loan, the supervisory policies of the agencies do not require automatic increases to the ALLL solely because the value of the collateral has declined to an amount that is less than the loan balance.

In assessing the ALLL, it is important to recognize that management’s process, methodology, and underlying assumptions require a substantial degree of judgment. Even when an organization maintains sound loan-administration and collection procedures and effective internal systems and controls, the estimation of losses may not be precise due to the wide range of factors that must be considered. Further, the ability to estimate losses on specific loans and categories of loans improves over time as substantive information accumulates regarding the factors affecting repayment prospects. When management has (1) maintained effective systems and controls for identifying, monitoring, and addressing asset-quality problems and (2) analyzed all significant factors affecting the collectibility of the portfolio, examiners should give considerable weight to management’s estimates in assessing the adequacy of the overall ALLL.

Examiners and bank holding company management should consider the impact of the Financial Accounting Standards Board’s (FASB) Statement No. 114, “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan” (FAS 114) (as amended by FASB Statement No. 118, “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan—Income Recognition and Disclosures”), on the ALLL-estimating process. FAS 114 sets forth guidance for estimating the impairment of

---

1. The estimation process described in this section permits a more accurate estimate of anticipated losses than could be achieved by assessing the loan portfolio solely on an aggregate basis. However, it is only an estimation process and does not imply that any part of the ALLL is segregated for, or allocated to, any particular asset or group of assets. The ALLL is available to absorb overall credit losses originating from the loan and lease portfolio. The balance of the ALLL is management’s estimation of potential credit losses, synonymous with its determination as to the adequacy of the overall ALLL.
a loan for general financial reporting purposes. Under FAS 114, a loan is impaired when, based on current information and events, it is probable that a creditor will be unable to collect all amounts due (principal and interest) according to the contractual terms of the loan agreement.

When a creditor has determined that a loan is impaired, FAS 114 requires that an allowance be established based on the present value of the expected future cash flows of the loan discounted at the loan’s effective interest rate (that is, the contract rate, as adjusted for any net deferred loan fees or costs, premiums, or discounts) or, as a practical expedient, at the loan’s observable market price or at the fair value of the collateral if the loan is collateral dependent. Since the allowances under FAS 114 apply only to a subset of loans, FAS 114 does not address the adequacy of a creditor’s overall ALLL or how the creditor should assess the adequacy of its ALLL. Examiners should not focus unduly on the adequacy of this or any other portion of the ALLL established for a subset of loans. Bank holding companies are required to follow FAS 114 (as amended by FAS 118) when reporting in the FR Y-9C report for the holding company on a consolidated basis.

2065.2.1 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To evaluate the methodology and process that management employs in compiling an overall estimate of the ALLL.

2. To understand and evaluate the nature of the external (economic and social climate, the extent of competition) and internal (credit strategies, levels of acceptable credit risk, and lending policies and procedures) lending environment and how they might influence management’s estimate of the ALLL.

3. To determine the accuracy and reasonableness of management’s estimate of the overall ALLL.

4. To evaluate the quality of the BHC’s systems and management performance in identifying, monitoring, and resolving asset-quality problems.

2. The guidance on impairment in FAS 114 does not apply to “large groups of smaller balance homogeneous loans that are collectively evaluated for impairment,” loans that are measured at fair value or at the lower of cost or fair value, or leases and debt securities as defined in FAS 115, “Accounting for Certain Investments in Debt and Equity Securities.” FAS 114 does apply to loans that are restructured in a troubled-debt restructuring involving a modification of terms.

2065.2.2 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Determine whether the banking organization has carefully documented and applied an accurate and consistent method of analysis for estimating the overall ALLL. When making such a determination, ascertain whether—
   a. management has considered all significant factors and conditions that might affect the collectibility of the loan, including the borrower’s repayment practices, the value of accessible underlying collateral, and other factors (that is, those factors listed in this section);
   b. management has documented all factors that were considered and the methodology and process that were used to evaluate the adequacy of the allowance; and
   c. the complexity and scope of the analysis are appropriate for the size and nature of the organization.

2. Evaluate the methodology and process that management has followed in arriving at an overall estimate of the ALLL.

3. Determine the reasonableness of management’s consolidated estimate of the ALLL, including the range of possible credit losses. Determine whether management has properly evaluated the overall composition of the loan portfolio at all organizational levels by—
   a. identifying potential problem loans, including loans classified by all bank regulatory agencies;
   b. determining trends with respect to loan volume (growth in particular, rapid growth), levels of delinquencies, nonaccruals, and nonperforming loans;
   c. considering the previous loss and recovery experience including the timeliness of charge-offs;
   d. evaluating the performance of concentrations of credit (related interests, geographic regions, industries, lesser-developed countries (LDCs), highly leveraged loans, and the size of credit exposures (few large loans versus numerous small loans));
   e. determining the amount of loans and problem loans (delinquent, nonaccrual, and nonperforming) by lending officer or committee; and
   f. evaluating the levels and performance of loans involving related parties.

4. For each level of the organization, determine the percentage of past-due loans to the loan portfolio and compare it with prior periods.
The examiner may find it beneficial to compute the ratio for groups of loans by type, size, or risk levels.

5. Compare the loans classified during regulatory examinations or BHC inspections with the previous examinations or inspections and also with those classified by management before the regulatory examinations or inspections. Investigate the current status of previously classified loans.

6. Compute the percentage of the ALLL to average outstanding loans and compare those results with those of the previous inspection. Investigate the reasons for variations between those periods.

7. Assess the quality of the organization’s systems and internal controls in identifying, monitoring, and addressing asset-quality problems.
WHAT’S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

This section has been fully revised to set forth the 2006 Interagency Policy Statement on the Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses (ALLL), which was issued on December 13, 2006, by the federal bank and thrift regulatory agencies (the banking agencies.) (See SR-06-17.) This guidance updates and replaces the 1993 policy statement. The policy was revised to ensure consistency with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and recent supervisory guidance. The Federal Reserve believes the guidance is broadly applicable to bank holding companies. Accordingly, examiners should apply the policy, as appropriate, during inspections of bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries.

2065.3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE ALLL POLICY STATEMENT

The 2006 policy statement discusses the nature and purpose of the allowance for loan and lease losses (ALLL); the responsibilities of boards of directors, the institution’s management, and the examiners of banking organizations regarding the ALLL; factors to be considered in the estimation of the ALLL; and the objectives and elements of an effective loan review system, including a sound credit grading system. The statement states that it is the responsibility of the board of directors and management of each institution to maintain the ALLL at an appropriate level. Each institution is responsible for developing, maintaining, and documenting an effective loan review system, including a sound credit grading system. The statement states that it is the responsibility of the board of directors and management of each institution to maintain the ALLL at an appropriate level. Each institution is responsible for developing, maintaining, and documenting an effective loan review system, including a sound credit grading system. The statement states that it is the responsibility of the board of directors and management of each institution to maintain the ALLL at an appropriate level.

To fulfill this responsibility, each institution should ensure that controls are in place to consistently determine the ALLL in accordance with GAAP, the institution’s stated policies and procedures, management’s best judgment, and relevant supervisory guidance. The policy statement also discusses the analysis of the loan and lease portfolio, factors to consider in estimating credit losses, and the characteristics of an effective loan-review system.

The policy statement continues the policy that Federal Reserve examiners will generally accept bank management’s estimates in their assessment of the appropriateness of the ALLL when management has (1) maintained effective loan review systems and controls for identifying, monitoring, and addressing asset-quality problems in a timely manner; (2) analyzed all significant environmental factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio as of the evaluation date in a reasonable manner; (3) established an acceptable ALLL-evaluation process for both individual loans and groups loans that meets the objectives for an appropriate ALLL; and (4) incorporated reasonable and properly supported assumptions, valuations, and judgments into the evaluation process.

The policy also reiterates the points of agreement between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the banking agencies since 1999: (1) the need for management to exercise significant judgment when estimating the ALLL, (2) the concept of a range of losses, and (3) the appropriateness of a properly developed and documented ALLL. Accordingly, the policy emphasizes that an institution should provide reasonable support and documentation of its ALLL estimates, including adjustments to the allowance for qualitative or environmental factors and unallocated portions of the allowance. This emphasis on support and documentation supplements, but does not replace, the guidance in the 2001 Interagency Policy Statement on the Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses Methodologies and Documentation for Banks and Savings Institutions (see SR-01-17).

Additionally, institutions are reminded that the allowance is an institution-specific estimate and generally should not be based solely on a “standard percentage” of loans. While peer group or other benchmark averages are an appropriate tool to evaluate the reasonableness of the allowance, it is the institution’s responsibility to analyze the collectibility of the loan portfolio to estimate the allowance. To that end, the policy statement does not reference standardized loss estimates (that is, 15 percent for loans classified as substandard and 50 percent for loans classified as doubtful).

The policy statement also includes guidance on SFAS 114, “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan,” which describes the evaluation and measurement of impairment for loans that are impaired on an individual basis, and SFAS 5, “Accounting for Contingencies,” which describes the same for pools of loans grouped according to risk factors. The relationship between the two standards is described as
well as the application of each standard in estimating the ALLL. Lastly, the policy reminds institutions that allowances related to off-balance-sheet financial instruments such as loan commitments or letters of credit should not be reported as part of the ALLL. Any allowance for these types of instruments is recorded as an “other liability.”

This policy statement applies to all depository institutions supervised by the banking agencies, except for U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks. In addition, the Federal Reserve believes the guidance is broadly applicable to bank holding companies as well. Accordingly, examiners should apply the policy, as appropriate, during inspections of bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries, in addition to the examination of state member banks.

Although the policy statement discusses key concepts and requirements in GAAP and existing supervisory guidance on the ALLL, the banking agencies recognized that institutions may not have had sufficient time to complete any enhancements needed to bring their ALLL processes and documentation into full compliance with the revised guidance for year-end 2006 reporting purposes. Nevertheless, such enhancements were to be completed and effective in the subsequent near term.

The text of the interagency policy statement follows. (See also sections 2065.1, 2065.2, and 2065.4.)

2065.3.1 2006 INTERAGENCY POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ALLOWANCE FOR LOAN AND LEASE LOSSES

This 2006 interagency policy statement1 revises and replaces the 1993 policy statement on the ALLL. It reiterates key concepts and requirements included in generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and existing ALLL supervisory guidance.2 The principal sources of guidance on accounting for impairment in a loan portfolio under GAAP are Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5, “Accounting for Contingencies” (FAS 5) and Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 114, “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan” (FAS 114). In addition, the Financial Accounting Standards Board Viewpoints article that is included in Emerging Issues Task Force Topic D-80 (EITF D-80), “Application of FASB Statements No. 5 and No. 114 to a Loan Portfolio,” presents questions and answers that provide specific guidance on the interaction between these two FASB statements and may be helpful in applying them.

In July 1999, the banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) issued a Joint Interagency Letter to Financial Institutions. The letter stated that the banking agencies and the SEC agreed on the following important aspects of loan loss allowance practices:

- Arriving at an appropriate allowance involves a high degree of management judgment and results in a range of estimated losses.
- Prudent, conservative—but not excessive—loan loss allowances that fall within an acceptable range of estimated losses are appropriate. In accordance with GAAP, an institution should record its best estimate within the range of credit losses, including when management’s best estimate is at the high end of the range.
- Determining the allowance for loan losses is inevitably imprecise, and an appropriate allowance falls within a range of estimated losses.
- An “unallocated” loan loss allowance is appropriate when it reflects an estimate of probable losses, determined in accordance with GAAP, and is properly supported.
- Allowance estimates should be based on a comprehensive, well-documented, and consistently applied analysis of the loan portfolio.
- The loan loss allowance should take into consideration all available information existing as of the financial statement date, including environmental factors such as industry, geographical, economic, and political factors.

In July 2001, the banking agencies issued the Policy Statement on Allowance for Loan and...
Maintenance of an Appropriate Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses

2065.3

Lease Losses Methodologies and Documentation for Banks and Savings Institutions (2001 policy statement). The policy statement is designed to assist institutions in establishing a sound process for determining an appropriate ALLL and documenting that process in accordance with GAAP. See section 2065.4.1. In March 2004, the agencies also issued the Update on Accounting for Loan and Lease Losses. This guidance provided reminders of longstanding supervisory guidance as well as a listing of the existing allowance guidance that institutions should continue to apply.

2065.3.1.1 Nature and Purpose of the ALLL

The ALLL represents one of the most significant estimates in an institution’s financial statements and regulatory reports. Because of its significance, each institution has a responsibility for developing, maintaining, and documenting a comprehensive, systematic, and consistently applied process for determining the amounts of the ALLL and the provision for loan and lease losses (PLLl). To fulfill this responsibility, each institution should ensure controls are in place to consistently determine the ALLL in accordance with GAAP, the institution’s stated policies and procedures, management’s best judgment, and relevant supervisory guidance. As of the end of each quarter, or more frequently if warranted, relevant supervisory guidance. As of the end of procedures, management with GAAP, the institution should ensure controls are in place to consistently determine the ALLL in accordance with GAAP, the institution’s stated policies and procedures, management’s best judgment, and relevant supervisory guidance. As of the end of each quarter, or more frequently if warranted, each institution must analyze the collectibility of its loans and leases held for investment (hereafter referred to as loans) and maintain an ALLL at a level that is appropriate and determined in accordance with GAAP. An appropriate ALLL covers estimated credit losses on individually evaluated loans that are determined to be impaired as well as estimated credit losses inherent in the remainder of the loan and lease portfolio. The ALLL does not apply, however, to loans carried at fair value, loans held for sale, off-balance-sheet credit exposures (for example, financial instruments such as off-balance-sheet loan commitments, standby letters of credit, and guarantees), or general or unspecified business risks.

For purposes of this policy statement, the term estimated credit losses means an estimate of the current amount of loans that it is probable the institution will be unable to collect given facts and circumstances since the evaluation date. Thus, estimated credit losses represent net charge-offs that are likely to be realized for a loan or group of loans. These estimated credit losses should meet the criteria for accrual of a loss contingency (that is, through a provision to the ALLL) set forth in GAAP. When available information confirms that specific loans, or portions thereof, are uncollectible, these amounts should be promptly charged off against the ALLL. For “purchased impaired loans,” GAAP provides:

5. See “Interagency Guidance on Certain Loans Held for Sale” (March 26, 2001) for the appropriate accounting and reporting treatment for certain loans that are sold directly from the loan portfolio or transferred to a held-for-sale account. Loans held for sale are reported at the lower of cost or fair value. Declines in value occurring after the transfer of a loan to the held-for-sale portfolio are accounted for as adjustments to a valuation allowance for held-for-sale loans and not as adjustments to the ALLL.

6. Credit losses on off-balance-sheet credit exposures should be estimated in accordance with FAS 5. Any allowance for credit losses on off-balance-sheet exposures should be reported on the balance sheet as an “other liability,” and not as part of the ALLL.

7. FAS 5 requires the accrual of a loss contingency when information available prior to the issuance of the financial statements indicates it is probable that an asset has been impaired at the date of the financial statements and the amount of loss can be reasonably estimated. These conditions may be considered in relation to individual loans or in relation to groups of similar types of loans. If the conditions are met, accrual should be made even though the particular loans that are uncollectible may not be identifiable. Under FAS 114, an individual loan is impaired when, based on current information and events, it is probable that a creditor will be unable to collect all amounts due according to the contractual terms of the loan agreement. It is implicit in these conditions that it must be probable that one or more future events will occur confirming the fact of the loss. Thus, under GAAP, the purpose of the ALLL is not to absorb all of the risk in the loan portfolio, but to cover probable credit losses that have already been incurred.

8. A purchased impaired loan is defined as a loan that an institution has purchased, including a loan acquired in a purchase business combination, that has evidence of deterioration of credit quality since its origination and for which it is probable, at the purchase date, that the institution will be unable to collect all contractually required payments. When reviewing the appropriateness of the reported ALLL of an institution with purchased impaired loans, examiners should consider the credit losses factored into the initial investment.
hibits “carrying over” or creating an ALLL in the initial recording of these loans. However, if, upon evaluation subsequent to acquisition, it is probable that the institution will be unable to collect all cash flows expected at acquisition on a purchased impaired loan (an estimate that considers both timing and amount), the loan should be considered impaired for purposes of applying the measurement and other provisions of FAS 5 or, if applicable, FAS 114.

Estimates of credit losses should reflect consideration of all significant factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio as of the evaluation date. For loans within the scope of FAS 114 that are individually evaluated and determined to be impaired, these estimates should reflect consideration of one of the standard’s three impairment measurement methods as of the evaluation date: (1) the present value of expected future cash flows discounted at the loan’s effective interest rate,10 (2) the loan’s observable market price, or (3) the fair value of the collateral if the loan is collateral dependent.

An institution may choose the appropriate FAS 114 measurement method on a loan-by-loan basis for an individually impaired loan, except for an impaired collateral-dependent loan. The agencies require impairment of a collateral-dependent loan to be measured using the fair value of collateral method. As defined in FAS 114, a loan is collateral dependent if repayment of the loan is expected to be provided solely by the underlying collateral. In general, any portion of the recorded investment in a collateral-dependent loan (including any capitalized accrued interest, net deferred loan fees or costs, and unamortized premium or discount) in excess of the fair value of the collateral that can be identified as uncollectible, and is therefore deemed a confirmed loss, should be promptly charged off against the ALLL.11

All other loans, including individually evaluated loans determined not to be impaired under FAS 114, should be included in a group of loans that is evaluated for impairment under FAS 5.12 While an institution may segment its loan portfolio into groups of loans based on a variety of factors, the loans within each group should have similar risk characteristics. For example, a loan that is fully collateralized with risk-free assets should not be grouped with uncollateralized loans. When estimating credit losses on each group of loans with similar risk characteristics, an institution should consider its historical loss experience on the group, adjusted for changes in trends, conditions, and other relevant factors that affect repayment of the loans as of the evaluation date.

For analytical purposes, an institution should attribute portions of the ALLL to loans that it evaluates and determines to be impaired under FAS 114 and to groups of loans that it evaluates collectively under FAS 5. However, the ALLL is available to cover all charge-offs that arise from the loan portfolio.

2065.3.1.2 Responsibilities of the Board of Directors and Management

2065.3.1.2.1 Appropriate ALLL Level

Each institution’s management is responsible for maintaining the ALLL at an appropriate level and for documenting its analysis according to the standards set forth in the 2001 policy statement. Thus, management should evaluate the ALLL reported on the balance sheet as of the end of each quarter or more frequently if warranted, and charge or credit the PLLL to bring the ALLL to an appropriate level as of each evaluation date. The determination of the amounts of the ALLL and the PLLL should be based on management’s current judgments about the credit quality of the loan portfolio, and

11. For further information, refer to the illustration in appendix B of the 2001 policy statement (see the appendix in section 2065.4.1.8).
12. An individually evaluated loan that is determined not to be impaired under FAS 114 should be evaluated under FAS 5 when specific characteristics of the loan indicate that it is probable there would be estimated credit losses in a group of loans with those characteristics. For further guidance, refer to the frequently asked questions that were distributed with this policy statement.
The institution evaluates any loss estimation following:

- The institution’s process for determining an appropriate level for the ALLL is based on a comprehensive, well-documented, and consistently applied analysis of its loan portfolio.\(^\text{13}\) The analysis should consider all significant factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio and should support the credit losses estimated by this process. The institution has an effective loan review system and controls (including an effective loan classification or credit grading system) that identify, monitor, and address asset quality problems in an accurate and timely manner.\(^\text{14}\) To be effective, the institution’s loan review system and controls must be responsive to changes in internal and external factors affecting the level of credit risk in the portfolio.
- The institution has adequate data capture and reporting systems to supply the information necessary to support and document its estimate of an appropriate ALLL.
- The institution evaluates any loss estimation models before they are employed and modifies the models’ assumptions, as needed, to ensure that the resulting loss estimates are consistent with GAAP. To demonstrate this consistency, the institution should document its evaluations and conclusions regarding the appropriateness of estimating credit losses with the models or other estimation tools. The institution should also document and support any adjustments made to the models or to the output of the models in determining the estimated credit losses.
  - The institution promptly charges off loans, or portions of loans, that available information confirms to be uncollectible.
  - The institution periodically validates the ALLL methodology. This validation process should include procedures for a review, by a party who is independent of the institution’s credit approval and ALLL estimation processes, of the ALLL methodology and its application in order to confirm its effectiveness. A party who is independent of these processes could be the internal audit staff, a risk management unit of the institution, an external auditor (subject to applicable auditor independence standards), or another contracted third party from outside the institution. One party need not perform the entire analysis, as the validation can be divided among various independent parties.

The board of directors is responsible for overseeing management’s significant judgments and estimates pertaining to the determination of an appropriate ALLL. This oversight should include but is not limited to—

- reviewing and approving the institution’s written ALLL policies and procedures at least annually;
- reviewing management’s assessment and justification that the loan review system is sound and appropriate for the size and complexity of the institution;
- reviewing management’s assessment and justification for the amounts estimated and reported each period for the PLLL and the ALLL; and
- requiring management to periodically validate and, when appropriate, revise the ALLL methodology.

For purposes of the Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income (Call Report) and/or the Consolidated Financial Statement for Bank Holding Companies (such as the FR Y-9C) an

---

\(^{13}\) As noted in the 2001 policy statement, an institution with less complex lending activities and products may find it more efficient to combine a number of procedures while continuing to ensure that the institution has a consistent and appropriate ALLL methodology. Thus, much of the supporting documentation required for an institution with more complex products or portfolios may be combined into fewer supporting documents in an institution with less complex products or portfolios.

\(^{14}\) Loan review and loan classification or credit grading systems are discussed in Attachment 1 of this policy statement. In addition, state member banks and savings associations should refer to the asset quality standards in the Interagency Guidelines Establishing Standards for Safety and Soundness, which were adopted by the Federal Reserve Board (see appendix D-1, 12 C.F.R. 208). For national banks, see appendix A to Part 30; for state nonmember banks, appendix A to Part 364; and for savings associations, appendix A to Part 570.
When a range of losses is determined, institutions should maintain an acceptable range of estimated credit losses. The amounts of which take into account all relevant facts and circumstances as of the evaluation date:

- For loans within the scope of FAS 114 that are individually evaluated and found to be impaired, the associated ALLL should be based upon one of the three impairment measurement methods specified in FAS 114.16
- For all other loans, including individually evaluated loans determined not to be impaired under FAS 114, the associated ALLL should be measured under FAS 5 and should provide for all estimated credit losses that have been incurred on groups of loans with similar risk characteristics.
- For estimated credit losses from transfer risk on cross-border loans, the impact to the ALLL should be evaluated individually for impaired loans under FAS 114 or evaluated on a group basis under FAS 5. See this policy statement’s attachment 2 for further guidance on considerations of transfer risk on cross-border loans.
- For estimated credit losses on accrued interest and fees on loans that have been reported as part of the respective loan balances on the institution’s balance sheet, the associated ALLL should be evaluated under FAS 114 or FAS 5 as appropriate, if not already included in one of the preceding components.

Because deposit accounts that are overdrawn (that is, overdrafts) must be reclassified as loans on the balance sheet, overdrawn accounts should be included in one of the first two components above, as appropriate, and evaluated for estimated credit losses.

Determining the appropriate level for the ALLL is inevitably imprecise and requires a high degree of management judgment. Management’s analysis should reflect a prudent, conservative, but not excessive ALLL that falls within an acceptable range of estimated credit losses.

When a range of losses is determined, institutions should maintain appropriate documentation to support the identified range and the rationale used for determining the best estimate from within the range of loan losses.

As discussed more fully in attachment 1 of this policy statement, it is essential that institutions maintain effective loan review systems. An effective loan review system should work to ensure the accuracy of internal credit classification or grading systems and, thus, the quality of the information used to assess the appropriateness of the ALLL. The complexity and scope of an institution’s ALLL evaluation process, loan review system, and other relevant controls should be appropriate for the size of the institution and the nature of its lending activities. The evaluation process should also provide for sufficient flexibility to respond to changes in the factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio.

Credit losses that arise from the transfer risk associated with an institution’s cross-border lending activities require special consideration. In particular, for banks with cross-border lending exposure, management should determine that the ALLL is appropriate to cover estimated losses from transfer risk associated with this exposure over and above any minimum amount that the Interagency Country Exposure Review Committee requires to be provided in the Allocated Transfer Risk Reserve (or charged off against the ALLL). These estimated losses should meet the criteria for accrual of a loss contingency set forth in GAAP. (See attachment 2 for factors to consider.)

2065.3.1.2.2 Factors to Consider in the Estimation of Credit Losses

Estimated credit losses should reflect consideration of all significant factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio as of the evaluation date. Normally, an institution should determine the historical loss rate for each group of loans with similar risk characteristics in its portfolio based on its own loss experience for loans in that group. While historical loss experience provides a reasonable starting point for the institution’s analysis, historical losses—or even recent trends in losses—do not by themselves form a sufficient basis to determine the appropriate level for the ALLL. Management also should consider those qualitative or environmental factors that are likely to cause estimated credit losses associated with the institution’s existing portfolio to differ from historical loss experience, including but not limited to—

---

15. A component of the ALLL that is labeled “unallocated” is appropriate when it reflects estimated credit losses determined in accordance with GAAP and is properly supported and documented.

16. As previously noted, the use of the fair value of collateral method is required for an individually evaluated loan that is impaired if the loan is collateral dependent.

17. See footnote 12.
changes in lending policies and procedures, including changes in underwriting standards and collection, charge-off, and recovery practices not considered elsewhere in estimating credit losses;

• changes in international, national, regional, and local economic and business conditions and developments that affect the collectibility of the portfolio, including the condition of various market segments;18

• changes in the nature and volume of the portfolio and in the terms of loans;

• changes in the experience, ability, and depth of lending management and other relevant staff;

• changes in the volume and severity of past due loans, the volume of nonaccrual loans, and the volume and severity of adversely classified or graded loans;19

• changes in the quality of the institution’s loan review system;

• changes in the value of underlying collateral for collateral-dependent loans;

• the existence and effect of any concentrations of credit, and changes in the level of such concentrations; and

• the effect of other external factors such as competition and legal and regulatory requirements on the level of estimated credit losses in the institution’s existing portfolio.

In addition, changes in the level of the ALLL should be directionally consistent with changes in the factors, taken as a whole, that evidence credit losses, keeping in mind the characteristics of an institution’s loan portfolio. For example, if declining credit quality trends relevant to the types of loans in an institution’s portfolio are evident, the ALLL level as a percentage of the portfolio should generally increase, barring unusual charge-off activity. Similarly, if improving credit quality trends are evident, the ALLL level as a percentage of the portfolio should generally decrease.

2005.3.1.2.3 Measurement of Estimated Credit Losses

FAS 5. When measuring estimated credit losses on groups of loans with similar risk characteristics in accordance with FAS 5, a widely used method is based on each group’s historical net charge-off rate adjusted for the effects of the qualitative or environmental factors discussed previously. As the first step in applying this method, management generally bases the historical net charge-off rates on the “annualized” historical gross loan charge-offs, less recoveries, recorded by the institution on loans in each group.

Methodologies for determining the historical net charge-off rate on a group of loans with similar risk characteristics under FAS 5 can range from the simple average of, or a determination of the range of, an institution’s annual net charge-off experience to more complex techniques, such as migration analysis and models that estimate credit losses.20 Generally, institutions should use at least an “annualized” or 12-month average net charge-off rate that will be applied to the groups of loans when estimating credit losses. However, this rate could vary. For example, loans with effective lives longer than 12 months often have workout periods over an extended period of time, which may indicate that the estimated credit losses should be greater than that calculated based solely on the annualized net charge-off rate for such loans. These groups may include certain commercial loans as well as groups of adversely classified loans. Other groups of loans may have effective lives shorter than 12 months, which may indicate that the estimated credit losses should be less than that calculated based on the annualized net charge-off rate.

Regardless of the method used, institutions should maintain supporting documentation for

---

18. Credit loss and recovery experience may vary significantly depending upon the stage of the business cycle. For example, an overreliance on credit loss experience during a period of economic growth will not result in realistic estimates of credit losses during a period of economic downturn.

19. For banks and savings associations, adversely classified or graded loans are loans rated “substandard” (or its equivalent) or worse under its loan classification system.

20. Annual charge-off rates are calculated over a specified time period (for example, three years or five years), which can vary based on a number of factors including the relevance of past periods’ experience to the current period or point in the credit cycle. Also, some institutions remove loans that become adversely classified or graded from a group of nonclassified or nongraded loans with similar risk characteristics in order to evaluate the removed loans individually under FAS 114 (if deemed impaired) or collectively in a group of adversely classified or graded loans with similar risk characteristics under FAS 5. In this situation, the net charge-off experience on the adversely classified or graded loans that have been removed from the group of nonclassified or nongraded loans should be included in the historical loss rates for that group of loans. Even though the net charge-off experience on adversely classified or graded loans is included in the estimation of the historical loss rates that will be applied to the group of nonclassified or nongraded loans, the adversely classified or graded loans themselves are no longer included in that group for purposes of estimating credit losses on the group.
the techniques used to develop the historical loss rate for each group of loans. If a range of historical loss rates is developed instead for a group of loans, institutions should maintain documentation to support the identified range and the rationale for determining which rate is the best estimate within the range of loss rates. The rationale should be based on management’s assessment of which rate is most reflective of the estimated credit losses in the current loan portfolio.

After determining the appropriate historical loss rate for each group of loans with similar risk characteristics, management should consider those current qualitative or environmental factors that are likely to cause estimated credit losses as of the evaluation date to differ from the group’s historical loss experience. Institutions typically reflect the overall effect of these factors on a loan group as an adjustment that, as appropriate, increases or decreases the historical loss rate applied to the loan group. Alternatively, the effect of these factors may be reflected through separate stand-alone adjustments within the FAS 5 component of the ALLL. Both methods are consistent with GAAP, provided the adjustments for qualitative or environmental factors are reasonably and consistently determined, are adequately documented, and represent estimated credit losses. For each group of loans, an institution should apply its adjusted historical loss rate, or its historical loss rate and separate stand-alone adjustments, to the recorded investment in the group when determining its estimated credit losses.

Management must exercise significant judgment when evaluating the effect of qualitative factors on the amount of the ALLL because data may not be reasonably available or directly applicable for management to determine the precise impact of a factor on the collectibility of the institution’s loan portfolio as of the evaluation date. Accordingly, institutions should support adjustments to historical loss rates and explain how the adjustments reflect current information, events, circumstances, and conditions in the loss measurements. Management should maintain reasonable documentation to support which factors affected the analysis and the impact of those factors on the loss measurement. Support and documentation includes descriptions of each factor, management’s analysis of how each factor has changed over time, which loan groups’ loss rates have been adjusted, the amount by which loss estimates have been adjusted for changes in conditions, an explanation of how management estimated the impact, and other available data that supports the reasonableness of the adjustments. Examples of underlying supporting evidence could include, but are not limited to, relevant articles from newspapers and other publications that describe economic events affecting a particular geographic area, economic reports and data, and notes from discussions with borrowers.

There may be times when an institution does not have its own historical loss experience upon which to base its estimate of the credit losses in a group of loans with similar risk characteristics. This may occur when an institution offers a new loan product or when it is a newly established (that is, de novo) institution. If an institution has no experience of its own for a loan group, reference to the experience of other enterprises in the same lending business may be appropriate, provided the institution demonstrates that the attributes of the group of loans in its portfolio are similar to those of the loan group in the portfolio providing the loss experience. An institution should only use another enterprise’s experience on a short-term basis until it has developed its own loss experience for a particular group of loans.

**FAS 114.** When determining the FAS 114 component of the ALLL for an individually impaired loan, an institution should consider estimated costs to sell the loan’s collateral, if any, on a discounted basis, in the measurement of impairment if those costs are expected to reduce the cash flows available to repay or otherwise satisfy the loan. If the institution bases its measure of loan impairment on the present value of expected future cash flows discounted at the loan’s effective interest rate, the estimates of these cash flows should be the institution’s best estimate based on reasonable and support-

---

21. An overall adjustment to a portion of the ALLL that is not attributed to specific segments of the loan portfolio is often labeled “unallocated.” Regardless of what a component of the ALLL is labeled, it is appropriate when it reflects estimated credit losses determined in accordance with GAAP and is properly supported.

22. As noted in FAS 114, some individually impaired loans have risk characteristics that are unique to an individual borrower and the institution will apply the measurement methods on a loan-by-loan basis. However, some impaired loans may have risk characteristics in common with other impaired loans. An institution may aggregate those loans and may use historical statistics, such as average recovery period and average amount recovered, along with a composite effective interest rate as a means of measuring impairment of those loans.
able assumptions and projections. All available evidence should be considered in developing the estimate of expected future cash flows. The weight given to the evidence should be commensurate with the extent to which the evidence can be verified objectively. The likelihood of the possible outcomes should be considered in determining the best estimate of expected future cash flows.

2065.3.1.2.4 Analyzing the Overall Measurement of the ALLL

Institutions also are encouraged to use ratio analysis as a supplemental tool for evaluating the overall reasonableness of the ALLL. Ratio analysis can be useful in identifying divergent trends (compared with an institution’s peer group and its own historical experience) in the relationship of the ALLL to adversely classified or graded loans, past due and nonaccrual loans, total loans, and historical gross and net charge-offs. Based on such analysis, an institution may identify additional issues or factors that previously had not been considered in the ALLL estimation process, which may warrant adjustments to estimated credit losses. Such adjustments should be appropriately supported and documented.

While ratio analysis, when used prudently, can be helpful as a supplemental check on the reasonableness of management’s assumptions and analyses, it is not a sufficient basis for determining the appropriate amount for the ALLL. In particular, because an appropriate ALLL is an institution-specific amount, such comparisons do not obviate the need for a comprehensive analysis of the loan portfolio and the factors affecting its collectibility. Furthermore, it is inappropriate for the board of directors or management to make adjustments to the ALLL when it has been properly computed and supported under the institution’s methodology for the sole purpose of reporting an ALLL that corresponds to the peer group median, a target ratio, or a budgeted amount. Institutions that have high levels of risk in the loan portfolio or are uncertain about the effect of possible future events on the collectibility of the portfolio should address these concerns by maintaining higher equity capital and not by arbitrarily increasing the ALLL in excess of amounts supported under GAAP.23

2065.3.1.2.5 Estimated Credit Losses in Credit-Related Accounts

Typically, institutions evaluate and estimate credit losses for off-balance-sheet credit exposures at the same time that they estimate credit losses for loans. While a similar process should be followed to support loss estimates related to off-balance-sheet exposures, these estimated credit losses are not recorded as part of the ALLL. When the conditions for accrual of a loss under FAS 5 are met, an institution should maintain and report as a separate liability account, an allowance that is appropriate to cover estimated credit losses on off-balance-sheet loan commitments, standby letters of credit, and guarantees. In addition, recourse liability accounts (that arise from recourse obligations on any transfers of loans that are reported as sales in accordance with GAAP) should be reported in regulatory reports as liabilities that are separate and distinct from both the ALLL and the allowance for credit losses on off-balance-sheet credit exposures.

When accrued interest and fees are reported separately on an institution’s balance sheet from the related loan balances (that is, as other assets), the institution should maintain an appropriate valuation allowance, determined in accordance with GAAP, for amounts that are not likely to be collected unless management has placed the underlying loans in nonaccrual status and reversed previously accrued interest and fees.24

2065.3.1.3 Examiner Responsibilities

Examiners should assess the credit quality of an institution’s loan portfolio, the appropriateness of its ALLL methodology and documentation, and the appropriateness of the reported ALLL in not simply default to a peer ratio or a “standard percentage” after determining an appropriate level of ALLL under its methodology. However, there may be circumstances when an institution’s ALLL methodology and credit risk identification systems are not reliable. Absent reliable data of its own, management may seek data that could be used as a short-term proxy for the unavailable information (for example, an industry average loss rate for loans with similar risk characteristics). This is only appropriate as a short-term remedy until the institution creates a viable system for estimating credit losses within its loan portfolio.

24. See instructions for the Call Report or the Consolidated Financial Statement for Bank Holding Companies (such as the FR Y-9C) for further guidance on placing a loan in nonaccrual status.

23. It is inappropriate to use a “standard percentage” as the sole determinant for the amount to be reported as the ALLL on the balance sheet. Moreover, an institution should
the institution’s regulatory reports. In their review and classification or grading of the loan portfolio, examiners should consider all significant factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio, including the value of any collateral. In reviewing the appropriateness of the ALLL, examiners should do the following:

- Consider the effectiveness of board oversight as well as the quality of the institution’s loan review system and management in identifying, monitoring, and addressing asset quality problems. This will include a review of the institution’s loan review function and credit grading system. Typically, this will involve testing a sample of the institution’s loans. The sample size generally varies and will depend on the nature or purpose of the examination.
- Evaluate the institution’s ALLL policies and procedures and assess the methodology that management uses to arrive at an overall estimate of the ALLL, including whether management’s assumptions, valuations, and judgments appear reasonable and are properly supported. If a range of credit losses has been estimated by management, evaluate the reasonableness of the range and management’s best estimate within the range. In making these evaluations, examiners should ensure that the institution’s historical loss experience and all significant qualitative or environmental factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio (including changes in the quality of the institution’s loan review function and the other factors previously discussed) have been appropriately considered and that management has appropriately applied GAAP, including FAS 114 and FAS 5.
- Review management’s use of loss estimation models or other loss estimation tools to ensure that the resulting estimated credit losses are in conformity with GAAP.
- Review the appropriateness and reasonableness of the overall level of the ALLL. In some instances this may include a quantitative analysis (for example, using the types of ratio analysis previously discussed) as a preliminary check on the reasonableness of the ALLL. This quantitative analysis should demonstrate whether changes in the key ratios from prior periods are reasonable based on the examiner’s knowledge of the collectibility of loans at the institution and its current environment.
- Review the ALLL amount reported in the institution’s regulatory reports and financial statements and ensure these amounts reconcile to its ALLL analyses. There should be no material differences between the consolidated loss estimate, as determined by the ALLL methodology, and the final ALLL balance reported in the financial statements. Inquire about reasons for any material differences between the results of the institution’s ALLL analyses and the institution’s reported ALLL to determine whether the differences can be satisfactorily explained.
- Review the adequacy of the documentation and controls maintained by management to support the appropriateness of the ALLL.
- Review the interest and fee income accounts associated with the lending process to ensure that the institution’s net income is not materially misstated.

As noted in the “Responsibilities of the Board of Directors and Management” section of this policy statement, when assessing the appropriateness of the ALLL, it is important to recognize that the related process, methodology, and underlying assumptions require a substantial degree of management judgment. Even when an institution maintains sound loan administration and collection procedures and an effective loan review system and controls, its estimate of credit losses is not a single precise amount due to the wide range of qualitative or environmental factors that must be considered.

An institution’s ability to estimate credit losses on specific loans and groups of loans should improve over time as substantive information accumulates regarding the factors affecting repayment prospects. Therefore, examiners should generally accept management’s estimates.

25. In an examiner’s review of an institution’s loan review system, the examiner’s loan classifications or credit grades may differ from those of the institution’s loan review system. If the examiner’s evaluation of these differences indicates problems with the loan review system, especially when the loan classification or credit grades assigned by the institution are more liberal than those assigned by the examiner, the institution would be expected to make appropriate adjustments to the assignment of its loan classifications or credit grades to the loan portfolio and to its estimated credit losses. Furthermore, the institution would be expected to improve its loan review system. (This policy statement’s attachment 1 discusses effective loan review systems.)

26. As noted previously, accrued interest and fees on loans that have been reported as part of the respective loan balances on the institution’s balance sheet should be evaluated for estimated credit losses. The accrual of the interest and fee income should also be considered. Refer to GAAP and the agencies’ regulatory reporting instructions for further guidance on income recognition.
when assessing the appropriateness of the institution’s reported ALLL, and not seek adjustments to the ALLL, when management has—

- maintained effective loan review systems and controls for identifying, monitoring, and addressing asset quality problems in a timely manner;
- analyzed all significant qualitative or environmental factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio as of the evaluation date in a reasonable manner;
- established an acceptable ALLL evaluation process for both individual loans and groups of loans that meets the GAAP requirements for an appropriate ALLL; and
- incorporated reasonable and properly supported assumptions, valuations, and judgments into the evaluation process.

If the examiner concludes that the reported ALLL level is not appropriate or determines that the ALLL evaluation process is based on the results of an unreliable loan review system or is otherwise deficient, recommendations for correcting these deficiencies, including any examiner concerns regarding an appropriate level for the ALLL, should be noted in the report of examination. The examiner’s comments should cite any departures from GAAP and any contraventions of this policy statement and the 2001 policy statement, as applicable. Additional supervisory action may also be taken based on the magnitude of the observed shortcomings in the ALLL process, including the materiality of any error in the reported amount of the ALLL.

2065.3.1.4 ALLL Level Reflected in Regulatory Reports

The agencies believe that an ALLL established in accordance with this policy statement and the 2001 policy statement, as applicable, falls within the range of acceptable estimates determined in accordance with GAAP. When the reported amount of an institution’s ALLL is not appropriate, the institution will be required to adjust its ALLL by an amount sufficient to bring the ALLL reported on its Call Report and/or Consolidated Financial Statement for Bank Holding Companies (such as the FR Y-9C) to an appropriate level as of the evaluation date. This adjustment should be reflected in the current period provision or through the restatement of prior period provisions, as appropriate in the circumstances.

2065.3.1.5 Appendix 1—Loan Review Systems

The nature of loan review systems may vary based on an institution’s size, complexity, loan types, and management practices. For example, a loan review system may include components of a traditional loan review function that is independent of the lending function, or it may place some reliance on loan officers. In addition, the use of the term loan review system can refer to various responsibilities assigned to credit administration, loan administration, a problem loan workout group, or other areas of an institution. These responsibilities may range from administering the internal problem loan reporting process to maintaining the integrity of the loan classification or credit grading process (for example, ensuring that timely and appropriate changes are made to the loan classifications or credit grades assigned to loans) and coordinating the gathering of the information necessary to assess the appropriateness of the ALLL. Additionally, some or all of this function may be outsourced to a qualified external loan reviewer. Regardless of the structure of the loan review system in an institution, an effective loan review system should have, at a minimum, the following objectives:

- promptly identify loans with potential credit weaknesses;
- appropriately grade or adversely classify loans, especially those with well-defined credit weaknesses that jeopardize repayment, so that timely action can be taken and credit losses can be minimized;
- identify relevant trends that affect the collectibility of the portfolio and isolate segments of the portfolio that are potential problem areas;

27. The loan review function is not intended to be performed by an institution’s internal audit function. However, as discussed in the banking agencies’ March 2003 Interagency Policy Statement on the Internal Audit Function and Its Outsourcing, some institutions seek to coordinate the internal audit function with several risk-monitoring functions such as loan review. The policy statement notes that coordination of loan review with the internal audit function can facilitate the reporting of material risk and control issues to the audit committee, increase the overall effectiveness of these monitoring functions, better utilize available resources, and enhance the institution’s ability to comprehensively manage risk. However, the internal audit function should maintain the ability to independently audit other risk-monitoring functions, including loan review, without impairing its independence with respect to these other functions.
• assess the adequacy of and adherence to internal credit policies and loan administration procedures and monitor compliance with relevant laws and regulations;
• evaluate the activities of lending personnel including their compliance with lending policies and the quality of their loan approval, monitoring, and risk assessment;
• provide senior management and the board of directors with an objective and timely assessment of the overall quality of the loan portfolio; and
• provide management with accurate and timely credit quality information for financial and regulatory reporting purposes, including the determination of an appropriate ALLL.

2065.3.1.5.1 Loan Classification or Credit Grading Systems

The foundation for any loan review system is accurate and timely loan classification or credit grading, which involves an assessment of credit quality and leads to the identification of problem loans. An effective loan classification or credit grading system provides important information on the collectibility of the portfolio for use in the determination of an appropriate level for the ALLL.

Regardless of the type of loan review system employed, an effective loan classification or credit grading framework generally places primary reliance on the institution’s lending staff to identify emerging loan problems. However, given the importance and subjective nature of loan classification or credit grading, the judgment of an institution’s lending staff regarding the assignment of particular classification or credit grades to loans should be subject to review by (1) peers, superiors, or loan committee(s); (2) an independent, qualified part-time or full-time employee(s); (3) an internal department staffed with credit review specialists; or (4) qualified outside credit review consultants. A loan classification or credit grading review that is independent of the lending function is preferred because it typically provides a more objective assessment of credit quality. Because accurate and timely loan classification or credit grading is a critical component of an effective loan review system, each institution should ensure that its loan review system includes the following attributes:

• a formal loan classification or credit grading system in which loan classifications or credit grades reflect the risk of default and credit losses and for which a written description is maintained, including a discussion of the factors used to assign appropriate classifications or credit grades to loans;\(^28\)
• an identification or grouping of loans that warrant the special attention of management\(^29\) or other designated “watch lists” of loans that management is more closely monitoring;
• documentation supporting the reasons why particular loans merit special attention or received a specific adverse classification or credit grade and management’s adherence to approved workout plans;
• a mechanism for direct, periodic, and timely reporting to senior management and the board of directors on the status of loans identified as meriting special attention or adversely classified or graded and the actions taken by management; and
• appropriate documentation of the institution’s historical loss experience for each of the groups of loans with similar risk characteristics into which it has segmented its loan portfolio.\(^30\)

2065.3.1.5.2 Elements of Loan-Review Systems

Each institution should have a written policy that is reviewed and approved at least annually by the board of directors to evidence its support of and commitment to maintaining an effective loan review system. The loan review policy should address the following elements that are described in more detail below: the qualifications and independence of loan review personnel; the frequency, scope and depth of reviews;

---

\(^{28}\) A bank or savings association may have a loan classification or credit grading system that differs from the framework used by the banking agencies. However, each institution that maintains a loan classification or credit grading system that differs from the banking agencies’ framework should maintain documentation that translates its system into the framework used by the banking agencies. This documentation should be sufficient to enable examiners to reconcile the totals for the various loan classifications or credit grades under the institution’s system to the banking agencies’ categories.

\(^{29}\) For banks and savings associations, loans that have potential weaknesses that deserve management’s close attention are designated “special mention” loans.

\(^{30}\) In particular, institutions with large and complex loan portfolios are encouraged to maintain records of their historical loss experience for credits in each of the categories in their loan classification or credit grading framework. For banks, these categories should be (1) those used by or (2) categories that can be translated into those used by, the banking agencies.
the review of findings and follow-up; and work-
paper and report distribution.

Qualifications of loan review personnel. Persons
involved in the loan review or credit grading
function should be qualified based on their level
of education, experience, and extent of formal
credit training. They should be knowledgeable
in both sound lending practices and the institu-
tion’s lending guidelines for the types of loans
offered by the institution. In addition, they
should be knowledgeable of relevant laws and
regulations affecting lending activities.

Independence of loan review personnel. An
effective loan review system uses both the ini-
tial identification of emerging problem loans by
loan officers and other line staff, and the credit
review of loans by individuals independent of
the credit approval process. An important
requirement for an effective system is to place
responsibility on loan officers and line staff for
continuous portfolio analysis and prompt identi-
fication and reporting of problem loans. Because
of frequent contact with borrowers, loan officers
and line staff can usually identify potential prob-
lems before they become apparent to others.
However, institutions should be careful to avoid
overreliance upon loan officers and line staff for
identification of problem loans. Institutions
should ensure that loans are also reviewed by
individuals who do not have control over the
loans they review and who are not part of, and
are not influenced by anyone associated with,
the loan approval process.

While larger institutions typically establish a
separate department staffed with credit review
specialists, cost and volume considerations may
not justify such a system in smaller institutions.
In some smaller institutions, an independent
committee of outside directors may fill this role.
Whether or not the institution has an indepen-
dent loan review department, the loan review
function should report directly to the board of
directors or a committee thereof (although senior
management may be responsible for
appropriate administrative functions so long as
they do not compromise the independence of
the loan review function).

Some institutions may choose to outsource
the credit review function to an independent
outside party. However, the responsibility for
maintaining a sound loan review process cannot
be delegated to an outside party. Therefore,
institution personnel who are independent of the
lending function should assess control risks,
develop the credit review plan, and ensure
appropriate follow-up of findings. Furthermore,
the institution should be mindful of special
requirements concerning independence should it
consider outsourcing the credit review function
to its external auditor.

Frequency of reviews. Loan review personnel
should review significant credits\(^\text{31}\) at least annu-
ally, upon renewal, or more frequently when
internal or external factors indicate a potential
for deteriorating credit quality in a particular
loan, loan product, or group of loans. Optimally,
the loan review function can be used to provide
useful continual feedback on the effectiveness
of the lending process in order to identify any
emerging problems. A system of ongoing or
periodic portfolio reviews is particularly impor-
tant to the ALLL determination process because
this process is dependent on the accurate and
timely identification of problem loans.

Scope of reviews. Reviews by loan review per-
sonnel should cover all loans that are significant
and other loans that meet certain criteria. Man-
agement should document the scope of its
reviews and ensure that the percentage of the
portfolio selected for review provides reason-
able assurance that the results of the review
have identified any credit quality deterioration
and other unfavorable trends in the portfolio and
reflect its quality as a whole. Management
should also consider industry standards for loan
review coverage consistent with the size and
complexity of its loan portfolio and lending
operations to verify that the scope of its reviews
is appropriate. The institution’s board of direc-
tors should approve the scope of loan reviews
on an annual basis or when any significant
interim changes to the scope of reviews are
made. Reviews typically include—

- loans over a predetermined size;
- a sufficient sample of smaller loans;
- past due, nonaccrual, renewed, and restruct-
tured loans;
- loans previously adversely classified or
graded and loans designated as warranting the
special attention of management\(^\text{32}\) by the
institute or its examiners;
- insider loans; and
- loans constituting concentrations of credit risk

---

\(^{31}\) Significant credits in this context may or may not be
loans individually evaluated for impairment under FAS 114.

\(^{32}\) See footnote 29.
and other loans affected by common repayment factors.

**Depth of reviews.** Reviews should analyze a number of important aspects of the loans selected for review, including—

- credit quality, including underwriting and borrower performance;
- sufficiency of credit and collateral documentation;
- proper lien perfection;
- proper approval by the loan officer and loan committee(s);
- adherence to any loan agreement covenants;
- compliance with internal policies and procedures (such as aging, nonaccrual, and classification or grading policies) and laws and regulations; and
- appropriate identification of individually impaired loans, measurement of estimated loan impairment, and timeliness of charge-offs.

Furthermore, these reviews should consider the appropriateness and timeliness of the identification of problem loans by loan officers.

**Review of findings and follow-up.** Loan review personnel should discuss all noted deficiencies and identified weaknesses and any existing or planned corrective actions, including time frames for correction, with appropriate loan officers and department managers. Loan review personnel should then review these findings and corrective actions with members of senior management. All noted deficiencies and identified weaknesses that remain unresolved beyond the scheduled time frames for correction should be promptly reported to senior management and the board of directors.

Credit classification or grading differences between loan officers and loan review personnel should be resolved according to a prearranged process. That process may include formal appeals procedures and arbitration by an independent party or may require default to the assigned classification or grade that indicates lower credit quality. If an outsourced credit review concludes that a borrower is less creditworthy than is perceived by the institution, the lower credit quality classification or grade should prevail unless internal parties identify additional information sufficient to obtain the concurrence of the outside reviewer or arbiter on the higher credit quality classification or grade.

**Workpaper and report distribution.** The loan review function should prepare a list of all loans reviewed (including the date of the review) and documentation (including a summary analysis) that substantiates the grades or classifications assigned to the loans reviewed. A report that summarizes the results of the loan review should be submitted to the board of directors at least quarterly. In addition to reporting current credit quality findings, comparative trends can be presented to the board of directors that identify significant changes in the overall quality of the portfolio. Findings should also address the adequacy of and adherence to internal policies and procedures, as well as compliance with laws and regulations, in order to facilitate timely correction of any noted deficiencies.

2065.3.1.6 Appendix 2—International Transfer Risk Considerations

With respect to international transfer risk, an institution with cross-border exposures should support its determination of the appropriateness of its ALLL by performing an analysis of the transfer risk, commensurate with the size and composition of the institution’s exposure to each country. Such analyses should take into consideration the following factors, as appropriate:

- the institution’s loan portfolio mix for each country (for example, types of borrowers, loan maturities, collateral, guarantees, special credit facilities, and other distinguishing factors);
- the institution’s business strategy and its debt-management plans for each country;
- each country’s balance of payments position;
- each country’s level of international reserves;
- each country’s established payment performance record and its future debt-servicing prospects;
- each country’s sociopolitical situation and its effect on the adoption or implementation of economic reforms, in particular those affecting debt servicing capacity;
- each country’s current standing with multilateral and official creditors;
- the status of each country’s relationships with other creditors, including institutions; and

---

33. The board of directors should be informed more frequently than quarterly when material adverse trends are noted.
• the most recent evaluations distributed by the banking agencies' Interagency Country Exposure Review Committee.
WHAT’S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

Effective July 2012, this section has been revised to delete a reference to SR-04-5, “Interagency Update on Accounting for Loan and Lease Losses,” deemed inactive by SR-12-6. Also, certain accounting references have been updated for the Financial Accounting Standards Board’s (FASB’s) Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) numbering and referencing system.

A supplemental interagency Policy Statement on Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses (ALLL) Methodologies and Documentation for Banks and Savings Institutions1 was issued by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) on July 2, 2001.2 The policy statement clarifies the agencies’ expectations for documentation that supports the ALLL methodology. Additionally, the statement emphasizes the need for appropriate ALLL policies and procedures, which should include an effective loan-review system. The guidance also provides examples of appropriate supporting documentation, as well as illustrations on how to implement this guidance. (See SR-01-17.) While this policy statement, by its terms, applies only to depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (which includes state member banks), the Federal Reserve believes this guidance is broadly applicable to bank holding companies. Accordingly, examiners should apply the policy, as appropriate, in their inspections of bank holding companies and their nonbank subsidiaries. This policy, however, does not apply to federally insured branches and agencies of foreign banks. Federally insured branches and agencies of foreign banks continue to be subject to separate guidance issued by their primary supervisory agency.

The guidance requires that a financial institution’s ALLL methodology be in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and all outstanding supervisory guidance. An ALLL methodology should be systematic, consistently applied, and auditable. The methodology should be validated periodically and modified to incorporate new events or findings, as needed. The guidance specifies that management, under the direction of the board of directors, should implement appropriate procedures and controls to ensure compliance with the institution’s ALLL policies and procedures. Institution management should (1) segment the portfolio to evaluate credit risks; (2) select loss rates that best reflect the probable loss; and (3) be responsive to changes in the organization, the economy, or the lending environment by changing the methodology, when appropriate. Furthermore, supporting information should be included on summary schedules, whenever feasible. Under this policy, institutions with less-complex loan products or portfolios, such as community banks, may use a more streamlined approach to implement this guidance.

The policy statement is consistent with the Federal Reserve’s long-standing policy to promote strong internal controls over an institution’s ALLL process. In this regard, the policy statement recognizes that determining an appropriate allowance involves a high degree of management judgment and is inevitably imprecise. Accordingly, an institution may determine that the amount of loss falls within a range. In accordance with GAAP, an institution should record its best estimate within the range of credit losses. (See also sections 2065.2 and 2065.3.)

The policy statement is provided below. Some wording has been slightly modified for this manual, as indicated by asterisks or text enclosed in brackets. Some footnotes have also been renumbered.

2065.4.1 2001 POLICY STATEMENT ON ALLL METHODOLOGIES AND DOCUMENTATION

Boards of directors of banks *** are responsible for ensuring that their institutions have controls in place to consistently determine the allowance for loan and lease losses (ALLL) in accordance with the institutions’ stated policies and procedures, GAAP, and ALLL supervisory guidance.3 To fulfill this responsibility, boards of directors instruct management to develop and maintain an appropriate, systematic, and consis-

---

2. The guidance was developed in consultation with Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) staff, who issued parallel guidance in the form of Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 102.
3. [The actual policy statement includes a bibliography] that lists applicable ALLL GAAP guidance, interagency statements, and other reference materials that may assist in understanding and implementing an ALLL in accordance with GAAP. See [the appendix] for additional information on applying GAAP to determine the ALLL.
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tently applied process to determine the amounts of the ALLL and provisions for loan losses. Management should create and implement suitable policies and procedures to communicate the ALLL process internally to all applicable personnel. Regardless of who develops and implements these policies, procedures, and underlying controls, the board of directors should assure themselves that the policies specifically address the institution’s unique goals, systems, risk profile, personnel, and other resources before approving them. Additionally, by creating an environment that encourages personnel to follow these policies and procedures, management improves procedural discipline and compliance.

The determination of the amounts of the ALLL and provisions for loan and lease losses should be based on management’s current judgments about the credit quality of the loan portfolio, and should consider all known relevant internal and external factors that affect loan collectibility as of the reporting date. The amounts reported each period for the provision for loan and lease losses and the ALLL should be reviewed and approved by the board of directors. To ensure the methodology remains appropriate for the institution, the board of directors should have the methodology periodically validated and, if appropriate, revised. Further, the audit committee should oversee and monitor the internal controls over the ALLL-determination process.

The [Federal Reserve and other] banking agencies have long-standing examination policies that call for examiners to review an institution’s lending and loan-review functions and recommend improvements, if needed. Additionally, in 1995 and 1996, the banking agencies adopted interagency guidelines establishing standards for safety and soundness, pursuant to section 39 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (FDI Act). The interagency asset-quality guidelines and [this guidance will assist] an institution in estimating and establishing a sufficient ALLL supported by adequate documentation, as required under the FDI Act. Additionally, the guidelines require operational and managerial standards that are appropriate for an institution’s size and the nature and scope of its activities.

For financial-reporting purposes, including regulatory reporting, the provision for loan and lease losses and the ALLL must be determined in accordance with GAAP. GAAP requires that allowances be well documented, with clear explanations of the supporting analyses and rationale. This [2001] policy statement describes but does not increase the documentation requirements already existing within GAAP. Failure to maintain, analyze, or support an adequate ALLL in accordance with GAAP and supervisory guidance is generally an unsafe and unsound banking practice.

This guidance [the 2001 policy statement] applies equally to all institutions, regardless of the size. However, institutions with less-complex lending activities and products may find it more efficient to combine a number of procedures (for example, information gathering, documentation, and internal-approval processes) while continuing to ensure the institution has a consistent and appropriate methodology. Thus, much of the supporting documentation required for an institution with more-complex products or portfolios may be combined into fewer supporting documents in an institution with less-complex products or portfolios. For example, simplified documentation can include spreadsheets, checklists, and other summary documents.

4. All institutions are encouraged to establish audit committees; however, at small institutions without audit committees, the board of directors retains this responsibility.

5. Institutions and their auditors should refer to Statement on Auditing Standards No. 61, “Communication with Audit Committees” (as amended by Statement on Auditing Standards No. 90, “Audit Committee Communications”), which requires certain discussions between the auditor and the audit committee. These discussions should include items, such as accounting policies and estimates, judgments, and uncertainties that have a significant impact on the accounting information included in the financial statements.

6. The [other] banking agencies are the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Office of Thrift Supervision.

7. Institutions should refer to the guidelines *** for state member banks, appendix D to part 208***.

8. The documentation guidance within this 2001 policy statement is predominantly based upon the GAAP guidance from FASB’s ASC section 450-20-25, Contingencies - Loss Contingencies - Recognition (formerly Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5, “Accounting for Contingencies”); ASC Subtopic 310-10-05, Receivables - Overall (formerly Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 114, “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan”); Emerging Issues Task Force Topic No. D-80 (EITF Topic D-80 and attachments), “Application of FASB Statements No. 5 and No. 114 to a Loan Portfolio” (which includes the Viewpoints article—an article issued in 1999 by FASB staff providing guidance on certain issues regarding the ALLL, particularly on the application of FAS 5 and FAS 114 and how these statements interrelate); Chapter 9, “Credit Losses,” the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants’ (AICPA)’s Audit and Accounting Guide, Depository and Lending Institutions: Banks and Savings Institutions, Credit Unions, Finance Companies and Mortgage Companies, 2008 update; and the SEC’s Financial Reporting Release No. 28 (FRR 28).

9. Failure to maintain adequate supporting documentation does not relieve an institution of its obligation to record an appropriate ALLL.
ments that many institutions currently use. Illustrations A and C provide specific examples of how less-complex institutions may determine and document portions of their loan-loss allowance.

2065.4.1.1 Documentation Standards

Appropriate written supporting documentation for the loan-loss provision and allowance facili-
lates review of the ALLL process and reported amounts, builds discipline and consistency into the ALLL-determination process, and improves the process for estimating loan and lease losses by helping to ensure that all relevant factors are appropriately considered in the ALLL analysis. An institution should document the relationship between the findings of its detailed review of the loan portfolio and the amount of the ALLL and the provision for loan and lease losses reported in each period. 10

At a minimum, institutions should maintain written supporting documentation for the following decisions, strategies, and processes:

- policies and procedures—
  - over the systems and controls that maintain an appropriate ALLL and
  - over the ALLL methodology
- loan-grading system or process
- summary or consolidation of the ALLL balance
- validation of the ALLL methodology
- periodic adjustments to the ALLL process

2065.4.1.2 Policies and Procedures

Financial institutions utilize a wide range of policies, procedures, and control systems in their ALLL process. Sound policies should be appropriately tailored to the size and complexity of the institution and its loan portfolio.

In order for an institution’s ALLL methodology to be effective, the institution’s written policies and procedures for the systems and controls that maintain an appropriate ALLL should address but not be limited to—

- the roles and responsibilities of the institution’s departments and personnel (including the lending function, credit review, financial reporting, internal audit, senior management, audit committee, board of directors, and others, as applicable) who determine, or review, as applicable, the ALLL to be reported in the financial statements;
- the institution’s accounting policies for loans, [leases, and their loan losses], including the policies for charge-offs and recoveries and for estimating the fair value of collateral, where applicable;

10. This position is fully described in the SEC’s FRR 28, in which the SEC indicates that the books and records of public companies engaged in lending activities should include documentation of the rationale supporting each period’s determination that the ALLL and provision amounts reported were adequate.

- the description of the institution’s systematic methodology, which should be consistent with the institution’s accounting policies for determining its ALLL; 11 and
- the system of internal controls used to ensure that the ALLL process is maintained in accordance with GAAP and supervisory guidance.

An internal-control system for the ALLL-estimation process should—

- include measures to provide assurance regarding the reliability and integrity of information and compliance with laws, regulations, and internal policies and procedures;
- reasonably assure that the institution’s financial statements (including regulatory reports) are prepared in accordance with GAAP and ALLL supervisory guidance; 13 and
- include a well-defined loan-review process containing—
  - an effective loan-grading system that is consistently applied, identifies differing risk characteristics and loan-quality problems accurately and in a timely manner, and prompts appropriate administrative actions;
  - sufficient internal controls to ensure that all relevant loan-review information is appropriately considered in estimating losses. This includes maintaining appropriate reports, details of reviews performed, and identification of personnel involved; and
  - clear formal communication and coordination between an institution’s credit-administration function, financial-reporting group, management, board of directors, and others who are involved in...

11. Further explanation is presented in the “Methodology” section that appears below.
12. In addition to the supporting documentation requirements for financial institutions, as described in interagency asset-quality guidelines, public companies are required to comply with the books and records provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act). Under sections 13(b)(2)–(7) of the Exchange Act, registrants must make and keep books, records, and accounts, which, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of assets of the registrant. Registrants also must maintain internal accounting controls that are sufficient to provide reasonable assurances that, among other things, transactions are recorded as necessary to permit the preparation of financial statements in conformity with GAAP. See also SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 99, Materiality.
the ALLL-determination or -review process, as applicable (e.g., written policies and procedures, management reports, audit programs, and committee minutes).

2065.4.1.3 Methodology

An ALLL methodology is a system that an institution designs and implements to reasonably estimate loan and lease losses as of the financial statement date. It is critical that ALLL methodologies incorporate management’s current judgments about the credit quality of the loan portfolio through a disciplined and consistently applied process.

An institution’s ALLL methodology is influenced by institution-specific factors, such as an institution’s size, organizational structure, business environment and strategy, management style, loan-portfolio characteristics, loan-administration procedures, and management information systems. However, there are certain common elements an institution should incorporate in its ALLL methodology. A summary of common elements is provided in [the appendix].

2065.4.1.3.1 Documentation of ALLL Methodology in Written Policies and Procedures

An institution’s written policies and procedures should describe the primary elements of the institution’s ALLL methodology, including portfolio segmentation and impairment measurement. In order for an institution’s ALLL methodology to be effective, the institution’s written policies and procedures should describe the methodology—

• for segmenting the portfolio:
  — how the segmentation process is performed (i.e., by loan type, industry, risk rates, etc.),
  — when a loan-grading system is used to segment the portfolio:
    • the definitions of each loan grade,
    • a reconciliation of the internal loan grades to supervisory loan grades, and
    • the delineation of responsibilities for the loan-grading system.

• for determining and measuring impairment under FAS 114:
  — the methods used to identify loans to be analyzed individually;
  — for individually reviewed loans that are impaired, how the amount of any impairment is determined and measured, including—
    • procedures describing the impairment-measurement techniques available and
    • steps performed to determine which technique is most appropriate in a given situation;
  — the methods used to determine whether and how loans individually evaluated under FAS 114, but not considered to be individually impaired, should be grouped with other loans that share common characteristics for impairment evaluation under FAS 5.

• for determining and measuring impairment under FAS 5—
  — how loans with similar characteristics are grouped to be evaluated for loan collectibility (such as loan type, past-due status, and risk);
  — how loss rates are determined (e.g., historical loss rates adjusted for environmental factors or migration analysis) and what factors are considered when establishing appropriate time frames over which to evaluate loss experience; and
  — descriptions of qualitative factors (e.g., industry, geographical, economic, and political factors) that may affect loss rates or other loss measurements.

The supporting documents for the ALLL may be integrated in an institution’s credit files, loan-review reports or worksheets, board of directors’ and committee meeting minutes, computer reports, or other appropriate documents and files.

2065.4.1.4 ALLL Under FAS 114

An institution’s ALLL methodology related to FAS 114 loans begins with the use of its normal loan-review procedures to identify whether a loan is impaired as defined by the accounting standard. Institutions should document—

• the method and process for identifying loans to be evaluated under FAS 114 and
• the analysis that resulted in an impairment decision for each loan and the determination of the impairment-measurement method to be
Once an institution has determined which of the three available measurement methods to use for an impaired loan under FAS 114, it should maintain supporting documentation as follows:

- When using the present-value-of-expected-future-cash-flows method—
  - the amount and timing of cash flows,
  - the effective interest rate used to discount the cash flows, and
  - the basis for the determination of cash flows, including consideration of current environmental factors and other information reflecting past events and current conditions.

- When using the fair-value-of-collateral method—
  - how fair value was determined, including the use of appraisals, valuation assumptions, and calculations,
  - the supporting rationale for adjustments to appraised values, if any,
  - the determination of costs to sell, if applicable, and
  - appraisal quality, and the expertise and independence of the appraiser.

- When using the observable-market-price-of-a-loan method—
  - the amount, source, and date of the observable market price.

Illustration A describes a practice used by a small financial institution to document its FAS 114 measurement of impairment using a comprehensive worksheet. Examples 1 and 2 provide examples of applying and documenting impairment-measurement methods under FAS 114. Some loans that are evaluated individually for impairment under FAS 114 may be fully collateralized and therefore require no ALLL. Example 3 presents an institution whose loan portfolio includes fully collateralized loans. It describes the documentation maintained by that institution to support its conclusion that no ALLL was needed for those loans.

---

**Illustration A**  
**Documenting an ALLL Under FAS 114**  
**Comprehensive worksheet for the impairment-measurement process**

A small institution utilizes a comprehensive worksheet for each loan being reviewed individually under FAS 114. Each worksheet includes a description of why the loan was selected for individual review, the impairment-measurement technique used, the measurement calculation, a comparison to the current loan balance, and the amount of the ALLL for that loan. The rationale for the impairment-measurement technique used (e.g., present value of expected future cash flows, observable market price of the loan, fair value of the collateral) is also described on the worksheet.

**Example 1: ALLL Under FAS 114—Measuring and Documenting Impairment**

**Facts.** Approximately one-third of Institution A’s commercial loan portfolio consists of large-balance, nonhomogeneous loans. Due to their large individual balances, these loans meet the criteria under Institution A’s policies and procedures for individual review for impairment under FAS 114. Upon review of the large-balance loans, Institution A determines that certain of the loans are impaired as defined by FAS 114.

**Analysis.** For the commercial loans reviewed under FAS 114 that are individually impaired, Institution A should measure and document the impairment on those loans. For those loans that are reviewed individually under FAS 114 and considered individually impaired, Institution A must use one of the methods for measuring impairment that is specified by FAS 114 (that is, the present value of expected future cash flows, fair value of collateral less costs to sell, or the loan’s observable market price).
the loan’s observable market price, or the fair value of collateral.

An impairment-measurement method other than the methods allowed by FAS 114 cannot be used. For the loans considered individually impaired under FAS 114, under the circumstances described above, it would not be appropriate for Institution A to choose a measurement method not prescribed by FAS 114. For example, it would not be appropriate to measure loan impairment by applying a loss rate to each loan based on the average historical loss percentage for all of its commercial loans for the past five years.

Institution A should maintain, as sufficient, objective evidence, written documentation to support its measurement of loan impairment under FAS 114. If it uses the present value of expected future cash flows to measure impairment of a loan, it should document (1) the amount and timing of cash flows, (2) the effective interest rate used to discount the cash flows, and (3) the basis for the determination of cash flows, including consideration of current environmental factors and other information reflecting past events and current conditions. If Institution A uses the fair value of collateral to measure impairment, it should document (1) how it determined the fair value, including the use of appraisals, valuation assumptions and calculations; (2) the supporting rationale for adjustments to appraised values, if any, and the determination of costs to sell, if applicable; (3) appraisal quality; and (4) the expertise and independence of the appraiser. Similarly, Institution A should document the amount, source, and date of the observable market price of a loan, if that method of measuring loan impairment is used.

**Example 2: ALLL Under FAS 114—Measuring Impairment for a Collateral-Dependent Loan**

**Facts.** Institution B has a $10 million loan outstanding to Company X that is secured by real estate, which Institution B individually evaluates under FAS 114 due to the loan’s size. Company X is delinquent in its loan payments under the terms of the loan agreement. Accordingly, Institution B determines that its loan to Company X is impaired, as defined by FAS 114. Because the loan is collateral dependent, Institution B measures impairment of the loan based on the fair value of the collateral. Institution B determines that the most recent valuation of the collateral was performed by an appraiser 18 months ago and, at that time, the estimated value of the collateral (fair value less costs to sell) was $12 million.

Institution B believes that certain of the assumptions that were used to value the collateral 18 months ago do not reflect current market conditions and, therefore, the appraiser’s valuation does not approximate current fair value of the collateral. Several buildings, which are comparable to the real estate collateral, were recently completed in the area, increasing vacancy rates, decreasing lease rates, and attracting several tenants away from the borrower. Accordingly, credit-review personnel at Institution B adjust certain of the valuation assumptions to better reflect the current market conditions as they relate to the loan’s collateral. After adjusting the collateral-valuation assumptions, the credit-review department determines that the current estimated fair value of the collateral, less costs to sell, is $8 million. Given that the recorded investment in the loan is $10 million, Institution B concludes that the loan is impaired by $2 million and records an allowance for loan losses of $2 million.

**Analysis.** Institution B should maintain documentation to support its determination of the allowance for loan losses of $2 million for the loan to Company X. It should document that it measured impairment of the loan to Company X by using the fair value of the loan’s collateral, less costs to sell, which it estimated to be $8 million. This documentation should include (1) the institution’s rationale and basis for the $8 million valuation, including the revised valuation assumptions it used; (2) the valuation calculation; and (3) the determination of costs to sell, if applicable. Because Institution B arrived at the valuation of $8 million by modifying an earlier appraisal, it should document its rationale and basis for the changes it made to the valuation assumptions that resulted in the collateral value declining from $12 million 18 months ago to $8 million in the current period.

---

15. Question 16 in Exhibit D-80A of EITF Topic D-80 and [its] attachments indicates that environmental factors include existing industry, geographical, economic, and political factors.

16. When reviewing collateral-dependent loans, Institution B may often find it more appropriate to obtain an updated appraisal to estimate the effect of current market conditions on the appraised value instead of internally estimating an adjustment.

17. In accordance with the FFIEC’s Federal Register
Example 3: ALLL Under FAS 114—Fully Collateralized Loans

**Facts.** Institution C has $10 million in loans that are fully collateralized by highly rated debt securities with readily determinable market values. The loan agreement for each of these loans requires the borrower to provide qualifying collateral sufficient to maintain a loan-to-value ratio with sufficient margin to absorb volatility in the securities’ market prices. Institution C’s collateral department has physical control of the debt securities through safekeeping arrangements. In addition, Institution C perfected its security interest in the collateral when the funds were originally distributed. On a quarterly basis, Institution C’s credit-administration function determines the market value of the collateral for each loan using two independent market quotes and compares the collateral value to the loan carrying value. If there are any collateral deficiencies, Institution C notifies the borrower and requests that the borrower immediately remedy the deficiency. Due in part to its efficient operation, Institution C has historically not incurred any material losses on these loans. Institution C believes these loans are fully collateralized and therefore does not maintain any ALLL balance for these loans.

**Analysis.** To adequately support its determination that no allowance is needed for this group of loans, Institution C must maintain the following documentation:

- The management summary of the ALLL must include documentation indicating that, in accordance with the institution’s ALLL policy, (1) Institution C has verified the collateral protection on these loans, (2) no probable loss has been incurred, and (3) no ALLL is necessary.
- The documentation in Institution C’s loan files must include (1) the two independent market quotes obtained each quarter for each loan’s collateral amount, (2) the documents evidencing the perfection of the security interest in the collateral and other relevant supporting documents, and (3) Institution C’s ALLL policy, including guidance for determining when a loan is considered “fully collateralized,” which would not require an ALLL. Institution C’s policy should require the following factors to be considered and fully documented:
  - volatility of the market value of the collateral
  - recency and reliability of the appraisal or other valuation
  - recency of the institution’s or third party’s inspection of the collateral
  - historical losses on similar loans
  - confidence in the institution’s lien or security position including appropriate—
    - type of security perfection (e.g., physical possession of collateral or secured filing);
    - filing of security perfection (i.e., correct documents and with the appropriate officials);
    - relationship to other liens; and
    - other factors as appropriate for the loan type.

---

**2065.4.1.5 ALLL Under FAS 5**

**2065.4.1.5.1 Segmenting the Portfolio**

For loans evaluated on a group basis under FAS 5, management should segment the loan portfolio by identifying risk characteristics that are common to groups of loans. Institutions typically decide how to segment their loan portfolios based on many factors, which vary with their business strategies as well as their information system capabilities. Smaller institutions that are involved in less complex activities often segment the portfolio into broad loan categories. This method of segmenting the portfolio is likely to be appropriate in only small institutions offering a narrow range of loan products. Larger institutions typically offer a more diverse and complex mix of loan products. Such institutions may start by segmenting the portfolio into major loan types but typically have more detailed information available that allows them to further segregate the portfolio into product-line segments based on the risk characteristics of each portfolio segment. Regardless of the segmentation method used, an institution should maintain documentation to support its conclusion that the loans in each segment have similar attributes or characteristics.
As economic and other business conditions change, institutions often modify their business strategies, which may result in adjustments to the way in which they segment their loan portfolio for purposes of estimating loan losses. Illustration B presents an example in which an institution refined its segmentation method to more effectively consider risk factors and maintains documentation to support this change.

Illustration B
Documenting Segmenting Practices

Documenting a refinement in a segmentation method

An institution with a significant portfolio of consumer loans performed a review of its ALLL methodology. The institution had determined its ALLL based upon historical loss rates in the overall consumer portfolio. The ALLL methodology was validated by comparing actual loss rates (charge-offs) for the past two years to the estimated loss rates. During this process, the institution decided to evaluate loss rates on an individual-product basis (e.g., auto loans, unsecured loans, or home equity loans). This analysis disclosed significant differences in the loss rates on different products. With this additional information, the methodology was amended in the current period to segment the portfolio by product, resulting in a better estimation of the loan losses associated with the portfolio. To support this change in segmentation practice, the credit-review committee records contain the analysis that was used as a basis for the change and the written report describing the need for the change.

Institutions use a variety of documents to support the segmentation of their portfolios. Some of these documents include—

- loan trial balances by categories and types of loans,
- management reports about the mix of loans in the portfolio,
- delinquency and nonaccrual reports, and
- a summary presentation of the results of an internal or external loan-grading review.

Reports generated to assess the profitability of a loan-product line may be useful in identifying areas in which to further segment the portfolio.

2065.4.1.5.2 Estimating Loss on Groups of Loans

Based on the segmentation of the loan portfolio, an institution should estimate the FAS 5 portion of its ALLL. For those segments that require an ALLL, the institution should estimate the loan and lease losses, on at least a quarterly basis, based upon its ongoing loan-review process and analysis of loan performance. The institution should follow a systematic and consistently applied approach to select the most appropriate loss-measurement methods and support its conclusions and rationale with written documentation. Regardless of the methods used to measure losses, an institution should demonstrate and document that the loss-measurement methods used to estimate the ALLL for each segment are determined in accordance with GAAP as of the financial statement date.

One method of estimating loan losses for groups of loans is through the application of loss rates to the groups’ aggregate loan balances. Such loss rates typically reflect the institution’s historical loan-loss experience for each group of loans, adjusted for relevant environmental factors (e.g., industry, geographical, economic, and political factors) over a defined period of time. If an institution does not have loss experience of its own, it may be appropriate to reference the loss experience of other institutions, provided that the institution demonstrates that the attributes of the loans in its portfolio segment are similar to those of the loans included in the portfolio of the institution providing the loss experience. Institutions should maintain supporting documentation for the technique used to develop their loss rates, including the period of time over which the losses were incurred. If a range of loss is determined, institutions should maintain documentation to support the identified range and the rationale used for determining which estimate is the best estimate within the range of loan losses. An example of...
how a small institution performs a comprehensive historical loss analysis is provided as the first item in illustration C.

Before employing a loss-estimation model, an institution should evaluate and modify, as needed, the model’s assumptions to ensure that the resulting loss estimate is consistent with GAAP. In order to demonstrate consistency with GAAP, institutions that use loss-estimation models typically document the evaluation, the conclusions regarding the appropriateness of estimating loan losses with a model or other loss-estimation tool, and the support for adjustments to the model or its results.

In developing loss measurements, institutions should consider the impact of current environmental factors and then document which factors were used in the analysis and how those factors affected the loss measurements. Factors that should be considered in developing loss measurements include the following:

- levels of and trends in delinquencies and impaired loans
- levels of and trends in charge-offs and recoveries
- trends in volume and terms of loans
- effects of any changes in risk-selection and underwriting standards, and other changes in lending policies, procedures, and practices
- experience, ability, and depth of lending management and other relevant staff
- national and local economic trends and conditions
- industry conditions
- effects of changes in credit concentrations

For any adjustment of loss measurements for environmental factors, the institution should maintain sufficient, objective evidence to support the amount of the adjustment and to explain why the adjustment is necessary to reflect current information, events, circumstances, and conditions in the loss measurements.

The second item in illustration C provides an example of how an institution adjusts its commercial real estate historical loss rates for changes in local economic conditions. Example 4 provides an example of maintaining supporting documentation for adjustments to portfolio-segment loss rates for an environmental factor related to an economic downturn in the borrower’s primary industry. Example 5 describes one institution’s process for determining and documenting an ALLL for loans that are not individually impaired but have characteristics indicating there are loan losses on a group basis.

Illustration C
Documenting the Setting of Loss Rates

Comprehensive loss analysis in a small institution

A small institution determines its loss rates based on loss rates over a three-year historical period. The analysis is conducted by type of loan and is further segmented by originating branch office. The analysis considers charge-offs and recoveries in determining the loss rate. The institution also considers the loss rates for each loan grade and compares them to historical losses on similarly rated loans in arriving at the historical loss factor. The institution maintains supporting documentation for its loss-factor analysis, including historical losses by type of loan, originating branch office, and loan grade for the three-year period.

Adjustment of loss rates for changes in local economic conditions

An institution develops a factor to adjust loss rates for its assessment of the impact of changes in the local economy. For example, when analyzing the loss rate on commercial real estate loans, the assessment identifies changes in recent commercial building occupancy rates. The institution generally finds the occupancy statistics to be a good indicator of probable losses on these types of loans. The institution maintains documentation that summarizes the relationship between current occupancy rates and its loss experience.

Example 4: ALLL Under FAS 5—Adjusting Loss Rates

Facts. Institution D’s lending area includes a metropolitan area that is financially dependent
upon the profitability of a number of manufacturing businesses. These businesses use highly specialized equipment and significant quantities of rare metals in the manufacturing process. Due to increased low-cost foreign competition, several of the parts suppliers servicing these manufacturing firms declared bankruptcy. The foreign suppliers have subsequently increased prices, and the manufacturing firms have suffered from increased equipment maintenance costs and smaller profit margins. Additionally, the cost of the rare metals used in the manufacturing process increased and has now stabilized at double last year’s price. Due to these events, the manufacturing businesses are experiencing financial difficulties and have recently announced downsizing plans.

Although Institution D has yet to confirm an increase in its loss experience as a result of these events, management knows that it lends to a significant number of businesses and individuals whose repayment ability depends upon the long-term viability of the manufacturing businesses. Institution D’s management has identified particular segments of its commercial and consumer customer bases that include borrowers highly dependent upon sales or salary from the manufacturing businesses. Institution D’s management performs an analysis of the affected portfolio segments to adjust its historical loss rates used to determine the ALLL. In this particular case, Institution D has experienced similar business and lending conditions in the past that it can compare to current conditions.

Analysis. Institution D should document its support for the loss-rate adjustments that result from considering these manufacturing firms’ financial downturns. It should document its identification of the particular segments of its commercial and consumer loan portfolio for which it is probable that the manufacturing business’ financial downturn has resulted in loan losses. In addition, it should document its analysis that resulted in the adjustments to the loss rates for the affected portfolio segments. As part of its documentation, Institution D should maintain copies of the documents supporting the analysis, including relevant newspaper articles, economic reports, economic data, and notes from discussions with individual borrowers.

Since Institution D has had similar situations in the past, its supporting documentation should also include an analysis of how the current conditions compare to its previous loss experiences in similar circumstances. As part of its effective ALLL methodology, a summary should be created of the amount and rationale for the adjustment factor, which management presents to the audit committee and board for their review and approval prior to the issuance of the financial statements.

Example 5: ALLL Under FAS 5—Estimating Losses on Loans Individually Reviewed for Impairment but Not Considered Individually Impaired

Facts. Institution E has outstanding loans of $2 million to Company Y and $1 million to Company Z, both of which are paying as agreed upon in the loan documents. The institution’s ALLL policy specifies that all loans greater than $750,000 must be individually reviewed for impairment under FAS 114. Company Y’s financial statements reflect a strong net worth, good profits, and ongoing ability to meet debt-service requirements. In contrast, recent information indicates Company Z’s profitability is declining and its cash flow is tight. Accordingly, this loan is rated substandard under the institution’s loan-grading system. Despite its concern, management believes Company Z will resolve its problems and determines that neither loan is individually impaired as defined by FAS 114.

Institution E segments its loan portfolio to estimate loan losses under FAS 5. Two of its loan portfolio segments are Segment 1 and Segment 2. The loan to Company Y has risk characteristics similar to the loans included in Segment 1, and the loan to Company Z has risk characteristics similar to the loans included in Segment 2.

In its determination of the ALLL under FAS 5, Institution E includes its loans to Company Y and Company Z in the groups of loans with similar characteristics (i.e., Segment 1 for Company Y’s loan and Segment 2 for Company Z’s loan). Management’s analyses of Segment 1 and Segment 2 indicate that it is probable that each segment includes some losses, even though the losses cannot be identified to one or more specific loans. Management estimates that the use of its historical loss rates for these two segments, with adjustments for changes in environmental factors, provides a reasonable estimate of the institution’s probable loan losses in these segments.

22 These groups of loans do not include any loans that have been individually reviewed for impairment under FAS 114 and determined to be impaired as defined by FAS 114.
Analysis. Institution E should adequately document an ALLL under FAS 5 for these loans that were individually reviewed for impairment but are not considered individually impaired. As part of its effective ALLL methodology, Institution E documents the decision to include its loans to Company Y and Company Z in its determination of its ALLL under FAS 5. It should also document the specific characteristics of the loans that were the basis for grouping these loans with other loans in Segment 1 and Segment 2, respectively. Institution E maintains documentation to support its method of estimating loan losses for Segment 1 and Segment 2, including the average loss rate used, the analysis of historical losses by loan type and by internal risk rating, and support for any adjustments to its historical loss rates. The institution also maintains copies of the economic and other reports that provided source data.

2065.4.1.6 Consolidating the Loss Estimates

To verify that ALLL balances are presented fairly in accordance with GAAP and are auditable, management should prepare a document that summarizes the amount to be reported in the financial statements for the ALLL. The board of directors should review and approve this summary. Common elements in such summaries include—

- the estimate of the probable loss or range of loss incurred for each category evaluated (e.g., individually evaluated impaired loans, homogeneous pools, and other groups of loans that are collectively evaluated for impairment);
- the aggregate probable loss estimated using the institution’s methodology;
- a summary of the current ALLL balance;
- the amount, if any, by which the ALLL is to be adjusted; and
- depending on the level of detail that supports the ALLL analysis, detailed subschedules of loss estimates that reconcile to the summary schedule.

Illustration D describes how an institution documents its estimated ALLL by adding comprehensive explanations to its summary schedule. Generally, an institution’s review and approval process for the ALLL relies upon the data provided in these consolidated summaries. There may be instances in which individuals or committees that review the ALLL methodology and resulting allowance balance identify adjustments that need to be made to the loss estimates to provide a better estimate of loan losses. These changes may be due to information not known at the time of the initial loss estimate (e.g., information that surfaces after determining and adjusting, as necessary, historical loss rates, or a recent decline in the marketability of property after conducting a FAS 114 valuation based upon the fair value of collateral). It is important that these adjustments are consistent with GAAP and are reviewed and approved by appropriate personnel. Additionally, the summary should provide each subsequent reviewer with an understanding of the support behind these adjustments. Therefore, management should document the nature of any adjustments and the underlying rationale for making the changes. This documentation should be provided to those making the final determination of the ALLL amount. Example 6 addresses the documentation of the final amount of the ALLL.

---

23. Subsequent to adjustments, there should be no material differences between the consolidated loss estimate, as determined by the methodology, and the final ALLL balance reported in the financial statements.
Illustration D
Summarizing Loss Estimates

Descriptive comments added to the consolidated ALLL summary schedule

To simplify the supporting documentation process and to eliminate redundancy, an institution adds detailed supporting information to its summary schedule. For example, this institution’s board of directors receives, within the body of the ALLL summary schedule, a brief description of the institution’s policy for selecting loans for evaluation under FAS 114. Additionally, the institution identifies which FAS 114 impairment-measurement method was used for each individually reviewed impaired loan. Other items on the schedule include a brief description of the loss factors for each segment of the loan portfolio, the basis for adjustments to loss rates, and explanations of changes in ALLL amounts from period to period, including cross-references to more detailed supporting documents.

Example 6: Consolidating the Loss Estimates—Documenting the Reported ALLL

Facts. Institution F determines its ALLL using an established systematic process. At the end of each period, the accounting department prepares a summary schedule that includes the amount of each of the components of the ALLL, as well as the total ALLL amount, for review by senior management, the credit committee, and, ultimately, the board of directors. Members of senior management and the credit committee meet to discuss the ALLL. During these discussions, they identify changes that are required by GAAP to be made to certain of the ALLL estimates. As a result of the adjustments made by senior management, the total amount of the ALLL changes. However, senior management (or its designee) does not update the ALLL summary schedule to reflect the adjustments or reasons for the adjustments. When performing their audit of the financial statements, the independent accountants are provided with the original ALLL summary schedule that was reviewed by senior management and the credit committee, as well as a verbal explanation of the changes made by senior management and the credit committee when they met to discuss the loan-loss allowance.

Analysis. Institution F’s documentation practices supporting the balance of its loan-loss allowance, as reported in its financial statements, are not in compliance with existing documentation guidance. An institution must maintain supporting documentation for the loan-loss allowance amount reported in its financial statements. As illustrated above, there may be instances in which ALLL reviewers identify adjustments that need to be made to the loan-loss estimates. The nature of the adjustments, how they were measured or determined, and the underlying rationale for making the changes to the ALLL balance should be documented. Appropriate documentation of the adjustments should be provided to the board of directors (or its designee) for review of the final ALLL amount to be reported in the financial statements. For institutions subject to external audit, this documentation should also be made available to the independent accountants. If changes frequently occur during management or credit committee reviews of the ALLL, management may find it appropriate to analyze the reasons for the frequent changes and to reassess the methodology the institution uses.

2065.4.1.7 Validating the ALLL Methodology

An institution’s ALLL methodology is considered valid when it accurately estimates the amount of loss contained in the portfolio. Thus, the institution’s methodology should include procedures that adjust loss-estimation methods to reduce differences between estimated losses and actual subsequent charge-offs, as necessary.
determining whether there may be deficiencies in their overall methodology or loan-grading process. Examples are—

• a review of trends in loan volume, delinquencies, restructurings, and concentrations;
• a review of previous charge-off and recovery history, including an evaluation of the timeliness of the entries to record both the charge-offs and the recoveries;
• a review by a party that is independent of the ALLL-estimation process (this often involves the independent party reviewing, on a test basis, source documents and underlying assumptions to determine that the established methodology develops reasonable loss estimates); and
• an evaluation of the appraisal process of the underlying collateral. (This may be accomplished by periodically comparing the appraised value to the actual sales price on selected properties sold.)

2065.4.1.7.1 Supporting Documentation for the Validation Process

Management usually supports the validation process with the workpapers from the ALLL-review function. Additional documentation often includes the summary findings of the independent reviewer. The institution’s board of directors, or its designee, reviews the findings and acknowledges its review in its meeting minutes. If the methodology is changed based upon the findings of the validation process, documentation that describes and supports the changes should be maintained.

2065.4.1.8 Appendix—Application of GAAP

[This appendix was designated appendix B in the policy statement.] An ALLL recorded pursuant to GAAP is an institution’s best estimate of the probable amount of loans and lease-financing receivables that it will be unable to collect based on current information and events.24 A creditor should record an ALLL when the criteria for accrual of a loss contingency as set forth in GAAP have been met. Estimating the amount of an ALLL involves a high degree of management judgment and is inevitably imprecise. Accordingly, an institution may determine that the amount of loss falls within a range. An institution should record its best estimate within the range of loan losses.25

Under GAAP, Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5, “Accounting for Contingencies” (FAS 5), provides the basic guidance for recognition of a loss contingency, such as the collectibility of loans (receivables), when it is probable that a loss has been incurred and the amount can be reasonably estimated. Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 114, “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan” (FAS 114) provides more specific guidance about the measurement and disclosure of impairment for certain types of loans.26 Specifically, FAS 114 applies to loans that are identified for evaluation on an individual basis. Loans are considered impaired when, based on current information and events, it is probable that the creditor will be unable to collect all interest and principal payments due according to the contractual terms of the loan agreement.

For individually impaired loans, FAS 114 provides guidance on the acceptable methods to measure impairment. Specifically, FAS 114 states that when a loan is impaired, a creditor should measure impairment based on the present value of expected future principal and interest cash flows discounted at the loan’s effective interest rate, except that as a practical expedient, a creditor may measure impairment based on a loan’s observable market price or the fair value of collateral, if the loan is collateral dependent. When developing the estimate of expected future cash flows for a loan, an institution should consider all available information reflecting past events and current conditions, including the

24. This appendix provides guidance on the ALLL and does not address allowances for credit losses for off-balance sheet instruments (e.g., loan commitments, guarantees, and standby letters of credit). Institutions should record liabilities for these exposures in accordance with GAAP. Further guidance on this topic is presented in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants’ Audit and Accounting Guide, Banks and Savings Institutions, 2000 edition (AICPA Audit Guide). Additionally, this appendix does not address allow-


26. EITF Topic D-80 includes additional guidance on the requirements of FAS 5 and FAS 114 and how they relate to

* * *
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effect of existing environmental factors. The following illustration provides an example of an institution estimating a loan’s impairment when the loan has been partially charged off.

**Illustration**

Interaction of FAS 114 with an Adversely Classified Loan, Partial Charge-Off, and the Overall ALLL

An institution determined that a collateral-dependent loan, which it identified for evaluation, was impaired. In accordance with FAS 114, the institution established an ALLL for the amount that the recorded investment in the loan exceeded the fair value of the underlying collateral, less costs to sell.

Consistent with relevant regulatory guidance, the institution classified as “Loss,” the portion of the recorded investment deemed to be the confirmed loss and classified the remaining recorded investment as “Substandard.” For this loan, the amount classified “Loss” was less than the impairment amount (as determined under FAS 114). The institution charged off the “Loss” portion of the loan. After the charge-off, the portion of the ALLL related to this “Substandard” loan (1) reflects an appropriate measure of impairment under FAS 114, and (2) is included in the aggregate FAS 114 ALLL for all loans that were identified for evaluation and individually considered impaired. The aggregate FAS 114 ALLL is included in the institution’s overall ALLL.

Large groups of smaller-balance homogeneous loans that are collectively evaluated for impairment are not included in the scope of FAS 114. Such groups of loans may include, but are not limited to, credit card, residential mortgage, and consumer installment loans. FAS 5 addresses the accounting for impairment of these loans. Also, FAS 5 provides the accounting guidance for impairment of loans that are not identified for evaluation on an individual basis and loans that are individually evaluated but are not individually considered impaired. Institutions should ensure that they do not layer their loan-loss allowances. Layering is the inappropriate practice of recording in the ALLL more than one amount for the same probable loan loss. Layering can happen when an institution includes a loan in one segment, determines its best estimate of loss for that loan either individually or on a group basis (after taking into account all appropriate environmental factors, conditions, and events), and then includes the loan in another group, which receives an additional ALLL amount.

While different institutions may use different methods, there are certain common elements that should be included in any loan-loss allowance methodology. Generally, an institution’s methodology should—

- include a detailed analysis of the loan portfolio, performed on a regular basis;
- consider all loans (whether on an individual or group basis);
- identify loans to be evaluated for impairment on an individual basis under FAS 114 and segment the remainder of the portfolio into groups of loans with similar risk characteristics for evaluation and analysis under FAS 5;
- consider all known relevant internal and external factors that may affect loan collectibility;
- be applied consistently but, when appropriate, be modified for new factors affecting collectibility;
- consider the particular risks inherent in different kinds of lending;
- consider current collateral values (less costs to sell), where applicable;
- require that analyses, estimates, reviews, and other ALLL methodology functions be performed by competent and well-trained personnel;
- be based on current and reliable data;
- be well documented, in writing, with clear explanations of the supporting analyses and rationale; and
- include a systematic and logical method to consolidate the loss estimates and ensure the

---

27. In addition, FAS 114 does not apply to loans measured at fair value or at the lower of cost or fair value, leases, or debt securities.

28. According to the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council’s Federal Register notice, Implementation Issues Arising from FASB Statement No. 114, “Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan,” published February 10, 1995, institution-specific issues should be reviewed when estimating loan losses under FAS 114. This analysis should be conducted as part of the evaluation of each individual loan reviewed under FAS 114 to avoid potential ALLL layering.
ALLL balance is recorded in accordance with GAAP.29

A systematic methodology that is properly designed and implemented should result in an institution’s best estimate of the ALLL. Accordingly, institutions should adjust their ALLL balance, either upward or downward, in each period for differences between the results of the systematic determination process and the unadjusted ALLL balance in the general ledger.30

2065.4.2 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To evaluate internal controls over the loan-loss estimation process by evaluating the ALLL written policy and the process used to create and maintain the policy, loan-grading systems, and other associated internal controls over credit risk.
2. To determine the existence of an ALLL balance and review the summary schedule supporting it.
3. To analyze and review the evaluation for Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 114 (FAS 114) (for individually listed loans).
4. To analyze and review the evaluation for Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 (FAS 5) (for groups of loans).
5. To determine if the BHC has adequately developed a range of loss and a margin for imprecision.
6. To determine that the ALLL reflects estimated credit losses for specifically identified loans (or groups of loans) and any estimated probable credit losses inherent in the remainder of the loan portfolio at the balance-sheet date.
7. To analyze and review the ALLL-documentation support.
8. To determine the adequacy of the BHC’s process to evaluate the ALLL methodology and to adjust the methodology, as needed.

2065.4.3 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Determine if the board of directors has developed and maintained an appropriate, systematic, and consistently applied process to determine the amounts of the ALLL and provision for loan losses, or if it has instructed management to do so. Determine if the ALLL policies specifically address the BHC’s goals, risk profile, personnel, and other resources.
2. Determine if the board of directors has approved the written ALLL policy.
3. Determine if the BHC’s loan-loss estimate, in accordance with its methodology, is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles and supervisory guidance. Additionally, ensure that the BHC’s loan-loss estimate is materially consistent with the reported balance of the BHC’s ALLL account.
4. Determine if the ALLL methodology is periodically validated by an independent party and, if appropriate, revised.
5. Ascertain whether the audit committee is overseeing and monitoring the internal controls over the ALLL-documentation process.
6. Ascertain that the BHC maintains adequate written documentation of its ALLL, including clear explanations of the supporting analyses and rationale. The documentation should consist of—
   • policies and procedures over the systems and controls that maintain an appropriate ALLL and over the ALLL methodology,
   • the loan-grading system or process,
   • a summary or consolidation (including losses) of the ALLL balance,
   • a validation of the ALLL methodology, and
   • periodic adjustments to the ALLL process.
7. Determine if the amount reported for the ALLL for each period and the provisions for loan and leases losses are reviewed and approved by the board of directors.

29. Refer to paragraph 7.05 of the AICPA Audit Guide.
30. Institutions should refer to the guidance on materiality in SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 99, Materiality.
The federal banking agencies\(^1\) issued, in January 2012, “Interagency Supervisory Guidance on Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses Estimation Practices for Loans and Lines of Credit Secured by Junior Liens on 1–4 Family Residential Properties.” The guidance applies to all banking organizations with junior-lien loans. It was issued to address the allowance for loan and lease losses (ALLL) estimation practices for junior-lien loans and lines of credit (collectively, junior liens). (See SR-12-3.)

Domestic banking organizations that are supervised by the Federal Reserve are reminded to consider all credit quality indicators relevant to their junior liens. Generally, this information should include the delinquency status of senior liens associated with the institution’s junior liens and whether the senior lien has been modified. Institutions should ensure that during the ALLL estimation process, sufficient information is gathered to adequately assess the probable loss incurred within junior-lien portfolios.

This 2012 ALLL guidance applies to institutions of all sizes. The guidance states that an institution should use reasonably available tools to determine the payment status of senior liens associated with its junior liens, such as credit reports, third-party services, or, in certain cases, a proxy. It is expected that large, complex institutions would find most tools reasonably available and would use proxies in limited circumstances.

The guidance does not add or modify existing regulatory reporting requirements issued by the agencies or current generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). This guidance reiterates key concepts included in GAAP and existing supervisory guidance related to the ALLL. (See, for example, SR-06-17 (section 2065.3) and SR-01-17 (section 2065.4) and their attachments.

Institutions also are reminded to follow appropriate risk-management principles in managing junior-lien loans and lines of credit, including the May 2005 “Interagency Credit Risk Management Guidance for Home Equity Lending.” (See SR-05-11 and section 2010.2.4.)

---

1. The federal banking agencies are the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Federal Reserve Board), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), and the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA).
2065.5.1.1 Responsibilities of Management

2065.5.1.1.1 Consideration of All Significant Factors

Institutions should ensure that during the ALLL estimation process sufficient information is gathered to adequately assess the probable loss incurred within junior-lien portfolios. Generally, this information should include the delinquency status of senior liens associated with the institution’s junior liens and whether the senior-lien loan has been modified. Institutions with significant holdings of junior liens should gather and analyze data on the associated senior-lien loans it owns or services. When an institution does not own or service the associated senior-lien loans, it should use reasonably available tools to determine the payment status of the senior-lien loans. Such tools include obtaining credit reports or data from third-party services to assist in matching an institution’s junior liens with its associated senior liens. Additionally, an institution may, as a proxy, use the relevant performance data on similar senior liens it owns or services. An institution with an insignificant volume of junior-lien loans and lines of credit may use judgment when determining what information about associated senior liens not owned or serviced is reasonably available.

Institutions with significant holdings of junior liens should also periodically refresh other credit quality indicators the organization has deemed relevant about the collectibility of its junior liens, such as borrower credit scores and combined loan-to-value ratios (CLTVs), which include both the senior and junior liens. An institution should refresh relevant credit quality indicators as often as necessary considering economic and housing market conditions that affect the institution’s junior-lien portfolio. As noted in SR-06-17, “changes in the level of the ALLL should be directionally consistent with changes in the factors, taken as a whole, that evidence credit losses.” For example, if declining credit quality trends in the factors relevant to either junior liens or their associated senior-lien loans are evident, the ALLL level as a percentage of the junior-lien portfolio should generally increase, barring unusual charge-off activity. Similarly, if improving credit quality trends are evident, the ALLL level as a percentage of the junior-lien portfolio should generally decrease.

Institutions routinely gather information for credit-risk management purposes, but some may not fully use that information in the allowance estimation process. Institutions should consider all reasonably available and relevant information in the allowance estimation process, including information obtained for credit-risk management purposes. Financial Accounting Standards Board Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) Topic 450 states that losses should be accrued by a charge to income if information available prior to issuance of the financial statements indicates that it is probable that an asset has been impaired. The 2006 IPS states, “...estimates of credit losses should reflect consideration of all significant factors.” (See SR-06-17 and its attachment.) Consequently, it is considered inconsistent with both GAAP and supervisory guidance to fail to gather and consider reasonably available and relevant information that would significantly affect management’s judgment about the collectibility of the portfolio.2

2065.5.1.1.2 Adequate Segmentation

Institutions normally segment their loan portfolio into groups of loans based on risk characteristics as part of the ALLL estimation process. Institutions with significant holdings of junior liens should ensure adequate segmentation within their junior-lien portfolio to appropriately estimate the allowance for high-risk segments within this portfolio. A lack of segmentation can result in an allowance established for the entire junior-lien portfolio that is lower than what the allowance would be if high-risk loans were segregated and grouped together for evaluation in one or more separate segments. The following credit quality indicators may be appropriate for use in identifying high-risk junior-lien portfolio segments:

- delinquency and modification status of an institution’s junior liens
- delinquency and modification status of senior-lien loans associated with an institution’s junior liens

2. “Portfolio” refers to loans collectively evaluated for impairment under ASC Topic 450; this supervisory guidance may also be applicable to junior-lien loans that are subject to measurement for impairment under ASC Subtopic 310-10, Receivables - Overall (formerly Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 114, Accounting by Creditors for Impairment of a Loan) and ASC Subtopic 310-30, Loans and Debt Securities Acquired with Deteriorated Credit Quality (formerly AICPA Statement of Position 03-3, Accounting for Certain Loans or Debt Securities Acquired in a Transfer).
• current borrower credit score
• current CLTV
• origination channel
• documentation type
• property type (for example, investor owned or owner-occupied)
• geographic location of property
• origination vintage
• HELOCs where the borrower is making only the minimum payment due
• HELOCs where current information and conditions indicate that the borrower will be subject to payment shock

In particular, institutions should ensure their ALLL methodology adequately incorporates the elevated borrower default risk associated with payment shocks due to (1) rising interest rates for adjustable rate junior liens, including HELOCs,\(^3\) or (2) HELOCs converting from interest-only to amortizing loans. If the default rate of junior liens that have experienced payment shock is higher than the default rate of junior liens that have not experienced payment shock, an institution should determine whether it has a significant number of junior liens approaching their conversion to amortizing loans or approaching an interest rate adjustment date. If so, to ensure the institution’s estimate of credit losses is not understated, it would be necessary to adjust historical default rates on these junior liens to incorporate the effect of payment shocks that, based on current information and conditions, are likely to occur.

Adequate segmentation of the junior-lien portfolio by risk factors should facilitate an institution’s ability to track default rates and loss severity for high-risk segments and its ability to appropriately incorporate these data into the allowance estimation process.

2065.5.1.1.3 Qualitative or Environmental Factor Adjustments

As noted in SR-06-17, institutions should adjust a loan group’s historical loss rate for the effect of qualitative or environmental factors that are likely to cause estimated credit losses as of the evaluation date to differ from the group’s historical loss experience. Institutions typically reflect the overall effect of these factors on a loan group as an adjustment that, as appropriate, increases or decreases the historical loss rate applied to the loan group. Alternatively, the effect of these factors may be reflected through separate standalone adjustments within the ASC Subtopic 450-20 component of the ALLL.

When an institution uses qualitative or environmental factors to estimate probable losses related to individual high-risk segments within the junior-lien portfolio, any adjustment to the historical loss rate or any separate standalone adjustment should be supported by an analysis that relates the adjustment to the characteristics of and trends in the individual risk segments. In addition, changes in the allowance allocation for junior liens should be directionally consistent with changes in the factors taken as a whole that evidence credit losses on junior liens, keeping in mind the characteristics of the institution’s junior-lien portfolio.

2065.5.1.1.4 Charge-Off and Nonaccrual Policies

Banking institutions should ensure that their charge-off policy on junior liens is in accordance with the June 2000 Uniform Retail Credit Classification and Account Management Policy. (See SR-00-8 and the appendix of section 2241.0.1.) As stated in SR-06-17, “when available information confirms that specific loans, or portions thereof, are uncollectible, these amounts should be promptly charged off against the ALLL.”

Institutions also should ensure that income-recognition practices related to junior liens are appropriate. Consistent with GAAP and regulatory guidance, institutions are expected to have revenue recognition practices that do not result in overstating income. Placing a junior lien on nonaccrual, including a current junior lien, when payment of principal or interest in full is not expected is one appropriate method to ensure that income is not overstated. An institution’s income-recognition policy should incorporate management’s consideration of all reasonably available information including, for junior liens, the performance of the associated senior liens as well as trends in other credit quality indicators. The policy should require that consideration of these factors takes place before foreclosure on the senior lien or delinquency of the junior lien. The policy should also explain how management’s consideration of these factors affects income recognition prior to foreclosure on the

---

3. Forecasts of future interest rate increases should not be included in the determination of the ALLL. However, if rates have risen since the last rate adjustment, the effect of the increase on the amount of the payment at the next rate adjustment should be considered.
senior lien or delinquency of the junior lien to ensure income is not overstated.

2065.5.1.1.5 Responsibilities of Examiners

To the extent an institution has significant holdings of junior liens, examiners should assess the appropriateness of the institution’s ALLL methodology and documentation related to these loans, and the appropriateness of the level of the ALLL established for this portfolio. As noted in SR-06-17, for analytical purposes, an institution should attribute portions of the ALLL to loans that it individually evaluates and determines to be impaired under ASC Subtopic 310-10 and to groups of loans that it evaluates collectively under ASC Subtopic 450-20. However, the ALLL is available to cover all charge-offs that arise from the loan portfolio.

Consistent with SR-06-17, in their review of the junior-lien portfolio, examiners should consider all significant factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio. Examiners should take the following steps when reviewing the appropriateness of an institution’s allowance that is established for junior liens:

• Evaluate the institution’s ALLL policies and procedures and assess the methodology that management uses to arrive at an overall estimate of the ALLL for junior liens. This should include whether all significant qualitative or environmental factors that affect the collectibility of the portfolio (including those factors previously discussed) have been appropriately considered in accordance with GAAP.
• Review management’s use of loss-estimation models or other loss estimation tools to ensure that the resulting estimated credit losses are in conformity with GAAP.
• Review management’s support for any qualitative or environmental factor adjustments to the allowance related to junior liens. Examiners should ensure that all relevant qualitative or environmental factors were considered and adjustments to historical loss rates for specific risk segments within the junior-lien portfolio are supported by an analysis that relates the adjustments to the characteristics of and trends in the individual risk segments.
• Review the interest income accounts associated with junior liens to ensure that the institution’s net income is not overstated.

If the examiner concludes that the reported ALLL for junior liens is not appropriate or determines that the ALLL evaluation process is deficient, recommendations for correcting these deficiencies, including any examiner concerns regarding an appropriate level for the ALLL, should be noted in the inspection report. Examiners should cite any departures from GAAP and regulatory guidance, as applicable. Additional supervisory action may also be taken based on the magnitude of the observed shortcomings in the ALLL process.

2065.5.2 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

The inspection objectives for an institution that has significant holdings of loans secured by junior liens are as follows:

1. To evaluate the appropriateness of the institution’s methodology and documentation of the ALLL related to these loans.
2. To ascertain whether the institution’s policies, practices, procedures, and internal controls regarding the ALLL estimation practices for loans secured by junior liens are sufficient.
3. To determine whether the level of the ALLL is reasonable and adequate for the institution’s volume of such loans outstanding.
4. To evaluate if the institution has fully considered and accounted for all significant qualitative or environmental factors that affect the collectibility of such loans.
5. To ascertain whether the portfolio has been properly accounted in accordance with GAAP and whether all applicable supervisory and regulatory guidance, as well as statutory and regulatory requirements, have been adhered to.

2065.5.3 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. To the extent an institution has significant holdings of loans secured by junior liens, assess the appropriateness of the institution’s a. ALLL methodology and documentation related to these loans, and b. ALLL level established for this portfolio.
2. During the inspection’s review of the of the junior-lien portfolio, consider all significant qualitative or environmental factors that affect the collectibility of the junior-lien portfolio and whether they have been appropriately considered in accordance with GAAP.
3. Perform the following steps when reviewing the appropriateness of the institution’s ALLL that is established for junior liens:
   a. Evaluate the institution’s ALLL policies and procedures and assess the methodology that management uses to arrive at an overall estimate of the ALLL for junior liens.
   b. Review management’s use of loss-estimation models or other loss-estimation tools to ensure that the resulting estimated credit losses are in conformity with GAAP.
   c. Review management’s support for any qualitative or environmental factor adjustments to the ALLL related to junior liens. Ensure that all relevant qualitative or environmental factors were considered and adjustments to historical loss rates for specific risk segments within the junior-lien portfolio are supported by an analysis that relates the adjustment to the characteristics of and trends in the individual risk segments.
   d. Review the interest income accounts associated with junior liens to ensure that the institution’s net income is not overstated.

4. Provide comments in the inspection report when the ALLL for junior liens is not appropriate or if the ALLL evaluation process is deficient. Include recommendations for correcting these deficiencies and any concerns regarding an appropriate level for the ALLL.

5. Cite in the inspection report any departures from GAAP and regulatory guidance, as applicable.
Incentive compensation practices in the financial industry were one of many factors that contributed to the financial crisis that began in mid-2007. Banking organizations too often rewarded employees for increasing the organization’s revenue or short-term profit without adequate recognition of the risks the employees’ activities posed to the organization. These practices exacerbated the risks and losses at a number of banking organizations and resulted in the misalignment of the interests of employees with the long-term well-being and safety and soundness of their organizations. This section provides guidance on sound incentive compensation practices to banking organizations supervised by the Federal Reserve (also the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of Thrift Supervision (collectively, the ‘Agencies’)). This guidance is intended to assist banking organizations in designing and implementing incentive compensation arrangements and related policies and procedures that effectively consider potential risks and risk outcomes.

Alignment of incentives provided to employees with the interests of shareholders of the organization often also benefits safety and soundness. However, aligning employee incentives with the interests of shareholders is not always sufficient to address safety- and soundness concerns. Because of the presence of the federal safety net, (including the ability of insured depository institutions to raise insured deposits and access the discount window and payment services of the Federal Reserve), shareholders of a banking organization in some cases may be willing to tolerate a degree of risk that is inconsistent with the organization’s safety and soundness. Accordingly, the Federal Reserve expects banking organizations to maintain incentive compensation practices that are consistent with safety and soundness, even when these practices go beyond those needed to align shareholder and employee interests.

To be consistent with safety and soundness, incentive compensation arrangements at a banking organization should:

1. Provide employees incentives that appropriately balance risk and reward;
2. Be compatible with effective controls and risk-management; and
3. Be supported by strong corporate governance, including active and effective oversight by the organization’s board of directors.

These principles, and the types of policies, procedures, and systems that banking organizations should have to help ensure compliance with them, are discussed later in this guidance. The Federal Reserve expects banking organizations to regularly review their incentive compensation arrangements for all executive and non-executive employees who, either individually or as part of a group, have the ability to expose the organization to material amounts of risk, as well as to regularly review the risk-management, control, and corporate governance processes related to these arrangements. Banking organizations should immediately address any identified deficiencies in these arrangements or processes that are inconsistent with safety and soundness. Banking organizations are responsible for ensuring that their incentive compensation arrangements are consistent with the principles described in this guidance and that they do not encourage employees to expose the organization to imprudent risks that may pose a threat to the safety and soundness of the organization.

---

1. Examples of risks that may present a threat to the organization’s safety and soundness include credit, market, liquidity, operational, legal, compliance, and reputational risks.
2. As used in this guidance, the term “banking organization” includes national banks, state member banks, state nonmember banks, savings associations, U.S. bank holding companies, savings and loan holding companies, Edge and agreement corporations, and the U.S. operations of foreign banking organizations (FBOs) with a branch, agency, or commercial lending company in the United States. If the Federal Reserve is referenced, the reference is intended to also include the other supervisory Agencies.
3. This guidance (see 75 Fed. Reg. 36395, June 25, 2010, for the entire text) and the principles reflected herein are consistent with the Principles for Sound Compensation Practices issued by the Financial Stability Board (FSB) in April 2009, and with the FSB’s Implementation Standards for those principles, issued in September 2009.
4. In this guidance, the term “incentive compensation” refers to that portion of an employee’s current or potential compensation that is tied to achievement of one or more specific metrics (e.g., a level of sales, revenue, or income). Incentive compensation does not include compensation that is awarded solely for, and the payment of which is solely tied to, continued employment (e.g., salary). In addition, the term does not include compensation arrangements that are determined based solely on the employee’s level of compensation and does not vary based on one or more performance metrics (e.g., a 401(k) plan under which the organization contributes a set percentage of an employee’s salary).
The Federal Reserve recognizes that incentive compensation arrangements often seek to serve several important and worthy objectives. For example, incentive compensation arrangements may be used to help attract skilled staff, induce better organization-wide and employee performance, promote employee retention, provide retirement security to employees, or allow compensation expenses to vary with revenue on an organization-wide basis. Moreover, the analysis and methods for ensuring that incentive compensation arrangements take appropriate account of risk should be tailored to the size, complexity, business strategy, and risk tolerance of each organization. The resources required will depend upon the complexity of the firm and its use of incentive compensation arrangements. For some, the task of designing and implementing compensation arrangements that properly offer incentives for executive and non-executive employees to pursue the organization’s long-term well-being and that do not encourage imprudent risk-taking is a complex task that will require the commitment of adequate resources.

While issues related to designing and implementing incentive compensation arrangements are complex, the Federal Reserve is committed to ensuring that banking organizations move forward in incorporating the principles described in this guidance into their incentive compensation practices. As discussed further below, because of the size and complexity of their operations, large complex banking organizations (LCBOs) should have and adhere to systematic and formalized policies, procedures, and processes. These are considered important in ensuring that incentive compensation arrangements for all covered employees are identified and reviewed by appropriate levels of management (including the board of directors where appropriate and control units), and that they appropriately balance risks and rewards. In several places, this guidance specifically highlights the types of policies, procedures, and systems that LCBOs should have and maintain, but that generally are not expected of smaller, less complex organizations. LCBOs warrant the most intensive supervisory attention because they are significant users of incentive compensation arrangements and because flawed approaches at these organizations are more likely to have adverse effects on the broader financial system. The Federal Reserve will work with LCBOs as necessary through the supervisory process to ensure that they promptly correct any deficiencies that may be inconsistent with the safety and soundness of the organization.

The policies, procedures, and systems of smaller banking organizations that use incentive compensation arrangements are expected to be less extensive, formalized, and detailed than those of LCBOs. Supervisory reviews of incentive compensation arrangements at smaller, less-complex banking organizations will be conducted by the Federal Reserve as part of the evaluation of those organizations’ risk-management, internal controls, and corporate governance during the regular, risk-focused examination process. These reviews will be tailored to reflect the scope and complexity of an organization’s activities, as well as the prevalence and scope of its incentive compensation arrangements. Little, if any, additional examination work is expected for smaller banking organizations that do not use, to a significant extent, incentive compensation arrangements.

For all banking organizations, supervisory findings related to incentive compensation will be communicated to the organization and included in the relevant report of examination or inspection. In addition, these findings will be incorporated, as appropriate, into the organization’s policies, procedures, and systems. These are outlined in the report of examination or inspection. For those organizations that do not use incentive compensation arrangements, the Federal Reserve recognizes that the organization’s policies, procedures, and systems may not include specific provisions related to incentive compensation arrangements. In these instances, the Federal Reserve will continue to assess the organization’s policies, procedures, and systems for their ability to ensure the safety and soundness of the organization, and will consider the organization’s policies, procedures, and systems for their ability to ensure the safety and soundness of the organization, and will consider the organization’s effectiveness in ensuring that incentive compensation arrangements are appropriately designed and implemented.

5. In December 2009 the Federal Reserve, working with the other Agencies, initiated a special horizontal review of incentive compensation arrangements and related risk-management, control, and corporate governance practices of large banking organizations (LBOs). This initiative was designed to spur and monitor the industry’s progress towards the implementation of safe and sound incentive compensation arrangements, identify emerging best practices, and advance the state of practice more generally in the industry.

6. For supervisory purposes, the Federal Reserve (as well as the other federal bank regulatory agencies) segments the organizations it supervises into different supervisory portfolios based on, among other things, size, complexity, and risk profile. For purposes of this guidance, the LBOs referred to in the guidance are identified in this section as large complex banking organizations to be consistent with the Federal Reserve’s other supervisory policies. LBOs are designated by (1) the OCC as the largest and most complex national banks as defined in the Large Bank Supervision booklet of the Comptroller’s Handbook; (2) the FDIC, large, complex insured depository institutions (IDIs); and (3) the OTS, the largest and most complex savings associations and savings and loan holding companies.

7. This guidance does not apply to banking organizations that do not use incentive compensation.

8. To facilitate these reviews, where appropriate, a smaller banking organization should review its compensation arrangements to determine whether it uses incentive compensation arrangements to a significant extent in its business operations. A smaller banking organization will not be considered a significant user of incentive compensation arrangements simply because the organization has a firm-wide profit-sharing or bonus plan that is based on the bank’s profitability, even if the plan covers all or most of the organization’s employees.
tion’s rating component(s) and subcomponent(s) relating to risk-management, internal controls, and corporate governance under the relevant supervisory rating system, as well as the organization’s overall supervisory rating.

The Federal Reserve (or the organization’s appropriate federal supervisor) may take enforcement action against a banking organization if its incentive compensation arrangements or related risk-management, control, or governance processes pose a risk to the safety and soundness of the organization, particularly when the organization is not taking prompt and effective measures to correct the deficiencies. For example, the appropriate federal supervisor may take an enforcement action if material deficiencies are found to exist in the organization’s incentive compensation arrangements or related risk-management, control, or governance processes, or the organization fails to promptly develop, submit, or adhere to an effective plan designed to ensure that its incentive compensation arrangements do not encourage imprudent risk-taking and are consistent with principles of safety and soundness. As provided under section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818), an enforcement action may, among other things, require an organization to take affirmative action, such as developing a corrective action plan that is acceptable to the appropriate federal supervisor to rectify safety-and-soundness deficiencies in its incentive compensation arrangements or related processes. Where warranted, the appropriate federal supervisor may require the organization to take additional affirmative action to correct or remedy deficiencies related to the organization’s incentive compensation practices.

Effective and balanced incentive compensation practices are likely to evolve significantly in the coming years, spurred by the efforts of banking organizations, supervisors, and other stakeholders. The Federal Reserve will review and update this guidance as appropriate to incorporate best practices that emerge from these efforts.

2068.0.1 SCOPE OF APPLICATION

The incentive compensation arrangements and related policies and procedures of banking organizations should be consistent with principles of safety and soundness.9 Incentive compensation arrangements for executive officers as well as for non-executive personnel who have the ability to expose a banking organization to material amounts of risk may, if not properly structured, pose a threat to the organization’s safety and soundness. Accordingly, this guidance applies to incentive compensation arrangements for:

1. Senior executives and others who are responsible for oversight of the organization’s firm-wide activities or material business lines;10
2. Individual employees, including non-executive employees, whose activities may expose the organization to material amounts of risk (e.g., traders with large position limits relative to the organization’s overall risk tolerance); and
3. Groups of employees who are subject to the same or similar incentive compensation arrangements and who, in the aggregate, may expose the organization to material amounts of risk, even if no individual employee is likely to expose the organization to material risk (e.g., loan officers who, as a group, originate loans that account for a material amount of the organization’s credit risk).

For ease of reference, these executive and non-executive employees are collectively referred to hereafter as “covered employees” or “employees.” Depending on the facts and circumstances of the individual organization, the types of employees or categories of employees that are outside the scope of this guidance because they do not have the ability to expose the organization to material risks would likely include, for example, tellers, bookkeepers, couriers, or data processing personnel.

In determining whether an employee, or group of employees, may expose a banking organization to material risk, the organization with the FBO’s group-wide policies developed in accordance with the rules of the FBO’s home country supervisor. The policies of the FBO’s U.S. operations should also be consistent with the FBO’s overall corporate and management structure, as well as its framework for risk-management and internal controls. In addition, the policies for the U.S. operations of FBOs should be consistent with this guidance.

10. Senior executives include, at a minimum, “executive officers” within the meaning of the Federal Reserve’s Regulation O (see 12 CFR 215.3(e)(1)) and, for publicly traded companies, “named officers” within the meaning of the Securities and Exchange Commission’s rules on disclosure of executive compensation (see 17 CFR 229.402(a)(3)). Savings associations should also refer to OTS’s rules on loans by saving associations to their executive officers, directors, and principal shareholders. (12 CFR 563.43).
should consider the full range of inherent risks arising from, or generated by, the employee’s activities, even if the organization uses risk-management processes or controls to limit the risks such activities ultimately may pose to the organization. Moreover, risks should be considered to be material for purposes of this guidance if they are material to the organization, or are material to a business line or operating unit that is itself material to the organization.11

For purposes of illustration, assume that a banking organization has a structured-finance unit that is material to the organization. A group of employees within that unit who originate structured-finance transactions that may expose the unit to material risks should be considered “covered employees” for purposes of this guidance even if those transactions must be approved by an independent risk function prior to consummation, or the organization uses other processes or methods to limit the risk that such transactions may present to the organization.

Strong and effective risk-management and internal control functions are critical to the safety and soundness of banking organizations. However, irrespective of the quality of these functions, poorly designed or managed incentive compensation arrangements can themselves be a source of risk to a banking organization. For example, incentive compensation arrangements that provide employees strong incentives to increase the organization’s short-term revenues or profits, without regard to the short- or long-term risk associated with such business, can place substantial strain on the risk-management and internal control functions of even well-managed organizations.

Moreover, poorly balanced incentive compensation arrangements can encourage employees to take affirmative actions to weaken or circumvent the organization’s risk-management or internal control functions, such as by providing inaccurate or incomplete information to these functions, to boost the employee’s personal compensation. Accordingly, sound compensation practices are an integral part of strong risk-management and internal control functions. A key goal of this guidance is to encourage banking organizations to incorporate the risks related to incentive compensation into their broader risk-management framework. Risk-management procedures and risk controls that ordinarily limit risk-taking do not obviate the need for incentive compensation arrangements to properly balance risk-taking incentives.

2068.0.2 PRINCIPLES OF A SOUND INCENTIVE COMPENSATION SYSTEM

2068.0.2.1 Principle 1: Balanced Risk-Taking Incentives

Incentive compensation arrangements should balance risk and financial results in a manner that does not encourage employees to expose their organizations to imprudent risks. Incentive compensation arrangements typically attempt to encourage actions that result in greater revenue or profit for the organization. However, short-run revenue or profit can often diverge sharply from actual long-run profit because risk outcomes may become clear only over time. Activities that carry higher risk typically yield higher short-term revenue, and an employee who is given incentives to increase short-term revenue or profit, without regard to risk, will naturally be attracted to opportunities to expose the organization to more risk.

An incentive compensation arrangement is balanced when the amounts paid to an employee appropriately take into account the risks (including compliance risks), as well as the financial benefits, from the employee’s activities and the impact of those activities on the organization’s safety and soundness. As an example, under a balanced incentive compensation arrangement, two employees who generate the same amount of short-term revenue or profit for an organization should not receive the same amount of incentive compensation if the risks taken by the employees in generating that revenue or profit differ materially. The employee whose activities create materially larger risks for the organization should receive less than the other employee, all else being equal.

The performance measures used in an incentive compensation arrangement have an important effect on the incentives provided employees and, thus, the potential for the arrangement to encourage imprudent risk-taking. For example, if an employee’s incentive compensation payments are closely tied to short-term revenue or profit of business generated by the employee, without any adjustments for the risks associated with the business generated, the potential for the arrangement to encourage imprudent risk-taking

---

11. Thus, risks may be material to an organization even if they are not large enough themselves to threaten the solvency of the organization.
may be quite strong. Similarly, traders who work with positions that close at year-end could have an incentive to take large risks toward the end of a year if there is no mechanism for factoring how such positions perform over a longer period of time. The same result could ensue if the performance measures themselves lack integrity or can be manipulated inappropriately by the employees receiving incentive compensation.

On the other hand, if an employee’s incentive compensation payments are determined based on performance measures that are only distantly linked to the employee’s activities (e.g., for most employees, organization-wide profit), the potential for the arrangement to encourage the employee to take imprudent risks on behalf of the organization may be weak. For this reason, plans that provide for awards based solely on overall organization-wide performance are unlikely to provide employees, other than senior executives and individuals who have the ability to materially affect the organization’s overall risk profile, with unbalanced risk-taking incentives.

Incentive compensation arrangements should not only be balanced in design, they also should be implemented so that actual payments vary based on risks or risk outcomes. If, for example, employees are paid substantially all of their potential incentive compensation even when risk or risk outcomes are materially worse than expected, employees have less incentive to avoid activities with substantial risk.

- **Banking organizations** should consider the full range of risks associated with an employee’s activities, as well as the time horizon over which those risks may be realized, in assessing whether incentive compensation arrangements are balanced.

The activities of employees may create a wide range of risks for a banking organization, such as credit, market, liquidity, operational, legal, compliance, and reputational risks, as well as other risks to the viability or operation of the organization. Some of these risks may be realized in the short term, while others may become apparent only over the long term. For example, future revenues that are booked as current income may not materialize, and short-term profit-and-loss measures may not appropriately reflect differences in the risks associated with the revenue derived from different activities (e.g., the higher credit or compliance risk associated with subprime loans versus prime loans). In addition, some risks (or combinations of risky strategies and positions) may have a low probability of being realized, but would have highly adverse effects on the organization if they were to be realized (“bad tail risks”). While shareholders may have less incentive to guard against bad tail risks because of the infrequency of their realization and the existence of the federal safety net, these risks warrant special attention for safety-and-soundness reasons given the threat they pose to the organization’s solvency and the federal safety net.

Banking organizations should consider the full range of current and potential risks associated with the activities of covered employees, including the cost and amount of capital and liquidity needed to support those risks, in developing balanced incentive compensation arrangements. Reliable quantitative measures of risk and risk outcomes (“quantitative measures”), where available, may be particularly useful in developing balanced compensation arrangements and in assessing the extent to which arrangements are properly balanced. However, reliable quantitative measures may not be available for all types of risk or for all activities, and their utility for use in compensation arrangements varies across business lines and employees. The absence of reliable quantitative measures for certain types of risks or outcomes does not mean that banking organizations should ignore such risks or outcomes for purposes of assessing whether an incentive compensation arrangement achieves balance. For example, while reliable quantitative measures may not exist for many bad-tail risks, it is important that such risks be considered given their potential effect on safety and soundness. As in other risk-management areas, banking organizations should rely on informed judgments, supported by available data, to estimate risks and risk outcomes in the absence of reliable quantitative risk measures.

**Large complex banking organizations.** In designing and modifying incentive compensation arrangements, LCBOs should assess in advance of implementation whether such...
arrangements are likely to provide balanced risk-taking incentives. Simulation analysis of incentive compensation arrangements is one way of doing so. Such analysis uses forward-looking projections of incentive compensation awards and payments based on a range of performance levels, risk outcomes, and levels of risks taken. This type of analysis, or other analysis that results in assessments of likely effectiveness, can help an LCBO assess whether incentive compensation awards and payments to an employee are likely to be reduced appropriately as the risks to the organization from the employee’s activities increase.

- An unbalanced arrangement can be moved toward balance by adding or modifying features that cause the amounts ultimately received by employees to appropriately reflect risk and risk outcomes.

If an incentive compensation arrangement may encourage employees to expose their banking organization to imprudent risks, the organization should modify the arrangement as needed to ensure that it is consistent with safety and soundness. Four methods are often used to make compensation more sensitive to risk. These methods are:

1. Risk Adjustment of Awards: The amount of an incentive compensation award for an employee is adjusted based on measures that take into account the risk the employee’s activities may pose to the organization. Such measures may be quantitative, or the size of a risk adjustment may be set judgmentally, subject to appropriate oversight.

2. Deferral of Payment: The actual payout of an award to an employee is delayed significantly beyond the end of the performance period, and the amounts paid are adjusted for actual losses or other aspects of performance that are realized or become better known only during the deferral period.13 Deferred payouts may be altered according to risk outcomes either formulaically or judgmentally, subject to appropriate oversight. To be most effective, the deferral period should be sufficiently long to allow for the realization of a substantial portion of the risks from employee activities, and the measures of loss should be clearly explained to employees and closely tied to their activities during the relevant performance period.

3. Longer Performance Periods: The time period covered by the performance measures used in determining an employee’s award is extended (for example, from one year to two or more years). Longer performance periods and deferral of payment are related in that both methods allow awards or payments to be made after some or all risk outcomes are realized or better known.

4. Reduced Sensitivity to Short-Term Performance: The banking organization reduces the rate at which awards increase as an employee achieves higher levels of the relevant performance measure(s). Rather than offsetting risk-taking incentives associated with the use of short-term performance measures, this method reduces the magnitude of such incentives. This method also can include improving the quality and reliability of performance measures in taking into account both short-term and long-term risks, for example improving the reliability and accuracy of estimates of revenues and long-term profits upon which performance measures depend.14

These methods for achieving balance are not exclusive, and additional methods or variations may exist or be developed. Moreover, each method has its own advantages and disadvantages. For example, where reliable risk measures exist, risk adjustment of awards may be more effective than deferral of payment in reducing incentives for imprudent risk-taking. This is because risk adjustment potentially can take account of the full range and time horizon of risks, rather than just those risk outcomes that occur or become more evident during the deferral period. On the other hand, deferral of payment may be more effective than risk adjustment in mitigating incentives to take hard-to-measure risks (such as the risks of new activities that are aggressive, but potentially achievable.

---

13. The deferral-of-payment method is sometimes referred to in the industry as a “clawback.” The term “clawback” also may refer specifically to an arrangement under which an employee must return incentive compensation payments previously received by the employee (and not just deferred) if certain risk outcomes occur. Section 304 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7243), which applies to chief executive officers and chief financial officers of public banking organizations, is an example of this more specific type of “clawback” requirement.

14. Performance targets may have a material effect on risk-taking incentives. Such targets may offer employees greater rewards for increments of performance that are above the target or may provide that awards will be granted only if a target is met or exceeded. Employees may be particularly motivated to take imprudent risk in order to reach performance targets that are aggressive, but potentially achievable.
or products, or certain risks such as reputational or operational risk that may be difficult to measure with respect to particular activities, especially if such risks are likely to be realized during the deferral period. Accordingly, in some cases two or more methods may be needed in combination for an incentive compensation arrangement to be balanced.

The greater the potential incentives an arrangement creates for an employee to increase the risks associated with the employee’s activities, the stronger the effect should be of the methods applied to achieve balance. Thus, for example, risk adjustments used to counteract a materially unbalanced compensation arrangement should have a similarly material impact on the incentive compensation paid under the arrangement. Further, improvements in the quality and reliability of performance measures themselves, for example improving the reliability and accuracy of estimates of revenues and profits upon which performance measures depend, can significantly improve the degree of balance in risk-taking incentives.

Where judgment plays a significant role in the design or operation of an incentive compensation arrangement, strong policies and procedures, internal controls, and ex post monitoring of incentive compensation payments relative to actual risk outcomes are particularly important to help ensure that the arrangements as implemented are balanced and do not encourage imprudent risk-taking. For example, if a banking organization relies on the judgment of one or more managers to ensure that the incentive compensation awards to employees are appropriately risk-adjusted, the organization should have policies and procedures that describe how managers are expected to exercise that judgment to achieve balance and that provide for the manager(s) to receive appropriate available information about the employee’s risk-taking activities to make informed judgments.

Large complex banking organizations. Methods and practices for making compensation sensitive to risk are likely to evolve rapidly during the next few years, driven in part by the efforts of supervisors and other stakeholders. LCBOs should actively monitor developments in the field and should incorporate into their incentive compensation systems new or emerging methods or practices that are likely to improve the organization’s long-term financial well-being and safety and soundness.

- The manner in which a banking organization seeks to achieve balanced incentive compensation arrangements should be tailored to account for the differences between employees—including the substantial differences between senior executives and other employees—as well as between banking organizations.

Activities and risks may vary significantly both across banking organizations and across employees within a particular banking organization. For example, activities, risks, and incentive compensation practices may differ materially among banking organizations based on, among other things, the scope or complexity of activities conducted and the business strategies pursued by the organizations. These differences mean that methods for achieving balanced compensation arrangements at one organization may not be effective in restraining incentives to engage in imprudent risk-taking at another organization. Each organization is responsible for ensuring that its incentive compensation arrangements are consistent with the safety and soundness of the organization.

Moreover, the risks associated with the activities of one group of non-executive employees (e.g., loan originators) within a banking organization may differ significantly from those of another group of non-executive employees (e.g., spot foreign exchange traders) within the organization. In addition, reliable quantitative measures of risk and risk outcomes are unlikely to be available for a banking organization as a whole, particularly a large, complex organization. This factor can make it difficult for banking organizations to achieve balanced compensation arrangements for senior executives who have responsibility for managing risks on an organization-wide basis solely through use of the risk-adjustment-of-award method.

Furthermore, the payment of deferred incentive compensation in equity (such as restricted stock of the organization) or equity-based instruments (such as options to acquire the organization’s stock) may be helpful in restraining the risk-taking incentives of senior executives and other covered employees whose activities may have a material effect on the overall financial performance of the organization. However, equity-related deferred compensation may not be as effective in restraining the incentives of lower-level covered employees (particularly at large organizations) to take risks because such employees are unlikely to believe that their
actions will materially affect the organization’s stock price.

Banking organizations should take account of these differences when constructing balanced compensation arrangements. For most banking organizations, the use of a single, formulaic approach to making employee incentive compensation arrangements appropriately risk-sensitive is likely to result in arrangements that are unbalanced at least with respect to some employees.15

Large complex banking organizations. Incentive compensation arrangements for senior executives at LCBOs are likely to be better balanced if they involve deferral of a substantial portion of the executives’ incentive compensation over a multi-year period in a way that reduces the amount received in the event of poor performance, substantial use of multi-year performance periods, or both. Similarly, the compensation arrangements for senior executives at LCBOs are likely to be better balanced if a significant portion of the incentive compensation of these executives is paid in the form of equity-based instruments that vest over multiple years, with the number of instruments ultimately received dependent on the performance of the organization during the deferral period.

The portion of the incentive compensation of other covered employees that is deferred or paid in the form of equity-based instruments should appropriately take into account the level, nature, and duration of the risks that the employees’ activities create for the organization and the extent to which those activities may materially affect the overall performance of the organization and its stock price. Deferral of a substantial portion of an employee’s incentive compensation may not be workable for employees at lower pay scales because of their more limited financial resources. This may require increased reliance on other measures in the incentive compensation arrangements for these employees to achieve balance.

- Banking organizations should carefully consider the potential for “golden parachutes” and the vesting arrangements for deferred compensation to affect the risk-taking behavior of employees while at the organizations.

Arrangements that provide for an employee (typically a senior executive), upon departure from the organization or a change in control of the organization, to receive large additional payments or the accelerated payment of deferred amounts without regard to risk or risk outcomes can provide the employee significant incentives to expose the organization to undue risk. For example, an arrangement that provides an employee with a guaranteed payout upon departure from an organization, regardless of performance, may neutralize the effect of any balancing features included in the arrangement to help prevent imprudent risk-taking.

Banking organizations should carefully review any such existing or proposed arrangements (sometimes called “golden parachutes”) and the potential impact of such arrangements on the organization’s safety and soundness. In appropriate circumstances an organization should consider including balancing features—such as risk adjustment or deferral requirements that extend past the employee’s departure—in the arrangements to mitigate the potential for the arrangements to encourage imprudent risk-taking. In all cases, a banking organization should ensure that the structure and terms of any golden parachute arrangement entered into by the organization do not encourage imprudent risk-taking in light of the other features of the employee’s incentive compensation arrangements.

Large complex banking organizations. Provisions that require a departing employee to forfeit deferred incentive compensation payments may weaken the effectiveness of the deferral arrangement if the departing employee is able to negotiate a “golden handshake” arrangement with the new employer.16 This weakening effect can be particularly significant for senior executives or other skilled employees at LCBOs whose services are in high demand within the market.

Golden handshake arrangements present special issues for LCBOs and supervisors. For example, while a banking organization could adjust its deferral arrangements so that departing employees will continue to receive any accrued deferred compensation after departure

---

15. For example, spreading payouts of incentive compensation awards over a standard three-year period may not appropriately reflect the differences in the type and time horizon of risk associated with the activities of different groups of employees, and may not be sufficient by itself to balance the compensation arrangements of employees who may expose the organization to substantial longer-term risks.

16. Golden handshakes are arrangements that compensate an employee for some or all of the estimated, non-adjusted value of deferred incentive compensation that would have been forfeited upon departure from the employee’s previous employment.
(subject to any clawback or malus\textsuperscript{17}), these changes could reduce the employee’s incentive to remain at the organization and, thus, weaken an organization’s ability to retain qualified talent, which is an important goal of compensation, and create conflicts of interest. Moreover, actions of the hiring organization (which may or may not be a supervised banking organization) ultimately may defeat these or other risk-balancing aspects of a banking organization’s deferral arrangements. LCBOs should monitor whether golden handshake arrangements are materially weakening the organization’s efforts to constrain the risk-taking incentives of employees. The Federal Reserve will continue to work with banking organizations and others to develop appropriate methods for addressing any effect that such arrangements may have on the safety and soundness of banking organizations.

- Banking organizations should effectively communicate to employees the ways in which incentive compensation awards and payments will be reduced as risks increase.

In order for the risk-sensitive provisions of incentive compensation arrangements to affect employee risk-taking behavior, the organization’s employees need to understand that the amount of incentive compensation that they may receive will vary based on the risk associated with their activities. Accordingly, banking organizations should ensure that employees covered by an incentive compensation arrangement are informed about the key ways in which risks are taken into account in determining the amount of incentive compensation paid. Where feasible, an organization’s communications with employees should include examples of how incentive compensation payments may be adjusted to reflect projected or actual risk outcomes. An organization’s communications should be tailored appropriately to reflect the sophistication of the relevant audience(s).

\textsuperscript{17} A malus arrangement permits the employer to prevent vesting of all or part of the amount of a deferred remuneration award. Malus provisions are invoked when risk outcomes are worse than expected or when the information upon which the award was based turns out to have been incorrect. Loss of unvested compensation due to the employee voluntarily leaving the firm is not an example of malus as the term is used in this guidance.

2068.0.2.2 Principle 2: Compatibility with Effective Controls and Risk-Management

A banking organization’s risk-management processes and internal controls should reinforce and support the development and maintenance of balanced incentive compensation arrangements.

In order to increase their own compensation, employees may seek to evade the processes established by a banking organization to achieve balanced compensation arrangements. Similarly, an employee covered by an incentive compensation arrangement may seek to influence, in ways designed to increase the employee’s pay, the risk measures or other information or judgments that are used to make the employee’s pay sensitive to risk.

Such actions may significantly weaken the effectiveness of an organization’s incentive compensation arrangements in restricting imprudent risk-taking. These actions can have a particularly damaging effect on the safety and soundness of the organization if they result in the weakening of risk measures, information, or judgments that the organization uses for other risk-management, internal control, or financial purposes. In such cases, the employee’s actions may weaken not only the balance of the organization’s incentive compensation arrangements, but also the risk-management, internal controls, and other functions that are supposed to act as a separate check on risk-taking. For this reason, traditional risk-management controls alone do not eliminate the need to identify employees who may expose the organization to material risk, nor do they obviate the need for the incentive compensation arrangements for these employees to be balanced. Rather, a banking organization’s risk-management processes and internal controls should reinforce and support the development and maintenance of balanced incentive compensation arrangements.

- Banking organizations should have appropriate controls to ensure that their processes for achieving balanced compensation arrangements are followed and to maintain the integrity of their risk-management and other functions.

To help prevent damage from occurring, a banking organization should have strong con-
controls governing its process for designing, implementing, and monitoring incentive compensation arrangements. Banking organizations should create and maintain sufficient documentation to permit an audit of the effectiveness of the organization’s processes for establishing, modifying, and monitoring incentive compensation arrangements. Smaller banking organizations should incorporate reviews of these processes into their overall framework for compliance monitoring (including internal audit).

Large complex banking organizations. LCBOs should have and maintain policies and procedures that (1) identify and describe the role(s) of the personnel, business units, and control units authorized to be involved in the design, implementation, and monitoring of incentive compensation arrangements; (2) identify the source of significant risk-related inputs into these processes and establish appropriate controls governing the development and approval of these inputs to help ensure their integrity; and (3) identify the individual(s) and control unit(s) whose approval is necessary for the establishment of new incentive compensation arrangements or modification of existing arrangements.

An LCBO also should conduct regular internal reviews to ensure that its processes for achieving and maintaining balanced incentive compensation arrangements are consistently followed. Such reviews should be conducted by audit, compliance, or other personnel in a manner consistent with the organization’s overall framework for compliance monitoring. An LCBO’s internal audit department also should separately conduct regular audits of the organization’s compliance with its established policies and controls relating to incentive compensation arrangements. The results should be reported to appropriate levels of management and, where appropriate, the organization’s board of directors.

- Appropriate personnel, including risk-management personnel, should have input into the organization’s processes for designing incentive compensation arrangements and assessing their effectiveness in restraining imprudent risk-taking.

Developing incentive compensation arrangements that provide balanced risk-taking incentives and monitoring arrangements to ensure they achieve balance over time requires an understanding of the risks (including compliance risks) and potential risk outcomes associated with the activities of the relevant employees. Accordingly, banking organizations should have policies and procedures that ensure that risk-management personnel have an appropriate role in the organization’s processes for designing incentive compensation arrangements and for assessing their effectiveness in restraining imprudent risk-taking.18 Ways that risk managers might assist in achieving balanced compensation arrangements include, but are not limited to:

1. reviewing the types of risks associated with the activities of covered employees;
2. approving the risk measures used in risk adjustments and performance measures, as well as measures of risk outcomes used in deferred-payout arrangements; and
3. analyzing risk-taking and risk outcomes relative to incentive compensation payments.

Other functions within an organization, such as its control, human resources, or finance functions, also play an important role in helping ensure that incentive compensation arrangements are balanced. For example, these functions may contribute to the design and review of performance measures used in compensation arrangements or may supply data used as part of these measures.

Compensation for employees in risk-management and control functions should be sufficient to attract and retain qualified personnel and should avoid conflicts of interest.

The risk-management and control personnel involved in the design, oversight, and operation of incentive compensation arrangements should have appropriate skills and experience needed to effectively fulfill their roles. These skills and experiences should be sufficient to equip the personnel to remain effective in the face of challenges by covered employees seeking to increase their incentive compensation in ways that are inconsistent with sound risk-management or internal controls. The compensation arrangements for employees in risk-management and control functions thus should be sufficient to attract and retain qualified personnel.

---

18. Involvement of risk-management personnel in the design and monitoring of these arrangements also should help ensure that the organization’s risk-management functions can properly understand and address the full range of risks facing the organization.
sonnel with experience and expertise in these fields that is appropriate in light of the size, activities, and complexity of the organization.

In addition, to help preserve the independence of their perspectives, the incentive compensation received by risk-management and control personnel staff should not be based substantially on the financial performance of the business units that they review. Rather, the performance measures used in the incentive compensation arrangements for these personnel should be based primarily on the achievement of the objectives of their functions (e.g., adherence to internal controls).

- Banking organizations should monitor the performance of their incentive compensation arrangements and should revise the arrangements as needed if payments do not appropriately reflect risk.

Banking organizations should monitor incentive compensation awards and payments, risks taken, and actual risk outcomes to determine whether incentive compensation payments to employees are reduced to reflect adverse risk outcomes or high levels of risk taken. Results should be reported to appropriate levels of management, including the board of directors where warranted and consistent with Principle 3 below. The monitoring methods and processes used by a banking organization should be commensurate with the size and complexity of the organization, as well as its use of incentive compensation. Thus, for example, a small, noncomplex organization that uses incentive compensation only to a limited extent may find that it can appropriately monitor its arrangements through normal management processes.

A banking organization should take the results of such monitoring into account in establishing or modifying incentive compensation arrangements and in overseeing associated controls. If, over time, incentive compensation paid by a banking organization does not appropriately reflect risk outcomes, the organization should review and revise its incentive compensation arrangements and related controls to ensure that the arrangements, as designed and implemented, are balanced and do not provide employees incentives to take imprudent risks.

2068.0.2.3 Principle 3: Strong Corporate Governance

Banking organizations should have strong and effective corporate governance to help ensure sound compensation practices, including active and effective oversight by the board of directors.

Given the key role of senior executives in managing the overall risk-taking activities of an organization, the board of directors of a banking organization should directly approve the incentive compensation arrangements for senior executives. The board also should approve and document any material exceptions or adjustments to the incentive compensation arrangements established for senior executives and should carefully consider and monitor the effects of any approved exceptions or adjustments on the balance of the arrangement, the risk-taking incentives of the senior executive, and the safety and soundness of the organization.

The board of directors of an organization also is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the organization’s incentive compensation arrangements for all covered employees are appropriately balanced and do not jeopardize the safety and soundness of the organization. The involvement of the board of directors in oversight of the organization’s overall incentive compensation program should be scaled appropriately to the scope and prevalence of the organization’s incentive compensation arrangements.

Large complex banking organizations and organizations that are significant users of incentive compensation. The board of directors of an LCBO or other banking organization that uses incentive compensation to a significant extent should actively oversee the development and operation of the organization’s incentive compensation policies, systems, and related control processes. The board of directors of such an organization should review and approve the overall goals and purposes of the organization’s incentive compensation system. In addition, the board should provide clear direction to management to ensure that the goals and policies it establishes are carried out in a manner that

19. As used in this guidance, the term “board of directors” is used to refer to the members of the board of directors who have primary responsibility for overseeing the incentive compensation system. Depending on the manner in which the board is organized, the term may refer to the entire board of directors, a compensation committee of the board, or another committee of the board that has primary responsibility for overseeing the incentive compensation system. In the case of FBOs, the term refers to the relevant oversight body for the firm’s U.S. operations, consistent with the FBO’s overall corporate and management structure.
achieves balance and is consistent with safety and soundness.

The board of directors of such an organization also should ensure that steps are taken so that the incentive compensation system—including performance measures and targets—is designed and operated in a manner that will achieve balance.

- The board of directors should monitor the performance, and regularly review the design and function, of incentive compensation arrangements.

To allow for informed reviews, the board should receive data and analysis from management or other sources that are sufficient to allow the board to assess whether the overall design and performance of the organization’s incentive compensation arrangements are consistent with the organization’s safety and soundness. These reviews and reports should be appropriately scoped to reflect the size and complexity of the banking organization’s activities and the prevalence and scope of its incentive compensation arrangements.

The board of directors of a banking organization should closely monitor incentive compensation payments to senior executives and the sensitivity of those payments to risk outcomes. In addition, if the compensation arrangement for a senior executive includes a clawback provision, then the review should include sufficient information to determine if the provision has been triggered and executed as planned.

The board of directors of a banking organization should seek to stay abreast of significant emerging changes in compensation plan mechanisms and incentives in the marketplace as well as developments in academic research and regulatory advice regarding incentive compensation policies. However, the board should recognize that organizations, activities, and practices within the industry are not identical. Incentive compensation arrangements at one organization may not be suitable for use at another organization because of differences in the risks, controls, structure, and management among organizations. The board of directors of each organization is responsible for ensuring that the incentive compensation arrangements for its organization do not encourage employees to take risks that are beyond the organization’s ability to manage effectively, regardless of the practices employed by other organizations.

Large complex banking organizations and organizations that are significant users of incentive compensation. The board of an LCBO or other organization that uses incentive compensation to a significant extent should receive and review, on an annual or more frequent basis, an assessment by management, with appropriate input from risk-management personnel, of the effectiveness of the design and operation of the organization’s incentive compensation system in providing risk-taking incentives that are consistent with the organization’s safety and soundness. These reports should include an evaluation of whether or how incentive compensation practices may increase the potential for imprudent risk-taking.

The board of such an organization also should receive periodic reports that review incentive compensation awards and payments relative to risk outcomes on a backward-looking basis to determine whether the organization’s incentive compensation arrangements may be promoting imprudent risk-taking. Boards of directors of these organizations also should consider periodically obtaining and reviewing simulation analysis of compensation on a forward-looking basis based on a range of performance levels, risk outcomes, and the amount of risks taken.

- The organization, composition, and resources of the board of directors should permit effective oversight of incentive compensation.

The board of directors of a banking organization should have, or have access to, a level of expertise and experience in risk-management and compensation practices in the financial services industry that is appropriate for the nature, scope, and complexity of the organization’s activities. This level of expertise may be present collectively among the members of the board, may come from formal training or from experience in addressing these issues, including as a director, or may be obtained through advice received from outside counsel, consultants, or other experts with expertise in incentive compensation and risk-management. The board of directors of an organization with less complex and extensive incentive compensation arrangements may not find it necessary or appropriate to require special board expertise or to retain and use outside experts in this area.

In selecting and using outside parties, the board of directors should give due attention to potential conflicts of interest arising from other dealings of the parties with the organization or for other reasons. The board also should exercise caution to avoid allowing outside parties to
obtain undue levels of influence. While the retention and use of outside parties may be helpful, the board retains ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the organization’s incentive compensation arrangements are consistent with safety and soundness.

Large complex banking organizations and organizations that are significant users of incentive compensation. If a separate compensation committee is not already in place or required by other authorities, the board of directors of an LCBO or other banking organization that uses incentive compensation to a significant extent should consider establishing such a committee—reporting to the full board—that has primary responsibility for overseeing the organization’s incentive compensation systems. A compensation committee should be composed solely or predominantly of non-executive directors. If the board does not have such a compensation committee, the board should take other steps to ensure that non-executive directors of the board are actively involved in the oversight of incentive compensation systems. The compensation committee should work closely with any board-level risk and audit committees where the substance of their actions overlap.

- A banking organization’s disclosure practices should support safe and sound incentive compensation arrangements.

If a banking organization’s incentive compensation arrangements provide employees incentives to take risks that are beyond the tolerance of the organization’s shareholders, these risks are likely to also present a risk to the safety and soundness of the organization. To help promote safety and soundness, a banking organization should provide an appropriate amount of information concerning its incentive compensation arrangements for executive and non-executive employees and related risk-management, control, and governance processes to shareholders to allow them to monitor and, where appropriate, take actions to restrain the potential for such arrangements and processes that encourage employees to take imprudent risks. Such disclosures should include information relevant to employees other than senior executives. The scope and level of the information disclosed by the organization should be tailored to the nature and complexity of the organization and its incentive compensation arrangements.

- Large complex banking organizations should follow a systematic approach to developing a compensation system that has balanced incentive compensation arrangements.

At banking organizations with large numbers of risk-taking employees engaged in diverse activities, an ad hoc approach to developing balanced arrangements is unlikely to be reliable. Thus, an LCBO should use a systematic approach—supported by robust and formalized policies, procedures, and systems—to ensure that those arrangements are appropriately balanced and consistent with safety and soundness. Such an approach should provide for the organization effectively to:

1. Identify employees who are eligible to receive incentive compensation and whose activities may expose the organization to material risks. These employees should include:
   a. senior executives and others who are responsible for oversight of the organization’s firm-wide activities or material business lines;
   b. individual employees, including non-executive employees, whose activities may expose the organization to material amounts of risk; and
   c. groups of employees who are subject to the same or similar incentive compensation arrangements and who, in the aggregate, may expose the organization to material amounts of risk;

2. Identify the types and time horizons of risks to the organization from the activities of these employees;

3. Assess the potential for the performance measures included in the incentive compensation arrangements for these employees to encourage the employees to take imprudent risks;

4. Include balancing elements, such as risk

21. On the other hand, as noted previously, compensation arrangements that are in the interests of the shareholders of a banking organization are not necessarily consistent with safety and soundness.

22. A banking organization also should comply with the incentive compensation disclosure requirements of the federal securities law and other laws as applicable. See, for example, Proxy Disclosure Enhancements, SEC Release Nos. 33-9089, 34-61175, 74 F.R. 68334 (Dec. 23, 2009) (to be codified at 17 C.F.R. 229 and 249).
adjustments or deferral periods, within the incentive compensation arrangements for these employees that are reasonably designed to ensure that the arrangement will be balanced in light of the size, type, and time horizon of the inherent risks of the employees’ activities;

5. Communicate to the employees the ways in which their incentive compensation awards or payments will be adjusted to reflect the risks of their activities to the organization; and

6. Monitor incentive compensation awards, payments, risks taken, and risk outcomes for these employees and modify the relevant arrangements if payments made are not appropriately sensitive to risk and risk outcomes.

2068.0.3 CONCLUSION ON SOUND INCENTIVE COMPENSATION

Banking organizations are responsible for ensuring that their incentive compensation arrangements do not encourage imprudent risk-taking behavior and are consistent with the safety and soundness of the organization. The Federal Reserve expects banking organizations to take prompt action to address deficiencies in their incentive compensation arrangements or related risk-management, control, and governance processes. The Federal Reserve intends to actively monitor the actions taken by banking organizations in this area and will promote further advances in designing and implementing balanced incentive compensation arrangements. Where appropriate, the Federal Reserve will take supervisory or enforcement action to ensure that material deficiencies that pose a threat to the safety and soundness of the organization are promptly addressed. The Federal Reserve also will update this guidance as appropriate to incorporate best practices as they develop over time.
WHAT’S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

Effective July 2014, this section is revised to include a June 13, 2014, interagency Addendum to the 1998 “Interagency Policy Statement on Income Tax Allocation in a Holding Company Structure” (Addendum). The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (Agencies) announced the issuance of the Addendum to ensure that insured depository institutions (IDIs) in a consolidated group maintain an appropriate relationship regarding the payment of taxes and treatment of tax refunds. The purpose of the Addendum is to ensure that tax allocation agreements expressly acknowledge an agency relationship between a holding company1 and its subsidiary IDI to protect the IDI’s ownership rights in tax refunds. State member banks and holding companies should implement the guidance as soon as reasonably possible, which the Agency expect would not be later than October 31, 2014. This Addendum clarifies and supplements but does not replace the 1998 Interagency Policy Statement. (Refer to SR-14-6.)

A holding company and its depository institution subsidiaries may generally file a consolidated group income tax return. For bank regulatory purposes, however, each depository institution is viewed as, and reports as, a separate legal and accounting entity. Each holding company subsidiary that participates in filing a consolidated tax return should record its tax expenses or tax benefits as though it had filed a tax return as a separate entity. The amount and timing of any intercompany payments or refunds to the subsidiary that result from its being a part of the consolidated return group should be no more favorable than if the subsidiary was a separate taxpayer. A consolidated return permits the parent’s and other subsidiaries’ taxable losses to be offset against other subsidiaries’ taxable income, with the parent most often providing the principal loss. This can be illustrated with the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent Only</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Non-bank A</th>
<th>Non-bank B</th>
<th>Consolidated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to consolidated net taxable income (loss):</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$(50)</td>
<td>$2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed tax rate</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax payment/ (benefit)</td>
<td>$(40)</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$(20)</td>
<td>$940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the parent, as the representative of the consolidated group to the Internal Revenue Service, would collect $800 from the bank subsidiary and $200 from Nonbank Subsidiary A, and pay $20 to Nonbank Subsidiary B. In return, the parent would remit to the tax authorities $940, resulting in a net cash retention of $40 by the parent.

Bank holding companies employ numerous methods to determine the amount of estimated payments to be received from their subsidiaries. Although the tax-accounting methods to be used by bank holding companies are not prescribed by the Federal Reserve System, the method employed must afford subsidiaries equitable treatment compared with filing separate returns. In general terms, tax transactions between any subsidiary and its parent should be conducted as though the subsidiary was dealing directly with state or federal taxing authorities.

The tax structure of holding companies becomes more complicated when deferred taxes are considered in the intercorporate tax settlements. Deferred taxes occur when taxable income, for financial reporting purposes, differs from taxable income as reported to the taxing authorities. This difference is due to timing differences between financial-statement income and tax income for loan-loss provisions and other items, such as foreign tax credits. In addition, differences result from the use of the cash basis of accounting for tax purposes, as opposed to the accrual basis of accounting used in financial reporting.

---

1. For the purpose of this guidance, the term, “holding company” refers to a bank holding company or a savings and loan holding company.

2. The issue becomes more complex because of GAAP-based tax expenses versus actual taxes paid under relevant tax laws (the difference between the two expenses is either a deferred tax liability or asset on the balance sheet). If the sharing agreement is based on the tax expense on the statement of income, more funds may be transferred to the paying agent than are required to settle the actual taxes owed.
cial reporting. The different bases are chosen by management.

An example of deferred income taxes follows, using an estimated tax rate of 40 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Reporting</th>
<th>Tax Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tax income</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently payable</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred portion</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deferred portion represents the tax effect of delaying the recognition of income or taking more of a deduction for tax-return purposes (40% x $50). This is a temporary difference since over the “life” of the holding company, income and deductions should theoretically equalize for both book and tax purposes.

Financial Accounting Standards Board Accounting Standards Codification 740-10 Statement No. 109 (FAS 109), “Accounting for Income Taxes,” provides guidance on many aspects of accounting for income taxes, including the accounting for deferred tax liabilities and assets. FAS 109 describes how a bank holding company should record (1) taxes payable or refundable for the current year and (2) deferred tax liabilities and assets for the future tax consequences of events that have been recognized in the banking organization’s financial statements or tax returns.

Generally, all bank and other holding companies file annual income tax returns. The holding company pays the entire amount of tax (that is, the amount still due after estimated tax payments) on or before the due date for filing, or it can elect to pay by the extension deadline if one is granted. Bank holding companies may receive extensions from taxing authorities to file their returns later. For the federal tax return, a six-month extension may be granted.

Bank holding companies have engaged in intercorporate income tax settlements that have the effect of transferring assets and income from a bank subsidiary to the parent company. The Board will apply appropriate supervisory remedies to situations that are considered inequitable or improper. These remedies may include, under certain circumstances, the Board’s cease-and-desist powers.

On occasion, bank holding companies have used deferred tax assets as a vehicle to transfer cash or other earning assets of subsidiaries, principally from the bank, into the parent company. The Board’s opinion is that each deferred tax asset or liability must remain on the books of the subsidiary. If deferred tax assets have been transferred to the parent, regardless of when the transfer may have occurred, immediate arrangements must be made to return the asset to the appropriate subsidiary. Instances of transferring deferred tax assets to the parent are worthy of inclusion in the Examiner’s Comments and Matters Requiring Special Board Attention section or page of the inspection report.

March 15 —Due date for income tax return for U.S. corporations or foreign corporations with offices in the United States. Last day for filing for the automatic six-month extension.

September 15 —Due date of return if six-month extensions were granted.

Bank holding companies have engaged in intercorporate income tax settlements that have the effect of transferring assets and income from a bank subsidiary to the parent company. The Board will apply appropriate supervisory remedies to situations that are considered inequitable or improper. These remedies may include, under certain circumstances, the Board’s cease-and-desist powers.

On occasion, bank holding companies have used deferred tax assets as a vehicle to transfer cash or other earning assets of subsidiaries, principally from the bank, into the parent company. The Board’s opinion is that each deferred tax asset or liability must remain on the books of the subsidiary. If deferred tax assets have been transferred to the parent, regardless of when the transfer may have occurred, immediate arrangements must be made to return the asset to the appropriate subsidiary. Instances of transferring deferred tax assets to the parent are worthy of inclusion in the Examiner’s Comments and Matters Requiring Special Board Attention section or page of the inspection report.

2070.0.1 INTERAGENCY POLICY STATEMENT ON INCOME TAX ALLOCATION IN A HOLDING COMPANY STRUCTURE

In 1998, the federal bank and savings association’s regulatory agencies (the agencies) issued the following policy statement to provide guidance to banking organizations and savings associations regarding the allocation and payment of taxes among a holding company and its subsidiaries. A holding company and its subsidiaries will often file a consolidated group income tax return. However, for bank regulatory purposes, each depository institution of the consolidated group is viewed as, and reports as, a separate legal and accounting entity. Accordingly, each depository institution’s applicable income taxes, reflecting either an expense or benefit, should be recorded as if the institution had filed as a
separate tax-paying entity.\(^3\) The amount and timing of payments or refunds should be no less favorable to a subsidiary than if it was a separate taxpayer. Any practice that is not consistent with this policy statement may be viewed as an unsafe and unsound practice prompting either informal or formal corrective action. See SR-98-38.

2070.0.1.1 Tax-Sharing Agreements

A holding company and its subsidiary institutions are encouraged to enter into a written comprehensive tax-allocation agreement tailored to their specific circumstances. The agreement should be approved by the respective boards of directors. Although each agreement will be different, tax-allocation agreements usually address certain issues common to consolidated groups.

Therefore, such an agreement should—

1. require a subsidiary depository institution to compute its income taxes (both current and deferred) on a separate-entity basis;
2. discuss the amount and timing of the institution’s payments for current tax expense, including estimated tax payments;
3. discuss reimbursements to an institution when it has a loss for tax purposes; and
4. prohibit the payment or other transfer of deferred taxes by the institution to another member of the consolidated group.

2070.0.1.2 Measurement of Current and Deferred Income Taxes

Generally accepted accounting principles, instructions for the preparation of the federally supervised bank Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income, and other guidance issued by the agencies require depository institutions to account for their current and deferred tax liability or benefit.

When the depository-institution members of a consolidated group prepare separate bank regulatory reports, each subsidiary institution should record current and deferred taxes as if it files its tax returns on a separate-entity basis, regardless of the consolidated group’s tax-paying or -refund status. Certain adjustments for statutory tax considerations that arise in a consolidated return, e.g., application of graduated tax rates, may be made to the separate-entity calculation as long as they are made on a consistent and equitable basis among the holding company affiliates.

In addition, when an organization’s consolidated income tax obligation arising from the alternative minimum tax (AMT) exceeds its regular tax on a consolidated basis, the excess should be consistently and equitably allocated among the members of the consolidated group. The allocation method should be based upon the portion of tax preferences, adjustments, and other items generated by each group member which causes the AMT to be applicable at the consolidated level.

2070.0.1.3 Tax Payments to the Parent Company

Tax payments from a subsidiary institution to the parent company should not exceed the amount the institution has properly recorded as its current tax expense on a separate-entity basis. Furthermore, such payments, including estimated tax payments, generally should not be made before the institution would have been obligated to pay the taxing authority had it filed as a separate entity. Payments made in advance may be considered extensions of credit from the subsidiary to the parent and may be subject to affiliate transaction rules, i.e., sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act.

A subsidiary institution should not pay its deferred tax liabilities or the deferred portion of its applicable income taxes to the parent. The deferred tax account is not a tax liability required to be paid in the current reporting period. As a result, the payment of deferred income taxes by an institution to its holding company is considered a dividend subject to dividend restrictions,\(^4\) not the extinguishment of a liability. Furthermore, such payments may constitute an unsafe and unsound banking practice.

---

3. Throughout the policy statement, the terms “separate entity” and “separate taxpayer” are used synonymously. When a depository institution has subsidiaries of its own, the institution’s applicable income taxes on a separate-entity basis include the taxes of the subsidiaries of the institution that are included with the institution in the consolidated group return.

4. These restrictions include the prompt-corrective-action provisions of section 38(d)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831o(d)(1)) and its implementing regulations: for insured state nonmember banks, 12 CFR 325, subpart B; for national banks, 12 CFR section 6.6; for savings associations, 12 CFR 565; and for state member banks, 12 CFR 208.45.
2070.0.1.4 Tax Refunds from the Parent Company

An institution incurring a loss for tax purposes should record a current income tax benefit and receive a refund from its parent in an amount no less than the amount the institution would have been entitled to receive as a separate entity. The refund should be made to the institution within a reasonable period following the date the institution would have filed its own return, regardless of whether the consolidated group is receiving a refund. If a refund is not made to the institution within this period, the institution’s primary federal regulator may consider the receivable as an extension of credit or a dividend from the subsidiary to the parent. A parent company may reimburse an institution more than the refund amount it is due on a separate-entity basis. Provided the institution will not later be required to repay this excess amount to the parent, the additional funds received should be reported as a capital contribution.

If the institution, as a separate entity, would not be entitled to a current refund because it has no carry-back benefits available on a separate-entity basis, its holding company may still be able to utilize the institution’s tax loss to reduce the consolidated group’s current tax liability. In this situation, the holding company may reimburse the institution for the use of the tax loss. If the reimbursement will be made on a timely basis, the institution should reflect the tax benefit of the loss in the current portion of its applicable income taxes in the period the loss is incurred. Otherwise, the institution should not recognize the tax benefit in the current portion of its applicable income taxes in the loss year. Rather, the tax loss represents a loss carry-forward, the benefit of which is recognized as a deferred tax asset, net of any valuation allowance.

Regardless of the treatment of an institution’s tax loss for regulatory reporting and supervisory purposes, a parent company that receives a tax refund from a taxing authority obtains these funds as agent for the consolidated group on behalf of the group members. Accordingly, an organization’s tax-allocation agreement or other corporate policies should not purport to characterize refunds attributable to a subsidiary depositary institution that the parent receives from a taxing authority as the property of the parent.

5. See 26 CFR 1.1502-77(a).

2070.0.1.5 Income-Tax-Forgiveness Transactions

A parent company may require a subsidiary institution to pay it less than the full amount of the current income tax liability that the institution calculated on a separate-entity basis. Provided the parent will not later require the institution to pay the remainder of the current tax liability, the amount of this unremit liability should be accounted for as having been paid with a simultaneous capital contribution by the parent to the subsidiary.

In contrast, a parent cannot make a capital contribution to a subsidiary institution by “forgiving” some or all of the subsidiary’s deferred tax liability. Transactions in which a parent “forgives” any portion of a subsidiary institution’s deferred tax liability should not be reflected in the institution’s regulatory reports. These transactions lack economic substance because each member of the consolidated group is jointly and severally liable for the group’s potential future obligation to the taxing authorities. Although the subsidiaries have no direct obligation to remit tax payments to the taxing authorities, these authorities can collect some or all of a group liability from any of the group members if tax payments are not made when due.

2070.0.1.6 Appendix — 2014 Addendum to 1998 Interagency Policy Statement on Income Tax Allocation in a Holding Company Structure

Since the issuance of the 1998 Interagency Policy Statement, courts have reached varying conclusions regarding whether tax allocation agreements create a debtor-creditor relationship between a holding company and its IDI. Some courts have found that the tax refunds in question were the property of the holding company in bankruptcy (rather than property of the subsidiary IDI) and held by the holding company as

the IDI’s debtor.\footnote{7}{See e.g., F.D.I.C. v. Siegel (In re IndyMac Bancorp, Inc.), 470 F.3d 861, 2007 WL 1424626 (9th Cir. Apr. 23, 2007) (per curiam).}

On June 13, 2014, an Addendum to the 1998 Interagency Policy Statement (Addendum) was issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (Agencies). It explains that Consolidated Groups should review their tax allocation agreements to ensure the agreements achieve the objectives of the Interagency Policy Statement. This Addendum also clarifies how certain of the requirements of sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act (FRA) apply to tax allocation agreements between IDIs and their affiliates.

In reviewing their tax allocation agreements, Consolidated Groups should ensure the agreements: (1) clearly acknowledge that an agency relationship exists between the holding company and its subsidiary IDIs with respect to tax refunds, and (2) do not contain other language to suggest a contrary intent.\footnote{8}{This Addendum clarifies and supplements but does not replace the Interagency Policy Statement.} In addition, all Consolidated Groups should amend their tax allocation agreements to include the following paragraph or substantially similar language:

The [holding company] is an agent for the [IDI and its subsidiaries] (the “Institution”) with respect to all matters related to consolidated tax returns and refund claims, and nothing in this agreement shall be construed to alter or modify this agency relationship. If the [holding company] receives a tax refund from a taxing authority, these funds are obtained as agent for the Institution. Any tax refund attributable to income earned, taxes paid, and losses incurred by the Institution is the property of and owned by the Institution, and shall be held in trust for the benefit of the Institution. Nothing in this agreement is intended to be or should be construed to provide the [holding company] with an ownership interest in a tax refund that is attributable to income earned, taxes paid, and losses incurred by the Institution. The [holding company] shall forward promptly the amounts held in trust to the Institution. Nothing in this agreement is intended to be or should be construed to provide the [holding company] with an ownership interest in a tax refund that is attributable to income earned, taxes paid, and losses incurred by the Institution. The [holding company] hereby agrees that this tax sharing agreement does not give it an ownership interest in a tax refund generated by the tax attributes of the Institution.

Going forward, the Agencies generally will deem tax allocation agreements that contain this or similar language to acknowledge that an agency relationship exists for purposes of the Interagency Policy Statement, this Addendum, and sections 23A and 23B of the FRA.

All tax allocation agreements are subject to the requirements of section 23B of the FRA, and tax allocation agreements that do not clearly acknowledge that an agency relationship exists may be subject to additional requirements under section 23A of the FRA.\footnote{9}{Section 23A requires, among other things, that loans and extensions of credit from a bank to its affiliates be properly collateralized. 12 U.S.C. 371c(c).} In general, section 23B requires affiliate transactions to be made on terms and under circumstances that are substantially the same, or at least as favorable to the IDI as comparable transactions involving non-affiliated companies or, in the absence of comparable transactions, on terms and circumstances that would in good faith be offered to non-affiliated companies.\footnote{10}{12 U.S.C. 371c-1(a). Transactions subject to section 23B include the payment of money by a bank to an affiliate under contract, lease, or otherwise and transactions in which the affiliate acts as agent of the bank. Id. at § 371c-1(a)(2) & (a)(4).} Tax allocation agreements should require the holding company to forward promptly any payment due the IDI under the tax allocation agreement and specify the timing of such payment. Agreements that allow a holding company to hold and not promptly transmit tax refunds received from the taxing authority and owed to an IDI are inconsistent with the requirements of section 23B and subject to supervisory action. However, an Agency’s determination of whether such provision, or the tax allocation agreement in total, is consistent with section 23B will be based on the facts and circumstances of the particular tax allocation agreement and any associated refund.


2070.0.2 Qualifying Subchapter S Corporations

The Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996 made changes to the Internal Revenue Code (the
code). On October 29, 1996, the FFIEC issued a bulletin notifying all federally insured banks and thrifts of the impact of these changes. Thrift organizations may qualify for Subchapter S corporation status under the code’s revisions and could generally receive pass-through tax treatment for federal income tax purposes if certain criteria are met.

The bulletin states that no formal application is required to be filed with the federal bank and thrift regulatory agencies merely as a result of an election by a bank, thrift, or parent holding company to become a Subchapter S corporation. However, if an institution takes certain steps to meet the criteria to qualify for this tax status, particularly the code’s limitations on the number and types of shareholders, applications or notices to the agencies may be required.

The FFIEC bulletin also states that any distributions made by the Subchapter S banking organization to its shareholders, including distributions intended to cover shareholders’ personal tax liabilities for their shares of the income of the institution, will continue to be regarded as dividends and subject to any limitations under relevant banking law. See SR-96-28.

2070.0.3 Inspection Objectives

1. To determine whether the supervisory and accounting guidance set forth in ASC 740-10 (FASB 109), other tax-accounting standards, and the 1998 interagency policy statement on income tax allocation has been appropriately, equitably, and consistently applied.

2. To verify that the parent’s intercorporate tax policy contains a provision requiring the subsidiaries to receive an appropriate refund from the parent when they incur a loss, and that such a refund would have been receivable from the tax authorities if the subsidiary was filing a separate return.

3. To ascertain that tax payments and tax refunds between financial institution subsidiaries and the parent company have been limited to no more than what the institution might have paid to or received from the tax authorities, if it had filed its tax returns on a timely, separate-entity basis.12

4. To determine that no deferred tax liability, corresponding asset, or the deferred portion of its applicable income taxes has been transferred from a bank subsidiary to the parent company.

5. To verify that there has been proper accountability for tax-forgiveness transactions between the parent company and its financial institution subsidiaries.

6. To substantiate that corporate practices are consistent with corporate policies.

2070.0.4 Inspection Procedures

1. Obtain and discuss with the holding company’s management its intercorporate income tax policies and tax-sharing agreements. Obtain and retain a copy of the intercorporate tax policies and agreements in the workpaper files. Review the written intercorporate tax-settlement policy and ascertain that it includes the following:
   a. a description of the method(s) used in determining the amount of estimated taxes paid by each subsidiary to the parent
   b. an indication of when payments are to be made
   c. a statement that deferred taxes are maintained on the affiliate’s general ledger
   d. procedures for handling tax claims and refunds

Holding companies of depository institutions should also have written tax-sharing agreements with their subsidiaries that specify intercorporate tax-settlement policies. The Board encourages these holding companies to develop such agreements. For tax-sharing agreements, the following inspection procedures should be followed:
   a. Determine whether each subsidiary is required to compute its income taxes (current and deferred) on a separate-entity basis.
   b. Ascertain if the amount and timing of payments for current tax expense, including estimated tax payments, are discussed.
   c. Determine if reimbursements are discussed when an institution has a loss for tax purposes.
   d. Determine if there is a prohibition on the payment or other transfer of deferred taxes by an institution to another member of the consolidated group.

---

11. Subchapter S corporations are corporations that elect to pass corporate income tax losses, deductions, and credit through to their shareholders for federal income tax purposes.
12. The term “separate-entity basis” recognizes that certain adjustments, in particular tax elections in a consolidated return, may, in certain periods, result in higher payments by the depository institution than would have been made if the depository institution was unaffiliated.
2. Review briefly the parent’s intercompany transaction report; general ledger income tax accounts; cash receipts and disbursements; and, if necessary, tax-return workpapers and other pertinent corporate documents.
   a. Ascertain that the taxes collected by the parent company from each depository institution subsidiary do not exceed the amount that would have been paid if a separate return had been filed.
   b. When depository institution subsidiaries are making their tax payments directly to the taxing authorities, determine whether other subsidiaries are paying their proportionate share.

3. Review the separate regulatory reports for depository institution members of the holding company that are included in the filing of a consolidated tax return.
   a. Verify that each subsidiary institution is recording current and deferred taxes as if it was filing its own tax returns on a separate-entity basis.
   b. Ascertain that any adjustments for statutory tax considerations, arising from filing a consolidated return, are also made to the separate-entity calculations consistently and equitably among the holding company affiliates.

4. Determine if any excess amounts (tax benefits), resulting from the filing of a consolidated return, are consistently and equitably allocated among the members of the consolidated group.

5. Review the tax payments that are made from the bank and the nonbank subsidiaries to the parent company.
   a. Determine that payments, including estimated payments that are being requested, do not significantly precede the time that a consolidated or estimated current tax liability would be due and payable by the parent to the tax authorities.
   b. Verify with management that the tax payments to the parent company were not in excess of the amounts recorded by its depository institution subsidiaries as current tax expense on a separate-entity basis.
   c. Determine that subsidiary institutions are not paying their deferred tax liabilities on the deferred portions of their applicable income taxes to the parent company.
   d. Ascertain that the parent company is not deriving tax monies from depository institution subsidiaries that are used for other operating needs.

6. When a subsidiary incurs a loss, review the tax system to determine that bank and nonbank subsidiaries are receiving an appropriate refund from the parent company, that is, an amount that is no less than what would have been received if the tax return had been filed on a separate-entity basis.
   a. Verify that refunds are received no later than the date the institutions would have filed their own returns and that no refund is characterized as the parent company’s property.
   b. If the parent company does not require a subsidiary to pay its full amount of current tax liability, and the parent will not later require the institution to pay the remainder of the current tax liability, ascertain that the amount of the tax liability is recorded as having been paid and that the corresponding credit is recorded as a capital contribution from the parent to the subsidiary.

7. Determine that the deferred tax accounts of each bank subsidiary are maintained on its books and that they are not transferred to the parent organization.

8. Determine if the Internal Revenue Service or other tax authorities have assessed any additional tax payments on the consolidated group, and whether the holding company has provided an additional reserve to cover the assessment.

9. Complete the Other Supervisory Issues page or section of the Report of Bank Holding Company Inspection (FR 1225 or FR 1241).
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1. 12 U.S.C., unless specifically stated otherwise.  
2. 12 C.F.R., unless specifically stated otherwise.  
The purpose of this Section is to discuss the types of funding ordinarily found in holding companies and to analyze their respective characteristics. It is not intended that this section include an analysis of the inter-relationships of these factors because that will be addressed in the various subsections of Section 4000 of the Manual.

The three major types of funding are short-term debt, long-term debt and equity. The ideal “hypothetical” holding company balance sheet would reflect sufficient equity to fund total bank and nonbank capital needs.

The complexity of the debt and/or equity financing will depend greatly upon the size and financial status of the holding company as well as the access to certain capital markets. The small holding company will be limited in the type and/or sophistication of financing instruments available for its use, and probably would look to local sources for its debt and equity needs. This would include sale of equity and debt instruments to owners of the holding company. The medium-sized holding company has access to public markets through investment bankers and occasionally may issue its own corporate notes in the commercial paper market. The large holding company has a wide range of choices depending upon its financial condition and the economic climate at the time of any offering. It also has the ability to place debt privately as an alternate to dealing with public markets. In summary, the type of financing needed by a holding company will vary with the size and nature of its banking and nonbanking operations. The following subsections address those issues.
WHAT'S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

Effective July 2010, this section was revised to include a cross reference to section 4066.0 of this manual, which provides the March 17, 2010, interagency policy statement on ‘Funding and Liquidity Risk Management.’

A key principle underlying the Federal Reserve’s supervision of bank holding companies (BHCs) is that such companies should be operated in a way that promotes the soundness of their subsidiary banks. Holding companies are expected to avoid funding strategies or practices that could undermine public confidence in the liquidity or stability of their banks. Consequently, BHCs should develop and maintain funding programs that are consistent with their lending and investment activities and that provide adequate liquidity to the parent company and its nonbank subsidiaries.

For more information regarding the Federal Reserve’s supervisory expectations on liquidity risk management for BHCs, see section 4066.0, “Consolidated (Funding and Liquidity Risk Management).” This section provides the March 17, 2010, interagency policy statement on “Funding and Liquidity Risk Management.” (see also SR-10-6 and its attachment.)

2080.05.1 FUNDING AND LIQUIDITY

A principal objective of a parent BHC’s funding strategy should be to support capital investments in subsidiaries and long-term assets with capital and long-term sources of funds. Long-term or permanent financing not only reduces funding and liquidity risks, but also provides an organization with investors and lenders that have a long-run commitment to its viability. Long-term financing may take the form of term loans, long-term debt securities, convertible debentures, subordinated debt, and equity.

In general, liquidity can be measured by the ability of an organization to meet its maturing obligations, convert assets into cash with minimal loss, obtain cash from other sources, or roll over or issue new debt obligations. A major determinant of a BHC’s liquidity position is the level of liquid assets available to support maturing liabilities. The use of short-term debt, including commercial paper, to fund long-term assets can result in unsafe and unsound banking conditions, especially if a BHC does not have alternative sources of liquidity or other reliable means to refinance or redeem its obligations. In addition, commercial paper proceeds should not be used to fund corporate dividends or pay current expenses. Funding mismatches can exacerbate an otherwise manageable period of financial stress or, in the extreme, undermine public confidence in an organization’s viability.

This objective can best be achieved by limiting the use of short-term debt to fund assets that can be readily converted to cash without undue loss. It should be emphasized, however, that the simple matching of the maturity of short-term debt with the stated or nominal maturity of assets does not, by itself, adequately ensure an organization’s ability to retire its short-term obligations if the condition of the underlying assets precludes their timely sale or liquidation. In this regard, it is particularly important that parent company advances to subsidiaries be considered a reliable source of liquidity only to the extent that they fund assets of high quality that can readily be converted to cash. Consequently, effective procedures to monitor and ensure on an ongoing basis the quality and liquidity of the assets being funded by short-term debt are critical elements of a holding company’s overall funding program.

BHCs should establish and maintain reliable funding and contingency plans to meet ongoing liquidity needs and to address any unexpected funding mismatches that could develop over time. Such plans could include reduced reliance on short-term purchased funds, greater use of longer-term financing, appropriate internal limitations on parent company funding of long-term assets, and reliable alternate sources of liquidity. It is particularly important that BHCs have reliable plans or backup facilities to refinance or redeem their short-term debt obligations in the event assets being funded by these obligations cannot be liquidated in a timely manner when the debt must be repaid. In this connection,
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holding companies relying on backup lines of credit for contingency plan purposes should seek to arrange standby facilities that will be reliable during times of financial stress, rather than facilities that contain clauses which may relieve the lender of the obligation to fund the borrower in the event of a deterioration in the borrower’s financial condition.

In developing and carrying out funding programs, BHCs should avoid overreliance or excessive dependence on any single short-term or potentially volatile source of funds, such as commercial paper, or any single maturity range. Prudent internal liquidity policies and practices should include specifying limits for, and monitoring the degree of reliance on, particular maturity ranges and types of short-term funding. Special attention should be given to the use of overnight money since a loss of confidence in the issuing organization could lead to an immediate funding problem. BHCs issuing overnight liabilities should maintain, on an ongoing basis, a cushion of superior quality assets that can be immediately liquidated or converted to cash with minimal loss. The absence of such a cushion or a clear ability to redeem overnight liabilities when they become due should generally be viewed as an unsafe and unsound banking practice.

2080.05.2 ADDITIONAL SUPERVISORY CONSIDERATIONS

BHCs and their nonbank affiliates should maintain sufficient liquidity and capital strength to provide assurance that outstanding debt obligations issued to finance the activities of these entities can be serviced and repaid without adversely affecting the condition of the affiliated bank(s). In this regard, BHCs should maintain strong capital positions to enable them to withstand potential losses that might be incurred in the sale of assets to retire holding company debt obligations. It is particularly important that a BHC not allow its liquidity and funding policies or practices to undermine its ability to act as a source of strength to its affiliated bank(s).

The principles and guidelines outlined above constitute prudent financial practices for BHCs and most businesses in general. Holding company boards of directors should periodically assure themselves that funding plans, policies, and practices are prudent in light of their organizations’ overall financial condition. Such plans and policies should be consistent with the principles outlined above, including the need for appropriate internal limits on the level and type of short-term debt outstanding and the need for realistic and reliable contingency plans to meet any unanticipated runoff of short-term liabilities without adversely affecting affiliated banks.

2080.05.3 EXAMINER’S APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES IN EVALUATING LIQUIDITY AND INFORMULATING CORRECTIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

Reserve Bank examiners should be guided by these principles in evaluating liquidity and in formulating corrective action programs for BHCs that are experiencing earnings weaknesses or asset-quality problems, or that are otherwise subject to unusual liquidity pressures. In particular, BHCs with less than satisfactory supervisory ratings—composite (C) and the potential impact (I) of the parent company and nondepository entities—that is, 3 or worse), or any other holding companies subject to potentially serious liquidity or funding pressures, should be asked to prepare a realistic and specific action plan for reducing or redeeming entirely their outstanding short-term obligations without directly or indirectly undermining the condition of their affiliated bank(s). Such contingency plans should be reviewed and evaluated by Reserve Bank supervisory personnel during or subsequent to on-site inspections. Any deficiencies in the plan, if not addressed by management, should be brought to the attention of the organization’s board of directors. If the liquidity or funding position of such a company appears likely to worsen significantly, or if the company’s financial condition worsens to a sufficient degree, the company should be expected to implement, on a timely basis, its plan to curtail or eliminate its reliance on commercial paper or other volatile, short-term sources of funds. Any decisions or steps taken by Reserve Banks in this regard should be discussed and coordinated with Board staff.

Reference should also be made to other manual sections that address funding, cash flow, or liquidity (for example, 2010.1, 2080.0, 2080.1, 2080.2, 2080.4, 2080.5, 2080.6, 4010.0, 4010.1, 4010.2, 5010.27, and 5010.28).

1. It is important to note that there are securities registration requirements under the Securities Act of 1933 related to the issuance of commercial paper. A BHC should have procedures in place to ensure compliance with all applicable securities and SEC requirements. Refer to manual section 2080.1.
Commercial paper is a generic term that is generally used to describe short-term unsecured promissory notes issued by well-recognized and generally financially sound corporations. The largest commercial paper issuers are finance companies and bank holding companies which use the proceeds as a source of funds in lieu of fixed rate borrowing.

Generally accepted limitations on issuances and uses of commercial paper derive from Section 3(a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 (1933 Act). Section 3(a)(3) exempts from the registration requirements of the 1933 Act “any note . . . which arises out of a current transaction or the proceeds of which have been or are to be used for current transactions and which has a maturity at the time of issuance not exceeding nine months, exclusive of days of grace, or any renewal thereof the maturity of which is likewise limited. . . .” The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has rulemaking authority over the issuance of commercial paper.

The five criteria, as set forth in an SEC interpretation (SA Release #33–4412, September 20, 1961), that are deemed necessary to qualify securities for the commercial paper exemption are that the commercial paper must:

- Be of prime quality and negotiable;
- Be of a type not ordinarily purchased by the general public;
- Be issued to facilitate current operational business requirements;
- Be eligible for discounting by a Federal Reserve Bank;
- Have a maturity not exceeding nine months.

2080.1.1 MEETING THE SEC CRITERIA

The above criteria are discussed below.

2080.1.1.1 Nine-Month Maturity Standard

Although roll-over of commercial paper proceeds on maturity is common, the SEC has stated that obligations that are payable on demand or have provisions for automatic roll-over do not satisfy the nine-month maturity standard. However, the SEC staff has issued “no action” letters for commercial paper master note agreements which allow eligible investors to make daily purchases and withdrawals (subject to a minimum amount of $25,000) as long as the note and each investor’s interest therein, does not exceed nine months. Such master note agreements may permit prepayment by the issuer, or upon demand of the investor, at any time.

2080.1.1.2 Prime Quality

Most commercial paper is rated by at least one of five nationally recognized statistical rating organizations. The SEC has not clearly articulated the line at which it will regard a specific rating of commercial paper as being “not prime” and, indeed, there is no requirement that a rating be obtained at all in order to qualify. SEC staff has issued a series of “no-action” letters to individual bank holding companies based on specific facts and circumstances even where it does not appear that a rating was obtained. However, where commercial paper is downgraded to below what is generally regarded as “investment quality” (ratings of less than medium grade—refer to the Commercial Bank Examination Manual, section 203.1), or a rating is withdrawn, BHCs may not be able to issue commercial paper based on the Section 3(a)(3) exemption, in the absence of a marked significant improvement in the issuer’s financial condition.

2080.1.1.3 Current Transactions

There have been considerable interpretative problems arising out of the current transactions concept. The SEC staff has issued a partial laundry list of activities which would not be deemed suitable for investment of commercial paper proceeds, namely:

1. The discharge of existing indebtedness, unless such indebtedness is itself exempt under section 3(a)(3) of the 1933 Act;
2. The purchase or construction of a plant or the purchase of durable machinery or equipment;
3. The funding of commercial real estate development or financing;
4. The purchase of real estate mortgages or other securities;
5. The financing of mobile homes or home improvements; or
6. The purchase or establishment of a business enterprise.

The SEC has opined that commercial paper, which is used as bridge financing by a bank holding company to fund a permanent acquisition within the 270-day maturity period of the paper, will meet the current transactions criterion. The amount of a bank holding company’s commercial paper cannot exceed the aggregate amount of “current transactions” of the bank holding company and its subsidiaries on a consolidated basis. For this purpose, “current transactions” include dividends, interest, taxes and short-term loan repayments. In summary, in most cases, the “current transactions” requirement will not be a significant limitation on issuances of commercial paper by bank holding companies.

In addition to meeting SEC requirements, a bank holding company must meet funding and liquidity criteria prescribed by the Board. For a detailed discussion on acceptable use of commercial paper in connection with a bank holding company overall funding strategies, see Sections 2080.05 and 2080.6.

2080.1.1.4 Sales to Institutional Investors

Commercial paper is generally marketed only to institutional investors (corporations, pension funds, insurance companies, etc.) although sales to individuals are not prohibited. It is clear, however, from the legislative history of the Section 3(a)(3) exemption that commercial paper was not to be marketed for sale to the general public. Currently, SEC staff will not issue a no-action letter if the minimum denomination of the commercial paper to be issued is less than $25,000. One of the underlying premises of the Section 3(a)(3) exemption is that purchasers of commercial paper have sufficient financial sophistication to make informed investment decisions without the benefit of the information provided by a registration statement. It is, therefore, generally recognized today that any individual purchaser of commercial paper should meet the “accredited investor” criteria of commercial paper set forth in SEC Regulation D (17 C.F.R 230.501(a)). To qualify as an “accredited investor”, an individual can meet one of two tests—a net worth test or an income test. To qualify under the net worth test, an individual or an individual and his or her spouse must have a net worth at the time of purchase in excess of $1 million. The alternative test requires $200,000 in income for each of the last two years ($300,000 if the spouse’s income is included) and a reasonable expectation of reaching the same income level in the current year.

For additional information on marketing of commercial paper, see the next subsection.

2080.1.2 MARKETING OF COMMERCIAL PAPER

The sale of bank holding company (or nonbank subsidiary) commercial paper by an affiliated bank to depositors or other investors raises a number of supervisory issues. Of particular concern is the possibility that individuals may purchase holding company paper with the misunderstanding that it is an insured deposit or obligation of the subsidiary bank. The probability of this occurring is increased when a bank subsidiary is actively engaged in the marketing of the paper of its holding company or nonbank affiliate, or when the holding company or nonbank affiliate has a name similar to the name of the commercial bank subsidiary.

It is a long-standing policy of the Federal Reserve (refer to letters SR 90–19 and SR–620) that debt obligations of a bank holding company or a nonbank affiliate should not be issued, marketed or sold in a way that conveys the misimpression or misunderstanding that such instruments are either: 1) federally-insured deposits, or 2) obligations of, or guaranteed by, an insured depository institution. The purchase of such holding company obligations by retail depositors of an affiliated depository institution can, in the event of default, result in losses to individuals who believed that they had acquired federally-insured or guaranteed instruments. In addition to the problems created for these individuals, such a situation could impair public confidence in the affiliated depository institution and lead to unexpected withdrawals or liquidity pressures.

Events surrounding the sale of uninsured debt obligations of holding companies to retail customers of affiliated depository institutions have focused attention on the potential for problems in this area. In view of these concerns, the Federal Reserve emphasizes that this policy applies to the sale of both long- and short-term debt obligations of a bank holding company and any nonbank affiliate, as well as to the sale of uninsured debt securities issued by a state member bank or its subsidiaries. Debt obligations covered by this supervisory policy include commercial paper and all other short-term and long-
Bank holding companies and nondepository affiliates that have issued or plan to issue uninsured obligations or debt securities should not market or sell these instruments in any public area of an insured depository institution where retail deposits are accepted, including any lobby area of the depository institution. Bank holding companies and any affiliates that are engaged in issuing debt obligations should establish appropriate policies and controls over the marketing and sale of the instruments. In particular, internal controls should be established to ensure that the promotion, sale, and subsequent customer relationship resulting from the sale of uninsured debt obligations is separated from the retail deposit-taking functions of affiliated depository institutions.

State member banks, including their subsidiaries, may also be engaged in issuing nondeposit debt securities (such as subordinated debt), and it is equally important to ensure that such securities are not marketed or sold in a manner that could give the purchaser the impression that the obligations are federally-insured deposits. Consequently, state member banks and their subsidiaries that have issued or plan to issue nondeposit debt securities should not market or sell these instruments in any public area of the bank where retail deposits are accepted, including any lobby area of the bank. Consistent with long-standing Federal Reserve policy, debt obligations of bank holding companies or their nonbank affiliates, including commercial paper and other short- or long-term debt securities, should prominently indicate that: 1) they are not obligations of an insured depository institution; and 2) they are not insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In cases where purchasers do not take physical possession of the obligation, the purchasers should be provided with a printed advice that conveys this information. Employees engaged in the sale of bank holding company debt obligations should be instructed to relate this information verbally to potential purchasers. In addition, with respect to the sale of holding company debt obligations, the instruments or related documentation should not display the name of the affiliated bank in such a way that could create confusion among potential purchasers about the identity of the obligor. State member banks involved in the sale of uninsured nondeposit debt securities of the bank should establish procedures to ensure that potential purchasers understand that the debt security is not federally-insured or guaranteed.

Federal Reserve examiners are responsible for monitoring compliance with this supervisory policy; and, as part of the examination of state member banks and bank holding companies, are expected to continue to review the polices and internal controls relating to the marketing and sale of debt obligations and securities. Examiners should determine whether the marketing and sale of uninsured nondeposit debt obligations are sufficiently separated and distinguished from retail banking operations, particularly the deposit-taking function of the insured depository affiliate.

In determining whether the activities are sufficiently separated, examiners should take into account: 1) whether the sale of uninsured debt obligations of a holding company affiliate or uninsured nondeposit debt securities of a state member bank is physically separated from the bank’s retail-deposit taking function, including the general lobby area; 2) whether advertisements that promote uninsured debt obligations of the holding company also promote insured deposits of the affiliated depository institution in a way that could lead to confusion; 3) whether similar names or logos between the insured depository institution and the issuing nonbank affiliate are used in a misleading way to promote securities of a nonbank affiliate without clearly identifying the obligor; 4) whether retail deposit-taking employees of the insured depository institution are engaged in the promotion or sale of uninsured debt securities of a nonbank affiliate; 5) whether information on the sale of uninsured debt obligations of a nonbank holding company affiliate is available in the retail banking area; and 6) whether retail deposit statements for bank customers also promote information on the sale of uninsured debt obligations of the bank holding company or a nonbank affiliate.

The Board’s policy is that the manner in which commercial paper is sold should not lead bank customers or investors to construe commercial paper as an insured obligation or an instrument which may be higher in yield but equal in risk to insured bank deposits. All purchasers of commercial paper should clearly understand that such paper is an obligation of the parent company or nonbank subsidiary and not an obligation of the bank and that the quality

---

1. This policy is not intended to preclude the sale of holding company affiliate obligations from a bank’s money market desk, provided that the money market function is separate from any public area where retail deposits are accepted, including any lobby area.
of the investment depends on the risks and operating characteristics associated with the overall holding company and its nonbanking activities.

2080.1.3 THRIFT NOTES AND SIMILAR DEBT INSTRUMENTS

In the event a bank holding company or nonbanking affiliate issues thrift notes or other debt obligations which do not fall within the generally accepted definition of commercial paper, examiners should be guided by the Board’s 1978 position on the issuance of small denomination debt obligations by bank holding companies and their nonbanking affiliates. At that time, the Board was considering thrift notes issued by a nonbanking subsidiary of a bank holding company and concluded that such obligations should prominently indicate in bold type on their face that the obligations are not obligations of a bank and are not FDIC insured. The Board also stated that the obligations should not be sold on the premises of affiliated banks. Where there is substantial reliance on the sale of thrift notes to fund the operations of a bank holding company or nonbanking subsidiary, other than an industrial bank, a violation of the Glass–Steagall Act may be involved. Such cases should be discussed with Reserve Bank counsel.

2080.1.4 OTHER SHORT-TERM INDEBTEDNESS

A company’s access to bank credit is almost universal, and most small to medium-sized companies will reflect this type of debt on their balance sheets. An important point to remember about bank debt is that maturities of the bank notes are usually short-term while the proceeds of the borrowings are often applied to long-term assets, that is, investment in the bank’s capital and/or long-term debt accounts. The note may be subject to renewal on an annual basis, and the creditor may have the opportunity to call the note at renewal if the financial condition of the company has deteriorated. Rates of interest on short-term bank notes are usually pegged to the creditor’s prime rate plus some fraction thereof. The principal is often repaid over a period of years as the notes are rolled over despite their short-term maturity.

2080.1.5 CURRENT PORTION OF LONG-TERM DEBT

This type of debt has many of the short-term characteristics of bank debt, with possibly one additional important feature. Such debt is usually tied to a written agreement between creditor and debtor, and encompasses certain minimum standards of performance to be adhered to by the company. The examiner must review the agreement to determine that the company is operating within the parameters of the covenants laid out in the agreement. Failure to abide by the covenants can trigger default provisions of the agreement and escalate the repayment of the total loan balance outstanding.

2080.1.6 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the company’s policy and actual practices with respect to the sale of uninsured debt obligations and securities issued by bank holding companies, nonbank affiliates or State member banks. More often than not, an informal policy evolves from practice. It then becomes important to interview senior officers in charge of this function to determine if they are adequately aware of the statutory and regulatory constraints with respect to appropriate usage of commercial paper.

2. To review the company’s funding and liquidity strategy with a view to determining whether it has sufficient liquid assets to support maturing liabilities and whether there are any funding mismatches. (See Manual sections 2080.05, 4010.2.3, 4010.2.7, and 5010.24.1)

3. To determine compliance with the Federal Reserve System’s supervisory policy with regard to the marketing of commercial paper, thrift notes or similar type debt instruments (refer to Board letter S 2427 dated June 27, 1980, and supervisory letters SR 90–19 and SR 620).

4. To identify potential weaknesses in corporate policy and practices.

2080.1.7 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Review the bank holding company’s procedures for authorizing the issuance of commercial paper and other uninsured debt obligations and securities of the holding company and/or its nonbank affiliates.

2. Review the board of directors’ resolution authorizing the issuance of commercial paper and other uninsured debt obligations and securities.
3. Determine whether the company has sought a “no action” letter from the SEC. A “no action” letter indicates the SEC has reviewed the company’s issuance of commercial paper and plans “no action” to require the registration of the commercial paper as “securities.” Some companies rely on the opinion of their own counsel that their paper is not subject to SEC registration requirements. If the company does not have a “no action” letter, there should be a legal opinion on file from the holding company’s attorney regarding exemption from registration under section 5 of the 1933 Act.

4. Obtain a copy of the holding company’s written policy on paper usage to compare with resolution and practice.

5. Review to determine the extent to which the commercial paper and other uninsured debt obligations are supported by back-up lines of credit provided by unaffiliated banks. These lines are established to cover any unexpected run-off of paper at maturity. Commitments for lines of credit should be in writing and have expiration dates. Commitment fees substantiate the enforceability of the commitment whereas compensating balances tend to indicate that the lending commitment is less formal. The examiner should determine whether material adverse change clauses exist in back-up line of credit agreements which may affect their reliability. Comment if it appears that those provisions might be utilized.

Compensating balance arrangements should be disclosed. A company may commit to a compensating balance, but if it relies on its bank subsidiary to provide the funds the bank should be compensated for utilization of its funds.

Reciprocal back-up lines may be established. This may eliminate the need for fees or compensating balances and may provide a certain comfort level for company management.

6. Obtain a listing of commercial paper and other uninsured debt obligation holders from management to the extent known. In the case of larger BHCs, there is a choice between issuing paper on a local level or placing it nationally through the auspices of an investment banking firm. In the latter case, there is likely to be no record of who purchases the paper because the paper is usually sold on a bearer basis. Holding companies looking for a wider market, national recognition, and higher ratings place their paper through an investment banking firm. However, it should be recognized that the market for commercial paper placed in this manner is more sophisticated and knowledgeable and therefore more sensitive to adverse developments than a local market. The smaller company can be content to sell its paper on a local level through its corporate headquarters, knowing its customer profile and limiting the amount to any one paperholder, thereby limiting its exposure to refinancing problems caused by large scale redemptions.

7. Review for potential weaknesses in corporate policy and practices. Any amounts in excess of 10 percent in the hands of one paperholder should be discussed with management and noted in the report. A large paperholder could refuse to purchase new paper at maturity (rollover) and place the company in a liquidity squeeze, requiring sell-off of assets or draw down of back-up lines.

Rollovers are prohibited under the 1933 Act. The instrument must have a definite date of maturity with no automatic provision for reinvestment of proceeds. Companies must abide by the 270-day provision and if the paperholder elects to reinvest the funds, a new instrument should be executed.

8. Request a copy of the commercial paper, thrift note or similar type instrument, and any printed advice to the purchasing customer for review. These documents should be checked for compliance with the standards set forth under the captions “Marketing of Commercial Paper” and “Thrift Notes and Similar Debt Instruments” in this section of the Manual.

9. If a bank sells the commercial paper and/or other uninsured debt obligations of its holding company or nonbanking affiliate, review the procedures to separate their sale from the retail operations of the bank.

This segregation should be reviewed as part of all holding company inspections. Examiner judgment must be relied upon, to a large extent, to determine whether the marketing activities of commercial bank subsidiaries for the bank holding company’s commercial paper and other uninsured debt obligations are sufficiently separated and distinguished from retail banking operations, particularly the deposit-taking function. In making this determination, the examiner should consider whether:

a. The sale of uninsured debt obligations of a holding company affiliate or uninsured nondeposit debt securities of a state member bank is physically separated from the bank’s retail-deposit taking function, including the general lobby area;

b. Advertisements that promote uninsured debt obligations of the holding company also
promote insured deposits of the affiliated depository institution in a way that could lead to confusion;

c. Similar names or logos between the insured depository institution and the issuing non-bank affiliate are used in a misleading way to promote securities of a nonbank affiliate without clearly identifying the obligor;

d. Retail deposit-taking employees of the insured depository institution are engaged in the promotion or sale of uninsured debt securities of a nonbank affiliate;

e. Information on the sale of uninsured debt obligations of a nonbank holding company affiliate is available in the retail banking area; and

f. Retail deposit statements for bank customers also promote information on the sale of uninsured debt obligations of the bank holding company or a nonbank affiliate.

In those cases where the bank holding company or nonbanking affiliates issue thrift notes or similar type debt instruments, ascertain that these obligations are not being sold on the premises of affiliated banks.

10. The procedures in Nos. 8 and 9 address the manner in which bank holding companies (or nonbanking subsidiaries) market their commercial paper, thrift notes or similar type debt instruments; consequently, implementation will necessitate review of marketing procedures of all holding companies (or nonbanking subsidiaries), regardless of the type of charter or the identity of the primary supervisor of the subsidiary (affiliate) bank. Exceptions to the policies on the marketing of such paper should be noted on the “Commercial Paper and Lines of Credit” pages and discussed on the “Examiner’s Comments” page of the inspection report. The managements of all bank holding companies must be fully informed of the Federal Reserve’s policy with respect to the marketing of holding company debt obligations, as in SR Letter 90–19, and exceptions should be addressed in the supervisory follow-up process.
Funding (Long-Term Debt)  

Long-term debt represents an alternative financing method to short-term debt and equity funds. Before choosing this type of funding the bank holding company will need to determine how the advantages and disadvantages of long-term debt apply to its financial position and funding needs. Interest on long-term debt is an expense item and therefore is tax deductible. The company issuing debt effectively pays approximately “half-price” (interest expense net of tax deduction) on debt while the company issuing equity pays the full dividend rate without a tax benefit. Counterbalancing the tax advantage is the fact that long-term debt must be serviced and retired to prevent default and cannot be used as an offset for losses.

The issuance of long-term debt will be relatively advantageous to the holding company whose price/earnings ratio is low and whose stock is selling significantly below book value. In this instance, the cost to the company of equity funding rises proportionately to the drop in the price of the stock since less funds are obtained for an equal number of shares, yet the dividend per share remains the same.

A major factor influencing a bank holding company’s decision to issue long-term debt instead of equity is the dilution impact of new equity. Straight debt will not dilute ownership and is typically retired from cash flow, whereas new equity dilutes earnings per share (more so than the impact of the debt’s interest expense on earnings).

Preferred stock can be retired through a sinking fund and is sometimes convertible to common shares. Convertible stock adds to the dilution effect when the conversion is exercised and prior to conversion, “fully diluted” earnings per share must be reported that assume full conversion. The bank holding company will consider both stockholder and market reaction to any dilution effects of long-term financing. The BHC may view debt financing as the best alternative if it feels that a diluted earnings per share would drive down the market price of its stock and contribute to stockholder discontent.

Inherent in any financing are intangible costs. While it is evident that on the surface debt financing is cheaper than equity financing, it would be hard to quantify the effects of potential missed interest payment or default associated with debt instruments. The bank holding company also will be concerned with its additional “debt capacity” if the present issuance of debt pushes the debt/equity ratio beyond acceptable limits.

Theoretically, “straight debt” is a direct secured or unsecured obligation requiring repayment at maturity and generally taking a senior position in the claim on assets. Principal is sometimes payable in a lump sum, often through the use of a sinking fund, while interest is paid at stated periods throughout the life of the note.

2080.2.1 CONVERTIBLE SUBORDINATED DEBENTURE

A convertible subordinated debenture is an unsecured debt that is subordinate to other debt and convertible to common stock at a certain date or price. The essential provision of this debt is that it may eventually be retired by equity and inherently has the potential for dilution. With this type of financing, the creditor typically has the right to convert the bond into a stated number of shares of common stock at some future time. Usually the conversion price is 10 to 15 percent above the market price of the stock. This encourages the bondholder to keep the bond until the market price meets or surpasses the conversion price. In many convertible debt agreements, the bank holding company issuing debt will have the option to call the issue when the conversion price equals the market price.

The bank holding company will issue a convertible subordinated debenture when its stock price is depressed. The convertibility provision is added as a “sweetner” to the issue and counteracts the negative aspect of its subordinated position. The subordinated nature of this issue will help a bank holding company with prior debt which includes covenants that dictate against additional senior debt.

2080.2.2 CONVERTIBLE PREFERRED DEBENTURE

This debt instrument is similar to straight convertible debt except it is convertible into preferred stock. This alternative is open to the bank holding company which needs to add a “sweetner” to this issue in order to market it, but does not want dilution of “common” ownership.
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2080.2.3 NEGATIVE COVENANTS

The lender will be concerned with the borrower’s debt structure when offering financing. If the borrower’s debt/equity ratio is approaching an unacceptable level, the lender will try to assure that the bank holding company does not overextend itself. While the lender may demand the right to approve future equity issues, the lender is likely to be more willing to give such approval than to allow more debt because the equity issue adds to the capital base, and this base is a possible source of funds for the payment of debt.

Closely related to the restriction on further debt is the position of the lender in the liquidation of assets. The holder of a straight debt issue will usually demand to be senior to other debt holders. This characteristic is particularly suited to straight debt because straight debt is more vulnerable to default than convertible debt and doesn’t have other sweeteners such as a conversion right or a right to participate in distributions of earnings. The examiner will want to determine how the covenants affect future debt financing and if the effect is positive or negative.

The lender is likely to seek to insure that neither the structure nor policies of the bank holding company are altered without its approval during the life of the debt. The lender can insure this through other negative covenants attached to the debt. Some common covenants of this type include (1) limitations on capital expenditures and on the sale of assets, (2) restrictions on the BHC’s redemption of its own stock, (3) restrictions on investments in general, (4) restrictions on dividend payment without prior approval, and (5) the imposition of loan to capital ratios, deposit to capital ratios and asset to capital ratios.

2080.2.4 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the existence of and adherence to policies on long-term debt.
2. To review the use of long-term funds.
3. To determine the existence of debt covenants and compliance by the holding company.

2080.2.5 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Review the parent-only balance sheet and income statement for debt and interest expense captions.
2. Review the consolidated balance sheet and income statement for debt and interest expense captions.
3. Review any written policies and procedures available as part of an overall capital plan. If no plan or policies exist, the examiner should encourage management to develop them, and in large BHCs, to put them in writing.
4. Determine that the bank holding company does not finance long-term assets with short-term debt, as this leaves the holding company vulnerable to rising interest rates and the possibility of a credit crunch. On the other hand, it may be beneficial for the holding company to finance short-term assets with long-term debt. This is particularly true during periods of rising interest rates because the bank holding company can get higher yields on loans financed by lower cost long-term debt, than it can with commercial paper that has to be turned over at generally increasing rates. In any event, the bank holding company will need to insure that it has ample capacity to finance additional long-term assets with long-term debt when the opportunity presents itself.
5. Review any sinking fund provisions usually found with straight debt and straight preferred issues if the issue is not going to be refinanced by further debt or by an equity issue. Since payments to the fund will directly drain cash reserves, it is imperative that the bank holding company have adequate annual cash flow to service both the interest and add to the sinking fund. The larger the debt, the more the lender will look for a sinking fund feature as a means of precluding a default when maturity occurs and refinancing is not available. When a sinking fund exists the examiner will need to analyze the parent’s cash flow statement to see that payments do not produce an adverse cash drain.
Funding
(Equity)

The capacity of the holding company to serve as a source of financial strength to its bank subsidiaries is a major consideration of the Federal Reserve Board in supervising a bank holding company. The cornerstone of this financial strength is capital adequacy.

The financial structure of banking organizations allows for the use of substantial leverage. If capital is large in relation to debt, additional borrowing is relatively inexpensive. However, because of added risk to lenders, the cost of borrowing increases as new obligations are assumed. At some point, therefore, equity financing becomes less costly and may become the only alternative available for needed funds.

Basically, a holding company’s financial structure can be viewed in two ways: the “single entity” approach, whereby the holding company is considered an integrated entity and financial strength is assessed on the basis of its consolidated totals, and the “building block” approach, wherein the holding company is seen as a collection of individual components. In the latter view, the company’s financial strength is assessed primarily in terms of the financial structure of each component.

When applying the “building block” approach, the liability and capital structure of each subsidiary is compared to the norm of its particular industry. The use of the “building block” approach has some advantages:

1. Comparative statistics are usually available to measure the performance and strength of the individual subsidiaries.
2. It permits comparison of capitalization between holding companies engaged in differing activities.
3. It identifies the degree of leveraging within a single subsidiary of a bank holding company.

The parent should maintain a favorable balance of debt and equity so that it will be able to assist its subsidiaries when necessary through contributions of its own capital or through additional funds generated from debt or equity financing.

At times, however, sale of additional stock may not be a viable alternative for capital formation, even when a company can show a favorable debt/equity balance. Reluctance to enter into a new stock offering may stem from a desire to avoid further dilution of existing ownership interest or from an unfavorable market price of outstanding stock in relation to book value. In these instances, long-term quasi-capital funds may sometimes be obtained through other sources, such as convertible securities or subordinated debt.

2080.3.1 PREFERRED STOCK

Preferred stock is becoming a more acceptable alternative due to certain advantages. Through contracted covenants, it is senior to common stock because it usually has no voting voice in management as does common stock. Preferred stock usually carries a fixed dividend rate that is either cumulative or noncumulative. Cumulative preferred provides that unpaid dividends in prior years must be paid to preferred shareholders before common dividends can be paid. A noncumulative feature provides that dividends foregone during lean years are lost permanently.

From the viewpoint of the bank holding company, a noncumulative preferred issue is more desirable, while investors would desire a cumulative feature.

Perpetual preferred stock does not have a stated maturity date and it may not be redeemed at the option of the holder. Advantages that preferred stock can offer the bank holding company are (1) avoidance of dilution of earnings per common share and (2) absence of voting rights. On the other hand, dividend payments, particularly cumulative dividends, are expensive since they are not a tax-deductible expense as is interest on debt. Cumulative dividends can be particularly draining on cash when they are declared after several years of suspended dividends and payment is then made in a lump sum.

Preferred stock is usually retired by refinancing with debt or through its own conversion feature. If the bank holding company feels that it can afford an equity issue in the future but not at present, it can issue a convertible preferred debenture to postpone the equity issue until a later date. On the other hand, if debt is the desired method of financing but the present debt/equity ratio is not acceptable, the bank holding company will issue preferred and refinance with debt at a more opportune time. However, the Board has expressed concern that in applications to form a BHC, preferred stock not be used as a debt substitute resulting in circumvention of its debt guidelines. On applications with preferred stock which has debt-like characteris-
tics, such stock may be treated as debt in the financial analysis.

2080.3.2 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the existence of and adherence to parent company policies on capital adequacy within the subsidiaries and for the consolidated organization.
2. To review the use of proceeds of equity capital financings.
3. To review any debt covenants that pertain to a minimum acceptable capital position.

2080.3.3 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Review any existing BHC policies regarding capital adequacy or capital planning.
2. Request any plans regarding proposed capital issues.
Earnings retention provides the most immediate source of capital formation and growth. Earnings retained after dividend payout can often be sufficient to keep pace with asset growth, thereby preserving the balance or relationship between equity capital and total assets. Often referred to as “internal funding,” earnings retention should be carefully reviewed to assure that the BHC’s capital base is keeping pace with asset growth.

Bank earnings retention should be reviewed carefully due to the dividend requirements often imposed on banks by their parent companies. Although a bank’s board of directors must approve the declaration and payment of any bank dividend, often the bank’s board is actually ratifying a decision determined at the parent level. The need for bank retention of earnings is particularly pronounced either during periods of expansion or periods of declining earnings or losses.

Parent company management may be under pressure from shareholders or “the market” to increase dividends or to maintain dividends at historic levels despite reversals in consolidated earnings trends. Examiners should be careful to point out to management that dividend pressures often serve to the detriment of the bank subsidiary(ies) which is often asked to supply the proceeds via a dividend to the parent company. As a regulator of banks (and bank holding companies), the Federal Reserve System is concerned with the preservation and maintenance of a sound banking system and in particular, soundly capitalized banks. Earnings retention contributes to capital growth and should be encouraged. For additional information on earnings retention and dividends see sections sections 5199(b) and 5204 (also referred to as sections 56 and 60(b)) of the Revised Statutes and accordingly, should be reviewed with regard to those limitations. The Federal Reserve Board amended Regulation H regarding the payment of dividends by state member banks on December 20, 1990, [12 C.F.R. 208.19(a) and 208.19(b)]. The rule was revised, effective October 1, 1998, and replaced as renumbered section 208.5 (see 12 C.F.R. 208.5), “Dividends and other distributions.” It sets forth the “Limitation on withdrawal of capital by dividend or otherwise,” in subsection 208.5(d). The regulation discusses the elements that are taken into account in determining a state member bank’s dividend paying capacity. Two different calculations are performed to measure the amount of dividends that may be paid, a Net Income Test and an Undivided Profits Test.

2080.4.1 Net Income Test

The approval of the Federal Reserve is required for dividends declared by a member bank that in any calendar year exceeds the net income of the current year, combined with retained net income for the two preceding years (the “Net Income Test”).

2080.4.1.2 Undivided Profits Test

A member bank must receive prior approval of the Federal Reserve, and of at least two-thirds of the shareholders of each class of stock outstanding, before paying dividends in amounts greater than undivided profits.

2080.4.1 PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS BY BANK SUBSIDIARIES

Bank dividends can be determined to be excessive if they exceed the limitations imposed by either section 5199(b) or 5204 (also referred to
Funding (Pension Funding and Employee Stock Option Plans) Section 2080.5

Holding companies have turned to employee pension plans and, to a lesser degree, stock option plans as ways to provide added capital for holding company operations. While there may be a number of reasons for implementing such programs, one of the by-products is the flow of working capital into the holding company. The program usually involves a pre-tax contribution by the holding company to an employee benefit plan (e.g., profit sharing plan) and the resulting purchase by such plan of common or preferred shares of the holding company’s stock. The holding company benefits through the use of the funds for working capital, and the plan provides for retirement benefits for employees as shareholders in the company. Since ESOPs are administered under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), the guidelines delineated in SR 85–21 should be followed in determining whether possible ERISA violations exist. Reference should also be made to Manual section 4010.1.1.

2080.5.1 STOCK OPTION PROGRAMS

Employee stock option programs generate a nominal percentage of a holding company’s financing needs to reward key employees for service rendered via the reduced price of the company’s stock. While such programs constitute one method of available funding for a holding company, they generally may not be expected to add any capital amounts beyond nominal levels.

2080.5.2 EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS (ESOPS)

Employee Stock Ownership Plans (ESOP) are an alternative holding company funding tool. An ESOP is a tax-qualified employee benefit plan which is designed to be invested primarily in employer stock. The concept of an ESOP is to encourage the establishment of employee benefit programs which expand the employees’ share in company stock ownership. Participation in an ESOP may also significantly enhance employee motivation. The essential differences between an ESOP and other qualified stock bonus plans are that an ESOP is permitted, in certain circumstances, to incur liabilities in the acquisition of employer securities, and that an employer may receive additional tax credits for amounts contributed to ESOPs. Under limited circumstances, lenders to ESOP’s may also receive benefits that result in reduced borrowing costs to the ESOP. As long as ESOP meets the IRS requirements for a qualified employee plan, it may invest up to 100% of its assets in “qualifying” employer securities. It is exempt from some of the self-dealing limitations applicable to most employee benefit plans, as it is viewed as a means of providing stock ownership interests for employees rather than as a strictly a retirement plan. Furthermore, an ESOP may purchase the stock either from the employer company or from shareholders. Therefore, in addition to use as a tool of corporate finance, an ESOP may serve as a ready purchaser for outstanding stock, without a corresponding loss of voting control.

ESOPs are in some ways similar to deferred profit sharing plans. ESOPs are authorized under the same section, namely, section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code. Employer contributions (within limits based on a percentage of eligible payroll) are allowable deductions from the employer’s pre-tax income. Contributions are held in trust, and benefits when paid out upon an employee’s retirement, death, or termination of service, must be paid in company stock. The distinguishing feature of an ESOP lies in the fact that the direct purpose of the plan is to invest employer contributions in the stock of the company.

2080.5.2.1 Accounting Guidelines for Leveraged ESOP Transactions

Newly issued or existing shares of BHC stock are sometimes sold to the ESOP and paid for with money borrowed from a third party; these types of ESOPs are commonly referred to as “leveraged ESOPs.” The borrowings are generally serviced with contributions by the employer, which are a tax deductible expense. The borrowing arrangement by the ESOP often includes a guarantee or commitment by the employer (the BHC or the subsidiary bank) to make future contributions to the ESOP sufficient to meet debt service requirements. When this occurs, questions arise involving the appropriate accounting for the leveraged ESOP transaction. The Accounting Standards Executive Committee of the American Institute...
of CPAs has issued a Statement of Position (SOP) 72–3 which discusses ESOP borrowing situations. Since the Federal Reserve applies generally accepted accounting principles, banks and bank holding companies should follow SOP 76–3. The SOP statement covers cases where the employer either guarantees the ESOP loan or commits to make future ESOP contributions sufficient to service the debt. For such cases, the SOP indicates that the employer should credit a liability account for the amount of the ESOP debt and offset that entry by reducing shareholders’ equity. The liability recorded by the employer should be reduced as the ESOP makes payments on the debt. This liability is recorded because the guarantee or commitment is in substance the employer’s debt. When there is no guarantee, the ESOP is treated like any other shareholder.

In other words, where there is a leveraged ESOP which has purchased BHC stock, and there is a guarantee, commitment, or other arrangement which is in effect a guarantee relative to the debt service of the ESOP, for analytical purposes the amount of ESOP debt will be considered as parent debt and thus parent equity will be reduced accordingly. This will affect debt to equity ratios as well as consolidated capital ratios, where applicable.

2080.5.2.2 Fiduciary Standards under ERISA Pertaining to ESOPs

There are also general fiduciary standards under ERISA pertaining to ESOPs which have been delineated largely through court decisions rather than issuance of regulations. Although exempted from ERISA’s asset diversification requirement, ESOP transactions are still required to meet fiduciary standards of prudence, and must be designed and administered for the “exclusive benefit” of plan employees. (ERISA § 404(a) and 29 CFR 2550.407d-6). Yet, as stated above, ESOPs may have distinct advantages which inure primarily to the sponsoring company, its management and large shareholders. Due to these potential or actual conflicts of interest, it is important that the sponsoring employer and any other fiduciaries of a plan undertake every effort to assure full consideration of the best interests of plan employees.

The safeguarding of the statutory “exclusive” interests of plan employees pursuant to ERISA is within the jurisdiction of the IRS and the Department of Labor. The bank regulatory agencies also have some responsibility in their review and examination activities where employee benefit plans such as ESOPs are involved. In this connection, a Uniform Interagency Referral Agreement mandated by statute, has been in effect since 1980 whereby certain possible violations of the provisions of ERISA are referred to the DOL by the Division of Banking Supervision and Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority. SR §1–697 (SA) contains the procedures for making referrals to the Department of Labor. Attached to the SR letter is an exhibit, ERISA Referral Format, which lists the information necessary when making referrals. Holding company examiners can expedite the ERISA referral process by including that information in their reports.

2080.5.3 STATUS OF ESOP’S UNDER THE BHC ACT

On August 6, 1985, the Board determined (1985 FRB 804) that an ESOP that controls more than 25 percent of the voting shares of a bank or bank holding company is a bank holding company. The Board determined that the underlying trust which held the shares of the bank holding company is a “business trust” as defined in the BHC Act and was thus not excluded from the definition of a “company” under the terms of the Act.

2080.5.4 INSPECTION CONSIDERATIONS

Examiners should review unfunded pension liabilities of the BHC to determine their potential impact on the organization. In addition, examiners should review the soundness of any borrowings used to fund ESOP purchases of BHC stock. ESOP borrowings from an affiliated bank used to purchase BHC shares may result in an apparent increase in BHC capital which in fact turns out to have been funded with subsidiary bank funds, a practice considered suitable for in-depth review by examination staff. Section 401 (of the Internal Revenue Code) plan holdings of BHC stock need to be evaluated under the “content” provisions of the BHC Act, change in Bank Control Act, and Regulation Y.

When an ESOP is subject to the Change in Bank Control Act, this fact should be brought to the attention of a BHC’s management. Section 225.41 of Regulation Y specifies transactions—acquisitions—that would require providing the
Board with 60 days prior written notice before acquiring control of a bank holding company (or a state member bank), unless the transaction is exempt under section 225.42 of the Regulation. In addition to the above, a determination should be made as to whether the ESOP is a bank holding company. The examiner may also refer to the Financial Accounting Standards Board’s Statement No. 87, “Employers’ Accounting for Pensions.”
Funding (Bank Holding Company Funding from Sweep Accounts)

A key principle underlying the Federal Reserve’s supervision of bank holding companies is that such companies should be operated in a way that promotes the soundness of their subsidiary banks. Holding companies are expected to avoid funding strategies or practices that could undermine public confidence in the liquidity or stability of their banks. Consequently, bank holding companies should develop and maintain funding programs that are consistent with their lending and investment activities and that provide adequate liquidity to the parent company and its nonbank subsidiaries.

2080.6.1 FUNDING BY SWEEPING DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS

A principal objective of a bank holding company’s funding strategy should be to maintain an adequate degree of liquidity at the parent company and its subsidiaries. Funding mismatches can exacerbate an otherwise manageable period of financial stress and, in the extreme, undermine public confidence in an organization’s viability. In developing and carrying out funding programs, bank holding companies should give special attention to the use of overnight or extremely short-term liabilities since a loss of confidence in the issuing organization could lead to an immediate funding problem. Accordingly, bank holding companies relying on overnight or extremely short-term funding sources should maintain a level of superior quality assets, namely, assets that can be immediately liquidated or converted to cash with minimal loss, that is at least equal to the amount of those funding sources.

A potential source of funding mismatch arises from the use of what has been commonly referred to as deposit sweeps. This practice is based upon an agreement with a subsidiary bank’s deposit customers (typically corporate accounts) which permits these customers to reinvest amounts in their deposit accounts above a designated level in overnight obligations of the parent bank holding company. These obligations include such instruments as commercial paper, program notes, and master notes.

In view of the extremely short-term maturity of most sweep arrangements, banking organizations should exercise great care when investing the proceeds. Appropriate uses of the proceeds of deposit sweep arrangements are limited to short-term bank obligations, short-term U.S. Government securities, or other highly liquid, readily marketable, investment grade assets that can be disposed of with minimal loss of principal. Use of such proceeds to finance mismatched asset positions, such as those involving leases, loans, or loan participations, can lead to liquidity problems at the parent company and are not considered appropriate. The absence of a clear ability to redeem overnight or extremely short-term liabilities when they become due should generally be viewed as an unsafe and unsound banking activity.

Reserve Bank supervisory and examination personnel are to ensure that bank holding companies and their state member banks are in compliance with this section and related supervisory letters addressing the marketing of uninsured debt instruments, including master notes and other sweep arrangements (refer to Manual sections 2080.05 and 2080.1). Banking organizations not in compliance should take the necessary steps to achieve full compliance within a reasonable period of time. Reserve Banks should provide copies of the supervisory letter SR 90–31 to any bank holding company engaged in sweep arrangements with their subsidiary banks, or to any other organization if necessary to facilitate compliance.

---

1. Some banking organizations have interpreted language in a 1987 letter signed by the Secretary of the Board as condoning funding practices that may not be consistent with the principles set forth in this supervisory letter and prior Board rulings. The 1987 letter involved a limited set of facts and circumstances that pertained to a particular banking organization; it did not establish or revise Federal Reserve policies on the proper use of the proceeds of short-term funding sources. In any event, banking organizations should no longer rely on the 1987 letter to justify the manner in which they use the proceeds of sweep arrangements. Banking organizations employing sweep arrangements are expected to ensure that these arrangements conform with the policies contained in this section and in the Manual section 2080.05 on bank holding company funding.
WHAT’S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

Effective July 2010, this section has been revised to include a reference to the Board’s September 21, 2008, “Policy Statement on Equity Investments in Banks and Bank Holding Companies.” (See the Board’s September 22, 2008, press release and section 2090.4.) The policy statement provides additional guidance on the Board’s position on minority equity investments in banks and bank holding companies that generally do not constitute “control” for purposes of the Bank Holding Company Act. This policy updates the guidance found in the Board’s July 1982 “Policy Statement on Non-voting Equity Investments by Bank Holding Companies.” (See section 2090.4.)

2090.0.05 DEFINITIONS

The control provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act (the act) are found in section 2(a)(1) and (2) (see 12 U.S.C. 1841(a)) under the definition of a bank holding company. A bank holding company is defined as “any company which has control over any bank or over any company that is or becomes a bank holding company by virtue of the Act.”

The term “company” means any corporation, partnership, business trust, association, or similar organization, or any other trust. Any corporation in which the majority of the shares are owned by the United States or by any state is not considered a company.

A “company covered in 1970” means a company that became a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 and which would have been a bank holding company on June 30, 1968, if those amendments had been enacted on that date.

2090.0.1 CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTIONS OF CONTROL

The conclusive presumptions of control are established in section 2(a)(2)(A) and (B) of the act when—

1. a company directly or indirectly or acting through one or more other persons owns, controls, or has power to vote 25 percent or more of any class of voting securities of a bank or company or
2. a company controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors or trustees of the bank or company.

“Acting through one or more other persons” could include—

1. acting through the executive officer of a company, or a relative or business associate of that officer;
2. financing the purchase of shares of a bank or company when—
   a. the amount of credit approximates the purchase price,
   b. there is no definite maturity on the credit extended,
   c. the credit is obtained at a favorable rate of interest, and
   d. the bank whose shares are held as collateral maintains an excessive balance with the lending company;
3. by a resolution of a company’s board of directors, guaranteeing an individual against any loss in relationship to his ownership in a bank or company when such ownership represents 25 percent or more of any voting class;
4. recognizing earnings from another company; or
5. participating in policy formation or daily operations of another company.

The “power to vote” includes the right to vote, to direct the voting of shares, or to immediately transfer shares to the name of the holder of such rights or the holder’s nominee, pursuant to any proxy, contract, or agreement. However, when stock is held as collateral for a loan under an agreement which enables the lender to transfer the stock into the name of the lender or its nominee without the power to vote, the right to have the shares transferred does not in itself constitute control. To constitute control, the power to vote must be perfected along with the transfer of the stock into the name of the lender or its nominee.

1. Unless the terms of the trust require it to terminate within 25 years or not later than 21 years and 10 months after the death of individuals living on the effective date of the trust.
2090.0.2 DIRECT CONTROL

Direct control exists when a company (as defined in section 2(b) of the act) owns 25 percent or more of any one class of voting securities of a bank (as defined in section 2(c) of the act) or company. "Voting securities" includes potential as well as actual voting authority.

2090.0.3 INDIRECT CONTROL

Indirect ownership or control is defined in section 2(g) of the act in subsections 1 and 2 as follows:

"(1) Shares owned or controlled by any subsidiary of a bank holding company shall be deemed to be indirectly owned or controlled by such bank holding company; and

"(2) Shares held or controlled directly or indirectly by trustees for the benefit of (A) a company, (B) the shareholders or members of a company, or (C) the employees (whether exclusively or not) of a company, shall be deemed to be controlled by such company."

To assist in the interpretation of the above subsections the following explanations are provided.

1. All shares owned by a subsidiary of a bank holding company are deemed to be controlled by the parent’s ownership interest in the directly owned subsidiary.

2. Shares held in a trust for the benefit of a company are deemed to be controlled by such company regardless of whether the trustee or company votes the shares. A company is deemed to be the beneficial owner of shares which it does not vote if all other shareholders’ rights are retained by such company (that is, dividends, or other rights).

3. Shares owned by a trustee for the benefit of a company’s subsidiary (or the subsidiary’s shareholders, members, or employees) are deemed to be controlled by both the subsidiary and its parent.

4. Shares held in a trust for the benefit of an individual “stockholder, member, or employee” are not deemed to be controlled by a company because such shares are held for the individual regardless of his or her relationship with the company. For a company to have control over the shares held for the benefit of a company’s “stockholders, members, or employees,” the shares must be held as a class.

5. If a trust meets the definition of a company, it is possible for such a trust to be a bank holding company. In addition, it is possible for a bank through the administration of a trust(s) which does not meet the definition of a company to become a bank holding company (that is, a bank which has control over various trusts whose shares aggregate to 25 percent or more of a bank or bank holding company could be deemed a bank holding company; a bank which administers a trust that owns 25 percent or more of a bank or bank holding company (and such trust does not meet the definition of a company) could be a bank holding company.

In addition to the above determinants involving conclusive presumptions of control, the Board has determined that whenever the transferability of 25 percent or more of any class of voting securities of a company is restricted, in any manner, upon the transfer of 25 percent or more of any class of voting securities of another company, the holders of the two securities affected by the restriction constitute a company for the purposes of the act. This determination applies unless one of the issuers of such securities is a subsidiary of the other and is so identified in a Board order or in a registration statement or report accepted by the Board under the act.

In any administrative or judicial proceedings regarding conclusive presumptions of control, a company would not be considered to control a bank or company at any given time unless that company, at the time in question, directly or indirectly owned, controlled, or had power to vote 5 percent or more of any class of voting securities of the bank or company.

2090.0.4 REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTIONS OF CONTROL

A rebuttable presumption of control exists when the Board determines, after notice and opportunity for hearings, that a company directly or indirectly exercises a controlling influence over the management or policies of a bank or company (section 2(a)(2)(C) of the act). With regard to the above, there is a presumption that any company which directly or indirectly owns, controls, or has power to vote less than 5 percent of any class of voting securities of a given bank or company does not have control over that bank or company (section 2(a)(3) of the act). This 5 percent presumption does not prohibit the
Board from determining that a company exercises a “controlling influence” when such company owns, controls, or has power to vote less than 5 percent of any class of voting securities of another company or bank. However, in overcoming the presumption, the Board bears the burden of proving that such a controlling influence exists.

2090.0.4.1 Regulation Y Determinants of Control

The Board has established the following rebuttable presumptions of control in section 225.31 of Regulation Y for use in proceedings:

1. Control of voting securities.
   a. Securities convertible into voting securities. A company that owns, controls, or holds securities that are immediately convertible, at the option of the holder or owner, into voting securities of a bank or other company controls the voting securities.
   b. Option or restriction on voting securities. A company that enters into an agreement or understanding under which the rights of a holder of voting securities of a bank or other company are restricted in any manner controls the securities. This presumption does not apply where the agreement or understanding—
      (1) is a mutual agreement among shareholders granting to each other a right of first refusal with respect to their shares;
      (2) is incident to a bona fide loan transaction; or
      (3) relates to restrictions on transferability and continues only for the time necessary to obtain approval from the appropriate federal supervisory authority with respect to acquisition by the company of the securities.
2. Control over company.
   a. Management agreement. A company that enters into any agreement or understanding with a bank or other company (other than an investment advisory agreement), such as a management contract, under which the first company or any of its subsidiaries directs or exercises significant influence over the general management or overall operations of the bank or other company controls the bank or other company.
   b. Shares controlled by company and associated individuals. A company that, together with its management officials or principal shareholders (including members of the immediate families of either (as defined in 12 C.F.R. 206.2(k)) owns, controls, or holds with power to vote 25 percent or more of the outstanding shares of any class of voting securities of a bank or other company, if the first company owns, controls, or holds with power to vote more than 5 percent of the outstanding shares of any class of voting securities of the bank or other company.
   c. Common management officials. A company that has one or more management officials in common with a bank or other company controls the bank or other company, if the first company owns, controls, or holds with power to vote more than 5 percent of the outstanding shares of any class of voting securities of the bank or other company, and no other person controls as much as 5 percent of the outstanding shares of any class of voting securities of the bank or other company.
   d. Shares held as fiduciary. The presumptions of control in paragraphs 225.31(d)(2)(ii) and (iii) of Regulation Y do not apply if the securities are held by the company in a fiduciary capacity without sole discretionary authority to exercise the voting rights.

2090.0.4.2 Other Presumptions of Control

In addition to the rebuttable presumptions, there are a number of other circumstances that are indicative of control and may call for further investigation to uncover facts that support a determination of control. Such circumstances include the following:

1. A company owns at least 10 percent of each of two banks or at least 5 percent of each of three or more banks.
2. A company owns 5 percent or more of a bank or bank holding company and has been instrumental in the hiring or firing of one or more persons; establishing policies or places for branches; establishing hours of business; deciding on rates, terms, or acceptance of loans or deposits; following uniform advertising practices or using a common telephone system; or any other respects directing the activities of management or establishing the
policies of the bank or company.

3. A company lends to a borrower on more favorable terms than it would have for a borrower of comparable credit standing to enable the borrower to acquire voting shares of a bank or other company.

If the Board proposes to make a determination based on the above indicators of control, the Board bears the burden of providing evidence that such a control situation exists.

2090.0.5 PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING CONTROL

The question of whether a control situation exists may arise from information coming to the Board’s attention or from a company’s seeking to obtain the Board’s opinion regarding a specific situation. When this question arises, the Board has instructed each Reserve Bank to make every effort to resolve the matter with the company without resorting to the procedures outlined in this section. However, if the Reserve Bank is unsuccessful in resolving the matter, it is referred to the Board staff. If the Board staff feels the matter warrants Board consideration, it will recommend that the Board make a preliminary determination of control based on the available facts and so inform the company. (See section 225.31(a).) Following the preliminary determination of control, the company must, within 30 days (or longer as may be permitted by the Board), submit the information required by section 225.31(b).

If the company contests the Board’s determination, it is entitled to a formal hearing at its request. (See section 225.31(c).) Notwithstanding any other provision of the act, a company is not deemed to be a bank holding company by virtue of its control of—

1. “. . . shares [held] in a fiduciary capacity, except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (g)” (section 2(a)(5)(A) of the act);

2. “. . . shares acquired by it in connection with its underwriting of securities if such shares are held only for such period of time as will permit the sale thereof on a reasonable basis” (section 2(a)(5)(B) of the act);

3. “[a] company formed for the sole purpose of participating in a proxy solicitation if the voting rights of the shares acquired by such company are acquired in the ordinary course of such a solicitation” (section 2(a)(5)(C) of the act);

4. “. . . shares acquired in securing or collecting a debt previously contracted in good faith, until two years after the date of acquisition” (section 2(a)(5)(D) of the act);

(2) deposits from thrift institutions or savings banks;

(II) deposits arising out of the corporate business of thrift institutions or savings banks that own the bank or trust company; or

(III) deposits of public moneys.” (section 2(a)(5)(E) of the act); and

6. “. . . a single . . . bank, if such . . . company is a trust company or mutual savings bank located in the same State as the bank and if . . . (i) such ownership or control existed on the date of enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 and is specifically authorized by applicable State law, and (ii) the trust company or mutual savings bank does not after that date acquire an interest in any company that, together with any other interest it holds in that company, will exceed 5 percentum of any class of the voting shares of that company, except that this limitation shall not be applicable to investments of the trust company or mutual savings bank, direct and indirect, which are otherwise in accordance with the limitations applicable to national banks under section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24)” (section 2(a)(5)(F) of the act).

2090.0.6 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine whether any change in control of a bank holding company has resulted in a company (as defined by section 2(b) of the
act) becoming a bank holding company in violation of section 3(a)(1) of the act.
2. To ascertain whether an existing bank holding company has acquired either directly or indirectly additional banking assets in violation of section 3(a)(3) of the act.
3. To establish whether a company which has purchased its own stock is in compliance with section 225.4(b) of Regulation Y. (See section 2090.3.)

2090.0.7 INSPECTION PROCEDURES
1. Review the company’s stock records and the company’s investment portfolio.

2090.0.8 LAWS, REGULATIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND ORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Laws</th>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct control voting securities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect control as trustee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ltr. 1/14/76 to W. Lloyd, Chicago Fed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ltr. 10/16/73 to W. Lloyd, Chicago Fed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting through others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1970 FRB 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 FRB 865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972 FRB 717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 FRB 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 FRB 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of shares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 FRB 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttable presumption of control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972 FRB 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• nonvoting stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136 Fed. Reg. 18945 (Sept. 24, 1971)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other indicators of control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972 FRB 487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for determining control</td>
<td></td>
<td>S-2173 (Sept. 17, 1971)</td>
<td>Patagonia vs. BOG 517 F. 2d 803 (9th Cir. 1975)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonvoting equity investments by BHCs</td>
<td></td>
<td>225.143 4-172.1</td>
<td>1982 FRB 413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Laws 1</td>
<td>Regulations 1</td>
<td>Interpretations 1</td>
<td>Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity investments in banks and BHCs (2008 Policy Statement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>225.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 12 U.S.C., unless specifically stated otherwise.
2. 12 C.F.R., unless specifically stated otherwise.
WHAT’S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

This section has been revised to include a Board staff interpretation, pertaining to a qualified family partnership (QFP), that was issued on May 10, 2010. The interpretation considered whether a proposed assignment of an economic interest in the partnership interests of a partnership that is a QFP under section 2(o)(10) of the Bank Holding Company Act would cause the partnership to lose its status as a QFP.

2090.05.1 QUALIFIED FAMILY PARTNERSHIP EXEMPTION

Under the Bank Holding Company Act (the Act), any “company” (including a partnership) that controls a bank is considered a bank holding company (BHC).\(^1\) Section 2(o) of the Act (as amended by section 2610 of the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996)\(^2\) however, provides a limited exemption from the definition of company for a “qualified family partnership” (QFP), and accordingly, a partnership that qualifies as a QFP is not considered a BHC under the Act.\(^3\) A QFP, under the Act, is able to own and control a BHC without the partnership becoming subject to the registration, source of strength, approval, reporting, and other requirements imposed on a BHC.

In order to qualify for the Act’s exemption for a QFP, all the partners of the QFP must be individuals related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption; or trusts for the primary benefit of those individuals (collectively, “qualified parties”). In addition, the partnership must

- control any bank (its bank investments) through a single registered BHC that remains subject to all of the provisions of the Act;
- control only one registered BHC;
- not engage in any business activity except indirectly through ownership of other business entities (that is, the partnership must be an investment vehicle for the family and may not be an operating company);
- limit its investments to those permitted for a BHC under section 4(c) of the Act; and
- not be obligated on any debt, either directly or as a guarantor.\(^4\)

Any partnership requesting qualification as a QFP must commit (1) to be subject to Federal Reserve Board examination to ensure compliance with the conditions for eligibility and (2) to be treated as a BHC for purposes of enforcement actions by the Board. In addition, while a QFP is exempt from the prior-approval requirements of section 3 of the Act in connection with a bank acquisition, the partnership continues to be subject to the notice provisions of the Change in Bank Control Act.

As noted above, the primary benefits to becoming a QFP are (1) exemption from the capital requirements applicable to BHCs, (2) exemption from the reporting requirements applicable to a BHC, and (3) the freedom to make permissible nonbanking investments without prior Board approval. Because the QFP must use a single registered BHC to hold all of its bank investments, there continues to be a BHC subject to the requirements of the Act in every case. This structure ensures that the cross-guarantee provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act continue to apply to all banks controlled by a QFP.

2090.05.2 ASSIGNMENT OF ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP INTEREST THAT IS A QFP

Board staff issued a May 10, 2010, interpretation on whether a proposed assignment of an economic interest in the partnership interests of a partnership that is a QFP under section 2(o)(10) of the Act would cause the partnership to lose its status as a QFP.\(^5\) Board staff noted that the QFP exemption does not distinguish between the legal and beneficial ownership of such partnership interest. An assignment of the economic interests in a QFP interest, especially in the case of a limited partnership interest, would effectively give the assignee a beneficial interest in the QFP. Where the assignee is not a family member, Board staff believes that such

---

4. The QFP also must commit to examination by the Board and to the notice requirements of the Change in Bank Control Act if it acquires an additional bank.
an assignment would undermine the “family relationship” requirement of the Act and would expand the exemption beyond its limited scope. Accordingly, Board staff believes that an assignment of the economic interests in the partnership interest of a QFP to a non-qualified person would be inconsistent with the “relationship” requirement of the statute. The partnership would not be in compliance with the statutory requirements of a QFP and would be required to register as a BHC.
Control and Ownership
(Change in Control)

Section 2090.1

The Change in Bank Control Act of 1978 (the CBC Act), title VI of the Financial Institutions Regulatory and Interest Rate Control Act of 1978, gives the federal bank supervisory agencies the authority to disapprove changes in control of insured depository institutions.\(^1\) The Federal Reserve Board is the responsible federal banking agency for changes in control of bank holding companies and state member banks, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency are responsible for insured state nonmember and national banks respectively.

The CBC Act requires any person (that is, an individual, a partnership, a corporation, a trust, an association, a joint venture, a pool, a sole proprietorship, or an unincorporated organization) seeking to acquire control of any insured depository institution or bank holding company to provide 60 days' prior written notice to the appropriate federal banking agency. The act specifically exempts transactions that are subject to section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 or section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act because those transactions are covered by existing regulatory approval procedures. Accordingly, changes in control due to acquisitions by bank holding companies and changes in control of insured depository institutions resulting from mergers, consolidations, or other similar transactions are not covered by the CBC Act.

The CBC Act describes the factors that the Federal Reserve and the other federal banking agencies are to consider in determining whether a transaction covered by the CBC Act should be disapproved. These factors include the financial condition, competence, experience, and integrity of the acquiring person (or persons acting in concert); the effect of the transaction on competition; whether the acquiring persons have provided all required information; and whether the proposed transaction would result in an adverse effect on the Bank Insurance Fund or the Savings Association Insurance Fund. The Federal Reserve Board’s objectives in its administration of the CBC Act are to enhance and maintain public confidence in the banking system by preventing identifiable, serious adverse effects resulting from anticompetitive combinations of interests, inadequate financial support, and unsuitable management in the institutions. The Board will review each notice to acquire control of a state member bank or bank holding company and will disapprove transactions that are likely to have serious harmful effects. The Board’s intention is to administer the CBC Act in a manner that will minimize delays and government regulation of private-sector transactions.

If the Board disapproves a change-in-control filing, the Board will notify the proposed acquiring party in writing within three days after its decision. The notice of disapproval will include a statement of the basis for disapproval. The CBC Act provides that the acquiring party may request a hearing by the Board in the event of a disapproval and provides a procedure for further review by the courts.

Forms for filing notices of proposed transactions covered by the CBC Act are available from the Federal Reserve Banks. Persons contemplating an acquisition that would result in a change in control of a BHC or state member bank should request the appropriate forms and instructions from the Reserve Bank in whose District the affected institution is located. Forms and instructions may also be accessed from the Federal Reserve Board’s public web site (www.federalreserve.gov). The primary forms to be completed are the Interagency Biographical and Financial Report and the Interagency Notice of Change in Control. Filers are requested to consult with the appropriate Reserve Bank to confirm what specific information should be included in a particular notice. The Reserve Bank can provide specialized publication material that will assist the filers in placing a complete announcement of the proposed acquisition in the appropriate newspaper of general circulation. The Board of Governors also will publish the notices in the Federal Register. (See SR-03-19.)

When a substantially complete notice is received by the Federal Reserve Bank, a letter of acknowledgment will be sent to the acquiring person indicating the date of receipt. After reviewing the submitted information, the Federal Reserve may initiate name checks with certain other U.S. government agencies (including law enforcement) on some or all of the individuals related to the proposal. The information received from those name checks will be used to further the assessment of the relevant statutory factors, including the competence,

---

1. The term insured depository institution includes any depository institution holding company and any other company that controls an insured depository institution. The CBC Act is found in 12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(1)–(18).
experience, integrity, and financial ability of the individual filers.

2090.1.1 COMMITMENTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Approvals granted by the Federal Reserve under the CBC Act may be subject to commitments or conditions that require the filer to consult with appropriate Federal Reserve staff before acquiring further shares of the subject banking organization. The Board or the Reserve Bank may also impose restrictions on the acquisition of additional shares by any person who already controls an institution. The imposition of such commitments, conditions, or limitations is intended to ensure that statutory factors remain consistent with approval.

2090.1.2 COMPLETION OF THE TRANSACTION

The transaction may be completed 61 days after the date of receipt stated in the acknowledgment letter, unless the acquiring person has been notified by the Board that the acquisition has been disapproved or that the 60-day period has been extended as provided for in subparagraph (j)(1) of the CBC Act. To avoid undue interference with normal business transactions, the Board may issue a notice of its intention not to disapprove a proposal, after consulting with the relevant state banking authorities as the CBC Act requires.

2090.1.3 INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN NOTICES

The CBC Act requires a person proposing to acquire control of a bank holding company or state member bank to file a notice with the Federal Reserve Board that includes biographical and financial information on the filers; details of the proposed acquisition; information on any proposed structural, managerial, or financial changes that would affect the banking organization to be acquired; and other relevant information required by the Board.

A current statement of assets and liabilities, a brief income summary, and a statement of any material changes since the effective date of this financial-statement information is required. The Board reserves the right to require up to five years of financial data from any acquiring person. For complete details on the informational requirements of a change-in-control filing, see the Board’s public web site at www.federalreserve.gov/geleninfo/applications/aflf. In particular, review the System’s Form FR 2081a, Interagency Notice of Change in Control.

2090.1.4 TRANSACTIONS REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF PRIOR NOTICE

The CBC Act defines control as the power, directly or indirectly, to vote 25 percent or more of any class of voting securities or to direct the management or policies of a bank holding company or insured depository institution. Therefore, unless exempted by the CBC Act, any transaction that results in the acquiring party having voting control of 25 percent or more of any class of voting securities or that results in the power to direct the management or policies of such an institution would trigger the notice requirement. However, any person who on March 9, 1979, controlled a bank holding company or state member bank shall not be required to file a notice to maintain or increase control positions in the same institution. In addition, the Board’s regulation on a rebuttable presumption of control allows persons who on March 9, 1979, fell within a presumption to acquire additional shares of an institution without filing notice so long as they will not have voting control of 25 percent or more of the institution (Regulation Y, 12 C.F.R. 225.41). In connection with transactions that would result in greater voting control, such persons may file the required notice or request that the Board make a determination that they already control the institution.

Section 225.41 of Regulation Y sets forth the specific types of transactions that require prior notice under the CBC Act. Prior notice is required by any person (acting directly or indirectly) that seeks to acquire control of a state member bank or bank holding company. A person may include an individual, a group of individuals acting in concert, or certain entities (for example, corporations, partnerships, or trusts) that own shares of banking organizations but that do not qualify as bank holding companies. A person acquires control of a banking organization whenever the person acquires ownership, control, or the power to vote 25 percent or more of any class of voting securities of the institution.
2090.1.4.1 Rebuttable Presumption of Control

Persons who have the power to vote less than 25 percent of an institution’s shares may be required to file notice under the Board’s rebuttable presumption of control, found in section 225.41 of Regulation Y. The Board presumes that an acquisition of voting securities of a state member bank or bank holding company constitutes the acquisition of control under the CBC Act, requiring prior notice to the Board, if, immediately after the transaction, the acquiring person (or persons acting in concert) will own, control, or hold with power to vote 10 percent or more of any class of voting securities of the institution, and if—

1. the institution has registered securities under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l); or
2. no other person will own, control, or hold the power to vote a greater percentage of that class of voting securities immediately after the transaction.  

Other transactions resulting in a person’s control of less than 25 percent of a class of voting shares of a bank holding company or state member bank would not result in control for purposes of the CBC Act. In addition, customary one-time proxy solicitations and the receipt of pro rata stock dividends are not subject to the CBC Act’s notice requirements.

In some cases, corporations, partnerships, certain trusts, associations, and similar organizations that are not already bank holding companies may be uncertain whether to proceed under the CBC Act or under the Bank Holding Company Act with respect to a particular acquisition. These organizations should comply with the notice requirements of the CBC Act if they are not required to secure prior Board approval under the Bank Holding Company Act. However, some transactions (described in sections 2(a)(5)(D) and 3(a)(5)(A) and (B) of the Bank Holding Company Act), particularly foreclosures by institutional lenders, fiduciary acquisitions by banks, and increases of majority holdings by bank holding companies, do not require the Board’s prior approval. They are considered subject to section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act and, therefore, do not require notices under the CBC Act.

2090.1.4.2 Rebuttable Presumption of Concerted Action

The following persons are presumed to be acting in concert and must file a CBC Act notice if their share of ownership reaches the required levels:

1. a company and any controlling shareholder, partner, trustee, or management official of the company, if both the company and the person own voting shares of the state member bank or bank holding company
2. an individual and the individual’s immediate family
3. companies under common control
4. persons that are parties to an agreement, contract, understanding, relationship, or other arrangement, whether written or otherwise, regarding the acquisition, voting, or transfer of control of voting securities of a state member bank or bank holding company, other than through a revocable proxy
5. persons who have made or propose to make a joint filing under sections 13 and 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m), and the rules promulgated thereunder by the Securities and Exchange Commission
6. any person and any trust for which the person serves as trustee

If there is any doubt whether a proposed transaction requires a notice, the acquiring person should consult the Federal Reserve Bank for guidance. The CBC Act places the burden of providing notice on the prospective acquiring person.

2090.1.5 TRANSACTIONS NOT REQUIRING ANY NOTICE

Section 225.42 of Regulation Y sets forth the transactions that do not require any notice under the CBC Act or that require after-the-fact notice. The following transactions do not require any notice to the Federal Reserve:

---

2. If two or more persons, not acting in concert, each propose to acquire simultaneously equal percentages of 10 percent or more of a class of voting securities of the state member bank or bank holding company, each person must file prior notice to the Board.

3. Acting in concert includes knowing participation in a joint activity or parallel action towards a common goal of acquiring control of a state member bank or bank holding company whether or not pursuant to an express agreement.
1. **Existing control relationships.** The acquisition of additional shares if the acquirer is deemed to already have control of the banking organization.

2. **An increase in previously authorized acquisitions.** The acquisition of additional shares of a class of voting securities of a state member bank or bank holding company by any person (or persons acting in concert) who acquired and maintained control of the institution after complying with federal requirements.

3. **Any acquisition subject to approval under the Bank Holding Company Act or the Bank Merger Act.** Any acquisition of voting securities subject to approval under section 3 of the BHC Act or under the Bank Merger Act (section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act).

4. **Transactions exempt under the BHC Act.**

5. **A proxy solicitation.** Receipt of a revocable proxy in connection with a proxy solicitation for the purpose of conducting business at a regular or special meeting of the institution if the proxy terminates within a reasonable time.

6. **Stock dividends.** Receipt of voting securities as a result of a stock dividend (if the proportional interest of the recipient remains substantially the same).

7. **Acquisition of voting securities of a foreign banking organization.** The acquisition of voting securities of a qualifying foreign banking organization.

### 2090.1.6 TRANSACTIONS NOT REQUIRING PRIOR NOTICE

The transactions that require after-the-fact notice include the acquisition of voting securities (1) through inheritance, (2) as a bona fide gift, or (3) in satisfaction of a debt previously contracted in good faith. In these situations, the appropriate Reserve Bank must be notified within 90 days after the acquisition, and the acquirer must provide any relevant information requested by the Reserve Bank.

### 2090.1.7 UNAUTHORIZED OR UNDISCLOSED CHANGES IN BANK CONTROL

In some instances, a person acquires control of a banking organization without submitting the prior or after-the-fact notice required by Regulation Y. These unauthorized or undisclosed changes in bank control may not be known to the person, the state member bank, or the bank holding company but are discovered by Reserve Bank examiners during an inspection or examination of the affected institution. In most cases, such a violation of the CBC Act is addressed by having the person immediately file a notice with the Federal Reserve requesting authority to retain the acquired shares. The filing should include an explanation of the circumstances that resulted in the violation and a description of the actions that have been (or will be) taken by the filers to ensure no further violations of the statute. Although the burden to file a timely change in bank control notice is on the persons who are acquiring control or causing a change in control of a banking organization, an acquired banking organization or a banking organization undergoing a change in control may have better information regarding current ownership positions, including shareholder lists, than the acquiring individuals or individuals who propose a change in control. Therefore, it is important that state member banks and bank holding companies be familiar with the regulations and policies governing changes in bank control and, when possible, share such information with shareholders who have significant ownership positions.

### 2090.1.8 CHANGES OR REPLACEMENT OF AN INSTITUTION’S CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OR ANY DIRECTOR

Institutions must report promptly any changes or replacement of its chief executive officer or of any director, in accordance with paragraph 12 of the CBC Act. Under section 225.42(a)(7) of Regulation Y, acquisitions of control of foreign bank holding companies are also exempt from the reports and information required under paragraphs 9, 10, and 12 of the act. (See section 2090.1.5.)

---

4. A violation may be addressed through two other means. The affected party may either (1) submit, for the Federal Reserve’s approval, a specific plan for the prompt termination of the control relationship or (2) contest the preliminary determination of a control relationship by filing a response that sets forth the facts and circumstances in support of the party’s position that no control exists or, if appropriate, presenting such views orally to Federal Reserve staff.
2090.1.9 DISAPPROVAL OF CHANGES IN CONTROL

The CBC Act sets forth various factors to be considered in the evaluation of a proposal. The Board is required to review the competitive impact of the transaction; the financial condition of the acquiring person; and the competence, experience, and integrity of that person and the proposed management of the institution. In assessing the financial condition of the acquiring person, the Board will weigh any debt-servicing requirements in light of the acquiring person’s overall financial strength and the institution’s earnings performance, asset condition, capital adequacy, and future prospects, as well as the likelihood of an acquiring party making unreasonable demands on the resources of the institution.

2090.1.10 ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Paragraph 12 of the CBC Act requires that whenever a change in control of a bank holding company occurs, each insured depository institution is required to report promptly to the appropriate federal banking agency any changes or replacement of its chief executive officer or any director occurring in the next 12-month period. A statement of the past and current business and professional affiliations of the new chief executive officer or directors should be included in each institution’s report.

Paragraph 9 of the CBC Act indicates that whenever any insured depository institution makes a loan secured by 25 percent or more of the outstanding voting stock of an insured depository institution (or bank holding company), the president or other chief executive officer of the lending bank shall promptly report such fact to the appropriate federal banking agency. The report shall contain information similar to the informational requirements of the Notice of Change in Control.

2090.1.11 STOCK REDEMPTIONS

A stock redemption by a BHC may result in an existing shareholder (or shareholders) owning 25 percent or more of a class of voting securities, which would require the filing of both a change-in-control and treasury stock notification. Furthermore, a stock redemption by a BHC may result in an existing shareholder (or shareholders) owning between 10 percent and 25 percent of the outstanding shares and being the largest shareholder, thereby resulting in a rebuttable presumption of control. For additional information, see section 2090.3 “Treasury Stock Redemptions.”

2090.1.12 CORRECTIVE ACTION

The Federal Reserve has enforcement jurisdiction over those persons who file or should file notices under the CBC Act. Accordingly, violations of the requirement to file a change in bank control notice may result in the Federal Reserve taking enforcement action against the relevant persons in appropriate circumstances, including those involving willful or negligent misconduct. Violations may result in the persons being subject to a variety of sanctions, including the assessment of a civil money penalty.

Violations of the CBC Act are addressed through the same type of investigative and enforcement authority and formal corrective actions that are used in other administrative remedies (12 U.S.C. 1818(b)–(n)). The CBC Act also authorizes the assessment of civil money penalties for any violation of the CBC Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(16)) and allows the Board to seek divestiture of a BHC or bank from any person or company who violates the CBC Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(15)).

2090.1.13 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine that the BHC has complied with the prior-notification requirements of the CBC Act and that changes in ownership between 10 percent and 25 percent have been reviewed for rebuttable presumption considerations.

2. To determine that the BHC has complied with the reporting requirements of paragraph 12 of the CBC Act regarding changes in its board of directors or its chief executive officer that occur within 12 months of a change in control.

3. To determine that the BHC has complied with the reporting requirements of paragraph
9 of the CBC Act regarding loans made directly by the BHC secured by 25 percent or more of the outstanding voting stock of an insured depository institution (or bank holding company).

2090.1.14 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Review the BHC’s stock certificate register or log to determine if any person (or group of persons acting in concert) has acquired 10 percent or more of any class of voting securities.

2. Review changes in control of between 10 percent and 25 percent of any class of voting securities to determine if the controlling party is the single largest shareholder.

3. When inspecting a BHC that was the subject of a change in control and when a prior notification was filed, review the notification to determine that information submitted on the management of the BHC is still valid. When changes in directors or the chief executive officer occurred within 12 months of the change in control, determine if the BHC has reported such changes in compliance with paragraph 12 of the CBC Act.

4. When inspecting a BHC that has redeemed any of its own shares subsequent to March 9, 1979, thereby lowering the number of shares outstanding, determine whether the holdings of any individual shareholder have increased proportionally to greater than 10 percent, which might trigger the rebuttable presumption of control and may require prior notification of a change in control.

5. Review any loans made directly by the BHC that are secured by 25 percent or more of the outstanding shares of a bank (or bank holding company) and determine if the BHC has complied with the reporting requirements of paragraph 9 of the CBC Act.
Control and Ownership
(BHC Formations)

2090.2.1 FORMATION OF A BANK HOLDING COMPANY AND CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP

The formation of a bank holding company (BHC) and certain changes in the ownership of banks owned by a BHC come under the provisions of section 3 of the BHC Act. Section 3(a)(1) prohibits the formation of a BHC without prior Board approval. A company may receive approval pursuant to section 3(a)(1) to become either a one-bank holding company or a multibank holding company.

A primary reason for the formation of a one-bank holding company is to obtain income tax benefits.\(^1\) These benefits include offsetting operating/capital losses of one corporation against the profits/capital gains of another.

Once a company becomes a BHC, either by the formation of a one-bank or multibank holding company, section 3(a)(3) of the act prohibits the direct or indirect acquisition of over 5 percent of any additional bank’s or BHC’s shares without prior Board approval. In addition to the above, section 3(a)(3) serves to prevent an existing BHC from increasing, without prior Board approval, its ownership in an existing subsidiary bank unless the BHC already owns 50 percent of the shares of the bank (section 3(a)(5)(B)). A BHC that owns more than 50 percent of a bank’s shares may buy and sell those shares freely without Board approval, provided the ownership remains above 50 percent. If a BHC owns less than 50 percent of a bank’s shares, prior Board approval is required before each additional acquisition of shares until the BHC’s ownership of the bank reaches more than 50 percent.

2090.2.2 HISTORY OF THE POLICY STATEMENT ON THE FORMATION OF SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

The Board issued the policy statement in 1980 to facilitate the transfer of ownership of small community-based banks in a manner consistent with bank safety and soundness. The Board has generally discouraged the use of debt by BHCs to finance the acquisition of banks or other companies because high levels of debt can impair the ability of the holding company to serve as a source of strength to its subsidiary banks. The Board has recognized, however, that small BHCs have less access to equity financing than larger BHCs and that the transfer of ownership of small banks often requires the use of acquisition debt. Accordingly, the Board adopted the policy statement to permit the formation and expansion of small BHCs with debt levels that are higher than typically permitted for larger BHCs. The policy statement, which is codified in Regulation Y (12 CFR 225, appendix C), contains several conditions and restrictions designed to ensure that small BHCs that operate with the higher levels of debt permitted by the policy statement do not present an undue risk to the safety and soundness of their subsidiary banks.

2090.2.3 SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY AND SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT

In acting on applications filed under the BHC Act, the Board has adopted and continues to follow the principle that BHCs should serve as a source of strength for their subsidiary banks. When BHCs incur debt and rely on the earnings of their subsidiary banks as the means of repaying such debt, a question arises as to the probable effect on the financial condition of the holding company and its subsidiary bank or banks.

The Board believes that a high level of debt at the parent holding company level impairs the ability of a BHC to provide financial assistance to its subsidiary bank(s), and, in some cases, the servicing requirements on such debt may be a significant drain on the resources of the bank(s). For these reasons, the Board has not favored the use of acquisition debt in the formation of BHCs or in the acquisition of additional banks. Nevertheless, the Board has recognized that the transfer of ownership of small banks often requires the use of acquisition debt. The Board therefore has permitted the formation and expansion of small BHCs with debt levels higher than would

\(^1\) A domestic corporation may be entitled to a special deduction from gross income for dividends received from a taxable domestic corporation. There is (1) a 70 percent deduction for dividends received from a corporation that is less than 20 percent owned; and (2) an 80 percent deduction for dividends received from a corporation that is 20 to less than 80 percent owned, subject to certain limits.
be permitted for larger BHCs. Approval of these applications has been given on the condition that the small BHCs demonstrate the ability to service the acquisition debt without straining the capital of their subsidiary banks and, further, that such companies restore their ability to serve as a source of strength for their subsidiary banks within a relatively short period of time.

In the interest of continuing its policy of facilitating the transfer of ownership in banks without compromising bank safety and soundness, the Board has, as described below, adopted the following procedures and standards for the formation and expansion of small BHCs subject to this policy statement.

### 2090.2.3.1 Applicability of Policy Statement

The policy statement applies only to BHCs with pro forma consolidated assets of less than $3 billion that (1) are not engaged in significant non-banking activities either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary; (2) do not conduct significant off-balance-sheet activities (including securitization and asset management or administration) either directly or through a nonbank subsidiary; and (3) do not have a material amount of debt or equity securities outstanding (other than trust preferred securities) that are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Board may in its discretion exclude any BHC, regardless of asset size, from the policy statement if such action is warranted for supervisory purposes. With the exception of section 4 (Additional Application Requirements for Expedited/Waived Processing), the policy statement applies to savings and loan holding companies as if they were BHCs. While this policy statement primarily applies to the formation of small BHCs, it also applies to existing BHCs that wish to acquire an additional bank or company and to transactions involving changes in control, stock redemptions, or other shareholder transactions. The criteria are described below.

### 2090.2.3.2 Ongoing Requirements

The following guidelines must be followed on an ongoing basis for all organizations operating under this policy statement.

#### 2090.2.3.2.1 Reduction in Parent Company Leverage

Small BHCs are to reduce their parent company debt consistent with the requirement that all debt be retired within 25 years of being incurred. The Board expects that these BHCs reach a debt-to-equity ratio of .30 to 1 or less within 12 years after incurrence of the debt. The BHC must also comply with debt-servicing and other requirements imposed by its creditors.

Subordinated debt associated with trust preferred securities generally would be treated as debt for purposes of paragraphs 2.C. (dividend restrictions), 3.A. (minimum down payment), 4.A.1 (expedited treatment of certain filings), and 4.B.1 (stock redemption filing requirements) of the policy statement. A BHC, however, may exclude from debt an amount of subordinated debt associated with trust preferred securities that is up to 25 percent of the BHC’s equity (as defined below) less goodwill on the parent company’s balance sheet, in determining compliance with the requirements of such paragraphs of the policy statement. In addition, a BHC subject to the policy statement that has not issued subordinated debt associated with a new issuance of trust preferred securities after December 31, 2005, may exclude from debt any subordinated debt associated with trust preferred securities until December 31, 2010. BHCs subject to this policy statement may also exclude from debt until December 31, 2010, any subordinated debt associated with refinanced issuances of trust preferred securities originally issued on or prior to December 31, 2005, provided that the refinancing does not increase the BHC’s outstanding amount of subordinated debt. Subordinated debt associated with trust preferred securities will not be included as debt in determining compliance with any other requirements of this policy statement.

In addition, notwithstanding any other provision of the policy statement and for purposes of compliance with paragraphs 2.C., 3.A., 4.A.1,

---

2. The appropriate Reserve Bank should be contacted to determine the manner in which a specific situation may qualify for treatment under this policy statement.

3. The term debt as used in the ratio of debt to equity, means any borrowed funds (exclusive of short-term borrowings that arise out of current transactions, the proceeds of which are used for current transactions) and any securities issued by, or obligations of, the holding company that are the functional equivalent of borrowed funds.
and 4.B.i. of the policy statement, both a BHC that is organized in mutual form and a BHC that has made a valid election to be taxed under Subchapter S of Chapter 1 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code may exclude from debt subordinated debentures issued to the United States Department of the Treasury under (1) the Troubled Asset Relief Program established by the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. (See 74 Fed. Reg. 26,077 (June 1, 2009), Division A of Public Law 110-343, 122 Stat. 3765 (2008)), and (2) the Small Business Lending Fund established by the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, title IV of Public Law 111-240, 124 Stat. 2504 (2010).

The term equity as used in the ratio of debt to equity, means the total stockholders’ equity of the BHC, as defined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. In determining the total amount of stockholders’ equity, the BHC should account for its investments in the common stock of subsidiaries by the equity method of accounting.

Ordinarily, the Board does not view redeemable preferred stock as a substitute for common stock in a small BHC. Nevertheless, to a limited degree and under certain circumstances, the Board will consider redeemable preferred stock as equity in the capital accounts of the holding company if the following conditions are met: (1) the preferred stock is redeemable only at the option of the issuer and (2) the debt-to-equity ratio of the holding company would be at or remain below .30:1 following the redemption or retirement of any preferred stock. Preferred stock that is convertible into common stock of the holding company may be treated as equity.

2090.2.3.2.2 Capital Adequacy

Each insured depository subsidiary of a small BHC is expected to be well capitalized. Any institution that is not well capitalized is expected to become well capitalized within a brief period of time.

2090.2.3.2.3 Dividend Restrictions

A small BHC whose debt to equity ratio is greater than 1.0:1 is not expected to pay corporate dividends until such time as it reduces its debt to equity ratio to 1.0:1 or less and otherwise meets the criteria set forth in sections 225.14(c)(1)(ii), 225.14(c)(2), and 225.14(c)(7) of Regulation Y.4 Small BHCs formed before August 30, 2018 (the effective date of the policy statement), may switch to a plan that adheres to the intent of the policy statement provided they comply with the requirements set forth above.5

2090.2.3.3 Core Requirements for All Applicants

In assessing applications or notices by organizations subject to the policy statement, the Board will continue to take into account a full range of financial and other information about the applicant, and its current and proposed subsidiaries, including the recent trend and stability of earnings, past and prospective growth, asset quality, the ability to meet debt servicing requirements without placing an undue strain on the resources of the bank(s), and the record and competency of management. In addition, the Board will require applicants to meet the following requirements:

2090.2.3.3.1 Minimum Down Payment

The amount of acquisition debt should not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of the bank(s) or company to be acquired. When the owner(s) of the holding company incurs debt to finance the purchase of the bank(s) or company, such debt will be considered acquisition debt even though it does not represent an obligation of the BHC, unless the owner(s) can demonstrate that such debt can be serviced without reliance on the resources of the bank(s) or BHC.
2090.2.3.3.2 Ability to Reduce Parent Company Leverage

The BHC must clearly be able to reduce its debt-to-equity ratio and comply with its loan agreement(s) as stated within the ongoing requirements for reduction in parent company leverage, discussed under “Minimum Down Payment.” Failure to meet the criteria would normally result in denial of an application.

2090.2.3.4 Additional Application Requirements for Expedited/Waived Processing

2090.2.3.4.1 Expedited Notices under Sections 225.14 and 225.23 of Regulation Y

A small BHC proposal will be eligible for the expedited processing procedures set forth in sections 225.14 and 225.23 of Regulation Y if (1) the BHC is in compliance with the ongoing requirements of this policy statement, (2) the BHC meets the previously discussed core requirements for all applicants noted above, and (3) the following requirements are met:

1. The parent BHC has a pro forma debt-to-equity ratio of 1.0:1 or less.
2. The BHC meets all the criteria for expedited action of sections 225.14 and 225.23 of Regulation Y.

2090.2.3.4.2 Waiver of Stock-Redemption Filing

A small BHC will be eligible for the stock-redemption filing exemption for well-capitalized BHCs that is found in section 225.4(b)(6) if the following requirements are met:

1. The parent BHC has a pro forma debt-to-equity ratio of 1.0:1 or less.
2. The BHC is in compliance with the ongoing requirements of this policy statement and meets the requirements of sections 225.14(c)(1)(ii), 225.14(c)(2), and 225.14(c)(7) of Regulation Y.

2090.2.4 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine compliance with all commitments made in the application/notification process.
2. To determine if the BHC or SLHC is in compliance with the Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement (Regulation Y, appendix C), including whether the BHC’s debt is being reduced within the required or expected time periods.

2090.2.5 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Review all commitments made by the company and its shareholders to determine compliance therewith.
2. Determine whether the BHC or SLHC is in compliance with the Small Bank Holding Company and Savings and Loan Holding Company Policy Statement (Regulation Y, appendix C) by—
   a. verifying that the board of directors and senior management have established and regularly maintain a plan to
      • retire the BHC’s or the SLHC’s debt within 25 years of incurring the debt
      • reach a debt-to-equity ratio of .30:1 or less within 12 years of incurring the debt.
3. Ascertain if the BHC uses a regular periodic monitoring process to ensure the full retirement of the holding company’s debt within the above-stated required or expected periods.
4. Determine whether each insured depository subsidiary of a small BHC is well capitalized or, if not, whether it will be well capitalized within a brief period of time.
5. Determine whether the payment of corporate dividends has been restricted until the BHC’s debt-to-equity ratio is 1.0:1 or less and until the BHC otherwise meets the criteria set forth in sections 225.14(c)(1)(ii), 225.14(c)(2), and 225.14(c)(7) of Regulation Y.
### 2090.2.6 LAWS, REGULATIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND ORDERS

![Table](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Laws</th>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital adequacy guidelines of BHCs, SLHCs, and state member banks (Regulation Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3–2100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small BHC and SLHC Policy Statement Regulation Y, appendix C</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>4–868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited action for certain acquisitions by well-run BHCs</td>
<td>225.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>4–024.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited action for nonbanking proposals by well-run BHCs</td>
<td>225.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>4–037.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings and loan holding companies (Regulation LL) — Small BHC Policy Statement</td>
<td>238.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4–750.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 12 U.S.C., unless specifically stated otherwise.
2. 12 C.F.R., unless specifically stated otherwise.
Control and Ownership
(Treasury Stock Redemptions)  Section 2090.3

“Bootstrapping” is the term generally used to describe a treasury stock transaction in which a company incurs debt to purchase or redeem its own outstanding shares. Bootstrapping is often used to facilitate a change in control whereby a shareholder or shareholder group need only buy few or no shares in order to gain control. The repurchase or redemption is often made in accordance with a written agreement made between a former controlling shareholder(s) and the new controlling shareholder(s).

Section 225.4(b) of Regulation Y requires a bank holding company to file prior written notice with the Board before a purchase or redemption of any of its own equity securities if the gross consideration for the purchase or redemption, when aggregated with the net consideration paid by the company for all such purchases or redemptions during the preceding 12 months, is equal to 10 percent or more of the company’s consolidated net worth. (Net consideration is the gross consideration paid by the company for all of its equity securities purchased or redeemed during the period minus the gross consideration received for all of its equity securities sold during the period other than as a part of a new issue.)

Each notice shall furnish the following information:

• The purpose of the transaction, a description of the securities to be purchased or redeemed, the total number of each class outstanding, the gross consideration to be paid, and the terms of any debt incurred in connection with the transaction.

• A description of all equity securities redeemed within the preceding 12 months, the net consideration paid, and the terms of any debt incurred in connection with those transactions.

• A current and pro forma consolidated balance sheet if the bank holding company has total assets of over $150 million, or a current and pro forma parent-company-only balance sheet if the bank holding company has total assets of $150 million or less.

2090.3.1 CHANGE IN CONTROL ACT CONSIDERATIONS

As indicated earlier, treasury stock redemptions are often intended to facilitate a change in control of a bank holding company. By redeeming the shares held by an existing shareholder(s), the remaining shareholder(s) increases his proportionate ownership. If a “person’s” share ownership should rise above 25 percent or more of the remaining outstanding shares (subsequent to March 9, 1979), that person would then “control” the BHC. Under these circumstances, a change in control notification would have to be filed. If the treasury stock redemption is for an amount sufficient to trigger the requirement for a prior notification of redemption, then dual notifications are called for (change in control and redemption of treasury shares).

Similarly, prior notification is also required if a treasury stock redemption should result in a shareholder’s holdings rising to between 10 percent and 25 percent of the remaining outstanding shares, and if (a) that shareholder is the firm’s largest single shareholder immediately after the acquisition; or (b) the institution is registered under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (i.e., corporations having assets exceeding $1 million, more than 500 shareholders, and securities that are publicly traded). For additional information on change in control notification requirements, see section 2090.1.

Additional notices under the CIBC Act do not have to be filed if regulatory clearance had already been received to acquire 10 percent or more of the voting shares of a bank holding company, and subsequent treasury stock redemptions resulted in ownership of between 10 and 25 percent of the shares of the bank holding company. Refer to section 225.41(a)(2) of Regulation Y.

2090.3.2 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine that a BHC that has redeemed shares of its own stock has complied with section 225.4(b) of Regulation Y.

2. To determine that any new controlling shareholder of a BHC that has redeemed shares of its own stock has complied with section 225.41(a) of Regulation Y.

3. To determine if a treasury stock transaction has taken place for the purpose of depleting the original 25 percent equity investment in the purchase price.

1. Revised by the Board, effective November 9, 1990.
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2090.3.3 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Review the BHC’s reconcilement of stockholders’ equity to determine if shares have been redeemed.

2. If shares have been redeemed, review for compliance with treasury stock redemption approval and reporting requirements.

3. Determine whether the BHC is using, repeatedly, the less than 10 percent ownership exemption to avoid notice requirements, thus undermining the capital position of the banking organization, resulting in an unsafe and unsound practice.

4. Determine if the less than 10 percent ownership exemption is being used by the bank holding company when it does not satisfy the requirements of the Board’s capital guidelines for redemptions.

The exemption should not be used by a bank holding company that does not meet the Board’s capital guidelines for redemptions. Redemptions of permanent equity or other capital instruments before stated maturity could have a significant impact on an organization’s overall capital structure. Use of the exemption could significantly reduce its capital. Consequently, an organization considering such a step should consult with the Federal Reserve before redeeming any equity (prior to maturity) if such redemption could have a material effect on the level or composition of the organization’s capital base.

5. If shares have been redeemed, determine if any shareholder’s holdings have risen to 25 percent or more of the outstanding shares.

6. If shares have been redeemed, determine if any shareholder’s holdings have risen to between 10 percent and 25 percent of the outstanding shares. Furthermore, determine whether the shareholder is then the largest shareholder or the institution has registered securities under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

7. If a stock redemption occurred recently in a bank holding company, determine if the shareholders have maintained a 25 percent equity investment.
WHAT’S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

Effective January 2009, this section has been revised to incorporate the Board’s September 21, 2008, “Policy Statement on Equity Investments in Banks and Bank Holding Companies.” (See the Board’s September 22, 2008, Press Release and section 2090.4.4.) The policy statement provides additional guidance on the Board’s position on minority equity investments in banks and bank holding companies that generally do not constitute “control” for purposes of the Bank Holding Company Act. This policy updates the guidance found in the Board’s July 1982 “Policy Statement on Nonvoting Equity Investments by Bank Holding Companies.”

2090.4.1 OVERVIEW AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

For many years, bank holding companies, nonbank financial companies, private equity funds, and other firms made minority equity investments in banks and bank holding companies. These investments often raised questions about the extent to which the investment would cause the investor to become subject to supervision, regulation, and the other requirements applicable to bank holding companies under the Bank Holding Company Act (BHC Act or the Act) and the Board’s Regulation Y. In general, the BHC Act applies to any company that controls a bank or bank holding company (banking organization). The BHC Act provides that a company has control over a banking organization if (1) the company directly or indirectly, or acting through one or more other persons owns, controls, or has power to vote 25 percent or more of any class of voting securities of the banking organization; (2) the company controls, in any manner, the election of a majority of the directors or trustees of the banking organization; or (3) the Board determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that the company directly or indirectly exercises a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization.1 Minority equity investments in banking organizations are designed not to trigger either of the first two prongs of the definition of control. These investments often raised questions, however, regarding whether the investor would be able to exercise a controlling influence over the management or policies of a banking organization.2

The text and legislative history of the control definition in the BHC Act make manifest that possession by an investor of a modicum of influence over a banking organization would not amount to a controlling influence. At the same time, the definition does not require that an investor have absolute control over the management and policies of a banking organization. Instead, the Act requires that an investor be able to exercise an amount of influence over a banking organization’s management or policies that is significant but less than absolute control in fact of the banking organization. Notably, the primary definition of control in the Act is based on ownership of 25 percent or more of the voting shares of a banking organization—an amount that does not provide an investor in most cases with complete control over decisions but would allow the investor to play a significant role in the decision-making process.

In assessing whether an investor has the ability to exercise a controlling influence over a banking organization, the Board has been especially mindful of two key purposes of the BHC Act. First, the BHC Act was intended to ensure that companies that acquire control of banking organizations have the financial and managerial strength, integrity, and competence to exercise that control in a safe and sound manner. The BHC Act is premised on the principle that a company that controls a banking organization may reap the benefits of its successful management of the banking organization but also must be prepared to provide additional financial and managerial resources to the banking organization to support the company’s exercise of control. In this way, the Act ties the potential upside benefits of having a controlling influence over the management and policies of a banking organization to responsibility for the potential downside risks of exercising that controlling influence. By tying control and responsibility together, the Act ensures that

2. Contemporaneous minority investments in the same banking organization by multiple different investors also often raise questions about whether the multiple investors are a group acting in concert for purposes of the Change in Bank Control Act or are a single association for purposes of the BHC Act. These questions are beyond the scope of the 2008 Policy Statement.
companies have positive incentives to run a successful banking organization but also bear the costs of their significant involvement in the banking organization’s decision-making process, thus protecting taxpayers from imprudent risk taking by companies that control banking organizations. Minority investors in banking organizations typically seek to limit their potential downside financial exposure in the event of the failure of the banking organization. Concomitantly, the BHC Act requires that minority investors seeking this protection limit their influence over the management and policies of the banking organization.

Second, the BHC Act was intended to limit the mixing of banking and commerce. In particular, the Act effectively prevents commercial firms and companies with commercial interests from also exercising a controlling influence over a banking organization. Many minority investors in banking organizations own commercial investments that conflict with this limitation.

2090.4.2 BOARD’S 1982 POLICY STATEMENT ON NONVOTING EQUITY INVESTMENTS BY BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

On July 8, 1982, the Board issued a Policy Statement on Nonvoting Equity Investments by Bank Holding Companies (the 1982 Policy Statement) to provide guidance on the Board’s interpretation of the “controlling influence” prong of the control definition in the BHC Act. That statement for the first time outlined the policies that the Board would consider in reviewing whether a minority investment in a banking organization would result in the exercise by the investor of a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization. The 1982 Policy Statement focused on issues of particular concern in the 1980s in the context of investments by bank holding companies in out-of-state banking organizations. For example, the 1982 Policy Statement primarily addressed investments that included a long-term merger or stock purchase agreement between the investor and the banking organization that would be triggered on a change in the interstate banking laws, and so-called “lock-up” arrangements designed to prevent another company from acquiring the banking organization without the permission of the investor.

The 1982 Policy Statement sets out the Board’s concerns with these investments, the considerations the Board will take into account in determining whether the investments are consistent with the Act, and the general scope of arrangements to be avoided by bank holding companies. The Board recognized that the complexity of legitimate business arrangements precludes rigid rules designed to cover all situations and that decisions regarding the existence or absence of control in any particular case must take into account the effect of the combination of provisions and covenants in the agreement as a whole and the particular facts and circumstances of each case.

2090.4.2.1 Statutory and Regulatory Provisions

Under section 3(a) of the Act, a bank holding company may not acquire direct or indirect ownership or control of more than 5 percent of the voting shares of a bank without the Board’s prior approval (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)). In addition, this section of the Act provides that a bank holding company may not, without the Board’s prior approval, acquire control of a bank: that is, in the words of the statute, “for any action to be taken that causes a bank to become a subsidiary of a bank holding company” (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(2)). Under the Act, a bank is a subsidiary of a bank holding company if

1. The company directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds with power to vote 25 percent or more of the voting shares of the bank;
2. The company controls in any manner the election of a majority of the board of directors of the bank; or
3. The Board determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing that the company has the power, directly or indirectly, to exercise a controlling influence over the management or policies of the bank (12 U.S.C. 1841(d)).

2090.4.2.2 Review of Agreements

Prior to the permissibility of interstate banking, bank holding companies sought to make substantial equity investments in other bank holding companies across state lines, but without obtaining more than 5 percent of the voting shares or control of the acquiree. These invest-
ments involved a combination of the following arrangements:

1. Options on, warrants for, or rights to convert nonvoting shares into substantial blocks of voting securities of the acquiree bank holding company or its subsidiary bank(s);
2. Merger or asset acquisition agreements with the out-of-state bank or bank holding company that are to be consummated in the event interstate banking is permitted;
3. Provisions that limit or restrict major policies, operations, or decisions of the acquiree; and
4. Provisions that make acquisitions of the acquiree or its subsidiary bank(s) by a third party either impossible or economically impracticable.

The various warrants, options, and rights were not exercisable by the investing bank holding company until interstate banking was permitted. They were transferred by the investor either immediately or after the passage of a period of time or upon the occurrence of certain events.

After a careful review of a number of these arrangements, the Board concluded that investments in nonvoting stock, absent other arrangements, could be consistent with the Act. Some of the agreements reviewed appeared consistent with the Act because they were limited to investments of relatively moderate size in nonvoting equity that may become voting equity...

However, other agreements reviewed by the Board raised substantial problems of consistency with the control provisions of the Act because the investors... sought to assure the soundness of their investments, prevent takeovers by others, and allow for sale of their options, warrants, or rights to a person of the investor’s choice in the event a third party obtains control of the acquiree or the investor otherwise becomes dissatisfied with its investment. Since the Act precludes the investors from protecting their investments through ownership or use of voting shares or other exercise of control, the investors substituted contractual agreements for rights normally achieved through voting shares.

For example, various covenants in certain of the agreements sought to assure the continuing soundness of the investment by substantially limiting the discretion of the acquiree’s management over major policies and decisions, including restrictions on entering into new banking activities without the investor’s approval and requirements for extensive consultations with the investor on financial matters. By their terms, these covenants suggested control by the investing company over the management and policies of the acquiree.

Similarly, certain of the agreements deprived the acquiree bank holding company, by covenant or because of an option, of the right to sell, transfer, or encumber a majority or all of the voting shares of its subsidiary bank(s) with the aim of maintaining the integrity of the investment and preventing takeovers by others. These long-term restrictions on voting shares were within the presumption in the Board’s Regulation Y that attributes control of shares to any company that enters into any agreement placing long-term restrictions on the rights of a holder of voting securities (12 C.F.R. 225.31(d)(2)).

Finally, investors wished to reserve the right to sell their options, warrants or rights to a person of their choice to prevent being locked into what may become an unwanted investment. The Board took the position that the ability to control the ultimate disposition of voting shares to a person of the investor’s choice and to secure the economic benefits therefrom indicates control of the shares under the Act. The Board concluded that the ability to transfer rights to large blocks of voting shares, even if nonvoting in the hands of the investing company, could result in such a substantial position of leverage over the management of the acquiree as to involve a structure that would inevitably result in control prohibited by the Act.

2090.4.2.3 Provisions that Avoid Control

In 1982, the context of any particular agreement, provisions of the type described above were acceptable if combined with other provisions that serve to preclude control. The Board believed that such agreements would not be consistent with the Act unless provisions are included that will preserve management’s discretion over the policies and decisions of the acquiree and avoid control of voting shares.

As a first step towards avoiding control, management had to be free to conduct banking and permissible nonbanking activities. Another step to avoid control included the right of the acquiree to “call” the equity investment and

options or warrants to assure that covenants that may become inhibiting can be avoided by the acquiree. This right made such investments or agreements more like a loan in which the borrower has a right to escape covenants and avoid the lender’s influence by prepaying the loan.

A measure to avoid problems of control arising through the investor’s control over the ultimate disposition of rights to substantial amounts of voting shares of the acquiree might have included a provision granting the acquiree a right of first refusal before warrants, options, or other rights may be sold and requiring a public and dispersed distribution of those rights if the right of first refusal is not exercised.

The Board concluded that agreements that involve rights to less than 25 percent of the voting shares, with a requirement for a dispersed public distribution in the event of sale, have a much greater prospect of achieving consistency with the Act than agreement involving a greater percentage. This guideline was drawn by analogy from the provision in the Act that ownership of 25 percent or more of the voting securities of a bank constitutes control of the bank.

One effect of the guideline was to hold down the size of the nonvoting equity investment by the investing company relative to the acquiree’s total equity, thus avoiding the potential for control because the investor holds a very large proportion of the acquiree’s total equity. Observation of the 25 percent guideline also made provisions in agreements providing for a right of first refusal or a public and widely dispersed offering of rights to the acquiree’s shares more practical and realistic.

Finally, acquirers were to avoid certain arrangements regardless of other provisions in the agreement that were designed to avoid control. These are

1. Agreements that enabled the investing bank holding company (or its designee) to direct in any manner the voting of more than 5 percent of the voting shares of the acquiree;
2. Agreements whereby the investing company had the right to direct the acquiree’s use of the proceeds of an equity investment by the investing company to effect certain actions, such as the purchase and redemption of the acquiree’s voting shares; and
3. The acquisition of more than 5 percent of the voting shares of the acquiree that “simultaneously” with their acquisition by the investing company become nonvoting shares, remain nonvoting shares while held by the investor, and revert to voting shares when transferred to a third party.

2090.4.2.4 Review by the Board

The 1982 Policy Statement did not constitute the exclusive scope of the Board’s concerns, nor were the considerations with respect to control outlined in this statement an exhaustive catalog of permissible or impermissible arrangements. The Board instructed its staff to review agreements of the kind discussed in this statement and to bring to the Board’s attention those that raise problems of consistency with the Act.

2090.4.3 ACTIVITIES OF BANKING ORGANIZATIONS AND BOARD DETERMINATIONS SUBSEQUENT TO THE 1982 POLICY STATEMENT

Many aspects of the 1982 Policy Statement have broader applicability and have served as the foundation for the Board’s review more generally of whether a minority investment in a banking organization would give the investor a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization. In this regard, the 1982 Policy Statement identified a number of structural measures that the Board believed would limit the ability of an investor to exercise a controlling influence over a banking organization. These included restricting the use of covenants that constrain the discretion of banking organization management, limiting the amount of voting and nonvoting shares of the banking organization acquired by the investor, and limiting the ability of the investor to transfer large blocks of voting shares.

The Board made clear in the 1982 Policy Statement that the complexity of legitimate business arrangements precluded establishing rigid rules designed to cover all situations and that decisions regarding the presence or absence of control must take into account the specific facts and circumstances of each case. Accordingly, since the 1982 Policy Statement, the Board has determined whether an equity investor in a banking organization has a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization by considering carefully all the facts and circumstances surrounding the investor’s investment in, and relationship with, the banking organization. Large minority investors in a banking organization typically...
have avoided acquiring a controlling influence over the banking organization by providing the Board with a set of passivity commitments and by avoiding certain control-enhancing mechanisms. Specifically, minority investors have avoided acquiring control over a banking organization by, among other things

- restricting the size of their voting and total equity investment in the banking organization;
- avoiding covenants that would enable the investor to restrict the ability of the banking organization’s management to determine the major policies and operations of the banking organization;
- not attempting to influence the banking organization’s process for making decisions about major policies and operations;
- limiting director and officer interlocks with the banking organization; and
- limiting business relationships between the investor and the banking organization.

2090.4.4 BOARD’S 2008 POLICY STATEMENT ON EQUITY INVESTMENTS IN BANKS AND BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Since issuing the 1982 Policy Statement, the Board has reviewed a significant number of noncontrolling investments in banking organizations. The Board believed that it would be useful and appropriate to update its guidance in this area and therefore issued its Policy Statement on Equity Investments in Banks and Bank Holding Companies (the 2008 Policy Statement) on September 21, 2008. (See the Board’s September 22, 2008, Press Release.)

2090.4.4.1 Specific Approaches to Avoid Control

The 2008 Policy Statement discusses the Board’s views on specific approaches to avoid control.5

2090.4.4.1.1 Director Representation

The Board generally has not permitted a company that acquires between 10 and 24.9 percent of the voting stock of a banking organization (a minority investor) to have representation on the board of directors of the banking organization. The principal exception to this guideline has been in situations in which the investor owns less than 15 percent of the voting stock of the banking organization and another person (or group of persons acting together) owns a larger block of voting stock of the banking organization.

The Board has reexamined its precedent in this area and, based on its experience with minority investors and director representation, believes that a minority investor generally should be able to have a single representative on the board of directors of a banking organization without acquiring a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization. Typically, boards of directors of banking organizations have 9 or 10 members. Although having a representative on the board of the banking organization enhances the influence of a minority investor, the Board’s experience has shown that, in the absence of other indicia of control, it would be difficult for a minority investor with a single board seat to have a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization.6

Moreover, a minority investor that has up to two representatives on the board of directors of the banking organization is unlikely, absent other indicia of control, to be able to exercise a controlling influence over the banking organization when the investor’s aggregate director representation is proportionate to its total interest in the banking organization but does not exceed 25 percent of the voting members of the board.8

6. In addition to formal representation on the board of directors of a banking organization, minority investors also frequently seek to have a representative attend meetings of the board of directors of the banking organization in the capacity of a nonvoting observer. Attendance by a representative of a minority investor as an observer at meetings of the board of directors of a banking organization allows the investor access to information and a mechanism for providing advice to the banking organization but has not in previous situations allowed the investor to exercise a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization as long as the observer does not have any right to vote at meetings of the board.

7. An investor’s total interest is equal to the greater of the investor’s voting interest or total equity interest in the banking organization.

8. For example, an investor with a 10 percent voting interest and a 20 percent total equity interest generally could have two representatives on the board of directors of the banking organization if the investor’s director representation does not exceed 20 percent of the board seats. On the other hand, an investor with a 15 percent voting interest and a 33 percent total equity interest generally could have two representatives on the board of directors of the banking organization if the investor’s director representation does not exceed 25 percent.

5. See the 2008 Policy Statement at 12 C.F.R. 225.144, beginning at paragraph (c).
and another shareholder of the banking organization is a bank holding company that controls the banking organization under the BHC Act.\(^9\) The presence of another larger, controlling shareholder of the banking organization that has been approved by the Board, is subject to supervision and regulation by the Board, and is obligated to serve as a source of strength for the banking organization should serve as a powerful countervailing force to whatever influence the minority investor may have as a result of its investment and proportional director representation.

The Board continues to believe that a representative of a minority investor that serves on the board of directors of the banking organization should not serve as the chairman of the board of the banking organization or as the chairman of a committee of the board of the banking organization. The Board generally believes, however, that representatives of a non-controlling minority investor may serve as members of committees of the board of the banking organization when those representatives do not occupy more than 25 percent of the seats on any committee and do not have the authority or practical ability unilaterally to make (or block the making of) policy or other decisions that bind the board or management of the banking organization.

2090.4.4.1.2 Total Equity

The three-prong control test in the BHC Act makes no explicit reference to nonvoting equity investments. Nevertheless, the Board has long subscribed to the view that the overall size of an equity investment, including both voting and nonvoting equity, is an important indicator of the degree of influence an investor may have. Accordingly, the Board traditionally has taken account of the presence and size of nonvoting equity investments in its controlling influence analysis. For example, in the 1982 Policy Statement, the Board set forth a guideline that nonvoting equity investments that exceed 25 percent of the total equity of a banking organization generally raise control issues under the BHC Act.\(^10\) The Board has recognized in a few limited circumstances, however, that ownership by a minority investor of 25 percent or more of a banking organization’s total equity may not confer a controlling influence, usually in situations when another controlling investor is present or other extenuating circumstances indicate that the exercise of a controlling influence by the minority investor is unlikely.

The Board continues to believe that an investor that makes a very large equity investment in a banking organization is likely to have a controlling influence over the banking organization’s management or policies. Investors with large equity investments have a powerful incentive to wield influence over the banking organization in which they have invested. They have a substantial amount of money at stake in the enterprise, are among the first to absorb losses if the banking organization has financial difficulties, and participate in the profits of the banking organization going forward. Moreover, a banking organization is likely to pay heed to its large shareholders to help ensure it has the ability to raise equity capital in the future and to prevent the negative market signal that would be created by the sale of a large block of equity by an unhappy existing shareholder.

On the other hand, the Board recognizes that nonvoting equity does not provide the holder with voting rights that empower the holder to participate directly in the selection of banking organization management or otherwise in the banking organization’s decision-making process. Moreover, as noted above, the BHC Act defines control in terms of ownership of 25 percent or more of a class of voting securities but does not impose an express limit on ownership of nonvoting shares. The Board continues to believe that, in most circumstances, an investor that owns 25 percent or more of the total equity of a banking organization owns enough of the capital resources of a banking organization to have a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization. The Board continues to recognize, however, that the ability of an investor to exercise a controlling influence through nonvoting equity instruments depends significantly on the nature and extent of the investor’s overall investment in the banking organization and on the capital structure of the banking organization.

\(^9\) In determining what amount of director representation is proportional to an investor’s voting interest in a banking organization, the investor should round to the nearest whole number. For example, the Board would consider a minority investor that owns 15 percent of the voting stock of a banking organization to have proportionate director representation if it had two representatives on a board of directors with 10 or more members (but not on a board of directors with 9 or fewer members).

\(^10\) 12 C.F.R. 225.143(d)(4) and (d)(5).
In particular, the Board would not expect that a minority investor would have a controlling influence over a banking organization if the investor owns a combination of voting shares and nonvoting shares that, when aggregated, represents less than one-third of the total equity of the organization (and less than one-third of any class of voting securities, assuming conversion of all convertible nonvoting shares held by the investor) and does not allow the investor to own, hold, or vote 15 percent or more of any class of voting securities of the organization. In these situations, the limitation on voting rights reduces the potential that the investor may exercise influence that is controlling.

In previous cases, investors that have acquired nonvoting shares often have sought the right to convert those shares to voting shares under various circumstances. The Board continues to believe that nonvoting shares that may be converted into voting shares at the election of the holder of the shares, or that mandatorily convert after the passage of time, should be considered voting shares at all times for purposes of the BHC Act. However, in previous cases, the Board has recognized that nonvoting shares that are convertible into voting shares carry less influence when the nonvoting shares may not be converted into voting shares in the hands of the investor and may only be transferred by the investor: (1) to an affiliate of the investor or to the banking organization; (2) in a widespread public distribution; (3) in transfers in which no transferee (or group of associated transferees) would receive 2 percent or more of any class of voting securities of the banking organization; or (4) to a transferee that would control more than 50 percent of the voting securities of the banking organization without any transfer from the investor. Ownership of this form of nonvoting, convertible shares, within the limits discussed above, allows investors to provide capital to a banking organization in a way that is useful to the organization, minimizes the opportunity for the investor to exercise a controlling influence over the organization, and allows the investor to exit the investment without conveying control to another party outside the parameters of the BHC Act.

2090.4.4.1.3 Consultations with Management

In many previous cases, minority investors have agreed not to attempt to influence the operations, management, or strategies of the banking organization in which they have invested; not to threaten to sell their shares in the banking organization as a method for influencing decisions of banking organization management; and not to solicit proxies on any matter from the other shareholders of the banking organization. These commitments were designed to limit the exercise by a minority investor of a controlling influence over the management or policies of a banking organization.

The Board believes that it would be useful to provide additional guidance on the extent of communications between a minority investor and a banking organization’s management that would be consistent with a noncontrol determination. The Board believes that a noncontrolling minority investor, like any other shareholder, generally may communicate with banking organization management about, and advocate with banking organization management for changes in, any of the banking organization’s policies and operations. For example, an investor may, directly or through a representative on a banking organization’s board of directors, advocate for changes in the banking organization’s dividend policy; discuss strategies for raising additional debt or equity financing; argue that the banking organization should enter into or avoid a new business line or divest a material subsidiary; or attempt to convince banking organization management to merge the banking organization with another firm or sell the banking organization to a potential acquirer. These communications also generally may include advocacy by minority investors for changes in the banking organization’s management and recommendations for new or alternative management. Although these types of discussions represent attempts by an investor to influence the management or policies of the banking organization, discussions alone are not the type of controlling influence targeted by the BHC Act.

To avoid the exercise of a controlling influence, in all cases, the decision whether or not to adopt a particular position or take a particular action must remain with the banking organization’s shareholders as a group, its board of directors, or its management, as appropriate. The role of the minority investor in these decisions must be limited to voting its shares in its discretion at a meeting of the shareholders of the banking organization.

As discussed later in the 2008 Policy Statement, a minority investor may not have a contractual right to determine (or a veto right over) any of the major policies and operations of the bank or the composition of the bank’s management team.
organization (directly or by proxy, including in connection with a proxy solicitation launched by another shareholder), and by exercising voting privileges as a member of the board of directors of the banking organization (to the extent permitted as discussed above). Importantly, communications by minority investors should not be accompanied by explicit or implicit threats to dispose of shares in the banking organization or to sponsor a proxy solicitation as a condition of action or non-action by the banking organization or its management.

2090.4.4.1.4 Other Indicia of Control

2090.4.4.1.4.1 Business Relationships

The Board traditionally has prohibited a non-controlling minority investor in a banking organization from having any material business transactions or relationships with the banking organization. The Board historically has taken the view that a major supplier, customer, or lender to a banking organization can exercise considerable influence over the banking organization’s management and policies—especially when coupled with a sizeable voting stock investment—by threatening to terminate or change the terms of the business relationship.

The Board has recognized over the years, however, that not all business relationships—even when accompanied by a material investment—provide the investor a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization. Accordingly, the Board has frequently allowed business relationships that were quantitatively limited and qualitatively nonmaterial, particularly in situations where an investor’s voting securities percentage in the banking organization was closer to 10 percent than 25 percent. The Board continues to believe that business relationships should remain limited and will continue to review business relationships on a case-by-case basis within the context of the other elements of the investment structure. In that review, the Board will pay particular attention to the size of the proposed business relationships and to whether the proposed business relationships would be on market terms, non-exclusive, and terminable without penalty by the banking organization.

2090.4.4.1.4.2 Covenants

Because the BHC Act explicitly defines control (and many of its other thresholds) in terms that include a percentage of voting securities, companies often have structured their investments in banking organizations in the form of nonvoting securities and have attempted to substitute contractual agreements for the rights that normally are obtained through voting securities. The Board has taken and continues to hold the view that covenants that substantially limit the discretion of a banking organization’s management over major policies and decisions suggest the exercise of a controlling influence.\textsuperscript{12} In particular, the Board has been concerned about covenants or contractual terms that place restrictions on, or otherwise inhibit, the banking organization’s ability to make decisions about the following actions: (1) hiring, firing, and compensating executive officers; (2) engaging in new business lines or making substantial changes to its operations; (3) raising additional debt or equity capital; (4) merging or consolidating; (5) selling, leasing, transferring, or disposing of material subsidiaries or major assets; or (6) acquiring significant assets or control of another firm.\textsuperscript{13}

On the other hand, the Board generally has not viewed as problematic for control purposes those covenants that give an investor rights permissible for a holder of nonvoting securities as described in section 2(q)(2) of Regulation Y.\textsuperscript{14} These would include covenants that prohibit the banking organization from issuing senior securities or borrowing on a senior basis, modifying the terms of the investor’s security, or liquidating the banking organization. Noncontrolling covenants also could include covenants that provide the investor with limited financial information rights and limited consultation rights.

\textsuperscript{12} See 12 C.F.R. 225.143(d)(2).

\textsuperscript{13} For an investment to be eligible for inclusion in a banking organization’s regulatory capital, it must not contain or be covered by any covenants, terms, or restrictions that are inconsistent with safe and sound banking practices, see 12 C.F.R. 208, Appendix A, II and 12 C.F.R. 225, Appendix A, II(i). As described in 12 C.F.R. 250.166(b)(3), such provisions include terms that could adversely affect the banking organization’s liquidity or unduly restrict management’s flexibility to run the organization, particularly in times of financial difficulty, or that could limit the regulator’s ability to resolve problem bank situations.

\textsuperscript{14} 12 C.F.R. 225.2(q)(2).
2090.4.4.2 Conclusion of the 2008 Policy Statement

As noted above, whether a minority investor in a banking organization has a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organization depends on all the facts and circumstances surrounding the investor’s investment in, and relationship with, the banking organization. This policy statement sets forth some of the most significant factors and principles the Board will consider in determining whether investments in a banking organization are noncontrolling for purposes of the BHC Act.

Importantly, controlling-influence determinations depend not just on the contractual rights and obligations of the investor and the banking organization; they also depend on the amount of influence the investor, in fact, exercises over the banking organization. Accordingly, the Board has and will continue to monitor carefully minority investments in banking organizations to ensure that investors do not, in fact, exercise a controlling influence over the management or policies of the banking organizations in which they invest. The Board also continues to evaluate its policies in this area and will modify them as appropriate going forward to ensure that minority investments in banking organizations remain consistent with the BHC Act.
## 2090.4.5 LAWS, REGULATIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND ORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Laws</th>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Federal Reserve approval if a BHC acquires more than 5 percent (direct or indirect control) of voting shares of a bank</td>
<td>1842(a)(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reserve approval of a BHC acquiring control of a bank</td>
<td>1842(a)(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHCs and direct or indirect controlling influence over a bank</td>
<td>1841(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a bank outside of the home state of the investing bank holding company</td>
<td>1842(d)(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term restrictions on the rights of a holder of voting securities</td>
<td>225.31(d)(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific approaches that avoid control</td>
<td>225.144(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonvoting equity investments as a percent of total equity and control issues</td>
<td>225.143(d)(4) and (d)(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants and controlling influence issues</td>
<td>225.143(d)(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants and rights permissible for a holder of nonvoting securities.</td>
<td>225.2(q)(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonvoting Equity Investments by BHCs (1982 Policy Statement)</td>
<td>225.143</td>
<td>4-172.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity investments in banks and BHCs (2008 Policy Statement)</td>
<td>225.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 12 U.S.C., unless specifically stated otherwise.  
2. 12 C.F.R., unless specifically stated otherwise.  
Pursuant to Section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act, a bank holding company, directly or through its subsidiary banks, may not acquire more than 5 percent of the shares of an additional bank without the Board’s prior approval. However, it is recognized that banks acting as trustee may acquire such shares without prior notice. Therefore, the Act requires a bank or banks which are subsidiaries of bank holding companies and acquire in excess of the 5 percent threshold limit, to file an application with the Board within 90 days after the shares exceeding the limit are acquired. The limit generally applies only to other bank shares over which the acquiring fiduciary exercises sole discretionary voting authority. Nevertheless, the Board has waived this application requirement under most circumstances in Section 225.12 of Regulation Y, unless—

1. the acquiring bank or other company has sole discretionary authority to vote the securities and retains the authority for more than two years; or
2. the acquisition is for the benefit of the acquiring bank or other company, or its shareholders, employees, or subsidiaries.

In determining whether the threshold limits have been reached, shares acquired prior to January 1, 1971 can ordinarily be excluded. On the other hand, shares of another bank held under the following circumstances should, in certain instances, be included in the 5 percent threshold, even though sole discretionary voting authority is not held:

1. Shares held by a trust which is a “company”, as defined in Section 2(b) of the Bank Holding Company Act; and,
2. Shares held as trustee for the benefit of the acquiring bank or bank holding company, or its shareholders, employees or subsidiaries.

A bank holding company should have procedures for monitoring holdings of the stock of other banks and bank holding companies for compliance with the foregoing application requirements of the Act, for compliance with reporting requirements on form Y–6, and for compliance with certain similar reporting requirements under the federal securities laws. A general 5 percent threshold applies in all three situations, although differing requirements and exemptions apply.

Examiners specifically trained in trust examinations may need to conduct this portion of an inspection and, in appropriate circumstances, the examiner may need to consult with Federal Reserve Bank legal counsel. Trust examiners routinely review such matters in connection with individual trust examinations. The inspection objectives will be to determine whether the holdings of shares of other banks or bank holding companies, in a fiduciary capacity, are appropriately monitored to comply with section 3(a) of the Bank Holding Company Act with other reporting requirements for such holdings.
Control and Ownership (Control Determinants)

**2090.6.05 CONTROL DETERMINANTS**

The spin-off or sale of property by a bank holding company may not sever the bank holding company’s control relationship over such property for purposes of the Bank Holding Company Act. The factors which are normally considered in determining whether control has ceased include the presumptions of control listed in section 225.31(a) of Regulation Y and in sections 2(a)(2) and 2(g) of the Act, and certain ownership and voting rights.

Most of the irrebuttable and rebuttable presumptions of control were written to establish initially a control relationship between two companies. All of the presumptions of control must be considered before presuming that a divestiture is effective. Irrebuttable control relationships are established, or continue to be recognized, when any of the conditions listed in section 225.2(e) of Regulation Y or sections 2(a)(2)(A), 2(a)(2)(B), 2(g)(1), or 2(g)(2) of the Act exist. Thus, a company is assumed to have irrebuttable control over a bank or another company without a Board determination if:

1. The company directly or indirectly, or acting through one or more other persons, owns, controls, or has power to vote 25 percent or more of the voting securities of the bank or company;
2. The company controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors, trustees, or general partners (individuals exercising similar functions) of the bank or other company;
3. The Board determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that the company directly or indirectly exercises a controlling influence over the management or policies of the bank or company.

Rebuttable presumptions of control are listed in section 225.31(d) of Regulation Y and in sections 2(a)(2)(C) of the Act. These sections describe situations which are not as clearly defined as the irrebuttable presumptions. For example, a company which enters into a management contract that gives the company significant control over the operations or management of a bank or other company may be deemed to exercise a controlling influence over that bank or other company. Section 225.31(c) of Regulation Y and section 2(a)(2)(C) of the Act require a Board determination to establish that a company directly or indirectly exercises a controlling influence over the management or policies of a bank or other company.

**2090.6.1 INSPECTION OBJECTIVES**

1. To determine whether or not a significant voting or ownership interest exists.
2. To determine whether any rebuttable presumptions of control raise any control issues (see section 225.31(d) of Regulation Y).
3. To determine whether section 2(g)(2) of the Act or any of the other irrebuttable presumptions of control listed in section 225.2(e) of Regulation Y raise any control issues.

**2090.6.2 INSPECTION PROCEDURES**

The examiner should review the stock records of the transferor, the transferee, and the transferred entity, if possible. Management contracts, trust agreements, and any pertinent agreements among these parties also should be reviewed for any evidence of a control relationship. When following these procedures for a bank holding company which has divested or will divest of property, the examiner should be aware that the criteria for establishing a continuing control relationship are more stringent than those for establishing an initial control relationship. Thus, the examiner should review all ownership and voting rights rather than just those above 5 or 25 percent.

The examiner should review the records of the bank holding company, its parents, and its subsidiaries as well as the records of any company being divested and the company (and its parent and subsidiaries) acquiring divested property for evidence of a continuing control relationship. If the transferee is an individual or if the records of the transferee are not available,
the examiner should inquire whether any of the specific control relationships exist. Specifically, the examiner should determine whether the transferee, its parent, or its subsidiaries, are indebted to or have common personnel (officers, directors, trustees, beneficiaries, policy making employees, consultants, etc.) with the transferor, its parent, or its subsidiaries.

### 2090.6.3 LAWS, REGULATIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND ORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Laws$^1$</th>
<th>Regulations$^2$</th>
<th>Interpretations$^3$</th>
<th>Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presumptions of control</td>
<td>Sections 2(g)(1) and 2(g)(2) of the act</td>
<td>225.31(a)</td>
<td>225.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerning divestitures</td>
<td></td>
<td>225.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttable presumptions of control</td>
<td></td>
<td>225.31(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements placed on transferee and transferor to ensure a complete separation</td>
<td>Alfred I. duPont Testamentary Trust; September 21, 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control is not terminated if a rebuttable presumption of control is applicable</td>
<td>Alfred I. duPont Testamentary Trust; October 3, 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of “transferee,” “transferee,” “shares,” and procedures</td>
<td>225.139(c)(1)</td>
<td>1978 FRB 211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Transferee” includes individuals</td>
<td>225.139 (footnote 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit Home Insurance Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota; August 30, 1978</td>
<td>The Moody Foundation, Galveston, Texas; January 16, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Laws</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Interpretations</td>
<td>Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumption of control through common directors, officers, etc.</td>
<td>225.139</td>
<td></td>
<td>GATX Corporation, Chicago, Illinois; February 21, 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of ownership to less than 5 percent of a subsidiary is an effective divestiture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Securities Corporation, Lake City, Tennessee; August 29, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual may be a transferee; an insignificant debt relationship may exist</td>
<td>225.139</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercantile National Corporation, Dallas, Texas; June 2, 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control terminated although shares were pledged as collateral on a note representing part of purchase price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equimark Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; February 4, 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to retain control pursuant to rebuttable presumption; approved, but company not authorized to acquire additional shares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Bancorp, Inc., Dallas, Texas; February 22, 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to divest control pursuant to rebuttable presumption; approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commanche Land and Cattle Company, Commanche, Texas; January 15, 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness of transferee to transferor</td>
<td>225.139(c)(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 FRB 237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject Laws, Regulations, Interpretations, Orders*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Laws(^1)</th>
<th>Regulations(^2)</th>
<th>Interpretations(^3)</th>
<th>Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board staff letter on a determination of control after a spin-off transaction</td>
<td>Imperial Bancorp; August 19, 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 12 U.S.C., unless specifically stated otherwise.
2. 12 C.F.R., unless specifically stated otherwise.
WHAT’S NEW IN THIS REVISED SECTION

This section has been revised to include a March 21, 2006, Board staff legal opinion that confirms that a direct conversion from a state-chartered bank to a national bank would not, by itself, cause a parent company to lose its grandfather rights maintained under section 4(f) of the BHC Act. The BHC Act prevents a grandfathered nonbank BHC from acquiring control of an additional bank or thrift as a limited-purpose trust company, which would not be a bank for the purposes of the BHC Act.

2090.7.1 CEBA AND FIRREA PROVISIONS FOR NONBANK BANKS

The Competitive Equality Banking Act (CEBA), effective August 10, 1987, amended section 2(c) of the BHC Act by expanding the definition of bank to include all FDIC-insured depository institutions. The definition also includes any other institution that (1) accepts demand deposits or other deposits that the depositor may make payable to third parties (demand deposits) and (2) is engaged in the business of making commercial loans. The new definition covers institutions that were not previously covered by the BHC Act (nonbank banks). Thrift institutions that remain primarily residential mortgage lenders continue to be excepted from the definition of bank.

CEBA amended section 4 of the BHC Act by adding a grandfather provision that permits a nonbanking company that on March 5, 1987, controlled an institution that became a bank under CEBA to retain the institution and not be treated as a bank holding company. A grandfathered company will lose its exemption, however, if it violates any of several prohibitions governing its activities. Among these prohibitions, a grandfathered company may not acquire control of an additional bank or a thrift institution or acquire more than 5 percent of the assets or shares of an additional bank or thrift. In addition, no bank subsidiary of the grandfathered company may commence to accept demand deposits and engage in the business of making commercial loans. A bank subsidiary of the grandfathered company may also not permit an overdraft (including an interday overdraft) or incur an overdraft on behalf of an affiliate at a Federal Reserve Bank.

If a grandfathered company no longer qualifies for an exemption, the company must divest control of all the banks it controls within 180 days after the date that the company receives notice from the Board that it no longer qualifies for the exemption. The exemption may be reinstated if, before the end of the 180-day notice period, the company (1) corrects the condition or ceases the activity that caused its exemption to end or submits a plan to the Board for approval to correct the condition or cease the activity within one year and (2) implements procedures reasonably adapted to avoid a recurrence of the condition or activity.

The Board may examine and require reports of grandfathered companies and of the nonbank banks they control but only to monitor or enforce compliance with the grandfather restrictions. The Board also may use civil enforcement powers, including cease-and-desist orders, to enforce compliance.

Grandfathered companies, their affiliates, and their nonbank banks are also subject to the

2. Section 225.52 of Regulation Y further defines the restrictions on overdrafts.
3. Section 225.52(b)(2)(ii) of Regulation Y provides that a nonbank bank (or an industrial bank) incurs an overdraft on behalf of an affiliate when (1) the nonbank bank holds an account at a Federal Reserve bank for an affiliate from which third-party payments can be made and (2) the posting of an affiliate’s transactions to the nonbank bank’s or industrial bank’s account creates an overdraft or increases the amount of an existing overdraft in the account.
4. The overdraft prohibition does not apply if the overdraft (1) results from an inadvertent computer or accounting error that is beyond the control of both the bank and the affiliate; (2) is permitted or incurred on behalf of an affiliate that is monitored by, reports to, and is recognized as a primary dealer by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and is fully secured, as required by the Board, by direct U.S. obligations, obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, or securities or obligations eligible for settlement by the Federal Reserve book-entry system; or (3) is permitted or incurred by or on behalf of an affiliate in connection with an activity that is financial in nature or incidental to a financial activity and does not cause the bank to violate any provision of sections 23A or 23B of the Federal Reserve Act directly or indirectly or by virtue of section 18(j) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.
anti-tying restrictions of the BHC Act and to the insider-lending restrictions of section 22(h) of the FRA and in Regulation O. Thus, for example, a nonbank bank may not condition a grant of credit on the purchase of a product or service from its grandfathered holding company, or vice versa, and it may not extend credit to insiders of the nonbank bank or its grandfathered holding company on preferential terms.

A bank holding company that controls a nonbank bank may retain it as long as the nonbank bank does not (1) engage in an activity that would have caused it to be a bank before the effective date of CEBA or (2) increase the number of locations from which it does business after March 5, 1987. These limitations do not apply if (1) the nonbank bank is viewed as an additional bank subsidiary of the bank holding company and (2) the BHC’s acquisition of the nonbank bank would be permissible under the interstate banking provisions of the BHC Act.

2090.7.2 RETAINING GRANDFATHER RIGHTS UNDER SECTION 4(F) OF THE BHC ACT

A state nonmember bank (Bank A) that became a “bank” for purposes of the BHC Act as a result of CEBA requested a determination that its conversion to a national bank and merger with a limited-purpose trust company would not cause its parent company to lose certain grandfather rights that it maintains under section 4(f) of the BHC Act. (See 12 U.S.C. 1843(f).)

The parent company could retain ownership of Bank A and not be treated as a bank holding company, but only if it and Bank A abided by the conditions set forth in section 4(f) of the BHC Act. One of these conditions generally prohibits the parent company from acquiring control of more than 5 percent of the shares or assets of an additional bank or savings association. (See 12 U.S.C. 1843(f)(2)(A)(i) and (ii).)

The parent company wished to convert Bank A into a national bank. The conversion would be effected directly, and the parent company would not establish, or acquire any shares of, a separate bank or savings association as part of the conversion process. Simultaneously with the conversion process, however, the parent company would establish a new, limited-purpose national bank trust company (trust company). It was represented that the trust company would comply with the limitations and restrictions in, and would qualify for, the trust company exception from the definition of bank under section 2(c)(2)(D) of the BHC Act. (See 12 U.S.C. 1841.) The parent company would then cause the trust company to merge into Bank A, with Bank A being the entity that survives the merger. Bank A would then change its name (new bank) and the location of its headquarters.

Under the proposed transaction, the parent company would remain the sole shareholder of new bank. It was represented that, prior to its merger with Bank A, the trust company would not be an operating company and would have no assets or liabilities. It was also represented that the proposal would not result in any change in ownership or control of Bank A.

The Board’s legal staff concluded that the direct conversion of Bank A from a state-chartered bank to a national bank would not, by itself, cause the parent company to lose its grandfather rights under section 4(f) of the BHC Act.6 Also, the BHC Act would not prevent the parent company from chartering the trust company. Although the BHC Act prevents a grandfathered nonbank bank from acquiring control of an additional bank or thrift (12 U.S.C. 1843(f)(2)(A)), the trust company as a limited-purpose trust company would not be a bank for the purposes of the BHC Act.

The Board’s Legal Division staff stated that it would not recommend that the Board determine that the transactions described in the request would cause the parent company to lose its grandfather rights under section 4(f) of the BHC Act. New bank is required to comply with the conditions applicable to a nonbank bank and a grandfathered holding company, respectively, under the BHC Act. (See the Board staff legal opinion dated March 21, 2006.)

5. Previously, a nonbank bank could accept demand deposits or engage in the business of making commercial loans, but could not engage in both activities.

## 2090.7.3 LAWS, REGULATIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND ORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Laws¹</th>
<th>Regulations²</th>
<th>Interpretations³</th>
<th>Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limitations on nonbank banks</td>
<td>1843(f)</td>
<td>225.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 12 U.S.C., unless specifically stated otherwise.
2. 12 C.F.R., unless specifically stated otherwise.
The Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA), effective August 9, 1990, provided [12 U.S.C. 1815 (e)] that any insured depository institution will be liable for any actual or reasonably anticipated loss incurred or to be incurred by the FDIC in connection with:

1. The default of a commonly controlled\(^1\) depository institution; or
2. Any assistance provided by the FDIC to any commonly controlled insured depository institution.

2090.8.1 FIVE YEAR PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY (5-YEAR TRANSITION RULE)

Sister banks, for five years from the enactment of the law, are protected against losses due to the default of a thrift acquired before enactment. The law also grants a five-year protection to thrifts for loss due to the default of a bank acquired before the law’s enactment.

2090.8.2 CROSS-GUARANTEE PROVISIONS

FIRREA contains cross-guarantee provisions. These provisions enable the FDIC to obtain reimbursement from insured depository institutions, in the event that the FDIC incurs a loss due to any assistance provided to, or a default of, a commonly controlled bank or thrift.

The FDIC will provide written notice when an insured depository institution is being held liable for losses sustained by the FDIC in connection with a commonly controlled bank or thrift. Upon receipt of the written notice from the FDIC, the insured depository institution is required to pay the amount specified. An insured depository institution is not liable for losses incurred by the FDIC, in connection with a commonly controlled institution, if the written notice is not received within two years from the date of the FDIC’s loss.

The liability the insured depository institution has to the FDIC is senior to shareholders’ claims and any obligation or liability owed to any affiliate of the depository institution.\(^2\) Claims of the FDIC against the depository institution are subordinate to any deposit liabilities, secured obligations and obligations that are subordinate to depositors (i.e., subordinated debt).

The FDIC may grant an insured depository institution a waiver of the cross-guarantee provisions, if it determines that such an exemption is in the best interests of the either the Bank or Savings Association Insurance Funds. Limited partnerships and affiliates of limited partnerships (other than an insured depository institution, which is a majority owned subsidiary of such partnership) may also be exempted from the provisions, if the limited partnership or its affiliate has filed a registration statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission, on or before April 10, 1989. The registration statement must indicate that as of the date of the filing, the partnership intended to acquire one or more insured depository institutions. If an insured depository institution is granted an exemption from the cross-guarantee provisions, then the institution and all of its insured depository institution affiliates must comply with the restrictions of sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act without regard to section 23A(d)(1) which provides for certain exemptions.

2090.8.3 EXCLUSION FOR INSTITUTIONS ACQUIRED IN DEBT COLLECTIONS

FIRREA provides an exclusion from the cross-guarantee provisions for an institution acquired in securing or collecting a debt previously contracted in good faith. However, during the entire exclusion period, the controlling bank and all of its insured depository institution affiliates must comply with the restrictions of sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act (FRA);\(^3\) for transactions with the insured depository institution involving acquisitions as a result of debts previously contracted in good faith.

\(^1\) Depository institutions are commonly controlled if:

a. Such institutions are controlled by the same depository institution holding company (including any company, such as nonbank banks, that are required to file reports under [12 U.S.C. 1843(f)(6)]; or
b. One depository institution is controlled by another depository institution.

\(^2\) Does not apply to any obligation to affiliates secured as of May 1, 1989.

\(^3\) Without regard to section 23A(d)(1) of the FRA.
The Federal Reserve has observed an increase in interest by some holding companies to establish arrangements that are designed to benefit certain shareholders, enhance short-term investor returns, and/or provide a distinct disincentive for investors to acquire or increase ownership in a holding company’s common stock and other capital instruments. In some instances, supervisory staff has found that these shareholder protection arrangements would have negative implications on a holding company’s capital or financial position, limit a holding company’s financial flexibility and capital-raising capacity, or otherwise impair a holding company’s ability to raise additional capital. These arrangements impede the ability of a holding company to serve as a source of strength to its insured depository subsidiaries and should not conduct its operations in an unsafe or unsound manner. Specifically, a holding company should stand ready to use available resources to provide adequate capital funds to its subsidiary banks and thrifts during periods of financial stress or adversity. See 12 U.S.C. 1831o-1; 12 C.F.R. 225.4(a); and 12 C.F.R. 238.8(a).

2. As discussed further below, these arrangements may come in many different forms, including all or portions of agreements between shareholders (or other relevant parties), company plans, organizing documents, and other contractual provisions that provide shareholder protections.

Examples of shareholder protection arrangements that have raised supervisory issues include, but are not limited to, provisions whereby:

- The holding company agrees to provide an investor with cash payments reflecting the difference between the price paid by the investor and a lower price per share paid by investors in subsequent transactions;
- The holding company agrees to provide an investor with additional shares of stock for minimal or no additional cost in the event that the holding company issues shares at a price below the price paid by the investor;
- Existing shareholders of the holding company are able to acquire additional shares at significant discounts to market value in a new offering if any shareholder crosses a specific ownership threshold;
- Investors with less-than-majority control are granted the contractual right to restrict or prevent the holding company from issuing additional shares; or
- The holding company’s board of directors has

3. Provisions of this type and the next example are often referred to as “down-round” provisions. Down-round provisions can take many forms, but all are designed to protect existing shareholders in the event a holding company’s stock price declines in a subsequent effort to raise capital or sell the holding company.

4. Provisions of this type are often referred to as “poison pills” and were originally developed as defenses against contested acquisitions. There are multiple common forms, but these provisions generally operate by increasing the ownership interest of shareholders other than a buyer of a significant block of shares, thereby diluting the buyer and preventing the takeover bid. Poison pill structures have also been applied in the context of tax benefit preservation plans (TBPPs), which, in general terms, are designed to preserve net operating losses within the requirements of section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code. Under section 382, the use of deferred tax assets can be restricted by an “ownership change.” Thus, TBPPs and poison pills use similar mechanisms to restrict changes in ownership, despite different underlying purposes. TBPPs may also take forms different from traditional poison pills.

As an example, a TBPP or poison pill may provide all shareholders, other than the shareholder crossing the relevant threshold, the right to acquire shares of the holding company at a substantial discount, reducing the incentive of shareholders to acquire more shares at or above the threshold. These rights may or may not terminate within a set amount of time.
the authority to nullify share purchases under certain circumstances, require the holding company to repurchase the shares of the company from a new owner of the shares, or take other actions that would significantly inhibit secondary market transactions in the shares of the holding company.\(^5\)

Arrangements of these types (in whatever form) have the potential to impose additional financial obligations on a holding company or restrict in some way the primary or secondary market for the holding company’s shares. Often, these arrangements serve to protect the value of the initial investment made by a particular subset of shareholders rather than the viability of the issuing holding company, or, in other ways, provide current shareholders with an advantage over future, similarly situated, investors.\(^6\)

**2093.0.2 SUPERVISORY OVERSIGHT**

If supervisory or applications staff determine that a particular shareholder protection arrangement impairs the ability of a holding company to raise or maintain capital, particularly during a period of stress on the firm, or that provisions of the arrangement are in violation of applicable supervisory enforcement actions, Federal Reserve staff should consult with appropriate Federal Reserve Board supervisory staff to determine the appropriate action. This can occur when:

- **Federal Reserve staff become aware of a proposed shareholder protection arrangement (for example, as part of an effort to raise capital or a proposal to expand):** Federal Reserve staff should incorporate a review of such arrangements during consideration of the specific proposal, whether or not there is a formal application or other approval requirement.

- **Federal Reserve staff become aware of an existing shareholder protection arrangement during the course of a supervisory activity (for example, in discussions with the holding company’s management):** Federal Reserve staff should incorporate a review of such arrangements in the examination scope or supervisory plan for the holding company and, on limited occasions, in connection with an application filing.\(^7\)

The Federal Reserve may direct a holding company’s board of directors to modify or remove a shareholder protection arrangement that gives rise to safety-and-soundness concerns. The corrective actions, if any, will vary depending on the facts and circumstances of the holding company, as well as applicable state and federal laws and regulations, corporate charter and by-laws, and other considerations.\(^8\)

The Federal Reserve may direct a holding company to comply with applicable supervisory guidance, including SR-13-13/CA-13-10, “Supervisory Considerations for the Communication of Supervisory Findings.” If a holding company has questions regarding the removal or modification of a shareholder protection arrangement, the holding company should consult with the appropriate Federal Reserve Bank.

---

5. These arrangements could include complete prohibitions on share transfers, as well as certain forms of buy-sell agreements, rights of first refusal, or similar arrangements that sufficiently restrict the transfer of shares as to effectively prohibit most, if not all, transfers.

6. In general, the right to participate in subsequent offerings to prevent dilution of ownership, when fully paid for, has not raised concerns.

7. This guidance is focused on supervisory actions going forward and is not intended to require active confirmation by a holding company or Federal Reserve staff on a routine basis that a shareholder protection issue does not exist. To facilitate the identification of shareholder protection arrangements that raise supervisory concern, the management and other representatives of holding companies are encouraged to bring all such existing or proposed arrangements to the attention of relevant supervisory and applications staff when appropriate.

8. Holding companies subject to the Board’s Regulation Q (12 C.F.R. 217) are subject to additional regulatory requirements that should be considered in connection with shareholder protection arrangements. In particular, common equity tier 1 capital instruments and additional tier 1 capital instruments are required to satisfy eligibility criteria that effectively disqualify instruments with certain features used in some shareholder protection arrangements, such as features that limit or discourage future capital issuances, compensate existing investors if new instruments are issued at a lower price, create incentives to redeem, or interfere with the full discretion of the issuer to cancel dividend payments except under limited circumstances. See 12 C.F.R. 217.20. Further, the Board may require a holding company to exclude capital instruments from regulatory capital if such instruments have characteristics or terms that diminish the instrument’s ability to absorb losses, or otherwise present safety-and-soundness concerns. See 12 C.F.R. 217.1(d)(2).