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MR. FORTENBERY: Thank you very much for coming to the 36th meeting of the Agriculture Advisory Committee to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

My name is Randy FORTENBERY. I'm from the School of Economics at Washington State University so I'll be serving as the chairman. My primary job will be to try to keep us on topic and on time this morning. So that's why I'm trying to start it on time.

A couple of quick housekeeping items. If you haven't remembered to do so, please turn your cell phone either off or on vibrate.

When it's your turn to speak today there's a red button you'll need to push on the microphone. But when you're done speaking you need to turn it back off so somebody else can speak. So try to remember to both turn it on and turn it off.

I think as we get started today we'll first try to just be informal in terms of people speaking up when the opportunity arises to comment. If that gets a little crowded then maybe we'll start having to get people to signal me and we'll call on people. I'd like to start the morning by introducing Chairman Gary Gensler who has a few comments for us to get us started.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Thank you. I'd
like to thank the members of this committee for joining us today. And I specifically want to thank Randy who's decided to take on chairing this committee.

It's a little bit different format. It's really that we were working with our advisory committees and through the government processes that some other agencies in government said we maybe really should have, since it's an advisory committee, an outside chair. But I will be the sponsoring Commissioner. So there's a small shift in
that. But we're so delighted that Randy was willing to take on this chairmanship.

Also, Christa. Where's Christa? There. So if Christa stands up. Lachenmayr --did I do that right? All right. She is serving officially as the Committee's Designated Federal Officer.

What does that mean? That means Christa is the person who if you need something, or you have a point of view, or you want to get some advice to us and you can't get me on the phone or Randy can't get us on the phone, Christa is, actually a term, the Designated Federal Officer, which is in the charter. Right, Christa? So she doesn't get to hide.

I also want to thank my fellow Commissioners, Commissioner Mark Wetjen who is here today. I know that Commissioner 0'Malia will be joining us. I think that Commissioner Chilton is on the phone but I want to just pause to see if he is. Oh, he has a one-way
line.
And I also want to take a moment to recognize and thank former Commissioner Mike Dunn, who I see here today. But Mike chaired this group. He's chaired it so well that no Commissioner could stand in his shoes and we now have Randy standing in your shoes, Mike. But good to see you, Mike.

And this group and the advice and input of its members, not only as a full Committee but each of you and your membership, has really been critical to the CFTC's mission.

And this meeting comes at a particular time in our regulatory processes that your advice is critical. We are nearly done, all of this financial regulation called Dodd-Frank, but it's being implemented.

And today comes at a time that it would be really helpful just to hear your feedback. How is it going? What's going well? What's not going so well? What
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adjustments or flexibility should we show, particularly as it relates to farmers and ranchers and producers and merchants and the agriculture interests that you know so well?

It also comes at a time that the Commission is looking at a process of finalizing some rules around enhancing customer protection. A lot has gone on, of course, as you know, in this field. A lot of good work by the self-regulatory organizations. A lot of good work here at the CFTC. But we are looking to possibly finalize some rules around this area in the fall, and your input at this critical time is very helpful.

With respect to swaps market reform, we'll update you and we'll hear your views. But it's really about making sure that farmers, ranchers, producers, merchants and others that use these complex products called derivatives work for you in the agricultural community.

And though the vast part of the markets are in interest rates and credit derivatives and so forth, just peering into the data repositories that we now have, that you can see, there's actually -- and I was just handed these figures. And these may be rough, but to give you a sense of size. Agricultural swaps in the data repository is about $\$ 200$ billion in notional.

So, you know, for most Americans that's not a small figure. It's not the large numbers in the interest rate swaps, but it's still a pretty relevant number.

Energy swaps, or more broad commodity swaps, are about $\$ 2$ and a half trillion. I think these numbers will grow in size because key reporting dates are still in front of us. Come mid-August, a lot of new reporting will come into the data repository. So this is not a full picture yet.

The overall swaps market, as you probably know, is greater than $\$ 300$ trillion Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
in size, but those numbers are significantly in the interest rate swap market.

And, again, I think the agricultural swaps, whether it's \$200 billion or $\$ 1$ trillion, it's really relevant to the hedging and lowering risk in your community. So we look forward to hearing from you. And I turn it back to Randy, who I assume will let my fellow Commissioners say some things if they wish.

MR. FORTENBERY: Yes. So to my left is Commissioner Mark Wetjen who I think has a few comments for us as well. Commissioner Wetjen.

COMMISSIONER WETJEN: Thanks, Dr. FORTENBERY. Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to everyone who's here today for being part of this important first meeting of the Ag Advisory Committee, at least since I've been at the Commission. So it's great to have this group assembled.

And we've been spending, a lot of Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
us have been spending a good amount of time with folks from the ag sector this week. I was up in Congress and I think maybe some of the others around the table were also testifying this week in the House Ag Committee.

So I just want to thank those represented here for bringing a lot of good, useful attention to some key areas in our remaining rules where the ag interests in particular had a perspective that was important to understand.

The most important issue I would identify is this residual interest issue and our customer protection rulemaking that we hope to finalize very soon. So I think the Committee's done a very, very good job in highlighting this issue and making sure those of us here at the Commission fully understand it as we get through these next few weeks before considering a final draft and hopefully finalizing something very soon.

So I just want to thank everyone for being here. And thank you for your advocacy on some of these important issues, both in the customer protection space but also with respect to some of our other rulemakings. It's been very helpful, so thank you.

MR. FORTENBERY: I think, like myself, several of the Advisory Committee members are new, maybe new to the process, certainly new to this Committee. So perhaps the place to start would be for us to introduce ourselves to each other before we get to the first topic. Can we start over here on the left? Don't forget to push your button.

MR. LANCLOS: Kent Lanclos, Risk Management Agency.

MR. OWEN: I'm John Owen. I'm a rice, soybean and corn producer from northeast Louisiana. I'm also incoming chairman of the USA Rice Federation Producer's Group.

MR. BAIR: Jim Bair, North
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American Millers' Association.
MR. STRONG: Steve Strong with North American Export Grain Association. I'm also with Bunge in St. Louis in charge of corn risk for North America.

MR. DIERKS: I'm Neil Dierks. I'm the CEO of the National Pork Producers Council.

MR. GALLAGHER: Good morning, my name's Ed Gallagher. I'm representing National Milk Producers Federation today. I'm employed by Dairy Farmers of America and I'm the president of the DFA Risk Management Program.

MR. LUTTRELL: I'm Ed Luttrell. I'm the president of the National Grange.

MR. ANDERSON: M.J. Anderson with the Andersons in Maumee, Ohio, here representing National Grain and Feed Association.

MS. JABLONSKY: Hi, Brittany Jablonsky with the National Farmers Union.
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MR. CORDES: Hi, good morning. Scott Cordes representing National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. And in my normal day job I'm president of CHS Hedging.

MR. FRIESEN: Curt Friesen from Nebraska. I'm representing National Corn Growers. I'm a producer who actively uses the CME for hedging. I raise corn and soybeans.

MR. PENNER: Paul Penner from
Hillsboro, Kansas. A farmer from there, as well as first vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers.

MS. HAN: Jennifer Han from Managed Funds Association.

MR. YONKERS: I'm Bob Yonkers with the International Dairy Foods Association. MR. REYNOLDS: I'm Don Reynolds. I have a small rural bank in northern Missouri. I represent the Independent Community Bankers Association.

MR. HAYS: I'm John Hays with the
Farm Credit Council here in Washington, D.C.

MR. WELLMAN: I'm Steve Wellman, chairman of the American Soybean Association. I farm in southeast Nebraska, soybeans, corn and some wheat.

MR. MILLER: Dave Miller, director of research with the Iowa Farm Bureau, representing the American Farm Bureau and also a producer of corn and soybeans in southern Iowa.

MR. MAY: Bill May, president and CEO of the American Cotton Shippers Association which represents U.S. cotton merchants.

MS. PRESTON: Diana Preston with the American Bankers Association.

MR. SENTER: David Senter with the American Agriculture Movement.

MR. FORTENBERY: Okay, thank you very much. What we're going to do -- we have a pretty full agenda today. We're going to start off with an overview of the Dodd-Frank legislation and the status of its
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implementation. We have two presenters this morning. Okay, so there's going to be three presenters this morning. The Chairman's going to participate as well.

But we have Lee Ann Duffy from the Office of the General Counsel and Laurie Gussow from the Division of Market Oversight to sort of kick us off this morning. Take it away.

MS. DUFFY: I was going to make only the briefest of introductions. The DoddFrank Act established a comprehensive new regulatory framework for swaps. The legislation was enacted to reduce risk, increase transparency and promote market integrity within the financial system.

Under the Dodd-Frank Act, the CFTC now regulates swap dealers, requires standardized derivatives to be centrally cleared, requires standardized derivatives to be traded on regulated exchanges or swap execution facilities, and oversees a new swaps Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
reporting and record-keeping regime.
And Laurie's going to talk about reporting and record-keeping.

MS. GUSSOW: Thank you, Lee Ann. With the implementation of Dodd-Frank there was one area of transparency which I have been involved. And it is with respect to the reporting of swap data to the swap data repository. And in addition, the public dissemination of certain price and volume information regarding those transactions.

So, if you -- just as a general overview, I'm sure that all of you are quite familiar with the regulations that were passed back in July. Excuse me one second. My apologies. December of 2011 for Part 45 and Part 43. And then in June of 2012 for Part 46 for the historical record-keeping.

In addition to having the regulations in place, which you guys have been involved in from the beginning, we've had those in place for about 18 months now with
respect to 43 and 45 . We've also got the provisionally registered SDRs in CME, of course DTCC and ICE Trade Vault.

So we've got the players, we've got the rules. And so we have deadlines for reporting. And so with respect to the market participants, we have the implementation phased in based upon your status as the market participants.

So we have the swap dealers MSPs reporting with the first phase-in. Then of course we have the financial entities. And now we've had the first round of reporting for the non-registered entities. As some of you may have already begun reporting on July 1 with respect to your interest rate and credit default swap transactions.

And then we have our last phase of the implementation with respect to reporting going live August 19 with respect to the other three asset classes, other commodities, equities, and foreign exchange. So in
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addition to those basic time frames, we have some additional time to report the historic data and some other backloading if you've been relying on No-Action relief for reporting between the compliance date of April 10 and these delayed time frames that we just discussed.

And when we talked about reporting, we have of course the Part 45, which is the regulatory reporting. The data goes to the SDR. That's confidential data available for the regulators.

And then, in addition, if the swap is a publicly reportable swap transaction, there are certain price and volume information that is sent to the SDR which the SDR publicly disseminates on its website. So you can see transaction-by-transaction information about basically whatever has been sent to the SDR that is publicly reportable.

And like I said, that information is on each SDR's website. It's currently --
you know, those websites are currently in effect. The data is currently being publicly disseminated. So if you haven't had the opportunity to review it you might want to check out and see what is available.

Okay, so one common question is who reports? So the reporting hierarchy is set forth in Part 45. And again we start with the swap dealer. And then if there's no swap dealer in the transaction, the major swap participant would be the next reporting counterparty.

If there's neither a swap dealer nor major market participant then the financial entity, a financial entity, would be the reporting counterparty. If none of those entities are involved, or shall we say if there's two swap dealers, two MSPs, or two financial entities, there's a tie-breaker provision that sets forth how the decision will be made.

And then of course we also have to
Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
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look at whether it's a U.S. person versus a non-U.S. person. And in these instances of the tie-breaker situation or transactions with non-U.S. persons we have to look at where the transaction is executed, whether it was on a platform or bilaterally. So, again, this is set forth in the rule.

And at the end you will see all these resources are available online. So we've been really careful and diligent about providing this information so that it's easily accessible to you and anybody else that's interested in looking.

Another common question we get is with respect to reporting and record-keeping which Part 45 requires both reporting and record-keeping as you're aware. There's a unique identifier to which each counterparty to a swap must be identified. That identifier is called the Legal Entity Identifier, or an LEI. Right now we're in the phase-in process and we're using an interim identifier called
the CICI.
And if you have not yet checked it out you may want to go to the CICI utility, which is a publicly available website, to register for a CICI identifier. And there's a wealth of information on that website including frequently asked questions.

And so that should be able to assist you in the registration process. It's a very quick process, very easy. And so again, each counterparty to a swap that is reportable must obtain an LEI, or in the interim a CICI.

And, again, another very active area of conversation is what relief is available? We understand the end user or the non-registered entity is coming late to this. The swap dealers and MSPs have been involved and preparing for this for awhile now, so we are trying to provide the end users with as much information as possible.

And so I've provided on the screen Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
just a general list of No-Action relief letters that are currently available on the website that provide -- you know, that address several different reporting scenarios, and who the eligible participants are for relief and the relief involved. And again this is on the website and easily accessible.

And like I said, all this information is available to the public. I've given the Commission's website. All the rules are up there. The registered SDRs, which asset classes they support. We have frequently asked questions, Q\&As, we've got fact sheets about reporting. And again, the reporting relief.

And so just to walk you through it at a very high level because $I$ have received calls from outside counsel that haven't gotten here yet so maybe this would be helpful. So if you just go to Law and Regulation, and Dodd-Frank, one of our favorite places to look, there's a list of rulemaking areas, if
you go there. And then you can find under these tabs all the information that we've provided to you today in addition to information that $I$ haven't even touched upon.

So, we're here to answer questions and we're here to help you remain and come into compliance with the reporting rules. And hopefully we're providing the information for you to do so. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I'm going to take it to maybe just a little higher level than that detail as Lee Ann did. There are really three broad areas that have all been implemented in this financial reform. And then there's so much detail in 50 to 60 finalized rules.

The financial crisis was such that Congress asked to bring commonsense rules of the road to this esoteric and complex market called swaps.

Transparency. We've completed our various rule sets on transparency and now
there is transparency in this marketplace. To the regulators, as I indicated earlier and as Laurie has put in a more detailed tone, that there are data repositories. There are three of them now, but there are data repositories that collect data from market participants so that the regulators can see the full scale and scope of the marketplace.

There's always more work to be done but that is now in place and it's been phased from last December through the last phasing date is $I$ think as Laurie just put out, August 19.

The second part of transparency is public market transparency. You all can actually see the price and volume of transactions as they flow through the system. They're time-delayed and they've been being reported since last December and again phasing through this August 19 various time delays and so forth. But you can see the price and volume with the counterparty information
masked of course, similar to a modern-day ticker tape.

And a third part of transparency is that if you wish to, starting shortly you could actually go onto a centralized market structure. Whether that's called a designated contract market like you've used in the futures world, but shortly a platform called swap execution facilities.

Now you might think that primarily this will be for interest rate swaps and credit swaps and some of the high-volume swaps like that. But if a trading platform wishes to offer agricultural swaps there are rules of the road in place that they'll have to offer you various ways to transact and they'll have to send that information on your behalf to the data repository.

So it might even be that you want to transact an agricultural swap or an energy swap on one of these swap execution facilities. They will start registering and
being up and alive as soon as -- I think it's about 2 weeks from now, August 5. And they need to register by early October.

That's all in place already but there's a lot to come ahead on this transparency initiative as these swap execution facilities come alive later this year.

A second main piece of Dodd-Frank was lowering risk. And it's lowering risk through central clearing as well as lowering risk through the oversight of dealers.

Central clearing was a commitment of the futures industry for about 120 years. But now it's come to the swap marketplace for financial enterprises.

So most of you have a choice. You don't have to involve yourself in central clearing. What Congress pointed out and we've really kept in mind is that non-financial parties, farmers and ranchers and producers and millers like yourselves, but retail
companies and software companies and manufacturing companies, get a choice whether to use central clearing.

But for financial entities that make up about 90 percent of this derivatives market -- truly about 90 percent of the derivatives market are financial companies -that they use central clearing to lower the risk of an interconnected financial system.

And that, this Commission finalized rules, robust risk management rules for the clearinghouses, finalized rules on key interest rate swaps and key credit derivative swaps that they must be brought to the clearinghouse. And that phasing has been since March of this year through September of this year.

But as I say, as end users, if you're using an interest rate swap or using a credit derivative swap I would find it pretty unlikely that you would have to involve yourself in central clearing. I think there
is one information thing that you have to file in an SDR just that you are an end user. And that might be by September of some date. I can't remember the date in September.

And then the other way we're lowering risk is regulating the dealers, the large banks here in the U.S., the large banks around the globe. They started registering with us in December of last year.

But it means as you face a large bank, their registration means they are now subject to various business conduct rules on their sales practice, various rules that we have in place about making the markets fair and less subject to abuse. But also business conduct rules to make sure that they manage their risk better, that they confirm their trades, that they have various documentation for their trades and so forth. So those are the main things that have occurred.

And throughout the process we've been listening. We've worked with the
agricultural cooperatives and others around this table to ensure that you don't get caught up in maybe the swap dealer definitions and so forth. But it would be really helpful to get your advice on how you've seen this reform.

Because as I said, we're well past 90 percent finished, the various regulatory issues. We're probably well past halfway in terms of implementation. And this meeting couldn't come at a more timely moment to just hear from you as to what's working, what's not working, what tweaks or adjustments are appropriate.

And I think this Commission and any Commission really needs to be adjusting over time. I see Mike Dunn again. Mike said as we were voting for these rules that we should always stand ready to adjust. And I share Mike's view on that.

MR. FORTENBERY: Thanks very much,
Lee Ann, Laurie and Chairman Gensler.
Before $I$ throw it open for
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questions or comments let me just ask can everybody hear okay? Any problems there?

Please make sure when you're speaking, you speak into the microphone for two reasons. One so the rest of the Committee can hear, but also we're recording this for the purposes of constructing minutes of the meeting later. So it would help if we actually knew what was said when it's said.

Any questions or comments about the Dodd-Frank implementation, the Act itself? For any of the three presenters. Yes?

MR. CORDES: Just one comment. I'd give some feedback. You asked how things are going, that kind of thing. Some of the things that we're seeing in the industry is there's some confusion about what applies to who and where.

Sometimes with some of the swap dealers that the co-ops are dealing with, some are saying, okay, you've got to clear it, you don't, end user. So there's just some
confusion that needs to be worked through and a better understanding of what applies to who and when and where.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: That's helpful. And if you do have specifics, particularly as it relates to agriculture interests, please don't hesitate to let us know.

The clearing mandate is of course just these four big interest rate curves and some credit derivatives. I doubt many people around this table use credit derivatives, but maybe.

But please do. If there's an issue, don't hesitate to let us know.

MR. FORTENBERY: Other comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER WETJEN: I just want to follow up with the last question. Does it seem as though that's -- and I don't ask this question suggesting any skepticism on my part. I'm just trying to better understand things. Does it seem like that's more a function of
people starting to comply for the first time. And so are these questions anything out of the ordinary? Or is it more of a reflection of the rules being not as clear as they should be, or market participants seeking answers from the agency and they're not getting answers either soon enough, or the answers aren't sufficient? Or is it a combination of those two things, would you say?

MR. CORDES: I think it's probably a combination. I think probably the biggest challenge is there's so many things coming so fast that as these milestone dates hit, people aren't quite up to speed on what's required and trying to get that understanding. So I think maybe some clearer time lines back, or clarification on some of the things to help the participants would be helpful.

MR. FORTENBERY: Yes, sir.
MR. FRIESEN: When I have visited with my local grain elevator in my hedging, what they're doing is -- they are very
confused about who is required to report and things like that. They don't know if they're a swap dealer or not.

But one thing that they did bring up, and as farmers get more adept at using more risk management tools these elevators are trying to develop products that help us market grain. And some of those they feel are considered swaps.

So I mean the dollar amounts they're talking about are so small, could there be a floor in there where anything below that would not need to be reported? Because they're coming out with new products all the time and in order to use some of these tools, I do think some of them are going to be considered swaps the way they describe them.

So if something could be done to -- I guess we need all the risk management tools we can get. I appreciate their efforts to try and make it easier to market but they need to be clarified, $I$ guess.

MR. GALLAGHER: I'd like to follow up on that because we've seen some of the same in the dairy industry. And certainly some of the swaps we contemplate writing are going to be pretty small, notional amounts that are not going to be any type of an issue in any way, shape, or form in the security of the economy of the United States.

The other thing that we're finding is that we've built this house, we've all got this new house that we're getting used to living in. And some of us have some special needs because our industry is a little bit different.

And we've got these new utilities, say. And the operating instructions are a little bit vague and we're not quite sure how to operate them.

And in some cases, one particular issue that we're running across as a dairy cooperative is that we have a lot of marketing contracts that have volumetric optionality in
them. In order to -- we're kind of like the -- we're the dairy grid, like the electric grid. We make sure that whoever wants milk can get their milk and we move milk around so that everybody gets what they need when they need it. And so we have a lot of volumetric optionality into our contracts.

My reading of those is that they are not swaps. But it's not important what my reading is; it's important what yours is. And it's vague enough that it gives us some concern. And so we'd like to at some point have some more dialogue about just better understanding what would fit into probably the seventh part of that particular set of rules. So just continued dialogue.

We appreciate the dialogue that we've had to date and we really appreciate the flexibility that you've shown the agricultural industry.

COMMISSIONER WETJEN: I just had a quick response to that. I appreciate the
question and raising this.
That was part of our swap definition rule about a year ago. And that volumetric optionality test that you referred to was something that we did on an interim basis which is to say we sought additional comment on the seven-part test that you referred to.

So I guess my first question is, has your group filed a comment letter in response to that. Because I think when we were working through that at the time most of the focus was on the electrical utility space and less so on the dairy space. So I'm kind of interested to hear you say it might impact you.

And then secondly, in regards to whether -- well, if you didn't file a comment letter, $I$ would urge you to do that.

And then secondly, that's probably something, since it's been out for comment for some time maybe we can think about redressing
that at some point soon.
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I would share Commissioner Wetjen's thoughts that, Ed, if -even if you filed one because now you have a year of experience, you might want to re-file something because it may change. It would just be helpful. Or if you feel that you want to just set up a meeting, I'd look forward to it and I'd certainly take the meeting.

MR. GALLAGHER: Thank you.
MS. DUFFY: I also want to add the team, the staff team that worked on the products definition still consults on questions of the products definitions. So you can contact me or Dave Aron and we'd be happy to speak with you as well.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I think that Lee Ann raises a very good point that staff stands ready even at our small agency, time permitted, to deal with frankly the hundreds of questions that come up.

And as Commissioner Wetjen said on Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
the volumetric options it has generally been questions from the electric utility field. But whether it's Lee Ann herself -- Lee Ann helped write some of those provisions. And Dave Aron who she mentioned in our Office of General Counsel. But often it can be addressed through staff interpretation as well.

MR. FORTENBERY: Any other comments or questions? Yes.

MS. PRESTON: As the American Bankers Association, I would have to say we represent interests on all sides of the equation here.

I think we're often seen as the largest, most active players. We also encompass the smallest players that do swaps, in some cases once every 5 years.

So I would have to say I appreciate the dialogue that we have had with the Commission. I have found the staff extremely responsive and willing to listen.
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And I think some of what you were asking about, Commissioner Wetjen, you know, what are the challenges here. Some of them are new market players that have come in.

For example, we dealt with new trade affirmation platforms which the dealers and the end user banks and the banks in the middle all had to deal with and it was very challenging.

We appreciated the staff's time in
listening to us. We appreciate the accommodation in terms of saying that there will be some accommodation in terms of enforcement actions while this all sorts itself out. Because we really do represent banks on all sides of this equation.

MR. GALLAGHER: An issue that I had the opportunity to speak to your staff about relative to our members. But I'm curious if it goes beyond our members. So I'd like to ask the group a question about the LEI CICIs.

So one of the things that I've seen is that for a dairy farmer they're invested in their operation for decades and they're not moving anywhere.

And so my question was why would a dairy farmer need to have an annual resubmission and an annual re-payment for an LEI CICI when they're going to have the same address for decades. So that we know where they're going to be.

And I was just curious if there were other agricultural, other farm-based groups that had the same thought or the same idea. As opposed to having to have a farmer pay an annual fee for an LEI when they're in the same place all the time.

Any comments?
MR. FORTENBERY: Any responses to that? Any more discussion? Yes, sir.

MR. DIERKS: Just to Ed's
question, $I$ would suggest that $I$ think there's a lot of sense in that from the producers'
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perspective. I know some of our members that have started to use swaps in agriculture, it's the same kind of thing. I mean they're pretty identifiable. They've been there forever.

And as you sign up if there's some way of just you're in -- you do the LEI CICI and it just doesn't need to be renewed. It just should -- until maybe it's either -- or a longer period of time might work better for renewal.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I'm not close enough to it and a lot of this is also at the data repositories themselves. But for data integrity, I think the best technologist once told me that you want to have some time, whether it's once a year, in some circumstances you have to do it more often or less often. But some time just to make sure that you still have the right party and the right number. It's sort of like telephone numbers change and cell phone addresses change.

But I believe that's why the international regime, and when you use the term LEI, legal identifier, that's an international regime that's -- so even at a Morgan Stanley or Goldman Sachs they're -well, they'd like to think they'll be in existence a long time, too. But there's some need to refresh for data integrity. But I don't know why it landed on once a year and that may be some international arrangement. MS. HAN: Along the lines of $I$ guess the LEIs and CICIs. So we've been in the futures markets, our members, for a long time. And so -- in the swaps markets. And so we appreciate all the work the Commission is doing. We know it's been a lot of rulemaking. One thing that we would like to make sure is that with -- as we are moving into this new house as you've raised it, this new framework, and just making sure everything is working correctly.

We want to make sure that all of
the information kept at the swap data repositories are maintained in a confidential manner. Our members have been aware of instances when trade data has been released to the counterparty. And so we're quite concerned about that.

The futures markets have been working and so there haven't been problems. But here I think at this initial phase, we have seen issues. And so we would like for the Commission to ensure that swap data repositories maintain the data confidentially and make sure that both sides of the transaction, that they're not aware of who their counterparty is. And so that's something we'd like to emphasize.

MS. PRESTON: Since we are in the agricultural forum, $I$ would be remiss in not pointing out that we have a clearing mandate that has gone and been implemented through many parts of the marketplace, but that there is a proposed exemption from clearing for
cooperatives, for Farm Credit.
And while we appreciate that
farmers need access to agriculture, I again reiterate that we represent banks of all sizes and all different marketplaces, and do have some serious concerns about a proposed exemption for cooperatives. Farm Credit in particular has a swaps portfolio of \$26 billion and it seems like there is something that contradicts the mandate that the Commission has for central clearing. I just want to point that out.

MR. FORTENBERY: Time for one more comment or question before we take a quick break. Anybody else? Anything they'd like to get on the table? Okay, thank you, Lee Ann and Laurie for your time.

One thing I failed to mention is the slides that you see presented today will all be available to you after the meeting. So anything that pops up on the screen, you will have access to at a later time.

Why don't we take about a 15minute recess. We'll return at 10:30. So there's coffee in the back, water. Feel free to introduce yourself to the rest of the Committee members and I'll see you in about 15 minutes. The next subject is customer protection. Thank you.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:14 a.m. and resumed at 10:30 a.m.)

MR. FORTENBERY: Thank you. We have two more topics that we're going to discuss before lunch. The first one is on customer protection this morning and then we'll have a short session on ethanol and RINs. More specifically, RINs, Renewable Identification Numbers.

But the first thing we're going to do this morning is talk about customer protection. We have a panel to address the issue for us.

Anne Bagan who's the managing Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
director of the CME Group is going to be on the panel. She'll speak first. Gary Barnett, director of the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight. I'm tripping over the word. And Kevin Piccoli, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight. So Ms. Bagan.

MS. BAGAN: Good morning, everybody. As I'm sure you're aware, after the unhappy events in our industry over the past couple of years a number of industry groups were put together to look at whether there were ways that we could enhance customer protections.

I believe the FIA put together I think they were called the Financial Management Group. One thing they did that I would highly recommend you read if you have not, they put a FAQ together on how customer segregation works. It's an excellent document and it's very good for customers I think. So they put a group together to look at potential
enhancements.
The NFA also put a group together for self-regulatory organizations and participating on that were CME, Minneapolis, Kansas City and ICE. And we also were looking at ways that we could suggest enhancements to customer protection.

Those two groups actually came up with many of the same ideas. And so we have put those in place and I'll go through what some of those are real quickly. But these suggestions and rules that we've put in place have also been proposed by the CFTC in their recent rulemaking. So the whole industry I think is on board together.

So our goal here was to have greater transparency, increased detection and increased deterrence from situations where customer funds could be potentially lost.

And one thing that we put in was that all FCMs now must report all customer segregation computations to their designated
self-regulatory organization which would be either CME or NFA on a daily basis.

NFA had been doing that. CME did it on a for-cause basis. But now we're requiring all of our FCMs to submit those reports to us. To date for just 2013 CME has received approximately 15,000 of those reports which need to be reviewed every single day. We also are now getting semimonthly detailed reports of where the FCMs are investing their customer funds. To date for 2013 we've received about 1,500 of those which also have to be reviewed immediately.

We also have a rule in place now that if an FCM is going to decrease their excess segregated funds in any of the categories. So when I say segregated I mean trading U.S., trading foreign, or trading cleared swaps.

And if that excess decreases by 25
percent on any given day they must notify their DSRO and it must be approved by a senior
executive at the firm. And so for 2013 we have received approximately 80 of those notifications.

This is something that we will look at when we get the daily reports from firms. So if a firm does not report that to us on the day that it happens they will get a call from our management team and there's potential disciplinary action if they don't notify us. So the firms have been keeping on top of that.

We've also begun, about a year ago we started using Confirmation.com which allowed us to get direct confirmations from banks of balances that they were holding. And we could use that then on our regulatory examinations.

But besides that, and one thing that we're probably even more excited about, we -- "we" meaning NFA and CME have engaged an outside vendor called AlphaMetrix 360. And they actually aggregate balances for us at
banks, all cash and securities held on behalf of customers. And they report that to us for every single account at every one of our FCMs every day. And we use that as a measure against what the firms are reporting to make sure that they are in line and we know the funds are there. So we have been using that. Now right now that's just with banks. We are in phase II right now, programming, that will also get those balances from carrying brokers and clearing organizations. And we hope to have that up and running still this year. The carrying brokers have to be in by September.

Also, FIA, NFA, the Institute for Financial Markets and CME have been engaged in a study on whether insurance is a potential that we could have. We've received information from several different FCMs, both collateral and positions, and our consultants are now reviewing and analyzing all of that information.

Once they get done with that, and they are in the process. And we do expect it will take some time for them to do all the analytics. But once they do that then we'll go out for quotes on how much insurance will cost. So that's in process and I know that that's been something that a lot of people have been asking about the potential for that. And then finally from CME's perspective we put together what we called the farmer fund which was a fund we put together to be able to pay customers back perhaps on a more timely basis than they would get through the whole bankruptcy situation if there was a shortage in the customer funds that were being held. We used it for PFG and paid out approximately $\$ 2$ million, a little bit more than that, to their customers. So that's all been paid out as of this point.

One other thing I should say. We do regulatory examinations on our firms -- and if you're an FCM you know that -- every 9 to

15 months. But one other thing we are now doing -- and I should also point out those are done on a surprise basis. So the firms are not supposed to know when we are coming in. We just show up.

But now we're also going in intramonth just to look at the customer balances to make sure that what they're doing during the month is also in compliance with all the regulations. And so far to date we have not had any -- noted any problems with those.

But we go in intramonth again on a completely surprise basis and we tie out where the balances are. We can use the AlphaMetrix balances that we get on a daily basis to make sure that the funds are where they're supposed to be. And again we haven't had any significant problems noted at all with any of those reviews.

I don't know if you want me to go into any more detail on any of that?
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MR. FORTENBERY: Why don't we go on to the other two presentations and then we can come back for questions or discussion. Thank you.

MR. BARNETT: Great. Thank you, Anne. Okay. I want to talk to you a little bit about where we are with our customer protection rule set.

As you know, our mission is to help ensure the integrity of the futures and swaps market, and as part of that we must do everything we can to protect customers and their funds. And as Anne mentioned, in the aftermath of the FCM crises we saw in late 2011-2012 we saw weaknesses that needed to be dealt with.

And we reached out broadly on ways to enhance customer protections. We had three roundtables. We had multiple consultations with the SROs, many industry participants from the FIA, CME, NFA, the FCMs, the buy side customers, as well as many discussions with
fellow regulators, the accounting and auditing industry. We've considered comments on many, many comment letters, over 125 comment letters.

And in fact before we came out with our proposed rule set which I'll talk to you about a little bit we had already adopted some important improvements to protect customer funds. I'll just quickly tick through those.

We had completed amendments to Rule 125 regarding the investment of funds to prevent the use of customer funds for in-house lending through repurchase agreements. We required clearinghouses to collect margin on a gross basis so that FCMs would not be offsetting one customer's collateral against another and then sending only the net to the clearinghouse.

We had adopted the so-called LSOC rule for swaps to help ensure customer money was being protected individually all the way
to the clearinghouse. We had adopted customer protection enhancements for designated contract markets, basically codifying staff guidance on minimum requirements for SROs.

And then as Anne mentioned in July
2012 the CFTC approved the National Futures Association's proposal that stemmed from a coordinated effort as Anne mentioned with the CFTC, the SROs, other financial regulators and market participants to address some of the issues raised in MF Global. And then we proposed the rule set November 14, 2012.

Now, because the customer protection rule set, and Anne mentioned it so I'm going to just tick through it very quickly. But it's in the rule set. And it's there so that we can directly enforce those rules. Let me just quickly click through some of those requirements.

The first one is fixing Part 30, requiring that sufficient funds were held in the Part 30 accounts to meet the FCM's total
obligations to customers under the net liquidating equity method and no longer holding just what was needed for margin offshore with the rest being subject to risk. Maintaining written policies and procedures governing the maintenance of excess funds as Anne just described. And then also making the additional reports available, the daily computations of seg and secured and so forth.

But our rule package then goes on. And let me tick through some of those for you as well.

As mentioned the daily information for bank and custodial accounts is very, very important. The proposed rule set included -we wanted to get direct access which came up before AlphaMetrix was out. So we support the aggregator method.

We do need and we're continuing to
-- staff is continuing to recommend that we have in times of crisis when data is not being Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
pushed to us, that we have some kind of mechanism to allow us to have direct electronic access to bank and custodial account information in times of crisis, to be able to turn it on at that point.

We think also increasing
disclosure to customers regarding the risks associated with futures trading and also requiring FCMs to provide current and potential customers with specific information, firm-specific information about the institution.

We think greater enhanced controls at FCMs regarding how customer accounts are handled is important. And that's included in the proposed rule set.

We have requirements regarding standards for SRO examinations and the annual certification, the annual certified financial statement audits, including raising the minimum standards for independent public accountants.

We want and we proposed additional filings that would give us an effective early warning system to allow us to get ahead of problems, to try to see around the corner where possible. More than we had done. Kevin frequently discusses it as sort of in the past we had been driving with a look in the rear view mirror and we're trying to look forward more.

And then seventh, we had instituted a liquidity requirement for FCMs or proposed to do so to better detect FCMs that had become distressed and may put customer funds at risk.

All of these points of course are about ensuring that customers can have confidence that the funds they post as margin or collateral are fully segregated and protected.

The comment period on the proposed rule set closed on February 15 of this year. We've continued to take comments. A number of Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
you in the room we've met with recently. We have now prepared a comment summary with proposals on the final rules which are now with Commissioners. And we're working together again with these additional comments, with staff of the Commissioners and so on to finalize a draft, pens-down rule package for Commission consideration.

So in general we still think that the basic direction, and I'm loath to talk too much about where we are changing some things because it's part of the rulemaking process. But in general we still think basically fix Part 30, require more effective risk management, require the delivery of more forward-looking information to allow us to get ahead of issues, help assure better examinations by outside CPAs, SROs, and ourselves frankly, provide more information and disclosure for customers and implement some changes around capital and liquidity. That's it in a nutshell. We're Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
going to turn it to you and try to get your input and reaction to those things. But first Kevin's going to say some words about the exam process.

MR. PICCOLI: Sure. Thanks, Gary. So I thought I'd just spend a second on talking about the oversight process and how we put the pieces together.

So when I look at oversight there's three legs to the stool. The first is the CPA, the person who's coming in every year doing an annual audit of the intermediary.

The purpose of that CPA is really twofold. One, to provide us with a level of comfort that the financials that we get on a daily and monthly basis, we have an element of reliance on those because the CPA has gone through and they've looked at the controls, they looked at the process and the procedures that the firm has used in preparing their financials.

The other element that's critical Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
from the CPA is what we call the material inadequacy letter. So the CPA is charged with providing an opinion on the financial and regulatory reporting control.

So it's just reporting, it's not operating controls, it's not risk, but it's just for financial and regulatory reporting. But that also provides us with a level of comfort that during the year we have an element of relying on the CPAs when we get the monthly numbers.

I will say though that as we discover errors -- Let's say we're in the month of June. We get their financials and we find out there was material error -- We will go back to the year end and find out whether the CPA identified that error. And if not we'll challenge the CPA and say why did you not pick up this error. So we're trying to use that as an important leg in our oversight function.

The second leg is the DSROs Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
themselves. And with the CME and the NFA as the two primary ones. They as Anne mentioned perform a risk-based internal controls review every 9 to 15 months at the firms. And they're in there and getting into the detail on the firms themselves. As Anne also mentioned they receive the daily and the monthly filings as well that they review, as well as the notices coming in.

And then of course in the event of a crisis we will coordinate with Anne, the CME, the NFA on any particular issue, whether that's business continuity in Hurricane Sandy or a firm-related issue.

From the CFTC perspective, so the third leg to the stool, you know there we have obviously less staff, not as much as I would like, but that's the cards I'm dealt. But our focus is a couple fold. One, oversight of the DSROs, making sure the CME and the NFA are doing what has been asked of them and they're doing it appropriately.

We also perform what we call forcause exams. So if we see a firm is having particular problems, they're filing a lot of notices, or a lot of amended financial statements, that may indicate a control problem. We'll go in and look for it specifically. So a very targeted approach at the particular problem.

Our scope is very narrow because we just don't have the staffing to do fullscope exams and that's the role of the CME and the NFA. So we'll go in on a for-cause basis. We'll also do horizontal or sweeptype examinations. And by that we've done a few of them so far, one on liquidity where we go out to the firms and look at their liquidity, what are their sources of liquidity, do we think they're adequate, are they -- do they have enough committed lines. Does the firm have the proper governance over their asset liability management process. To ensure that if there is a liquidity problem
you've got the right folks looking at it, they've got the right banking relationships and committed lines or uncommitted lines to help shore up their capital and their excess.

Because there's basically three levels. You have the excess customer protection, the excess customer reserve, the residual interest. You have the excess net capital. So those two are very effective at providing an element of liquidity.

But on top of that there's the third piece and that's just banking liquidity, making sure -- because sometimes -- just because you have excess net capital doesn't mean that's liquid net capital. So we like to see what liquidity do they have in the market. So if there is a time when there's a large customer, big margin call that the customer can't make, the deficit in the account, the firm has the ability to have the cash to cover that call.

So the others that we have looked Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
at, we're looking at anti-money laundering processes. Their business continuity process. And that was in the wake of Hurricane Sandy. We did a joint review with the SEC and FINRA. And then targeted residuals is another one that we looked at recently.

And then just finally, we also do the daily monitoring, the monthly monitoring of the financials that come in. They go through our system and we do regression analysis, trend analysis and comparative analysis on the financials to see if there's anything that pops out from that standpoint.

So that's sort of the oversight function in a nutshell. Gary?

MR. BARNETT: Thank you very much. Why don't we turn it over. The real function here of course is to tell you a little bit about what we're doing, but to get your reactions too and your advice about what we're doing. So I'm going to just turn it over and open to comments, please.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I would say that's really critical because what we're trying to do is get in front of Commissioners a final document. We use this term in the CFTC folklore "pens down" meaning the staff has put their pens down and then Commissioners are weighing in. But that's a little misleading because Commissioners weigh in all the time before the staff gets to "pens down".

But this input, it comes at a really critical time because Gary and his team are trying to get something to the Commissioners in the next, you know, few weeks to 6 weeks.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Mr.
Chairman? Will the comments here be included in the comment file for the rule?

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I think they most definitely need to be. You know, we have a whole transcript so we can just put the whole transcript of this section into the administrative procedures record.

COMMISSIONER WETJEN: I wanted to add something too because Kevin in his presentation mentioned this. And this came up earlier in the week when Commissioner 0'Malia and I were up in the House.

Kevin mentioned the importance of doing examinations of FCMs. Those examinations require people. And so I wanted to make this point to this group because I think this group might be uniquely positioned to help the agency on this front.

After MF Global, after Peregrine, it's fair to say none of us want to have to go through that again. And one of the best ways to ensure against that in addition to some of these policy changes are routine, substantive, deep examinations of FCMs.

And in order to do that we need personnel, we need staff to do that. This Agency is underfunded. We have more responsibilities now than we did 3 years ago and we need the staff to do the job. We need
the staff to make sure something like MF Global, something like Peregrine doesn't happen again.

None of us want to see confidence in the markets we oversee shaken in the way it was. And one of the easiest ways we can do that is to advocate to the Congress to ensure that we have sufficient resources here. I can't say how important that is, or I can't overstate it rather. And as I said, I think this group here is probably uniquely positioned to help us on that front.

The rules are essentially finalized as Chairman Gensler said. We're 90 percent done. We're now in the next phase of this which is implementation. Not only do we need to do examinations, we need to get questions to folks -- or answers to questions rather when people bring issues to us which is all the more reason for additional resources, additional staff and personnel here that can provide those answers to questions and
undertake these examinations that are going to be very, very important.

MR. FORTENBERY: Who would like to start off the discussion? Questions or responses? Yes.

MR. GALLAGHER: So I appreciate everything that you folks are working on on this topic, but the totality of this and how it all fits together is a little bit beyond what I can comprehend.

I was curious, is there a way we could do a bit of a case study? And maybe use MF Global and Peregrine, and go back and show how these changes that you have made would have created a red flag or an alert that would have identified the issue sooner. And then what you would have done to alert those that had accounts with those two entities to be able to transition something that didn't create another issue. Any opportunity for that?

MR. BARNETT: We can't really use Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.

Peregrine or MF Global until it's sufficiently history and everything's public. So I don't think we should speak to them. But the concept, the principle that you're talking about, our rules till now have largely, the principles are right. And we were talking about this yesterday. Rules that say, you know, you will not commingle customer funds. You will not use customer funds improperly.

That's kind of like, in a way that's kind of like a speed limit that says you won't go faster than $X$ miles an hour. And if you don't have cops there to catch people you're not going to have sufficient deterrence. If you don't have sufficient risk management you can't self-police, a separation of duties and things that will mitigate the risk that people will violate things, or act out of conflicts of interest.

So, and if you have our
orientation, if the only things you deal with are violations and you look at them after
they've occurred, and they're either big enough to send to enforcement, or you fix them and move on, then you haven't dealt with trends and problems and so on.

So if you look at this, the main core idea of seg and its importance is there. And it's how to minimize, how to mitigate the risk to seg.

And one thing we did learn is that company risk, when people get -- you know, that failing to have sufficient internal review or risk management can be an issue. And also operating company risk can put customer funds at risk. And so if you look at these different proposals around that, they're trying to bolster the seg system.

So I know there are people -we've talked about alternative seg systems that are being looked at by the industry. We support that consideration. Whether it's insurance, whether it's some kind of perfect seg or alternative seg system. Those all have
gating and timing issues to it.
So when we have the system we have right now, and the industry has proposed this as well about the need to increase risk management, not management of risk. So, that's how $I$ would say if you look at the orientation, it's like greater risk management to help mitigate human problem, misfeasance or malfeasance. Allow us to do a better job. Don't just look in the window at something that's gone wrong. Try to look at what's going on, risk. So we need more forwardlooking information. Make sure that our examination and oversight has got that orientation to it as well.

Make sure we're keeping up with the rest of the world. FINRA and the SEC went to a more risk-based orientation 6-7 years ago. We've lagged. How do we catch up with that? How do we stay current with other best practices?

We tried to address all of those Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
sorts of things in this rule set. And that's kind of an organizing principle around the different pieces of it.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Gary, I'm going to answer the question directly. Peregrine. Lots of bad actors, you know, basically doctoring books and everything like that. That's well out there.

The system of the self-regulatory organizations and the CFTC being able to directly through modern technology means see what's in the bank account, see what's in the custodial account and have a confirmation, an online affirmative confirmation of those accounts is something that $I$ think directly addresses those issues -- not all of the Peregrine issues, but directly addresses.

And I think what already, and Anne went through some of this, but already the NFA and CME and others have started to use, I'm trying to remember what's the outside service?

MS. BAGAN: AlphaMetrix.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: AlphaMetrix to have those direct electronic views daily into the cash and custodial accounts.

I'm not participating in the specific matters around MF Global but more generically about the public policy issues, ensuring that a futures commission merchant keeps its books and records in a stronger way. And nobody can pull out more than 25 percent of what's called the excess without a CEO signature or senior officer signature I think addresses some of that. But that's my short version of what $I$ think your question was.

MR. GALLAGHER: Thank you. So if you do find an issue then what do you do? So do you alert the account-holders of the FCM that there may be an issue? Because that could create some sort of a dysfunctional system too.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Well, Kevin could briefly tell you. But if some futures commission merchant is using customer money at
any point in a day, intra-day, end of day, it doesn't matter, any point in the day that's a violation. And that's when Kevin and Gary and sometimes the full Commission, I mean we're alerted to these things as well. And it becomes a very intense discussion with the futures commission merchant. I guess that's -- I'd like to leave it there maybe.

MR. PICCOLI: Yes, I think very intense is probably an understatement. Yes. But whenever there are any issues that we see, whether they're at the CFTC, at the SEC, FINRA, or any other international regulator that we become aware of we always take a retrospective look and do a post mortem and say okay, could this happen with our registrants. Is there something we should change either in our internal examination process or should we send out what we call "Dear FCM" letters that go out to the FCMs and say by the way, we saw this, and just want to give you a heads up on it.

MS. BAGAN: And I would just like to add that as an SRO we have an assortment of emergency actions that we can take. In a situation where an FCM was not holding the customer funds that they told us they had we would be in there immediately and looking to transfer customers. And find out where did that money go.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Mr.
Chairman? Maybe we could answer -- I think you asked a very good question about when does the customer know. When will the customer be notified if something has gone wrong with his account. How will we address that? How does -- I think we know how using the SRO enhanced oversight responsibilities, but specifically how will we interface with the customer on these individual things under the new customer protection -- proposed customer protection rules.

MR. BARNETT: Okay. My answer may be too technical and you'll have to jump back Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
in.
We have struggled with some of the -- we get additional information. And what do we do when we have early warning issues? I mean it's one thing if we're talking about seg's been violated, but you know, early warning on capital or something like that. Or other stress problems that come up.

There is a real tension between having the forward-looking information as a regulatory tool and then accelerating the problem by making it public. We have provided that there should be more fulsome disclosure to customers about the markets and futures trading and so on and so forth. And from specific disclosure.

But at some point the information, the realtime information about problems at the FCM start to create -- if you disseminate that information it accelerates the problem. And you can't help resolve it. So there's a real issue there.

We struggle with that all the time. There have been situations we've been stuck in when we couldn't provide information we would have liked to. And then we turned to CME, for instance, with their powers to help protect, maybe stop allowing new people to come in, dealing with certain accounts, things like that. So it's a little bit of a balancing when things get really tough. COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Does that help or hurt?

MR. GALLAGHER: I appreciate that. That was helpful. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Gary, could you also mention maybe some of the Know Your FCM changes we made over a year ago? That might help people understand who they're commingled with, what they've been set up with in terms of -- I think those were done at least a year ago if not longer. It'll at least help customers understand where they're putting their money and who they're investing Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
with in a FCM.
MR. PICCOLI: So yes, there were a few things that we were able to get out very quickly. Financial information on the firms themselves. So the segregation amounts, excess amounts, net capital, where funds are invested. That information, through the NFA they were able to get that out very quickly on their website and it's right there for all investors to look at. Anyone wanting to do due diligence on their FCM can look at it and get a lot of useful financial data.

It's on a monthly basis right now where the information is updated. But that is all there as well. So that was I think very helpful to get out quickly.

MS. HAN: So we have looked at the customer protection rules. And one thing I think along these lines that we would advocate is that -- we support all the information that you propose to require FCM to disclose to you. But we think that there should be some
more information disclosed to customers.
Some of those would be schedules for the segregation amount, the secured amount in cleared swaps, cleared swaps and customer seg amount for the customer seg amounts as well as the summary balance sheet and some of the income statements monthly. So we think that that would be very helpful information to provide to customers. And so that way customers, you know, all the while can kind of make their own assessments too.

MR. FRIESEN: I guess as a small producer who uses Chicago Board of Trade and then the CME for the last 30 years, I've never had a problem. I was not involved in MF Global or any of those so I've been very fortunate.

But I use those products for risk management. And when we talk about margin call and things like that, and I've read some things and I don't know if they're up to date, what I'm seeing, or not.

But if you increase the amount of money that I have to place on margin right now, I mean I have 3 business days I think to send money in. And that works for me. You make that any tighter and at some point in time I'll probably quit using the Exchange. I just can't stay on top of it that much as a producer. As a small businessman you might say, it's too much of a requirement.

And on top of that if I see that correctly, $I$ mean it would put more money of mine at risk to a MF Global because I'd have more margin money there. So it puts me at higher risk.

As far as insurance, $I$ guess that would all be nice if they could buy insurance but they're going to pass that cost on to me too. So I guess I don't see a use for it.

I guess the only thing I can see from the MF Global bankruptcy that I think could be done differently is if my funds were put at the top of the list for bankruptcy.

But otherwise when you have bad actors that break the law I think they're going to continuously look for ways around your regulations and your rules. And it's unfortunate. So I expect it to still happen.

So I sweep my fund regularly now which I don't like to do. I used to keep quite a bit of money there so we didn't have to send money back and forth. But now it's different. So I mean some of that trust is gone.

But for you to send information for my FCM, that's of no use to me whatsoever. I'm not sophisticated enough to analyze that data. I hope $I$ know my FCM but it does me no good.

MR. BARNETT: Understood. The margin deficit residual interest issues that you were talking about is a very important question and one that we're looking at internally very carefully.

MR. ANDERSON: The NGFA represents Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
over 1,000 member companies encompassing all aspects of the agribusiness in the USA. We've been on record already similar to what you were saying.

First, we appreciate the effort that you guys made into some of the insurance funds. And we're anxiously awaiting to see your results on cost.

We do take issues with two things that we feel could greatly increase customer risks. First was the timing of when an FCM takes a capital charge. We've urged you to stay at the 3 -day window, again similar.

And also the concept of the residual interest where the FCM can kind of top up the account until the margin call is received. We feel if we change that that there is a strong likelihood that we see FCMs requiring pre-funding of the margin accounts to exactly your same point.

Now if I'm an elevator and I have \$2 million on deposit with my FCM I have to
have an additional $\$ 1$ million there. So there's more money potentially at risk in case someone does get around the regulations again and we have a situation similar to an MF Global.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Can I ask a follow-up of both of the last commenters? One of the challenges we have is the law itself. It's a law that's been in place for some time.

And I'm not a lawyer, but I'll paraphrase as I understand it, that thou shall not use one customer's money to secure or guarantee another customer's position or deficit. Roughly speaking.

And so what we put out in this proposal was a rule that basically said that. The futures commission merchants highlighted to us, "Well actually there's been a practice for some time, maybe years whereby if you had a deficit as you said." Is your first name? What's that?

MR. ANDERSON: M.J.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: M.J., okay. As
M.J. said, that you'd like to still have 3 days. So if they made a call on you on a Tuesday because you were in deficit you want until maybe Friday, 3 days or Thursday.

But what the futures commission merchants are doing is during those 3 days is possibly using somebody else's money to secure your deficit.

Now, the futures commission merchant itself might have enough of their own money, and it's totally appropriate that they would put some of their capital, their money in to secure your deficit.

What we did in this proposed rule
is what if the futures commission merchant isn't putting their money in to secure your deficit but they're using who wants to volunteer their money to be used for M.J.

Can I see by a show of hands who wants their surplus to be used for M.J.'s deficit? I haven't seen any raised hands.

Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.

That's the challenge that we have. That's the challenge that we have. Ed, you want your money to be used for M.J.'s deficit?

MR. GALLAGHER: At the right
interest rate $I$ may take that.
(Laughter)
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: All right. But that's -- I'm trying to frame this public policy and legal issue and what we are -- and this is the challenge that we have. And I don't know what the right answer is.

But M.J.'s got a deficit. He wants 3 days because -- and I'm sorry, I don't remember the gentleman's name who was so articulate.

MR. FRIESEN: Curt.
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Curt. Curt says I'm a small producer and businessman and I don't have the books to sort of keep up with this. That all sounded -- I mean I grew up, my dad had a small business with 30-35 employees and if he didn't make payroll on

Friday, he shut down. And my mom was the bookkeeper. So I identify with what Curt said.

But then there's this issue, does Curt's deficit or M.J.'s deficit get funded by Ed.

MR. GALLAGHER: I think that's a good question. We have no intention of wanting one for the other. As you mentioned, may fund it with another customer's as opposed to may put up their own capital for it as well.

Many FCMs are already down to one day. So where that money is trued up the next day. Again, we would support the idea that there's no -- one customer's funds is not used for another customer's deficit as well.

The concern we have is more the dollars that I need to margin my account, is that going to increase dramatically and therefore perhaps put more money at risk in the case of a default.

MR. MILLER: The question -- I might almost be ready to raise my hand and say customer to customer if it's at some level of -- again, we're not talking deficits necessarily, we're talking under margined.

I have a much bigger problem with the FCM using my excess funds for their internal investments that are not subject to margining rules. That was the creation of an MF Global, not the inter-transfer among customer segregated accounts.

So I think we need to make sure we understand in some regards this movement to the one day versus the industry practice if you will, particularly with small customer accounts.

> I've been on both sides of having reportable positions and been relatively a small customer. My FCM had me on a much tighter leash when I was on reportable positions than when $I$ was trading one contract of corn or two contracts of corn. And the
ability for me to use -- to satisfy it by bringing in a check the next morning which probably was not going to clear in the FCM's account for 2 days, $I$ don't really want that to go away. As opposed to me having to come off the tractor, figure out how to get a wire transfer for a $\$ 200$ margin call.

So I think there's a difference between when I was on a call with reportable positions as opposed to on a call that might be a $\$ 100$ call, a $\$ 200$ call, and the ability of a FCM to manage that internally.

And the movement of segregated funds at the margin, you know, being a net margining was not the result that resulted in either Peregrine or MF Global. And let's make sure we're not causing problems for functionality, particularly in the ag community to solve -- and none of this would have solved Peregrine or MF Global.

And I think that's the concern that's being raised is we're applying a
bandage to the wrong sore. You know, we're putting something on and we're trying to fix something that wasn't the problem, it wasn't the causality.

And I understand there may be issues with law that have to be clearly addressed by the Commission. But on the other hand, let's make sure we're not creating problems at the farm level, at the elevator level, et cetera, that in fact makes us riskier. In the name of customer protection, may make us all riskier.

And that I think is the concern that has been raised by Grain and Feed, been raised by American Farm Bureau, and I think a number of other institutions that represent the farmer interest.

MR. CORDES: I'd like to add just a few comments. And maybe staff can elaborate. Or maybe, Commissioner Wetjen, you mentioned earlier this is under review. And I know there's been a lot of testimony on
this. And I've made some comments as well.
I think part of our discussion here is how we interpret the new rules or the laws. We're not talking so much deficits, we're talking potential margin calls. I think there's a difference.

I mean nobody's asking anybody to cover someone else's deficit. The way the rules are written or proposed is as an FCM you're going to have to make sure your customer has enough money to meet a potential margin call, which means look at the market right now. If you've got a short position on corn and it's up 30 cents, do you have that additional money there?

The way the rules are written today I'm seeing it's going to be we're going to ask the customer to basically double-fund their margin call. You're going to have the initial margin call and you're going to have money in your account to fund the one day's move. That's the fallout or what it's looking Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
like at this point.
So I'd be curious if staff or one of the Commissioners would like to comment on how you're looking at handling those revised interpretations or rules.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: You know, I see Bob Wasserman and Ananda here as well. I don't know if either of you wanted to -Ananda is the head of our Division of Clearing and Risk. And I don't mean to take it away from you, Gary, but since he's maybe --

MS. BAGAN: Can I add something just before you start? And Scott is right, it's not deficits meaning a negative account balance. That's already covered by the regulations today. Firms have to put their own money in to cover those today.

It is the margin call issue that we're talking about. That's the change.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Scott, you're both with the same FCM. You're both with the same FCM and you both put on positions that
require a margin of $\$ 100$ each. Okay? And your -- and that's the margin of the CME, \$200. So the FCM gives your $\$ 100$ and Curt's \$100 to the CME, right? Fine.

Next day your margin requirement drops to \$80. Curt's margin requirement goes up to \$120. As far as the CME is concerned it's still \$200. But what we're saying is that the FCM cannot use your $\$ 20$ to fund his margin call. That's all we're saying.

So would you like that?
MR. CORDES: I'm not disagreeing with that. The way it's proposed today is you don't even have the next day to collect the \$200 as an FCM from him to get to the CME. You're saying it's realtime right now.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Right, but then the issue is -- the issue, and maybe this is something, you know, the staff can clarify. The issue is when the CME makes the margin call, that's the point in time when the clearing member has to pony up, right?

So at the time in which the obligation of the FCM arises to meet margin requirements that's the time at which the FCM has to make sure that it is not using one customer's funds to margin, secure, or guarantee another customer's obligations.

MS. BAGAN: But keep in mind too that if Scott's margin goes down to $\$ 80$ he can take that $\$ 20$ out immediately. The firm has to give that to him immediately. In which case now they do have to put up their own money.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: That's right.
MS. BAGAN: Or until Curt pays up.
MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: But what we want to say is we don't want -- we don't want a situation where the FCM uses its own funds. I'll speak for staff. We don't think it's right that the FCM puts its own capital into the seg account. Only at a point in time when Scott wants to withdraw his \$20. I mean, at all times his money should not be used to
margin, secure, or guarantee the obligations of another customer. That's the point.

MR. WASSERMAN: I think the issue we're trying to balance is this. There's some very real practicalities and you've pointed them out.

There's also the fact that if the FCM goes bust and you find out that your \$20 isn't there because actually they were using it to margin Curt's positions, and Curt as well had a bit of a problem, you'd be very upset. And among other things you'd be upset with, well, us.

On the other hand, you're right, there are practical issues. And we don't want to put folks in a position where there needs to be double margining.

So as Ananda said, the first issue is you put your position on, say, Monday morning. And there's an increase in margin requirements. Or let's say Curt does, rather. Your money isn't actually getting used until
the FCM moves money upstream, say, to the CME. So it's not an immediate matter. In other words, he has to be in the right place at all times.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Bob, can I ask a question?

MR. WASSERMAN: Sure.
COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: You raised -- at a point in bankruptcy we've got this pro rata distribution rule well outside of our ability to fix it in a rulemaking. So when it goes to bankruptcy it doesn't matter, everybody's money freezes. It doesn't matter whether he's $\$ 20$ up or $\$ 20$ down. If there's a hole everybody is frozen and that hole is distributed evenly. So it doesn't -- he can be mad but the Bankruptcy Code is the problem. How do you resolve a hole in bankruptcy under pro rata distribution?

MR. WASSERMAN: So the purpose of the -- there's two levels.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Unless it
takes 3 years like it's taking in MF Global.
MR. WASSERMAN: Well, again, I will note in MF Global most of the money did go out in a much shorter period of time, albeit it is only now that we're getting towards the very good result of hopefully getting close on 100 percent.

That said, MF Global is an example of where the rules were not followed and at a certain level if the rules are not followed there's problems there.

If the rules are followed and the question is what the rules are and we try to make sure that they are followed. We want to make sure that if the rules are followed and someone loses money because that does happen -

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Can we come back to the specific example?

MR. WASSERMAN: Sure.
COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: So how does this daily margin true-up rule protect you in
a pro rata distribution under bankruptcy if there's a hole in somebody's account?

MR. WASSERMAN: Forgive me, but the idea is that this is ensuring -- this is to reduce the likelihood of that hole occurring in the first place.

In other words, if Curt has a margin requirement of $\$ 120$ we want to make sure that there's $\$ 120$ of Curt's money there to meet that margin requirement so that if Curt defaults when there is a margin -- when there is an actual loss there's enough money there.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Okay, but in the case of a default, somebody defaults. Somebody has a hole, blows themselves up. How does this rule -- would this rule change anything about the pro rata distribution in bankruptcy?

MR. WASSERMAN: This rule is not intended to change the pro rata distribution in bankruptcy.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Can I use the example? The Advisory Committee is seeing us deliberate with our staff.

But Curt has a $\$ 120$ now margin requirement under the example but he only has \$100 in. And Scott has $\$ 100$ in but no longer -- he wants, you know, he might have wanted his \$20 back.

But before Scott got his \$20 back either the FCM goes bankrupt or, sorry Curt, Curt goes bankrupt. Just as an example.

Back to Commissioner 0'Malia's question. Will Scott get his $\$ 100$ or not? I mean, $I$ know that on Tuesday $\$ 20$ of Scott's dollars are being used to margin Curt. Curt only put $\$ 100$ in. Now Curt goes belly up. What happens? I don't know the answer. This is not a setup. I'm trying to understand. MR. WASSERMAN: Let's assume for the moment these are the only two customers. So if Curt loses $\$ 120$. Because let's say indeed maybe -- Curt loses $\$ 120$. The margin
being a measure of --
MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Let's answer the question. If Curt goes bankrupt, the FCM is fine, then Ed's fine. He can go away if he wants but there's no FCM insolvency. So if Curt goes -- and I hope you don't go bankrupt.

The issue is what happens if on that same day, the FCM is insolvent because of Curt's inability to fund the margin. That's the specific question.

So the issue then is whether there is a shortfall in segregation. Being -- if all the customers who have credit balances or equity show up and say give me my money back does the FCM have enough money to give it back.

Because Curt cannot get more than what he's entitled to. So I think what will happen is that there will be an attempt. And you know, and correct me if I'm wrong, but an attempt to freeze out Curt and try and move all of the positions and the money on the non-
defaulting customers to the extent possible.
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: And if the loss
is big enough, won't it be pro rata --
MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: If the loss is
big enough and there is a shortfall in segregation as a whole then the -- and there's
a bankruptcy filing then the pro rata distribution rules come into effect.

But the objective of this rule is to make sure, one, to be faithful to the statute.

MR. FORTENBERY: We have about 5 minutes left on the topic. Let me throw it back to the Committee and see if -- David, do you have a comment you'd like to make?

MR. MILLER: Again, it strikes me as part of the conversation. We're trying to solve a bankruptcy problem with a CFTC ruling with regard to the pro rata distributions.

We are still talking margin.
We're not talking deficit. The account is not deficit. The account may be under-margined,
and in an under-margined that doesn't mean there isn't sufficient -- if the position is liquidated for everyone to be made whole. Because you're still on a margin position.

It is a totally different thing if we're talking using my funds to cover somebody's deficit position. Then I am at risk because there is not sufficient funds in segregated accounts to make everyone whole.

But if it is simply a margin position that is under-funded for a very short period of transactional time I'm not at risk. I only become at risk if the other person goes deficit, not if they're under-margined.

And I think we're mistaking the ability to do transactional lubricity I'll call it to make the system work with markets that are moving constantly during the day. And we hit a settlement point at one time and this, $I$ can tell you, I've been both a broker, I've been on, like I said, been on multiple sides of this. If it's a significant risk I'm Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
in contact with them. Or they're in contact with me.

If it is this minor piece and I know the customer will send me the check tomorrow. But I'm not putting someone else at risk.

Now, if my account goes deficit because I've got $\$ 5,000$ in there and the market moves $\$ 10,000$ against me, that's a whole different situation than if my account went deficit.

I think we really are trying to solve something that's a bankruptcy issue with a rule that really takes and puts sand in the gears of functionality. And I think we need to be very, very careful about doing it.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: It's David, right? Yes, I assure you we're trying to be very, very careful.

I think that there's two issues.
One is the law, thou shall not use, secure, guarantee, you know, with one customer's money
other people. So that's this intra-day or intra 3-day what was the word you used? MR. MILLER: I used transactional lubricity.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Lubricity. I'll look it up later. But it sounds good.

That transactional lubricity intra-day or for 3 days, is that consistent or conflicting that thou shall not use, secure customer money, et cetera. That's a legal question. I'm not a lawyer but that's an important piece.

But I do think that there is some risk even if it's using somebody's margin because if the music stops and the FCM goes default and Curt's not there -- sorry Curt. And in liquidating the position CME has to move his position or liquidate the position, they needed the \$120. If they liquidated and only needed $\$ 5$ then that's all right. But the risk would probably come if they have to liquidate it and his initial margin wasn't
enough.
So I'm just saying there is some risk. How you measure that, I'm not saying, but there is some risk I think. And so it's a legal question and then there is some risk. And I do share -- it's not what Peregrine and the others were about.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Can I ask Bob and Ananda maybe so we don't avoid Commissioner discussion here. But if it's the law how have we not interpreted it this way previously? What was our standard before?

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: I think we, staff, I'll speak for staff, assumed that people knew what the law was and were complying with the law the way that the law said they had to comply.

And then it was through, you know, our activities as a result of these two unfortunate events that we realized that people had a different view of the law. In my view a wrong view of the law.

MS. BAGAN: But Ananda, I don't know that that's entirely true in that at the FCM level itself this is one of the things we look for on our regulatory examinations is to make sure that they are following the law at the FCM.

I'm not talking about what they put up at the clearinghouse, I'm talking about making sure they hold the funds they need to hold. And they are doing that. And they always have been doing that. That's different than what was going on at the clearinghouses.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: So what we're saying is let's clarify the law. This is the law. It's, you know, as Chairman has said, the statute is very clear. You cannot use one customer's money, funds, or property to margin, secure, or guarantee the obligations of another.

So, nobody's been able to make the argument with all due respect that what we're suggesting is not what the law says it is.

The arguments we've heard through all the comment letters is it's going to be expensive, the Earth's going to fall, so on and so forth. But nobody has said, nobody has done to my view a legal analysis saying your analysis is wrong. Right?

I mean the gentleman over there said, you know, it's a difference between deficit and margin. But the point is that if the example that $I$ gave takes place the FCM is using one customer's property to margin somebody else's requirement.

MR. FORTENBERY: We need to move on to the next topic. Let's have just one more comment if you'd like and then we'll --

MR. FRIESEN: Well, from my perspective, I mean I guess I was always more concerned when I had excess margin there. I kind of knew they were using my money to do something, I didn't know what, because somebody always uses it. Whether they invest it wisely or not, 1 was always hoping I'd get
it back.
But I guess my biggest concern as a user of the CME right now is that if $I$ have excess margin there and my FCM goes bankrupt why can't I get all my money back if customer accounts are segregated. Or how can we do that to protect my excess margin there.

The rest of it is just positions that, yes, they're frozen, that's unfortunate and that's taking a long time in some cases. But it puts me at risk. And I don't mind leaving those excess funds there if I know they're protected somehow.

MR. FORTENBERY: Thank you very much. Scott, one more?

MR. CORDES: Can I? Just one last comment. I'll keep it brief.

You talked about the practicality and what goes on. And I think one thing that needs to be considered is you've got wire transfers in, wire transfers out. They don't always necessarily go in the order you want.

So what is the practicality of how that works on a day's transaction, whether it's between you and your FCM, or the FCM and the clearinghouse.

MR. FORTENBERY: Okay, thank you very much. Thank you, Anne and Kevin and Gary.

We're going to change -COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Mr. Chairman, can I make one last comment?

MR. FORTENBERY: Okay. This is the last last comment.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: That's
fine. Make sure you wish Anne a happy birthday. It was yesterday. And 25 years of CME service today. So this is how she spends her day.
(Applause.)
MS. BAGAN: Thank you.
MR. FORTENBERY: Okay, that was a good comment.

We're going to change direction
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just a little bit and talk about renewable identification numbers, RINs. As you may know maybe eight or 10 weeks ago futures contracts were initiated to actually trade RINs explicitly.

We have two members of a panel today to talk to us about those. The first one is Phillip Verleger who's the principal of PKVerleger who's going to talk to us a little bit about the background of RINs.

And then also the Chief Economist, the interim Chief Economist here at the Commission, Scott Mixon, is also going to speak to us. So we'll go from there.

MR. VERLEGER: First, I have submitted a paper which will be also on our website.

Second, let me just summarize it. Ethanol has been used as a fuel additive for many years in the oil business. It has a high octane that makes it popular with refiners, especially when the price is low because it
cuts the cost of producing gasoline.
Other things being equal today refiners would blend as much ethanol as they could into gasoline. As you can see from this first chart the price of ethanol which is the black line is below the price of RBOB which is a refining blending stock for gasoline.

I might add that if you blend more ethanol you can make a lower-octane gasoline which is lower cost to manufacture.

Second point. Existing infrastructure within the petroleum industry distribution limits the amount of ethanol in gasoline to 10 percent. This is a regulation having to do with fire hazards and the rules that are established by UL Laboratories. You can install separate pumps for higher ethanol. They are very expensive. And so companies tend not to do that. Marketers tend not to do that.

Third point. Congress dictated a specific volume of ethanol that had to be Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
blended into motor fuels when it passed the Energy Act of 2004, more recently the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. EPA implements that act.

Today, this year, 20 billion gallons of renewable fuels must be blended in gasoline and other motor fuels; 16.5 billion of those are ethanol. The projected gasoline and diesel use is 183 billion gallons, that was the projection made by EIA last year. That means you have to blend about 11 percent. Now, you know, the traditional way of working in Washington would be to require a specific number of gallons or specific percentage in every gallon. EPA has introduced tradable credits called Renewable Identification Numbers. They are 18-digit long numbers which EPA tracks and can be traded like pollution credits or any other.

EPA has encountered significant difficulties with enforcement of the law, particularly as to biodiesel RINs. Several
people are in jail now.
Buyers of fraudulently created RINs were required to replace them. That is EPA, if they find they're fraudulent goes to the buyer, say Valero, and says you bought it from Sam, you have to buy some more. EPA has cleared some of that up now with the certification program.

There are six types of RINs. My focus today is going to be the D6 RIN as EPA calls it which is the ethanol RIN which is what CME trades. That is what's blended in gasoline.

Until -- if you look for a second, the table just shows in the second column the requirements.

Until this year the prices of RINs were essentially negligible. The reason was that essentially we were well below the 10 percent blend rate and companies were happy to move ahead. They were using more ethanol than required so the price was free.

But what has happened is gasoline demand has failed to keep up with the projected levels that were used by Congress when they passed the act.

If you look at this chart what we show is the trend in gasoline that was expected by Congress from EIA when the law was passed in 2006 as compared to what has actually happened. And we are now seeing roughly a 20 percent shortfall in gasoline consumption with an absolute fixed requirement for blending gasoline.

Now, the decline has come because consumers finally figured out after 30 years that energy prices were high and they ought to consume. And so if you look at Bureau of Economic Data on gasoline consumption which is probably the most accurate by month what you see is a trend line, the red line, of gasoline as a percentage of total consumption. That broke in 2005 and we are now again about 20 percent short and we're going further.

So what has happened is the price of RINs have risen dramatically. At the beginning of the year they were zero. Last week they were \$1.40. This morning I was informed by Tom Kloza, editor of OPIS, they dropped to 90 cents. They have since risen back to \$1.10.

This is a problem because Valero, one of the largest refiners, a company that $I$ was a member of the board of directors 20 years ago has said it's going to spend between $\$ 600$ and $\$ 800$ million this year for RINs. This is not a trivial subject. And so refiners have been pushing on Congress to change the law which would reduce their obligation.

All of the discussion so far has ignored though E85 which is a 15 percent blend of gasoline and an 85 percent blend of ethanol. Those of you from the Midwest will be familiar with it. It has been available for years but the price has not been
attractive. Consumers have been able to -could see it at the pump selling for less, in this case on the graph this comes from the AAA. The average price of E10 which is regular gasoline and E85, you can see it's below. But you don't get as much energy. So -- and my chart has reversed the colors. The price has tended to be well above the price of E10 and nobody's used it.

Well, recently as prices of RINs have increased the price of E 85 has been falling. Because E85 is essentially a tool for manufacturing a RINs. You get 0.75 RIN extra which you can sell. So you get -- if I sell Mr. Friesen a gallon of E85 I get a dollar back from somebody else. And some marketers are passing this on.

We have seen an experiment in Minnesota and what has happened is sales have tripled. We're seeing sales in other parts of the country. And we're actually seeing now if you look at the average price of gasoline from Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.

January at a price -- the green line is 20 percent -- 80 percent of E10. And below that we show the energy equivalent price of E85. It has dropped just in July to a point where it pays. And we are now seeing very large volumetric sales.

If the program continues as it is, and if EPA does not show flexibility $I$ think the E85 if you do the numbers will work out and we will see essentially the RIN problem that the oil refiners keep identifying go away. The market will clear.

It will help if there is active trade in the CME contract. When I checked their website last week there were 70 contracts open. Now I helped introduce the NYMEX crude contract many years ago so it takes awhile for a new contract to work, but we have yet to see significant activity.

There remain, however, some significant problems. The oil industry, part of the oil industry does not like it. And we Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
keep seeing -- we saw this week hearings in Congress calling for repeal of the Renewable Fuels Act. I think the consensus of Congress is that's not going to happen. The Republicans told the people, oil and ethanol people to go back and renegotiate it.

We have seen inability of EPA to issue rules in a timely fashion. Now, that shouldn't come as a surprise to anybody at this agency because Congress quite frequently imposes regulations which are far too complicated to be implemented in a timely fashion.

EPA is supposed to issue the final rules for a current year on the November of the previous years. They have not. And that creates uncertainty. It makes it difficult to trade.

And in fact today's drop in the price and then the rebound may have come because if you look at the timing of it from a report on Bloomberg where some of the
renewable fuels producers said well maybe we'll compromise on the agreement.

The basic facts though are that the program is basically sound. It's going to take some adjustment. But the flexibility is there, it's just being ignored. Thank you.

MR. FORTENBERY: Thank you, Phillip. Scott?

MR. MIXON: Okay. Well thank you for that. Okay, first I'd like to say just I appreciate the opportunity to address this Committee and importantly to hear the comments back. Our economic research at the Commission clearly benefits from hearing the inputs of market participants. It helps us to focus the research in impactful directions that help us to develop appropriate and thoughtful regulations which is of course one of our key jobs.

I'll say that I'm particularly proud to be addressing issues of agricultural interest today. As Chairman Gensler said this Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
is not the largest space in the markets that we regulate but it is key in terms of the history and the mission of the CFTC. And I'll say I'm personally mindful of this having grown up on a farm in Alabama myself. And if you go upstairs you'll see the toy farm machinery that I played with as a child up on my bookshelves. It's a constant reminder about the end users and the importance that they have in this market.

So with that in mind part of our motivation here to think about the RIN market, this Renewable Identification Number market, is to understand some of the details, both from that top-down perspective in terms of the fundamental forces of supply and demand that these markets are supposed to reflect, as well as some of those micro issues. We're very mindful always of how markets trade and the structure of these markets.

And this is a particularly
interesting market. It's one frankly that we Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
haven't focused on as much as we have our traditional agricultural markets. And that's because this market has only existed for a few years. So perhaps we can be forgiven for that.

The thing that caught everyone's attention of course was the fact that as we just heard the price of these RINs, these tradable credits that refiners have to produce to show compliance with the EPA law spiked up from about a nickel to a dollar within the span of a couple of months towards the end of 2012.

This caught everyone's attention. And what we've seen recently is even though those prices came off a bit, down to 60-70 cents, they've trended back up. But they've continued to show the volatility. And again they've gone from $\$ 1.40$ a few days ago back to much lower levels.

So actually I'll just go back for a second. This is the D6 RIN which we were
just talking about which is a corn-based ethanol. There are some different flavors of these RINs if you'll allow me that pun.

The D4 and D5, they represent different types. So the D4 biodiesel, that's more of a soybean-based type product. And the D5 is another type, more advanced biofuel.

The main point from this is those prices did seem to be moving in line with the regulation. So we didn't observe on the face of it these prices at least being out of line with each other and their relative levels whenever we evaluated them to just see what the prices looked like.

Because from the regulations, which are in fact a bit complex relative to what you might think, the obligated parties who have to deliver these RINs to the EPA can deliver D4 or D5 RINs as well as D6 RINs. So if they have to deliver D6 they could substitute D4 or D5.

Substitution only works one way
though. So these D6 RINs have to be less than or equal to the D4 or D5 RINs. So at least we observed that.

We started to dig a little further. We understood exactly the same story, that given the status quo the regulations impose requirements on the blending which given the status quo for marketing, for shares of the different types of products, for the amounts that have to be blended, that you would see the amount that had to be blended exceeding the amount that the market could contain with the current technology.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Scott, can you go back to the prior page? I'm sorry.

MR. MIXON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: So, the mandate is a governmental set of actors, the Environmental Protection Agency that says you must have this much biofuel. Is that what the blue is?

MR. MIXON: That's correct, that many gallons.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: And the red, what is a blend wall?

MR. MIXON: So this represents a number of assumptions, but it's basically what industry says they -- that's the maximum amount they can blend given the gasoline they're expecting to sell. So at a 10 percent ethanol rate that's as much as they can put in. That's as much as they can use in a given year of ethanol.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: So when the government says you only need the blue, the value of the RINs was small.

MR. MIXON: Negligible.
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: But is it as simple as when the blue passed the red, 2013, all of a sudden everybody, there's like a chase around the market, almost like a squeeze to buy these?

MR. MIXON: I wouldn't use the Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
word "squeeze" but --
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Yes, okay.
MR. MIXON: But effectively, yes. And that's -- on this next slide that's what the analysts have said is the fundamental explanation, that the only way that given this technology and the infrastructure that this difference will be made up is by buying RINs, buying these credits. Even if you don't use them, buying the credits to deliver to the EPA.

And the assumptions in the models, the assumptions that they're using is that the supply of RINs that they've been building up over the past couple of years will be completely depleted sometime in 2014. So they become valuable as this constraint becomes fairly binding.

And this was something that had been identified by some analysts. Some of these papers you see at the bottom, some of the ag economists had started identifying this
issue as a real barrier that you'd have to get through.

And you can see some of the titles. "Something Has to Give," "Why Isn't the Conventional RIN Price Higher?" So the fact they were at a nickel, the analysts were saying the value really should be much higher. So we started to see it much higher.

Doesn't say as much about the volatility or the exact level, but it does give that fundamental based explanation of some of the issues that are out there in the market.

So, you know, at that level we understood a little bit about that top-down issue, the set of policies, the set of market structures that were giving rise to these issues that were causing people to put a lot of attention on these markets.

And then the next step is to
really think about the bottom-up part. So we're very mindful about the way that these
things trade. This, as I said, it's not a traditional commodity derivative until recently whenever the exchanges launched futures contracts on RINs.

And so we did the research. This is our preliminary due diligence and I can share some of it with you. We talked to market participants to understand what they were doing. We talked to some of the brokers of RINs.

These products have only existed for a few years and prior to 2010 it was really a spreadsheet-based market. You can imagine if these things are $\mathbf{3 8}$-digit strings of numbers reflecting gallons of ethanol, you can imagine that might lead to some sort of transcription errors, fat fingers errors, difficulties in terms of dealing with the market.

And so the EPA set up the
Moderated Transaction System. So this is not a traditional market, it's not a centralized
limit order book when you think about an exchange. It's really more of a back office type accounting system as we understand it.

So transactions occur, they occur outside of the system but then they are basically booked into this EPA system. So the participants can see what they've done, they see the transactions they've done, but they don't see the entire marketplace. So this is something they get from their brokers. They talk to brokers who are in this market. So there is some post trade transparency that the EPA gets.

The transactions have to be booked into this system generally within a few days. And then there are reports that are due at the end of a quarter.

As we talk to the brokers we get a little bit more color. Really they're just estimates by the brokers, guesses about what they see in the marketplace. They obviously see their own slice of the market. They can
give us ideas about what might be out there.
But the guesses we've heard were perhaps 20 to 25 different brokers who dealt in these markets, send out market sheets. They give an idea about the prices they're seeing in the market, the interest they're seeing.

The numbers they suggest are that out of the 2.6 billion RINs that were available at the end of 2012 on a slow day you might have seen 5 or 10 million RINs trade. On a much more active day when there was a lot more volatility you might have seen maybe 100 million RINs trade.

In terms of the bid and the ask prices that they seem to see in the market they indicate that back in 2012 when these RINs were not particularly valuable, when they were trading around a nickel, you saw the spread effectively be around two-tenths of a penny. So that's about three or four percent wide which sounds reasonably wide.

Two thousand thirteen, middle of the year -- or sorry, maybe middle of the spring you saw them around 70 cents. Spreads still tended to be about three or four percent wide.

Recently, it's not obvious to us exactly why it might be a little bit smaller except the numbers are a bit larger. It seems like the spreads might be slightly smaller than they were before, but you still see spreads that are one and a half or two percentage points wide.

That's very large compared to what we think about typically in, say, futures markets. But you know, it might be what you might see in a more traditional cash market.

So this was certainly some of the color we were interested in understanding partly again because we saw the futures market starting to overlay derivatives contracts on top of these RIN instruments.

And then as we also heard alluded Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
before there were some difficulties in the market. It's an evolving market, it's a young market, and so one of the difficulties that was observed was from 2010 and 2011 there were some fraudulent trades that were entered for D5 RINs.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Can I just
caution? These are alleged frauds. These are not frauds by the CFTC's Division of Enforcement or anything like that.

MR. MIXON: The CFTC Division of Enforcement has had no connection with this.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: This is just what some market people were saying.

MR. MIXON: Color from market participants. Although we have had trials and people have -- and convictions, violations of the Environmental Protection Act as I understand it.

The impact of this was that we saw, according to the market participants, liquidity drying up for some of the smaller
plants, some of the smaller refiners if they weren't well known to some of the potential purchasers of RINs that they had -- the counterparty credit risk the purchasers were very mindful of since they bore it completely.

There have been some fixes as $I$ understand. There's a proposed rule from 2013 to validate these RINs. The EPA is not a validation entity for these RINs.

And the story again that the market participants have told us is that we have seen some financial institutions enter the market. But they have had difficulties establishing some of those relationships. They're not refiners, they're not in those markets, they don't know the same people.

So even if they're well known
financial entities within those circles they're not that well known within these particular circles. And so trading desks who might bring liquidity to these markets have not had as much traction as you might hope
because their counterparty credit risk issues are still perceived to be issues for them.

So this again says to us this is a very young market. It's an evolving market. It's one that only very recently over the last couple of months had futures markets that were introduced on it. They haven't gotten a lot of traction. The number of contracts is quite small. Open interest is quite small.

But it's one that we're watching very mindfully because it is connected with a number of the other products and commodities that we're interested in at the Commission, corn, soybeans, gasoline, ethanol, and so forth. And so this is an active area for us to be considering in terms of thinking about it in the research side.

MR. FORTENBERY: Thank you, Phillip and Scott. Any discussion about the RINs markets or the activities currently going on?

MR. FRIESEN: I think if I would Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
have been a wise investor $I$ would have bought RINs about five years ago or four years ago. MR. VERLEGER: Well, a couple of points. When the RIN market was created by Congress. And the standard, if you go back to your graph that shows the blend wall, the Congress very carefully decided that RINs accumulated two years ago would become invalid. So if you had gone and bought those RINs five years ago they would have become worthless.

I've been living as an economist with environmental regulations for years and one of the things they try to do is block every opportunity. So that a RIN that was generated in 2011 from selling gasoline with 10 percent ethanol which had no value in 2011 could have been used to meet a 2012 obligation. But it could not be used to meet a 2013 obligation.

Similarly, you have 2012 obligations that can be used, RINs accumulated Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
in 2012 that are being used for 2013. That's why both of our graphs show prices for 2012 and 2013.

But those 2012 RINs expire at the end of the year. They cannot be used for 2014.

To make things even more complicated, the regulations say you can only carry 20 percent of your 2012 RINs forward to 2013. And if you're deficit in 2014 you can use 2015 up to a certain point.

But the environmental regulations are roughly five times as long in terms of Federal Register pages for an economic impact as a CFTC regulation. So you think Dodd-Frank is bad, EPA is worse, or more complicated.

The situation is even more complicated because if that blend wall weren't reached the EPA Administrator now in office has the right to change it or to relax the standard so that the situation can be changed. Which makes trading of any kind of a financial
instrument of something like this even more difficult.

Last year they changed the D1, D2 for cellulosic ethanol because there was no cellulosic ethanol there. So this is extremely complicated.

I know the CFTC has had difficulties. You've managed to work with the FERC but it's difficult. It's going to be even more difficult in trying to work with the Environmental Protection Agency given the authorities the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has to change the rules unilaterally.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I just have a question for the Committee, not the presenters with all respect. How is this affecting the markets for corn and soy and what are you seeing? And secondly, what issues for this agency?

MR. FRIESEN: Well, I think -we've been following the RIN price pretty

Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
closely in Nebraska. We're I think the second largest ethanol producer in the country.

We've seen petroleum marketers in our area that are making around a $\$ 1.20$ per gallon profit on the 85 because of the RIN price currently. They're not passing it on to their customers. The customers don't realize this because they don't understand the RIN market.

But from what we've seen at least if you had -- the petroleum industry has blocked E15 from use even though stations that have chosen to market E15 have come under contract disputes with the petroleum industry. So essentially they're blocking E15 use which would lower the price of RINs. It's a conscious choice of theirs.

And I think the RIN market is going to be extremely volatile, and especially if suddenly we start using more E85 and the demand for those RINs drops. Because I think looking at the mandates that we can use that
amount if we choose to. But right now there's a conscious effort not to.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: There was, before I came down here kind of a wire story that said RINs dropped 50 cents over the last week. Any sense of what contributes to this immediate volatility? Do you have any sense at all, any thoughts on it?

MR. VERLEGER: In the paper I tried, I think I've made the first real hard attempt to figure out what an equilibrium price for a RIN is this year. And if you work at it two or three different ways you come out with about 90 cents.

Now, this is a commodity and so as Scott said the price had gone to $\$ 1.40$. You expect markets to overshoot.

But if you work through carefully and look at the limited information that's available. I've been working with a firm in Minnesota that markets a lot of gasoline and we have been passing through the benefit to
see. Our goal is to see what the consumer response is. How much -- what the price elasticity and substitution is.

And when you work through this and you look at the substitution 80 to 90 cents, maybe $\$ 1$ is about the right price this year. But markets overshoot. They've been overshooting for 200 years.

The largest problem here is uncertainty on regulation. The lack of data. The Energy Information Agency provides no information on the volumes of E10, E15, or E85 sold. So we don't know the quantities. All you can see is the prices.

You have the Bloomberg. I rely on Argus Media. So the prices are uncertain. This is really -- what do they call them in the Wall Street? A pink sheet market. So you're going to see a huge amount of volatility.

But the market clearing mechanisms are there, they're just not as transparent as
in many of our other bonds. If I were going to draw an analogy to financial markets I'd say this is a little more obscure than the municipal bond market where the margins tend to be very large.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: I'm just back to the Committee again with all respect. M.J.? I mean I'm not familiar with this RIN market. I'm just looking what's happening on the ground for farmers. Or is this not in their thoughts?

MR. MILLER: They're aware of it. But it's one of those where it's a complex market.

And the comments have been right on target. The value of RINs does have a connection to the value of corn but it's an indirect valuation, not a direct valuation. Because it has to do with ultimately the incentives that you might have for particular types of ethanol, not only production but blending and opportunities that come with
that.
But the substitution effect also brings in the soybean oil market in biodiesel. And you've had a recent drop, some would call it a collapse in the soybean market, the spot soybean market of $\$ 1.50$ in the last three days.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Let me ask this simple question. Do farmers -- does somebody who's planting corn or soy benefit if the RIN price is high or low? I mean I'm just trying to understand.

MR. MILLER: The higher the RIN price, the more incentive there is to produce ethanol.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: And does that in any way then feed back to somebody on the farm? I guess I'm seeing no.

MR. FRIESEN: I guess from my standpoint I don't think the RINs price has had a lot of impact on ethanol production. The RIN transfers with the gallon of ethanol
so it's whoever uses that ethanol to blend with who can use that RIN in their marketing ability.

MR. FORTENBERY: We're about just a couple of minutes into our lunch period. Is there one more comment from the Committee or question? Yes, go ahead.

MR. WELLMAN: Yes. Direct effect to the farmer and the price, I don't believe that it's tracked that well by the farmer back down to the farm. Now, if they have investments in an ethanol facility and things like that, yes, they might be more in tune with the RIN value.

But a quick question. Besides the D6 can you comment a little bit more about the comparison and the valuations between the D5 and D4? Is there any -- when the $D 6$ value changes is there any correlation between the D4, 5's, and 6?

MR. MIXON: Well, my first comment of course is that we are not a price-setting
agency. So I just want to get that out there.
But you can look at the chart here. And based on my understanding of the regulations because that deliverability of the D4 or D5 to satisfy the D6 obligation, you will see them have at least as much value as the D6.

And so prior to the D6 RINs having much value, having a value of about a nickel the D4 and D5, so the second generation biofuels, for example, they were more valuable. There are different constraints that the EPA has put out for them.

And then as the D6 constraint became more binding they seem just from the picture to be more closely related. But those are just observations from this particular chart.

MR. FORTENBERY: I'm going to suggest we go ahead and break for lunch. We can continue this discussion at lunch.

All the speakers and the Committee Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
members are invited to lunch up on the ninth floor. I think it takes a secret handshake to get to the ninth floor so there's staff by the elevators that can help you facilitate your transportation up there.

Phillip, you're going to be able to join us for a little bit for lunch. So feel free to continue the discussion at lunch. And we will reconvene at 1:00 o'clock. Thank you.
(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 12:08 p.m. and went back on the record at 1:06 p.m.)

MR. FORTENBERY: What we're going to do this afternoon is talk about the issue of voice recording and the voice recording requirements.

We have three different panel members and then as always we'll hear their presentations and then throw it open for comments or questions.

The first speaker is Ward Griffin
Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
who is Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Vince McGonagle who's with the Division of Enforcement and Scott Cordes with CHS Hedging. I think we're going to start with Ward. So go ahead.

MR. MCGONAGLE: It's Vince McGonagle.

MR. FORTENBERY: Sorry. What did I say?

MR. MCGONAGLE: Don't worry about it.
(Laughter.)
MR. FORTENBERY: Okay. Wrong glasses.

MR. GRIFFIN: Good afternoon. My name is Ward Griffin and I am the associate chief counsel of the CFTC's Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight.

I'd like to take a moment to thank Dr. FORTENBERY and the members of the Agriculture Advisory Committee for allowing us the opportunity to discuss the new oral
record-keeping requirements under Regulation 1.35.

On December 21, 2012 the Commission published in the Federal Register final rule amendments to Regulations 1.31 and 1.35 that will require futures commission merchants, retail foreign exchange dealers, certain introducing brokers and certain members of designated contract markets or swap execution facilities to record and retain records of oral communications.

The Commission noted that the overarching purpose of the final rule amendments was to promote market integrity and protect customers. And the Commission believes that the collection of and access to searchable records, both oral and written, are indispensable tools the Commission needs to ensure market integrity and to protect customers.

As noted by the Commission in the preamble of the final rule release the markets
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have undergone a significant transformation over the last few decades, and in particular over the last few years.

Technological advances have contributed to tremendous growth including significant numbers of retail customers as well as greater interconnectedness with order flow distributed across multiple trading centers. These changes have required the Commission to adapt and these rules are part of that adaptation.

The Commission sought through the proposed rule amendments to conform the existing record-keeping requirements of Regulation 1.35(a) to the record-keeping requirements for swap dealers and major swap participants as set forth in Regulation 23.202 which were finalized by the Commission in the spring of 2012.

The Commission published the final rule amendments in the Federal Register and solicited comments. The Commission received
many comments in response to the proposal. The Commission considered those comments prior to issuing the final rule amendments and the Commission narrowed the proposed amendments in several significant areas in response to those comments.

Comments to these proposed amendments to Regulation 1.35 primarily focused on a handful of key areas each of which was discussed by the Commission in the preamble of the final rule.

First, commenters addressed the oral record-keeping requirement generally. Such commenters discussed the costs involved in such requirements as well as the necessity and feasibility of such a requirement.

Second, commenters addressed the applicability of the proposed rule amendments to members of DCMs and SEFs including commercial end users and non-intermediaries who are not registered with the Commission to keep records of their cash commodity
transactions.
Third, commenters addressed the proposed requirement that each record be maintained in a separately identifiable electronic file, also known as tagging.

Additional other issues were raised by commenters. We need not go through the full range of comments here today, but to point out three such comments. Number one, there were requests for a significant compliance time table. Two, there were requests for alternative treatment for smaller firms. And three, there were requests for a shorter record retention period than what had been proposed.

As noted by the Commission in the final rule release the final rules will significantly advance the Commission's efforts to detect and defer abusive, disruptive, fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices that seriously harm market integrity and customers.

The information will benefit the Commission in its market analysis efforts such as investigating and preparing market reconstructions, and understanding causes of unusual market activity. Plus, the requirement that records be kept current and readily available facilitates the timely pursuit of potential violations which can be vitally important in seeking to freeze and recover any profits received from illegal activity.

However, to address comments received from the public the Commission incorporated several changes to what had originally been proposed. Again, these changes reduce the burden in several significant ways from what had been proposed.

First, the oral record-keeping requirement will be limited to those oral communications that lead to a transaction in a commodity interest and related cash or forward transactions. This represents a
reduction from the proposal which would have applied the requirement to commodity interests and cash commodity transactions.

Second, acknowledging that implementing and maintaining an oral communication recording system would be overly burdensome for small entities and the commercial end user non-intermediary members of a DCM or SEF the Commission excluded from the new requirement small introducing brokers, oral communications of a floor broker who is a member of a DCM or SEF that do not lead to the purchase or sale for any person other than the floor broker, and certain members of the DCM or SEF including floor traders, commodity pool operators, and members that are not registered or required to be registered with the Commission in any capacity.

The Commission also permitted covered persons to contract with other Commission registrants to retain the required records provided that the records retained by Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
the contractor registrant are the same records, thus allowing covered persons to avoid retaining the same records as other Commission registrants.

Third, the Commission removed the requirement that each transaction be maintained as a separate electronic file. Instead, the final rule requires that such records be kept in a form and manner identifiable and searchable by transaction. This eliminated the so-called tagging requirement.

Fourth, the Commission significantly reduced the retention period for the oral records from five years as had been proposed to one year.

The Commission also significantly extended the amount of time that affected entities would be afforded to come into compliance with the final rule with respect to the recording of oral communications. In doing so the entities subject to this Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
rulemaking were afforded approximately the same amount of time as had been given to swap dealers and major swap participants to come into compliance with their requirements under Regulation 23.202.

All affected CFTC registrants must be in compliance with the oral record-keeping requirements of regulation 1.35 by December 21, 2013 which will mark the one year anniversary of the publication of the final rule in the Federal Register.

Likewise, similar to the treatment afforded to swap dealers and major swap participants, the Commission delegated to the director of the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight the authority to grant alternative compliance schedules to affected registrants.

Specifically, the Commission delegated to the director of DSIO the authority to establish an alternative compliance schedule for a firm that requests
one provided that the firm establishes that it is technologically or economically impracticable for the firm acting in good faith to comply with the oral record-keeping requirement within a reasonable time period beyond December 21, 2013.

Because the rule requires the director of DSIO to make findings on this issue the burden is on the firm to produce sufficient documentation showing that notwithstanding the good faith efforts to achieve full compliance prior to December 21, 2013, full compliance is technologically or economically impracticable.

The division has learned from the experiences over the past several months in terms of the compliance efforts of swap dealers and major swap participants concerning the oral record-keeping requirement.

One point that I would like to stress is that time is of the essence. The final rule was published over seven months ago
and affected firms already should be well underway in working towards full compliance.

With less than five months remaining until the compliance date affected firms that have not yet initiated the process should do so immediately. Although vendors have informed us of the existence of costeffective, off-the-shelf applications firms should allow themselves plenty of time to allow for the installation and testing of such applications.

That concludes my prepared remarks today. With that I will hand the microphone over to Vince McGonagle with the Commission's Division of Enforcement.

MR. MCGONAGLE: Hi, good afternoon, everyone. Thank you, Ward. I'm just going to briefly touch on a couple of topics, the purpose for the audio taping rule.

I became involved in the issue on a more formal basis several years ago. There was an inter-divisional group that was
established that $I$ referred to as the Recordkeeping Task Force.

And at that time we along with representatives from then DMO, DCIO and OGC talked about where we thought record-keeping should go in the future and what we thought needed to have changed. We followed closely what other regulators were doing, what SEC had on the books, FINRA, FCA came out with an audio taping rule just a few years ago in 2009.

And so we sort of have this backdrop of we know that entities out there that are interested in following the transactions that they're entering into, that a good number of those entities were already taping their conversations. And we though from an enforcement standpoint audio tapes of those conversations is an important component of the enforcement program.

The rule made clear that the purpose of the audio taping rule is to promote Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
market integrity and protect customers. And Ward's talked about that pretty extensively. Some of the enforcement matters, without delving into any specifics, but I can say generally and to the extent that anyone has been looking at our web page for the past year will see a number of actions that reference evidence as part of either the findings of the Commission or in allegations of the complaint that are based on audio taped conversations.

The types of cases that I'm referring to include the following: allegations involving disclosures of material non-public customer information; segregation; failure to supervise; speculative limits; wash sales; non-bona fide prices; fraud; false reporting; and manipulation.

And so literally just over the course of the past few years from enforcement actions you see a broad range of activity, enforcement-related activity that relies on
and uses audio taped information.
In reviewing comments to the proposed rule we were cognizant of concerns that individuals had with respect to how that might affect them as small players potentially in the market versus the larger market interests that they thought that enforcement was focused on, particularly manipulative activity. But as I've talked about here we are looking at broad customer protection relief as well as market integrity issues.

We did, however, narrow the scope of the rule to focus on entities that deal only with customers. And we think in doing that we tried to hopefully strike a balance that preserves for the division information that is most likely to be of concern with respect to an enforcement investigation.

I can tell you though my personal feeling with respect to taping transactions, more is better. However, I think that the rule here is a great approach and I am very
thankful that the Commission considered and passed it.

With respect to searchability we received of course a number of questions following the rule coming out this past December concerning how entities should prepare themselves with respect to searchability.

In the rule guidance it sets forth some information that I think is helpful. The record-keeper should be able to readily access and identify records pertaining to a transaction or a counterparty by running a search of the raw data.

So what does that mean? Well, basically if you have off-the-shelf data analytics those analytics should have the ability, for example, if the Division of Enforcement sends a subpoena or a request for information where we're looking for trading information on a particular date, or on a particular line, or by a particular
individual, that those individuals who are responding to our request should be able to run the analytics available currently from these software programs and start a production that's focused on responding to those requests.

Compliance with searchability as I said can happen through the use of commercially available products capable of conducting speech analytics on recordings. Both land lines and mobile telephones should be recorded. Covered persons must ensure that covered communications do not occur on personal phones that lack the recording capability.

The Commission also indicated that it did not adopt any explicit safe harbors. However, the Commission recognized that it will consider good faith compliance with policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to comply with the oral communications component. Thank you.

MR. CORDES: Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak. I'm going to talk to this rule a little bit. And I want to add some color and a little bit of clarity on some of the issues that $I$ see as an FCM and maybe some of the other folks in the agricultural industry. I know there's others within our National Council of Farmer Cooperatives group that have this issue as well.

And really what I want to talk to a little bit is how you comply with some of this stuff and some of the challenges we have. And we have one example that I want to walk through just a little bit here that I think impacts some of the folks in the room here in how we look at that.

What I want to talk about is within CHS Hedging, we have branch offices around the countryside. And you'll see on the screen I've got just some dots where they are.

They represent 64 different branch Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
offices that we have around. They're branch offices of the FCM. They operate and act a lot like an introducing broker but they are a branch office.

Just to give you a little idea what the profile of these branch offices are, most of these are a relationship with I would say is the local cooperative or the local entity. And we have the individual that is licensed and registered there. We have oversight. We have auditing. But they're an employee of that local organization. And they're offering these commodity brokerage services as something ancillary to their other daytime activities.

Most of these branch offices
you'll see range in a revenue stream of maybe $\$ 5,000$ a year to $\$ 250,000$. Probably an average of $\$ 20,000$. They'll handle trades of maybe a total of 100 for the year up to 4,000 . Most of them are dealt around commodities such as the grain and the livestocks.

Lots of times what happens is this individual that's registered there and licensed is also maybe the person that's buying grain from farmers to that location. And what will happen lots of times is the farmer might come in and say you know what? I'd like to talk about the markets. I want to protect my crop but I'm maybe not ready to sell you grain. Is there another way that I can manage my risk, i.e., can I use my futures account. So there's that education ongoing that goes there.

Once trades take place they probably will call us or they will have an electronic order entry on their screen in their office that they can place the trade.

From there as the FCM in the home office we will manage that order flow. We'll have oversight to that order flow. We'll handle the margin calls, the money moving back and forth, that sort of thing.

You might ask a little bit, you Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
know, what's the value here if there's not a high-volume flow that's taking place at these branch offices. Lots of times it gets down to that farmer, that rancher at that local level. They have a trusted local contact they can deal with. There's easy access. They can come in and see them. They can call them on the phone. There's an education process that takes place. There's market intelligence, consultation. And really it offers them another risk management choice.

So with what I've described about what the profile and what these branch offices look like, today the way the rule is written these branch offices would have to comply with oral taping requirements. Because technically they are part of the FCM as a branch office and as an $\operatorname{FCM}$ we're required to tape.

Now we do that already today in our home office. We also do it in our two major other offices that $I$ have employees at, Kansas City and Indianapolis. So we have that
searchable record type thing there.
But it gets into these branch offices. It comes down to what is economically and what is technically feasible to do. So we have this question about recording cost and benefits.

If we go forward with compliance will these branch offices drop off because you can't comply with it? Then what happens to the risk management choices at that local level to the farmer?

We also run a little bit of a challenge around cell phones being searchable and how you can tag, that kind of thing. So with there $I$ wanted to give the rest of the Committee an opportunity to see some of the things that we see out there.

I know there's other firms in other situations probably some similar things. I would say maybe some solutions going forward outside of a No-Action letter is maybe looking at the rule a little bit and say can it be
looked at in a similar fashion to the IB you carved out for the smaller type thing. Is there a revenue stream by location? Is it a physical location? Is it specific commodities?

I would also point out these branch offices don't deal in over-the-counter transactions. It's all exchange-traded type products. So there's probably some solutions that can be had if you want to identify in those ways. But hopefully my presentation here is helpful to give the rest of the Committee and the Commission here some insight to what's taking place.

MR. FORTENBERY: Thanks, Ward, Vince and Scott. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Scott, if I could just ask just as an example because you're in the field and you have a sense of this. So three of your 64 offices you tape and this oral recording -- just focused on those 3 offices -- this oral recording rule is
at least aligned enough with what you already do. That's not where the issue is coming. It's coming from possibly the other 61 offices?

MR. CORDES: Yes, that's correct. It would be the other ancillary offices that we don't have the size and scale, yet they're adding a valuable service to the local agriculture community.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: So of those 60 odd other offices how many of them have, you know, these wonderful pictures. But how many of them are just like the one-person office? I just don't have a sense.

MR. CORDES: Yes, I would have to think right off the top of my head. It would be the majority of them. There might be I think one or two where there might be two people licensed, but neither one of them is it a full-time job for them. It's ancillary to their other duties that they maintain at that location.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: So you're saying there's like your 3 hubs and then there's 60 others that either have 1 or 2 people in them.

MR. CORDES: That would be correct.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: And they're only doing futures only.

MR. CORDES: Only doing futures. CHAIRMAN GENSLER: All right, thanks. That's helpful.

MR. FORTENBERY: Discussion? Yes.
MR. DIERKS: Just as a further clarification of that, Scott. When you talk about that one licensed person in that location, he might or she might only have maybe 15 or 20 minutes a day maybe dealing with the futures. They're also running the scale or taking delivery of corn that farmers bring in to sell or whatever. Is that correct?

MR. CORDES: Yes, it could be that Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
simple. Some might be 15 minutes a day. Some might not look at it for a day or two.

The nice thing they have with being a branch is we give them intel and information that they can pass down to the local. But as far as their time requirement it could vary. I mean some would do more but a lot of them it's not a -- it's a smaller part of their daily duties.

MR. ANDERSON: Could maybe either of you guys clarify a little bit? I know there's a distinction between what's required for a member of an exchange versus someone who's not a member of an exchange.

MR. GRIFFIN: If you'll bear with me I'll pull the exact language up.

MR. CORDES: Could you also expand -- you know, there's a little talk about -- it talks about cash transactions. I think some people think if they're dealing in cash commodities that they would have to tape as well, but I don't think that's --

MR. GRIFFIN: No, no, no. Right. There are two components and Scott was pointing out a second component. And I'll deal with that very quickly first.

There were a number of concerns with how the proposed rule had been phrased, that it would include cash commodity transactions which if you're a non-registrant member of a contract market that -- and you engage in these cash commodity transactions that are not related to a commodity interest transaction that it was going to -- it would expand the burden into an area where the Commission hasn't traditionally had any jurisdictional interest to get into. There was a legitimate costbenefit question there that is the burden that's being placed there, is it appropriate and/or is it from a cost-benefit perspective a good idea? And the Commission looked at that and said well, no, it's not.

And so to deal with that first
component the Commission had changed the language from the proposed rule to the final rule so that those cash commodity transactions, that that is out. So that addressed a fair amount of the concern with respect to the commodity markets. Go ahead. MR. ANDERSON: And is that only if you're not a member of an exchange? Or what if you're doing cash contracting but are also a member of an exchange?

MR. GRIFFIN: There are two components. So first you have, if you're just engaging in cash commodity transactions, you're a member but you're not an FCM, you're not another registrant above a certain threshold or within certain parameters.

I don't want to mix the two categories up too much. On the one hand you're talking about types of transactions that would trigger the requirement, right?

Then the second component is the nature of who the registrant is. And there
the Commission got in -- and again, this pertains specifically to the oral recordkeeping requirement alone. It does not pertain to written records and things of that nature.

But it's spelled out and I'll give you the exact cite. It's Regulation 1.35(a) -- excuse me. Well, it's at the end of (a)(1) but it's enumerated out romanettes (i) through (viii). And if you give me a second I'll walk through those very quickly.

Again, the rule --
CHAIRMAN GENSLER: You can send it to the Committee.

MR. GRIFFIN: Or I can send it to the Committee, whatever you like.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Just give the best oral answer.

MR. GRIFFIN: That would be fine. Yes. Essentially it carves out a number of folks. It carves out, again, oral communications that led solely to the Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
execution of a cash or forward transaction just as we discussed.

It carves out transactions by floor brokers who are transacting for themselves, if there isn't communication with a customer out there.

It carves out what we call small IBs which are introducing brokers that have an aggregate revenue from their IB business of not more than $\$ 5$ million total over the preceding 3-year period.

And others as well, floor traders, members of DCMs or SEFs that are not registered or required to be registered by the Commission. I mean all those persons are strictly carved out. So it is not applicable. The oral record-keeping requirement is not applicable to them.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: And this was -I mean hopefully we got the right balance. Scott raises the branch issue that we need to take a close look at.

But what we tried to do is when we proposed this $I$ want to say a year and a half, maybe 2 years ago, I think we got it too wide. It think it was too inclusive. And we got a lot of comments back from your interests and other interests as well, the FCM community, and we narrowed it as probably not completely to Vince's liking. But we -- he's in the Division of Enforcement so you can imagine where he'd come from.

But the Commissioners working together with the staff narrowed it and with these various exceptions and carve-outs to really principally be members of exchanges, FCMs that are members, and then these introducing brokers that are over a certain size as I remember. Is that?

MR. GRIFFIN: That's correct.
MR. STRONG: Scott, does this carving out of the cash transaction from the recording requirement, doesn't this take care of the 60-some branch offices? Or did I miss something there?

MR. CORDES: There are other activities that they're doing around cash -it does. But the activities they would do around exchange-traded products as a branch does not because that's a futures transaction. Today the way the rule is written that would still bring them under that review.

MR. KOTSCHWAR: The Commodity
Markets Council has been very interested in this issue for quite awhile and we in fact commented on it. And we were happy to get the relief that we got on the oral recording. Unfortunately, we feel like we've been a little bit duped and weren't paying close attention because at the same time we were getting relief on that the definition of an electronic record was being expanded to the point of including a lot of 21st century analogues for phone calls.

Today, great, we have a lot of -you know, a lot of grain is at least bought
and sold initially with a phone call. But more and more it's with a text or an instant message that has completely replaced the whole -- actually talking to somebody. So we have the same issues from a technology perspective and a searchability perspective trying to keep all these instant messages and everything else when we don't have to record the phone call. So we've got a -- this is a big problem for the CMC membership. Huge problem.

In the case of my company in particular we immediately just said no more doing anything with cell phones, or texting with mobile devices. You have to actually make a phone call. So we have forced them into the area where you gave us some relief because we are unable to do a lot of things with mobile devices especially.

So we don't think that's probably what the policy should have been. You know, we get relief from recording phone calls and that's what we're ironically forcing everybody
to do now. So a lot of members of CMC are very concerned.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Sir, your company is a registered FCM?

MR. KOTSCHWAR: No, we're just a member. We're a non-clearing member of a DCM.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Non-clearing member. Thank you.

MR. MILLER: I think the points being made here are salient from that perspective of there was an increasing amount of the transactions, particularly into things like branch offices, et cetera, that are coming from the tractor seat if you will, that are coming in the form of texts and these other types of things.

And I just would encourage the Commission to take a look at what type of requirements and administrative burden are you imposing if you expand those things into recordings that go beyond the voice recordings of these other things.

I probably do half of my cash grain transactions by text. And that's just the new technology. And I don't know of any -- to be honest $I$ assume my texts are not being recorded someplace unless it's NSA.
(Laughter.)
MR. MILLER: But so I think as you look at the old requirement that assumed everything was by voice is rapidly changing.

And in fact here may be, again, different entities. I know internally just our company has rules that are based upon other agencies and other things with regard to how long you store emails.

And if you extend this, what's the recording requirement. How long would these have to be stored. All these types of things become issues I think that need to be taken at least into consideration as to how extensive we're making these regulations and what the burden may be there.

MR. FRIESEN: So if I would walk
into my broker's office and visit with him and tell him to place an order then there's no communications that's recorded at all.

MR. MCGONAGLE: That's correct.
MR. FRIESEN: So it's just the telephone conversations. And I guess when I'm thinking now the times that I've done this there are some times he's on the road traveling quite a bit and so I do it by phone. But then he will have to call it in, I take it.

But now I won't be able to do that anymore. I'll have to call his home office or somewhere and place my order because he could no longer do that transaction. Is that correct?

MR. GRIFFIN: Are you talking about like a cell phone type situation where he's on the road? It would depend on how the broker or the FCM, how they would set up their structure.

Again, drawing from the lessons Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
that we've seen or that we've gotten over the last several months with the swap dealer, in the swap dealer context the mobile recording has been something that they have grappled with as well to varying degrees of success. And talking about having the ability to have these conversations when you're on the road, when you're away from your office.

One of seemingly the more workable solutions that firms have employed, while they're expecting the mobile technology, the mobile recording technology to improve here in the relatively near term, as a bit of a stopgap measure they are instructing their folks to essentially set up bridge lines, bridge conference lines with the home office.

So that whether they're on the road going home, or they're out at lunch, or they're going to Chicago for something that they can still have that customer interface through their mobile handheld. The actual call itself though is just being routed
through the home office. There's a bridge conference line that then is -- is then being recorded and making sure the call is fully compliant.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: And as I understand it, now these are the swap dealers many of whom also control FCMs. Scott's firm is different, $I$ do recognize that. But if you look at the major, some of the 10 or 15 largest FCMs they're broker-dealers and they're part of the same swap dealer families. That's how they're addressing this.

MR. CORDES: If I could just add though too. I would ask that the staff and the Commission do look a little bit at the cell phone recording issue. It really comes into what's a practical size and scale, and what's at risk to the industry.

I know in our particular situation I talked about our home office and our other two primary offices. They tend to deal with farmers and commercial entities in the trade,
probably a lot of the folks in this room. The majority of our business is transacted in the office on the phone.

But with the extended trading hours that are out there occasionally one of those employees could get a call from one of those customers on the way home or on the way into work. And how do you handle all that? I mean you're going to set up a bridging for each potential ones? Because it might happen once a week, it might happen once a month. It's not the majority of what takes place. But is it going to be strict that you have to cover every single phone call?

MR. MCGONAGLE: So the Commission did discuss this issue a little bit in coming out with the rule and talked about the concern if we didn't cover the use of mobile phones that it would chase the business to mobile phones, to an area then that wasn't captured. And so I think that's basically where the Commission came out.

If you're going to use a mobile phone and that's going to be part of your business then come up and use that technology that's available to record it or otherwise seek the alternative compliance schedule that Ward referenced and get that into the Commission as soon as possible.

MR. WELLMAN: As a producer, if I'm not making my own trades on the CME I'm calling one of those similar branches that Scott mentioned. But probably calling the employee on his personal cell phone because they're out not necessarily sitting in the office because like Scott said that's not their full-time job necessarily. So I question.

And maybe, you know, he then calls back to somebody in the office and actually makes the transaction. So I'm not sure where -- how that's all getting recorded.

And I don't quite, from my perspective, $I^{\prime \prime m}$ not sure why it's necessary.

I don't know exactly what problem we're trying to solve here, what problem we've had in the countryside that's trying to be addressed by this.

MR. FRIESEN: A little bit -- what
I feel. I mean you're doing this as a protection for me as a hedger? I mean, I fail to see I guess. I'm not a speculator. I don't trade in large volumes. So by implementing this, is this a protection for the consumer, me?

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Yes, very much so. It's about market integrity, our enforcement efforts. And this is true around the globe, whether it's in the United Kingdom or here or elsewhere have more and more gone to saying that these dealers, I'm going to use the word broadly, record their transactions and part of their record-keeping is these voice recordings. That's what's been implemented here for the swap dealers already.

And it had a provision similar I Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
think to this that -- I can't remember what you called it. Alternative compliance is it? Where a futures commission merchant or dealer could say no, actually the technology doesn't yet exist. We need more time. We need to change this.

But it's broadly speaking to help promote market integrity. Not that you're going to be a bad actor but it's that somebody on the other side, what they're doing.

And we need to address and sort through Scott's issue of these one- or twoperson offices. I appreciate that.

But the broad conceptual framework is just that a member -- I mean it was carved back. It's really a member of an exchange that's -- the futures commission merchants or the introducing brokers over a certain size if I remember.

And not to try to stop somebody from the occasional cell phone call at night. That's not the purpose.

MR. ANDERSON: Maybe just to piggyback a little bit on Curtis's point as well.

When that call is made in the middle of the night for that transaction that's going to represent a contract that then is going to be followed up in writing, required a signature coming back. So, there is another touch point after that phone call. MR. FORTENBERY: Any other -- yes, go ahead.

MR. KOTSCHWAR: I don't want to be monopolizing time here or piling on, Mr. Chairman. But you know, this --

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: We always enjoy our exchanges.
(Laughter.)
MR. KOTSCHWAR: Many of the members of CMC are -- many of our members have exchange memberships. We're non-clearing members. We do all of our business through an FCM. So the reason we're on the exchange,
it's an economic reason that we've decided to join the exchange because of the amount of trading we do, to take advantage of the benefits of membership.

That's the only reason we seem to be caught, wrapped around the axle in this whole notion of in our case it's not the oral recording. Oral recording worked out for us. It's the written records that are associated with it. Because we're really struggling with that.

Take a good example. My company has got hundreds of locations all across the country. On any given day we'll be buying and selling all kinds of grains. We'll be buying corn from farmers in 20 different states. We'll be selling corn elsewhere.

At the end of the day, every time we buy 5,000 bushels of corn from a farmer we don't go hedge that discretely. We have to look at our overall book and see where we are. Are we net long or are we net short. Then
we're going to go take that position to the exchange is what we'll do. Or adjust our position on the exchange.

So the way we're dealing with this written communication record is those cash transactions cumulatively are why we're ultimately doing our futures transactions. In an abundance of caution we're looking at all those records saying, okay, we've got to keep all that electronic communication that led up to those cash grain sales. We're not sure if that's very good policy.

We keep the records we have to with farmers that we feel are commercially necessary. Any kind of communication we have with the farmer leading up to a sale, we still need a piece of paper. We're going to have a contract with that farmer. And that's the kind of stuff we keep.

Any of the communications we're having up to that, we don't have to record our phone calls. But to try and keep text
messages leading up to that, that is a huge burden which is why we're not doing it right now.

MR. ANDERSON: And to Lance's point even further. His competition may not be required to do that because they may not be a member of an exchange. So his elevator might be here not being able to communicate via text because the burden of recording is too great. But the elevator or the cooperative system next door who's not a member of an exchange doesn't get tangled up in this and therefore isn't subject to those same requirements.

MR. GRIFFIN: Aside from the policy point that I think you're trying to make, I think one point that's instructive is noting that the Commission said in the preamble to the final rule that there was actually an advisory that our Division of Market Oversight issued back in 2009 that addressed as you mentioned the 21st century
written communication, electronic communication component of -- the relationship there.

And the DMO had come out with this advisory saying that under the preexisting 1.35 , before this rule amendment was finalized in December that 1.35, the older version already required the retention of these written records by members of designated contract markets.

So $I$ mention that just kind of in passing. Again, that doesn't address the underlying policy concern that's there. But just want to make clear that at least it was the Commission's view by virtue of the DMO advisory that was put out in `09 that the capture and retention of these written communications were already required.

MR. KOTSCHWAR: And just respectfully I don't believe -- I think it's accurate to say that among the CMC membership no one was paying attention to industry
guidance. You know, we have a hard enough time figuring out what the regs are.

You know, when you put out guidance saying here's what the reg means, most people -- most people were not paying attention to that.

MR. MCGONAGLE: So when the rule -- when we have the clarification talks about electronic records we're focused on what is the communication. The content of the communication is what's driving the obligation to retain the records. That's what we're most interested in.

And to the extent that folks wanted to get tripped up in the method of communication I think the 2009 guidance came out that said don't get tripped up on the method of communication. If you want to text that's within your business right to do that but you need to retain it.

And so I'm saying that maybe more forcefully as an enforcement person than, you
know, you're going to hear from other sides of the house. But the record-keeping obligations have been in 1.35 to members of the contract markets, FCMs, RFEDs going back for a period of years. Members of a contract market have been required to maintain records of cash transaction 25-30 years now.

So I want to make sure that people are focused on that and are thinking that this isn't a new obligation when it comes to those transactions. And you're doing your best to comply with those provisions.

MR. ANDERSON: I think a lot of our membership has quickly caught up. Because we were caught a little off guard as well. But I think we've quickly caught up and made some decisions similar that if we can't track it then we're not going to do it that way.

However, again there's a little bit of a dichotomy between what a member of an exchange may have to do even if they're clearing through an FCM versus another --
their competition who may not be a member and therefore may be able to not have to record.

MR. GRIFFIN: At least to some extent with that if you're talking about communications between the member and the FCM with whom they're going through there is that component that the Commission discussed that one registrant or one affected entity can contract out with another entity that has to maintain the same records. So that you don't have a requirement where both sides are being forced to maintain the same record.

So in that case if -- to the extent that you're talking about communications between a member of a contract market, or a SEF for that matter, but member of a contract market and the FCM through whom they conduct business, there can be an agreement with the FCM that the FCM will retain those records for the required period.

MR. ANDERSON: I'm talking more in the case of a farmer. A farmer calls up
someone at the elevator, or texts someone at the elevator from the combine and says "Hey, what's December corn doing." And gets a text back that says "Five dollars."

If you're a member of an exchange the way our groups have been interpreting it you had to somehow record and make available that text. Whereas if that farmer sends that to a member who is -- or a company who's not a member of an exchange there's no obligation to retain that text on record.

MR. MCGONAGLE: Thanks, I appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. FORTENBERY: Any other comments? Questions?

MR. GALLAGHER: We're not -- the company I work for is not in the same -doesn't have the issue that you have because we're not one of those entities that have to keep track.

But boy let me tell you, when I listen to this conversation something is not
connecting here. Because this is crazy. To expect that the stuff that you were talking about has to be reported.

I can see the point when you are Goldman Sachs and you make a multiple billion dollar transaction that you get it recorded and something shows up so there's a trail.

But when you're talking about a farmer trying to protect their million dollar investment in their farm, or 2 or 3, whatever it ends up being, and they're calling about 4,000 or 5,000 bushels of corn. And you're going to treat them the same way as you're going to treat Goldman Sachs, I think there's a big disconnect between the people that are trying to do what they think is right with the practicality of what happens in the broader agricultural world.

And I really would encourage you to revisit this thing. Because this is a little bit out of control.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Ed, I hear you
but oral recording is exactly -- that's what we did. The farmer doesn't have to record anything.

MR. GALLAGHER: I understand that, but the way these transactions happen is -it's not going to happen in a way where there's -- you know, Goldman Sachs is going to be able to have, pay somebody $\$ 50,000$ to be a clerk sitting at a desk that can always --

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: No, no, we've got to address Scott's issue of this branch issue. And this has been very helpful. All of the issues, Lance's included, all of the issues -- that's because we're friends. But all of the issues are very helpful. And that's what an advisory committee is about, to bring these issues to us. But the farmer doesn't have to record it.

MR. PENNER: Thank you, Chairman. From my standpoint my cooperative representative which is a full-time guy from my cooperative, they have a policy where they
refuse to accept texts as orders anymore for that reason. And they actually even discourage the phone call because they want to have -- they don't want to have to do that. They want you to come in or say, you know, we'll send you a sheet and you will sign this.

So it actually discourages farmers from actually making timely marketing decisions at this point. Because that's the continued feedback.

MR. STRONG: Scott, do you have any global issues?

MR. CORDES: Not at this point I don't. Our firm is not stretched far enough outside the U.S. borders to be an issue yet. But I'm sure there's probably other ones that do.

MS. PRESTON: I have a question here. And I know some of our members are affected by this but I have not paid detailed attention to this.

It sounds like the Commission is Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
familiar with some of the technology that maybe the larger players are using, bridge technology. How is that functioning? And is that for incoming and outgoing calls? Or how is that set up?

MR. GRIFFIN: I will admit I am not a technology expert. So when I mentioned those things I'm basically passing along feedback that we have received from operations folks, technological experts either internally here or at some of the affected firms.

I'm not entirely certain how from a systems setup standpoint that would be constructed. But we'd be happy to talk with you further about that.

MS. PRESTON: Thanks. Yes, I mean I shouldn't do this but I'll think out loud. In terms of incoming calls call forwarding seems to work. And I don't know if the technology is there, is it a problem to record because it's forwarding to a cell phone.

So I guess then the issue might be Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
outgoing calls from a cell phone? Or we just don't have enough information yet?

MR. GRIFFIN: Yes, I think -- I think with those generally if you have an outgoing call if you are, you know, an AP of an FCM and you want to talk with your customer. You are on the road and you want to call that person that would generally involve calling in to the home office and having it then conferenced over to whomever that person is calling. That's my understanding but again I don't profess to be an expert on technology.

MS. PRESTON: And does the recording have to be within the control of the entity that has the recording obligation? Or can it be a third party?

MR. GRIFFIN: How do you mean that?

MS. PRESTON: Looking at the entity that is doing the bridging, that is doing the connectivity between the incoming call. Can that be done through a third party, Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
or does it have to be done through the party that has the recording obligation? MR. GRIFFIN: No, I mean the obligation, and Vince can correct me if I'm wrong, but the recording obligation goes to of course the registrant. But as you'll have with many different functions that are required for a particular registrant they'll contract with a third party vendor to assist in this case with recording and even retaining those oral communications for whatever period of time.

So in that instance it may not -I mean when I said earlier that there are, or we've been told about many off-the-shelf applications that are available, when I say that $I$ mean there are -- there isn't a need for affected firms to have to go out and wholly construct from scratch an entirely new system that works for their program and fits within their computers or whatever the case may be. That there are applications out Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc. there.

Because this has been in place in other contexts both domestically and internationally to varying degrees for a little while. And that has allowed the technology to become a bit more mature. And so it makes it -- again, from what we have been told repeatedly, that there are a number of opportunities out there.

But back to the original question who actually does it. I mean, the ultimate responsibility would be on the registrant itself. But if they're relying on a third party vendor to assist in capturing and whatnot $I$ would believe that's perfectly fine.

MR. MCGONAGLE: I agree with Ward.
I was just trying to find it somewhere in the rule release and $I$ haven't been able to come up with it so quickly.

MS. PRESTON: I just want to offer since our members have a lot of data security responsibilities already that if we can be of
assistance please let me know.
MR. GRIFFIN: Appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. FRIESEN: I guess listening to this as a producer and seeing the costs of it. And it's going to get passed down to me. I guess the benefit-cost ratio I would say we don't need it. But that's my opinion. You're asking for it, you got it.

I just don't see the risk-benefit as protecting my interest or the market's interest when you're talking just the small hedger. I don't see it. I can see the Goldman Sachs, some of the big companies, yes. I definitely would want to be recorded making transactions like that. But on our small scale $I$ don't see that it's ever going to be used. I don't see a need for it.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Vince or Ward, do you want to comment on the costbenefit analysis that we did on the rule? To respond to his question. What level of
granularity did we take this?
MR. MCGONAGLE: I'll start then. Ward's reading. He can jump in.

So the cost-benefit analysis outlined what we understood to be some typical costs. For example, commenters estimated that for a producer that's using one cloud-based solution monthly fees would be about $\$ 90$ a month for mobile phones and approximately $\$ 50$ a month for line and land lines.

So we have for a few pages in the cost-benefit analysis some level of granularity about what we understood from the community on these off-the-shelf software programs, about what they anticipated expenditures could be.

I haven't heard anything today from the users about what costs associated they've seen. But I would certainly be interested in hearing that.

MR. GRIFFIN: Yes, there's a measure of granularity in terms of some of the

Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
202-234-4433
numbers. But I mean beyond that, beyond what Vince said I don't have anything to add.

MR. GALLAGHER: Could you guys share who you looked at? So the cloud technology for $\$ 90$ a month and some of the others. Would it be possible to share what company's technology you looked at?

MR. MCGONAGLE: Yes. The rule that's available outlines who the entities were and the comment letters that they submitted that had those costs.

In looking at the costs. I'm going by footnotes. Starting around footnote 91 is where you're going to see in the costbenefit analysis the cross reference to what we were seeing or what we were hearing from the community about potential costs for implementing an audio taping system.

MR. GRIFFIN: And in that particular area, and again, I can't -- I don't have their letter here in front of me, but the footnotes to which Vince is referring is a
comment letter we received from a company called Compliant Phones where they provided some information on these particular issues.

I should stress in terms of not just that particular comment letter but all the comment letters there is still a comment file that's very much available on the Commission's website.

If you go onto the Federal
Register final rules page and you pull this up. This again was from December 21, 2012. There's a link to the comment file that will have that comment letter as well as all the others that the Commission received.

MR. MILLER: Again, just listening to the various issues it's not one that from my perspective I deal with directly. I use an online app and I trade directly. I don't go through -- I don't make any calls unless somebody's website goes down.

But the challenge is I think there are a number of people that do. And to the
extent that a rule, particularly a recording rule is changing the dynamics in the countryside of who can accept text and email communications versus who can't accept them, and decisions being made, there's a competitive structure that starts being influenced.

It really becomes a market access issue that ultimately falls to the farmer, that in particular areas I may lose the ability to have market access by the means of communication not because $I$ chose it. So it wasn't protecting me as a farmer. It's because costs that are deemed by somebody at some point not to be worth the benefit for whatever their customer base is. And you lose a communications technology advantage that is an advantage that is very good at the farm level.

I can tell you there are a number of places on my farm where $I$ have texting capability where $I$ do not have voice capability. I can't maintain a signal well
enough to do a call but $I$ can do a text because the text either goes through or it doesn't go through. And those places vary as you go across the field.

And so I guess I would just point out that the rule is having implications and we're hearing that out in the countryside that are totally unintended consequences of this rule. And would encourage the Commission to take a look at whether it's solving some of the branch office issues, but also some of the issues of -- my guess is there are less direct FCMs that are willing to deal with farmers because of this. And so the options of market access through whatever competitive measures are being unduly influenced by the rule.

MR. FORTENBERY: Any additional
comments?
MR. ANDERSON: One quick one. You mentioned the cost $\$ 90$ to $\$ 50$ a month. Was there -- in that same spot, you know, footnote 91, does it start talking about the benefits
value you guys placed on it as well?
MR. GRIFFIN: The benefits weren't quantified in terms of a dollar amount. I mean, it's I'm sure you can imagine pretty difficult to put a dollar figure on market integrity and preventing fraud and manipulation, things like that.

There's a great deal of discussion on the costs and to the extent that we were given some specific number figures of course they were very much put in and considered. In terms of the benefits there's a great deal of discussion on that as well.

MR. PENNER: Scott, $I$ have a question for you. In terms of your office that you handle orders from all your agents, if you utilized this technology would you not be covering the required percentage of calls and orders that would satisfy the amount of the volume of trades that would actually may be called into question at some future time?

You know, there's a threshold.

You know, materiality is an accounting concept. There's a threshold that you could stand.

MR. CORDES: Yes, I think you're getting to what's the size and scale. And the way it's written today you've got to record everything. The majority of our volume is handled at the home office and probably the two or three other offices kind of thing.

And I would also caution as you talk about the cost economic benefit, you can talk $\$ 90$ per month per cell phone. Well, it doesn't sound like much. Well, now you're pushing \$1,000 a year. If you've got 20 employees and just in case you take a phone call on the way home, you've now got $\$ 20,000$ a year. I mean it starts to add up in a hurry. You know, monthly charges don't look like a lot but they multiply fast.

MR. FRIESEN: Down the road if I have an app for my phone where $I$ can enter trades in I imagine there's an electronic
tracking of that since it is a trade. So, I mean, as I see technology coming, I mean I already on my home computer do all my own hedging through a program that the broker gives me.

So I mean, it makes it very simple and $I$ can see it being an app on a phone pretty quick. And so is all of this kind of a moot point if down the road I guess we can all just enter it in from our phone and do these transactions and we're done?

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Curt, I'll react this way. I think you're absolutely right. I think that whether it's Globex at CME or whatever that platform is at ICE or elsewhere that they have -- I mean a farmer sitting on their tractor in Iowa can use an app probably even today to do that transaction. And then there is an audit trail over at the Exchange.

And in most large offices -- this branch issue is an important one -- but most
large offices people are already voice recording possibly just to protect the FCM against some customer who says well, I don't know what trade you're talking about. They might have been recording it just for their own risk profiles. Yes, to protect against the amnesia trade.

So we weren't trying to pile on or do anything like that. Just trying to capture the audit trail that's already there. I do understand, you know, when you have one-person offices maybe we've got to address something.

And the text messaging and so forth is just a variation on the apps. To have the -- not the farmer but the firms keep an audit trail and not try to change it that the farmer can use whatever means to hedge their risk is ultimately -- that's what these markets are for. They're for commercial enterprises, whether they be farmers and ranchers, the millers and so forth, or even just a local bank and so forth to hedge their
risk, lock in a price, focus on what they do well which is innovate and produce services and goods in our economy.

MR. FRIESEN: I checked with my local elevator quick while we're here and they had estimated their cost at $\$ 20,000$ per location. Don't know what kind of technology they're looking at.

MR. FORTENBERY: Ward, Vince, Scott, thank you very much for your -- oh yes, go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. DIERKS: Actually more of a comment. And I guess -- and I think, Chairman Gensler, I thought your comments about making sense out of this is really good. Thanks for that. I mean half-person offices, how do you make it?

But actually I think for everybody in this room the reality of it is given the charge that CFTC's been given over the last few years and the scale of things, $I$ think the real charge for the people in this room is how
the CFTC goes through.
Because how -- what kind of exceptions do you make for agriculture? Given your futures in the Globex or the scale of the markets and the scale of the responsibility CFTC has. And I think that - - is that not going to be the ongoing challenge that it's easy for us in agriculture sometimes to say we need to be -- and for good reason we need to be carved out.

Because there are some real issues that if our food and fiber system is going to continue to produce and manage risk we have to do it kind of in a way that works with them. At the same time we have to have integrity of markets because I think we're still suffering at least in our industry from the two events that shall not be named on trust of the marketplace.

And I think it's very -- I
congratulate you on recognizing that there are some fundamental things on the ground that,
kind of, why do we spend this much money when it doesn't generate it.

But to David's point, there are issues of marketplace access that can change the structure of agriculture depending on can you manage your risk or not. And I guess, I don't know, that's how I see the world.

I want to congratulate you, I'm glad you had this meeting. It's too bad we haven't had one for 2 years.

Because I'd also, the last parting comment I'd like to make is the fact that $I$ think this group can serve as an advocate to the customers and the users of the marketplace when we do get unusual events that happen to help share information so that we don't -- so we can retain trust in the system.

I know we use -- because the hog business, we use the CME. But when we had our events of the fall of 2011 we had a lot of communication with the markets just to say give us information because we've got
producers out here with pitchforks and torches.

And I think in the future if there is an unexpected event $I$ would suggest that you touch on this group to help share information. Because I think it can be a benefit to help keep the marketplace -- keep the integrity of the marketplace. Realizing you guys are trying to do a hard job and keep it all in place. So excuse me for my longwinded comments but I wanted to get that in before the end.

I'd also suggest the panel on the consumer protection, I would suggest you put that on the agenda next time because I think there's some issues that didn't get talked about here that could have been talked about that I think would have been beneficial. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Thank you. And maybe this is the opportunity to thank Randy for conducting. You run a sharp gavel so it's
helpful. But to really elicit your advice and comments I think all of us at the Commission, staff and Commissioners alike benefit from your input, whether it's in the formal setting here which we should do more regularly as you said, or if it's directly to us.

Please do not be strangers. We need your advice and counsel. And we need it particularly because as you said, as Neil said, so much of what we're doing now relates to markets like the interest rate swap market and the credit derivative markets which are vast, are truly systemic in size.

But the agricultural interests of hedging risk for the farmer, for the miller, for the producer, rancher are critical. And it's also our origin. That's what we are. We started in the Department of Agriculture. But that's really what this agency is about.

And Mike Dunn's here trying to see if this city kid can say the right things. And he'll tell me afterwards what I missed.

But it really is our culture. So please keep the advice coming.

And we'll take up the issues on the customer protection, this voice recording, the Dodd-Frank implementation and even these RIN markets, but other topics as they come, please. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Thank you to Professor FORTENBERY and our staff for organizing this. And especially thank you to all the participants and your associations that have contributed thus far to our rulemakings. Thank you for your participation here. This was very helpful. Thanks.

MR. FORTENBERY: Okay, we've about reached the end of the day. Thanks very much to Chairman Gensler for sponsoring this Committee.

I realize that $I$ had to cut us off a little early on the customer protection discussion. I apologize for that. I apologize to Vince and anybody else whose name

I messed up this afternoon. I sometimes talk faster than $I$ read and it doesn't always end up well.

And I thank all of you for coming. I know it's a big time commitment, long travel for some people. Thanks very much for participating. I hope you got some value out of it as well as the CFTC staff and Commissioners.

I will appreciate any input you might have on future meeting topics including the customer protection issue. And we will be communicating with you on the most effective way to let us know, provide additional input and let us know what kind of topics and issues you think should be at the -- on the forefront the next time we meet.

So at this point I'm going to adjourn the meeting. Oh yes, sorry.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Randy, can I just suggest if you all can give Randy some sense if we were to meet -- rather than
waiting 2 years but say in 6 months or something. And just, obviously we can meet sooner if there's a need. But just to figure out some dates. So rather than waiting a long time to put something on the schedule, let's get something on the schedule.

COMMISSIONER O'MALIA: Mr. Chairman, I try to conduct a TAC meeting on a quarterly basis. So if that's any standard. Once a quarter.

CHAIRMAN GENSLER: Commissioner O'Malia always setting very high standards.

MR. FORTENBERY: I guess I'm not quite sure what our options are. Do we know? Okay. We'll be in touch about that. So you might think about what the optimal time frame is. Is that acceptable? Okay.

So at this point I'm going to adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much for your time and your input and safe travels.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter adjourned at 2:19 p.m.)
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| 157:21 158:10 | 209:20 211:12 | 18-digit 114:17 | 25-30 194:7 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 159:20 176:3 | 0 | $183114: 9$ |  | 70 4:12 119:15 |
| 194:5,7 214:21 |  | 19 19:20 26:13,20 | 3 | 2:3 |
| 216:10 221:1 | 0.75 118:13 |  | 3 69:21 83:3 87:2,5 |  |
| yesterday 72:7 | 09 192:16 | 2 | 87:7 88:13 99:1 | 8 |
| 111:15 |  | $228: 2$ 91:4 170:3 | 106:8 168:22 | 80 51:2 119:2 141:5 |
| Yonkers 2:12 | 1 | 176:3 197:10 | 170:2 197:10 | 85 117:19 139:5 |
| 15:15,15 | 119:15 170:3 174:8 | 216:10 221:1 | 3-day 85:13 106:2 |  |
| young 133:2 135:4 | 1,000 85:1 <br> 1,500 50:12 | $2.6131: 9$ | 3-year 175:11 | 9 |
|  | 1,500 50:12 | 2:19 221:22 | 30 57:20,22 61:14 | 953:22 64:4 |
| Z | $1.31148: 5$ | 20 114:5 116:10,21 | 82:14 93:14 | 9:30 1:13 |
| zero 117:3 | 1.35 4:17 148:2,6 | 117:10 119:1 | 116:14 | 9:315:2 |
| \$ | 150:8 155:8 192:6 | 131:3 137:9 | 30-35 88:21 | 90 29:5,6 31:7 |
|  |  | 170:17 189:16 | 31 4:8 | 70:14 117:6 |
| \$1 11:5 86:1 141:6 | 1.35(a) 149:15 | 211:14 | 36th 5:4 | 140:14 141:5 |
| \$1,000 211:14 | 174:7 | $200141: 8$ | 360 51:21 | 91 206:14 209:22 |
| \$1.10 117:7 | 1:00 146:9 | 2004 114:2 | 38-digit 129:14 |  |
| \$1.20 139:4 | 1:06 146:13 | 2005 116:21 |  |  |
| \$1.40 117:4 123:19 | 10 20:5 112:3 | 2006 116:8 | 4 |  |
| 140:16 | 113:14 115:19 | 2007 114:3 | 4,000 164:20 |  |
| \$1.50 143:6 | 126:9 131:11 | 2009 158:11 191:21 | 197:12 |  |
| \$10,000 105:9 | 136:17 183:9 | 193:16 | 43 18:17 19:1 |  |
| \$100 91:11 95:1,3,4 | 10:14 47:9 | 2010 129:12 133:4 | $4518: 16$ 19:1 20:9 |  |
| 101:6,6,13,16 | 10:30 47:2,10 | 2011 18:16 133:4 | 21:8 22:16 |  |
| \$120 95:7 100:8,9 | 100 99:7 131:13 | 136:16,17 216:20 | 46 18:17 |  |
| 101:4,21,22 | 164:20 | 2011-2012 55:15 | 48 4:9 |  |
| 106:19 | 11 4:3 114:11 | 2012 18:17 57:6,12 |  |  |
| \$2 10:15 53:17 | 112 4:14 | 123:13 131:10,17 | $5$ |  |
| 85:22 | 1155 1:13 | 136:18,21 137:1,2 | 5 28:2 40:18 103:12 |  |
| \$20 95:9 96:9,21 | 12 4:4 | 137:4,9 148:3 | 131:11 |  |
| 97:8 98:14,14 | 12:08 146:12 | 149:19 207:11 | 5's 144:20 |  |
| 101:8,9,14 | 120 28:14 | 2013 1:8 50:6,12 | 5,000 189:19 |  |
| \$20,000 164:19 | 121 4:14 | 51:1 126:18 134:7 | 197:12 |  |
| 211:16 214:6 | 125 56:3,12 | 136:20 137:1,3,10 | 50 25:15 140:5 |  |
| \$200 10:9 11:4 91:7 | 135 4:15 | 155:9 156:6,13 | 55 4:10 |  |
| 91:11 95:3,8,15 | 1457:12 | 2014 127:16 137:6 | 6 |  |
| \$250,000 164:18 | 147 4:18 | 137:10 | 64:2 68:14 144:20 |  |
| \$26 46:8 | 15 47:1,5 54:1 | 2015 137:11 | $221: 1$ |  |
| \$300 10:22 | 60:21 64:4 117:18 | 21 148:3 155:9 | \| 6-7 74:18 |  |
| \$5 106:20 175:10 | 170:17 171:1 | 156:6,12 207:11 | $60 \text { 25:15 169:10 }$ |  |
| \$5,000 105:8 | 183:9 | 21st 1:13 177:19 |  |  |
| 164:18 | 15,000 50:7 | 191:22 | 60-some 176:22 |  |
| \$50 205:9 209:20 | $1574: 18$ | 217 4:22 | 60-70 123:16 |  |
| \$50,000 198:8 | $16.5114: 7$ | $23.202149: 17$ | \| 60-70 123:16 $61 \text { 169:3 }$ |  |
| \$600 117:12 | 162 4:19 | 155:5 | $\text { \| } 61 \text { 169:3 }$ |  |
| \$80 95:6 96:8 | 168 4:20 | 25 1:850:20 76:9 | $64 \text { 163:22 168:20 }$ |  |
| \$800 117:12 $\mathbf{\$ 9 0}$ 205:8 206:5 | 17 4:6 | 111:15 131:3 | 64 163:22 168:20 |  |
| \$90 205:8 206:5 | 18 4:6 18:22 |  |  |  |
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